# Case

### Consequentialism

### Extn first

### Anthro

#### 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/wind bad

If we win wind/solar= bad for the environemt= a contestation to the idea that it causes a mindset shift in our relationship to the earth- creates insidious violence

#### Extend Sazark ev- overfilling steeping, scraping destroys wildlife habitats-

#### 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.

#### Wind power kills the environment: produces hazardous emissions increasing likelihood of warming, kills ecosystems, interferes with habitats, kills birds, deteriorates landscapes and destroys habitats.

Abbasi and Abasi 12

(Tasneem and S.A., Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology, “Is the Use of Renewable Energy Sources an Answer to the Problems of Global Warming and Pollution?” 2012, Taylor and Francis//wyo-mm)

Based on an LCA, Ardente et al. (2008) concluded that the largest environmental impacts caused by a wind farm are mainly due to wind turbines and building works. These impacts principally consist of air emissions, inert solid wastes, and small quantities of hazardous exhausted oils and lubricants. But there are several other impacts associated with wind energy that are beginning to acquire increasing poignancy with the increasing numbers and sizes of wind farms across the world. For example, wind generators interfere with habitats and cause noise pollution, aesthetic degradation, and interference with bird flight. It is feared that large-scale generation of electricity through windmills can reduce wind speeds and cause stress to ecosystems. Lakes that are downwind from the windmills may become warmer because of reduced evaporation from their surface. Soil moisture may also increase. In some situations, especially in developed countries, deterioration of landscape value due to installation of wind energy turbines is becoming a serious and contentious issue (Wolsink, 2007). At times it can deteriorate into stalemates and it has been suggested that attempts should be made to shift wind energy generation offshore (Söderholm et al., 2007). But that may entail serious environmental implications of its own. For example, an LCA of offshore and floating offshore wind turbines in comparison to natural gas–based electricity generation systems by Weinzettel et al. (2009) revealed that in comparison to the natural gas–based power plant, the offshore/floating wind–based power plants are worse in terms of human, water, and terrestrial ecotoxicity by 2–5.6 times, even as the latter are better than former in terms of global warming potential, photochemical oxidation, acidification, and eutrophication. The impacts on marine ecosystems may be negative as well as positive, but little is known about the extents of either and it is not possible to say to which side the balance would tilt (Inger et al., 2009). Nevertheless, by and large, the impacts of wind energy are not of great consequence except in certain sensitive areas and wind may prove to be a more ecologically benign source of energy for electricity production than most other options. All over the world, initiatives are being taken to enhance energy generation by wind power (Ardente et al., 2008; Araujo et al., 2008; Fadai, 2007; Himri et al., 2009; Ramesh, 2007; Sheble, 2009). In the state of Tamil Nadu, India, which is one of India's leading states in terms of wind energy utilization, up to 16% of the state's electricity production is now wind based (Subramanian, 2009). A few of the impacts associated with wind energy technology are discussed subsequently.

# CP

CP s’s 100% of the case- two internals

1. Wind and solar are a technology that shifts our mindset simply due to their use/aesthetics of them as a resource- they have no argument as to why a federal reorientation to this relationship is key
2. Wind/solar tech forces us into peak oil- no federal key warrant in this ev

#### [--] Extend EPA 2006 – States have success in *coordinated* financial incentives for renewable energy production and can pull funding from a variety of areas

#### [--] Solves federal key arguments because it ‘jump-starts’ private and federal investments with even small incentives.

#### Uniform action on energy policy through the States solves case better—accesses both uniform mandates and flexible adaptation

Energy Report 2001

[staff, v. 29, n. 33, August 13, p. lexis //mac-tjc]

The governors of all 50 states last week agreed to adopt a new energy policy, recognizing the need for new supplies as well as improved conservation. The National Governors Association, at its annual meeting in Providence, R.I., adopted the new policy in an effort to keep up with the massive changes in the energy industry, and following recent spikes in gasoline, home heating and natural gas prices. The new energy policy is the first major change in a decade to the governors' policy. "The policy sends a clear message that solving our nation's energy problems demand more conservation, especially utilizing renewable fuels like ethanol," said Iowa Gov. Thomas Vilsack, the Democrat chairman of the NGA Committee on Natural Resources, which drafted the new policy. "Our goal should always be to assure American families and businesses their energy prices will be stable." The new policy recognizes that energy and environmental challenges facing the United States, such as periodic shortages in oil, gas and electricity, cause hardship for consumers and businesses, harm the economy and can harm national security. "The United States' dependence on foreign sources of oil is at an all-time high while demand for energy continues to rise," said Oklahoma Gov. Frank Keating, a Republican. "Energy issues must be addressed nationally but state and local authority over energy and environmental matters also needs to be maintained. It would be a mistake to develop a national energy policy without full cooperation and partnership with the states and their governors." The policy recognizes that "demand for energy will continue to grow, however. Simultaneously, energy efficiency is projected to continue to improve. "Yet even with more conservation, innovation, and new technology, the United States will need more energy supplies," the NGA policy states. North Dakota Gov. John Hoeven, a Republican, added: "We must expand and upgrade the transmission networks to move energy from the source to the consumer. Improving energy transmission will impact conservation, efficiency and supply." The governors and Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham last week agreed to launch a two-year project aimed at culling together recommendations for new policies applying to generation, transmission and the development of regional electricity markets (see story below). The governors made it clear, however, that states - not the federal government - should play a lead role in shaping energy policy. "Energy issues must be addressed nationally, while still recognizing state and local authority over environmental and energy matters," the policy statement said. "The solution to the need for energy will require increased conservation and energy efficiency as well as exploration of new energy supplies, including environmentally responsible development of traditional sources and greater reliance on alternative and renewable sources. We also must continue the trend of reducing emissions associated with energy production."

#### States better for individual engagement – national politics are beholden to fossil fuel lobbies and disregard INDIVIDUALS. We’re a better platform for ADVOCACY

Byrne, 8

Byrne, et al., 2008.

In Peter Droege eds. Urban Energy Transition: From Fossil Fuels to Renewable Power.

Oxford, UK: Elsevier Pps.27-53.

Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Established in 1980 at the University of Delaware, the Center is a leading institution for interdisciplinary graduate education, research, and advocacy in energy and environmental policy. CEEP is led by Dr. John Byrne, Distinguished Professor of Energy & Climate Policy at the University. For his contributions to Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) since 1992, he shares the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize with the Panel's authors and review editors.

The political momentum built in US cities, states and regions to initiate climate mitigation and related efforts is to be contrasted with inaction by the US national government in addressing the climate challenge. Support for climate protection can be found in polling of Americans which points to 83% support among the country's citizens for greater national leadership in addressing climate change, and even deeper support for state and community action to address climate concerns (Opinion Research Corporation 2006). If the American people appear to support such initiatives, the question becomes why are states, cities and regions leading the way, rather than the national government? US national politics has for decades exhibited a troubling amenability to the interests of fossil fuel and automaker lobbies (Leggett 2001; Public Citizen 2005; NRDC 2001). A recent example of this influence can be found in the history of the National Energy Policy Development Group, which took input 'principally' from actors associated with such interests (US General Accounting Office (GAO) 2003). At the same time, the national administration has been noted for the presence of individuals with backgrounds in the auto, mining, natural gas, electric, and oil industries, in positions at the White House, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Departments, respectively, of Energy, Commerce, and the Interior (Bogardus, 2004; Drew and Oppel Jr 2004; NRDC, 2001). State-level politics may be able to obviate this influence through their efforts to allow a more direct citizen influence upon decision making. For example, 23 states permit citizens to petition for a direct vote (Initiative and Referendum Institute 2007), a strategy that has helped ensure the advancement of environmentally minded initiatives within states in recent years, such as the State of Washington's enactment by ballot of an RPS proposal in 2006 (Initiative and Referendum Institute 2007).

### 2NC Solvency – Vertical Diffusion

#### States action causes federal adoption means we solve 100% of case and don’t link to federal action key solvency deficits

#### -- Vertical policy diffusion – prefer this evidence it is specific to incentives and energy policy

Roberta Mann, Professor and Dean’s Distinguished Faculty Fellow, University of Oregon School of Law, “BUSINESS LAW FORUM TAXATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT: FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAX POLICIES FOR CLIMATE CHANGE: COORDINATION OR CROSS-PURPOSE?”, Lewis and Clark Law Review, Summer 2011. 15 Lewis & Clark L. Rev. 369

Several groups of researchers have examined the potential interactions between federal and state climate policies. n54 Andrew Aulisi [\*377] and other researchers from the World Resources Institute examined case studies to determine when leading state policies would "vertically diffuse" and be adopted by the national government. n55 The most significant factors for successful vertical policy diffusion were the push for diffusion by state champions, policy learning by example and innovation, and the spillover effect. n56 State officials may press for federal adoption of their policies because those policies may fail without expansion to the national level, due to "competition with other states with conflicting policies or weaker commitments to the policy goal." n57 State policies may demonstrate that a policy can be implemented and be effective. The spillover effect is "the extent to which the perceived benefits and costs of state policies cross over state lines to other states" or the nation. n58 The results of vertical diffusion may be full or partial preemption of the issue by the federal government, issuance of grants or incentives by the federal government to the states to perpetuate the activity, or federal mandates, with or without funding. n59 The researchers concluded that the RGGI cap-and-trade program contained all the significant vertical diffusion factors, including the somewhat less significant factor of business support for federal action. n60 The researchers predicted that the federal government is "likely to use partial preemption to respond to the RGGI ... standards." n61 The House-passed climate change bill (ACES) would have fully preempted existing regional cap-and-trade programs. n62 The choice of full preemption in the legislation may have been driven by the concerns of business constituents. Business interests have considerable influence on policymaking in the United States. n63 Business support for federal action is motivated by the desire for uniform standards, which enables businesses to avoid a patchwork of varying state rules that would increase compliance costs and create competitive advantages. n64

#### -- It will be taken up quickly

Paul L. Posner, Professor and director of the Master's in Public Administration program. He came to George Mason after serving as Director of Federal Budget and Intergovernmental Relations at the Government Accountability Office. He received his PhD from Columbia University., “Climate Change and the States: The Politics of Policy Expansion”, Paper Delivered at the Midwest Political Science Association Meeting in Chicago, 2009

Over a century later, Louis Brandeis observed that states are the “laboratories of democracy”, building a record of policy innovation that can be tapped by national officials when the time is ripe. 9 Our federal system has played this role over the years. The constitutional responsibilities for providing education, public health and safety, among other basic domestic services, ensures that states and local governments will often address emerging public issues and problems in their formative stages. John Teaford argues that states have played the role of policy incubators as far back as the 19 th Century, hatching reforms in child labor, public assistance and workman’s compensation that were later nationalized during the Progressive Movement and the New Deal. 10 Trends in Vertical Diffusion It can be argued that the role of the states as policy incubators has intensified in recent years. The growth of state policy and governance capacity has prompted greater policy activism. Over the past 50 years, structural and political reforms such as reapportionment of legislatures, the growth of professional staffs and enhanced revenue systems have transformed states from the “horse and buggy era” of American government to the workhorses of our federal system. Throwing off the yoke of segregation that clouded their national policy legitimacy, states became more responsive to a broader range of groups and interests, that found their way to state capitols. As states became more critical players in implementing the growing array of federal domestic programs, national advocacy groups joined the ranks of business and other traditional interest groups in organizing a state presence. 11 Thanks to many of these changes, ambitious state political leaders have become policy activists, often competing with one another to champion early adoption of many emerging policy ideas, whether it be nonsmoking ordinances, stricter alcohol driving regulations or more ambitious work requirements for welfare programs. The national adoption of state initiatives results from both state push and national pull,. While states have become more fertile sources of policy innovation, shifts in national political institutions have ensured that these state ideas will gain national attention more quickly than ever before. Fundamental changes in our party system have converted national political officials from being ambassadors of state and local party officials to become independent political entrepreneurs anxious to establish their own visible policy profiles to appeal for financing and votes from a diverse coalition of interests, media and voters. In a nation with a “24-7” news cycle focused on Washington, a more diverse and aggressive media is likely to report and analyze states policies and place these issues more readily on the policy agendas of national leaders. More assertive and diverse national interest groups and policy entrepreneurs stand at the ready to capitalize on states’ innovations to promote the national adoption of policies. State initiatives are often used to illustrate that the new policies are (1) feasible , (2) effective and (3) popular. Moreover, state policy initiatives trigger the deployment of powerful equity arguments – as more states adopt a policy, the failure of all states to adopt the policy comes to be viewed as promoting inequitable treatment of citizens, businesses or other entities solely based on their state of residence. At some point, the states’ policy initiatives reach a “tipping point” where the policy benefits are perceived to constitute a national minimum standard or even entitlement. In this kind of system, state policy innovations are not as much cause for celebration as for alarm by advocates seeking to nationalize policy and by opponents such as the business community seeking to slow the pace of policy innovation.

#### -- States are first-movers

Franz T. Litz, Esq., Senior Fellow at world resource institute, “toward a constructive dialogue on federal and state roles in u.s. climate change policy”, World Resource Institute, June 2008

A number of arguments exist to support state-level action on climate change. States have historically played a role as effective first-movers on important environmental issues, functioning as policy innovators, testing policies that have later been adopted at the federal level. States also bring an understanding of the unique circumstances within their boundaries and a familiarity with their stakeholders. States drive federal action, sometimes insisting that policies be strengthened even after the federal government has acted.

#### States create federal follow on

**Dutzik, 11** - senior policy analyst with Frontier Group, specializing in energy, transportation and climate policy (Tony, “The Way Forward on Global Warming Reducing Carbon Pollution Today and Restoring Momentum for Tomorrow by Promoting Clean Energy”, <http://www.environmentamerica.org/sites/environment/files/reports/The-Way-Forward-on-Global-Warming.pdf>)

Over the past several years, vast resources have been devoted to winning comprehensive energy and climate legislation at the federal level, and for good reason— comprehensive federal legislation will be necessary to produce the emission reductions needed to put America and the world on track to prevent the worst impacts of global warming.

There are, however, countless additional opportunities to reduce emissions using existing federal statutes as well as the opportunities presented by action at state and local levels of government.

In this report, we estimate the potential impacts of 30 public policies, measures and initiatives to reduce global warming pollution, most of which can be adopted at the state level. With 50 states, that makes more than 1,000 potential opportunities to reduce global warming pollution.

State and local action on global warming is not a “second-best” solution to the climate crisis. Indeed, time and again, ambitious public policy action at the local or state level has created a precedent for strong action at the federal level. Moreover, as described below, state and local campaigns can involve and engage citizens in ways that federal legislative campaigns cannot. Under the right conditions, these policies can not only deliver concrete emission reductions, but they can also spur changes in infrastructure and transform economic conditions in ways that will make the goals of an eventual national program easier to meet.

#### States are key to renewable transition

Rosalind Jackson, Press Contact for Network for New Energy Choices, “More States Make the Grade on renewable policies for American energy Consumers according to 5th Annual Report Card”, NNEC October 20, 2011

New York – October 20, 2011 - Renewable energy advocates today released the 2011 Edition of Freeing the Grid, a policy guide that grades all 50 states on two key programs: net metering and interconnection procedures. Together these policies empower energy customers to use rooftop solar and other small-scale renewables to meet their own electricity needs. Now in its fifth year of publication, the report shows that states nationwide are continuing to embrace best practices and drive further improvements in these core renewable energy policies. The report’s methodology was also adopted for use in the U.S. Department of Energy’s SunShot initiative, which aims to reduce the cost of going solar by 75% before the end of the decade. “It is clear that our nation’s states can and will continue their proud role as the growth drivers of America’s new energy economy. Renewable energy has strong support from state policymakers and the citizens they serve. That support is not restricted to any particular party affiliation or geographic location. It is bi-partisan, it is pervasive, and it is no surprise. If there’s one thing Americans in all our diversity can agree on, it’s that we can do better with our energy choices. Freeing the Grid outlines a better path forward,” said Adam Browning, Executive Director of Vote Solar. Freeing the Grid 2011 report highlights: • Net Metering Policies: Commonly known as the policy that lets a customer’s electric meter spin backwards, net metering is a simple billing arrangement that ensures solar customers receive fair credit for the electricity their systems generate during daytime hours. Net metering best practices have evolved to include virtual net metering, meter aggregation and other innovative community solar models that allow energy consumers to come together and take advantage of economies of scale when investing in clean energy. In 2011, 17 states received top “A” grades for their net metering policies, up from 15 in 2010 and only 5 in 2007. • Interconnection Procedures: Interconnection procedures are the rules and processes that an energy customer must follow to be able to “plug” their renewable energy system into the electricity grid. In some cases, the interconnection process is so lengthy, arduous and/or expensive that it thwarts the development of clean energy altogether. In recent years, many states have been working to streamline interconnection. In 2011, 23 states received “A” or “B” grades for good interconnection practices, up from twenty in 2010, and a tremendous improvement over the single “B” grade awarded in 2007. • Head of the Class: Massachusetts and Utah received top “A” grades in both policy categories for the second year in a row. In 2011 they are joined at the vanguard of best practices by Delaware, which made particularly impressive improvements to its interconnection practices from last year’s “F” grade. • Shows Promise: A number of states received an “A” in one category and a “B” in the other making them strong distributed renewable energy markets that have continued room for improvement: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, New Jersey, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia. • Most Improved: Indiana made impressive year-over-year improvements, from a “D” in net metering and “C” in interconnection in 2010 to solid “B”s in both categories this year. “The age of grid parity is upon us—in some places in the country, you can generate your own electricity with solar and wind more cheaply than buying dirty power from your utility. It’s truly the democratization of energy, but it only works if you have access to the plug and if you get fair credit for generation. Poor interconnection and net metering policies can stand in the way of building a sustainable, growth industry. Ensuring that residents and business have fair access to the grid and get fair credit on their utility bills are two simple but highly effective ways to unleash renewable energy growth,” said Kyle Rabin, Director of NNEC. “Renewable power has the ability to jointly address three of the most pressing issues facing our country today: the economy, energy and the environment. Given all that’s at stake, all 50 states should be making the grade. I encourage state policymakers and renewable advocates to explore Freeing the Grid and apply the lessons therein to improving these important energy policies in their own states,” said Joseph Wiedman, representing the Interstate Renewable Energy Council (IREC). “We produce Freeing the Grid each year to reflect current best practices in this dynamic policy arena and give state leaders a clear blueprint for renewable energy success. We are particularly proud to have had our 2011 guidelines used in the grant review process of the DOE’s new SunShot Program, an initiative to significantly reduce the cost of going solar in states and communities nationwide. With these policies, states have the tools they need to help make renewable energy cost-effective,” Laurel Varnado, Policy Analyst with the North Carolina Solar Center.

### 2NC AT: Perm – Do Both

#### [ ] Still links to federal government action disads.

#### [ ] Federal action stifles state action in anticipation

Barry Rabe, Prof Public Policy @ U. of Michigan, “Contested Federalism and American Climate Policy”, Publlius, 2011

The limited scope and uncertain future of new federal climate policy initiatives thus far under contested federalism underscored the reality that much of the American approach to climate policy will in all likelihood continue to be state- and regionally-centered in the coming years. After the surge of sub-federal policy development in the period of state domination, states began to slow their efforts, in large part due to anticipated federal action on a large scale. The collapse of Congressional deliberation on major legislation returned much of the lead in climate governance to states. This raised significant questions of implementation, including a series of major challenges and opportunities.

#### Overlap leads to policy failure

Rivlin, 12

(Sr. Fellow-Economic Studies at Brookings & Founding Director of CBO, 6/12, “Rethinking Federalism for More Effective Governance” http://publius.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2012/06/12/publius.pjs028.full?keytype=ref&ijkey=j9keOPmOHj0c2xV)

A bolder approach would be for the federal government to cede some major functions to the states and concentrate on carrying out its remaining national responsibilities more effectively. The case for dividing the governmental job rests partly on efficiency—**lowering the administrative cost of federal state overlap and interaction**. It also rests on the perception that the United States is an extremely diverse country and that many governmental services should be tailored to local conditions. Whether the service is education or housing or transportation, residents of inner city Philadelphia have different needs than those of rural Kansas or coastal Alaska. Governments closer to the scene are better able to assess the needs of citizens and design programs to meet them. It is easier for citizens at the state and local level to be actively involved in what their government does and call officials to account for their performance.

#### [ ] No solvency – duplicate action increases implementation problems and undermines solvency

Christopher K. Leman and Robert H. Nelson, Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C., and Professor of Politics, Brandeis University, , Economics Staff, Office of Policy Analysis, United States Department of the Interior, Summer 1982 (“The Rise of Managerial Federalism” – Environmental Law) p. lexis

When federal policy had limited goals, the hitches and compromises occasioned by intergovernmental bargaining were tolerable; today, however, when more social resources and values are at stake, the costs of joint action are much greater. Efforts to implement intergovernmental programs demonstrate that these programs are prone to disappointing results because of the complexity of joint action and the profusion of opportunities for participants to veto or alter results. The cost of joint action between levels of government may be too high when results are paramount. These views challenge the system of managerial federalism that has emerged since the New Deal. Joint intergovernmental program results may be worse than what either the states or the federal government would produce alone. Is the intergovernmental system, as it is currently conceived, simply unworkable? Would it be better to return to the classical federalism concept with a clear division of responsibilities, with most areas strictly assigned to the states? Or, conceivably, are the states anachronisms that should be replaced by a unified federal system with decentralization taking place through federal administrative regions designed for modern circumstances?

### 2NC AT: Perm – Links to Politics

#### [ ] Permutation doesn’t shield the link -

#### Forces federal government to run political gauntlet

Barry Rabe, Prof Public Policy @ U. of Michigan, “Contested Federalism and American Climate Policy”, Publlius, 2011

In response, federal officials considering policy engagement must weigh how seriously they will consider these collective and individual state claims, given the different ways in which state and local interests are represented in the two chambers of Congress and the significant regional differences in energy production and consumption that are so central to climate policy. In the House, California (with the lowest per capita rate of carbon emissions of any state) has more than fifty times the voting power of Wyoming (with the highest per capita rate of carbon emissions of any state), reflecting their respective populations. But in the Senate, the two states have identical voting power. These realities have long made the intersection of energy and environmental protection among the most contentious in American politics, given varied degrees of economic dependence between states on the extraction of fossil fuels and their use in meeting core energy needs (Lowry 2008). Any emerging federal policy must run this political gauntlet successfully, while also weighing the positions of the states against all other organized interests. Indeed, each interest is likely to prefer its own balance between federal and state authority in any emerging climate policy. This raises the possibility of very distinct policy alternatives, each of which would tilt the intergovernmental system in very different ways.

#### Causes political controversy – 10th amendment issues draws political fire

Set McLaughlin, Washington Times, “Obama, Romney use states’ rights as they see fit”, May 20, 2012. http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/may/20/obama-romney-use-states-rights-as-they-see-fit/print/

Rallying against overreach Tea party activists, constitutional conservatives and libertarians have rallied around the 10th Amendment as a bulwark against government overreach, wielding it in their revolt against the growth of the federal government that started under President George W. Bush and continues under Mr. Obama. The spirit of the 10th Amendment now weaves its way through the daily debates on Capitol Hill and has made its way into the presidential campaign, where Mr. Romney, in particular, touts a message that is wrapped in the notion of federalism and limited government from Washington. "As president, I will make the federal government simpler, smaller, smarter — and, by the way, more in keeping with the vision of the framers of our Constitution," Mr. Romney said last week at a campaign stop in Des Moines, Iowa. He vowed to "move programs to the states" and repeal the president's health care overhaul law, which many conservatives see as trampling on states' rights and prerogatives.

#### It’s legitimate and politics is a net benefit

**Harvard Law Review, 6** – the author isn’t named but the qualifications are: John M. Olin Fellow in Law, Economics, and Business at Harvard Law School (119 Harv. L. Rev. 1855, “STATE COLLECTIVE ACTION\*”, April, lexis)

Consider now the reasons why states may act collectively. In the simplest terms, collective action may be more desirable than individual state action because it opens a panoply of otherwise unavailable policy choices and may be more desirable than federal action because it allocates power to a better-positioned actor. n12 These advantages may exist **[\*1859]** because regional organizations have better information, are better positioned to act on that information, or avoid duplicative costs or coordination problems. n13 Also, collective action may be desirable politically because it may make certain programs either more or less politically salient. n14 Similarly, political actors may want to act collectively because doing so spreads or diversifies political risk. n15 Lastly, collective action may provide opportunities for economies of scale or rent-seeking behavior that states cannot achieve independently. n16

Some brief examples of how states may act collectively illustrate the importance of the topic. n17 As in the stylized examples, states may act collectively to reduce pollution. Groups of states also could develop plans to use common reserves of natural resources, including oil fields or aquifers that cross state lines, or plans to allocate the use of rivers, lakes, forests, or other natural resources. They may also regulate wildlife that lives in multiple states, either to protect that wildlife or to use it for commercial purposes. States may take similar action to regulate or allocate energy or to develop interstate transit infrastructure, such as highways, rail lines, or regional airports. States may regulate the production or distribution of goods or create economic development organizations organized either geographically or by some other trait, such as agricultural or oil and gas production. They also may wish to regulate certain industries or set labor standards in common ways or may wish to regulate products commonly by adopting similar production standards or tort rules. As a final example - although one can imagine many other motivations for state collective action - states may collectivize to provide better social welfare or governmental insurance programs.