## 1NC

### Off

#### Environmental reformism is merely an exercise in blame shifting and assuaging guilt, shielding us from ever having to take responsibility for our own personal complicity in the environmental crisis

**Bobertz, 95** (Bradley, Nebraska Law, Legitimizing Pollution Through Pollution Control Laws: Reflections on Scapegoating Theory, 73 Tex. L. Rev. 711)

A routine pattern in environmental lawmaking is a tendency to blame environmental problems on easily identifiable objects or entities rather than on the social and economic practices that actually produce them. [n17](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n17) Once identified as the culprit of an environmental problem, this blame-holder comes to symbolize and embody the problem itself. Lawmaking then begins to resemble a re-enactment of a scapegoat ritual, in which the community's misfortunes are symbolically transferred to an entity that is then banished or slain in order to cleanse the community of its collective wrongdoing and remove the source of its adversity. The topic of scapegoating is commonly encountered in studies of racism, [n18](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n18) family psychology, [n19](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n19) and mass sociology, [n20](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n20) but is not often associated with law and legal scholarship. Nevertheless, parallels appear to exist between the general scapegoat phenomenon and environmental lawmaking.The term "scapegoat" derives from the guilt offerings ceremony set forth in the biblical book of Leviticus. According to the Levitical  [\*717]  scapegoat ceremony, Aaron placed both hands on the head of a live goat and confessed the sins of the people of Israel. [n21](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n21) Having thereby transferred the collective guilt of the people to the goat, he drove the goat into the desert "to carry off their iniquities to an isolated region." [n22](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n22) This ceremony was to be repeated each year on the Day of Atonement. Other sacrifice rituals, including the "sin offering for the community" [n23](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n23) and the "guilt offerings," [n24](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n24) were to be performed on a periodic basis. Essentially identical, [n25](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n25) these other ceremonies involve the slaying of a young bull as a means for forgiving inadvertent transgressions of the people. [n26](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n26)Other cultures also employ similar sacrifice rituals to expunge evils brought about by the collective misconduct of the community. Beginning with James Frazer's The Golden Bough, [n27](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n27) anthropologists have catalogued a remarkable variety of sacrifice rituals intended to expel collective sin. [n28](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n28) Despite subtle variations in form and emphasis, these ceremonies follow a remarkably similar pattern: the participants view the ritual as a necessary measure for expelling collective wrongdoing, often after some misfortune or calamity has befallen the community. [n29](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n29) Often, both the transference of the community's sins to the scapegoat object and the sacrifice of the object itself are performed by persons having special standing in the community, typically of a religious character. [n30](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n30) [\*718]  While we might view these sacrifice rituals as acts of merely symbolic import, the participants themselves clearly believe the ceremonies accomplish their desired ends. The people of Southern Africa do not place the blood of their sick people on the head of a goat (which is then banished to the veldt) to engage the curiosity of European anthropologists. They simply intend to make sick people well. [n31](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n31) Likewise, the people put to death in Salem were killed because they were thought (proven!) to be witches, not because they were personifications of some other social anxiety. [n32](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n32) To the detached observer, the bizarre and gruesome aspects of the ceremonies may stand out, but the participants do what they do because they believe it will work. [n33](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n33)This Article is not intended to support the notion that the targets of environmental regulation, in one way or another, are "scapegoats" in the common understanding of the term -- deserving of pity and freedom from compliance with environmental laws. Instead, I intend to shed light on a simple but troubling pattern: Environmental legislation is more likely to emerge from the lawmaking process when the problem it seeks to control is readily symbolized by an identifiable object, entity, or person -- a "scapegoat" in the sense discussed above. In the absence of such a scapegoat, however, lawmakers are less likely to take action. This pattern is particularly problematic because the identified scapegoat often bears an incomplete or distorted relationship to the actual problem at hand, resulting in laws that are likewise incomplete or distorted. As discussed below in Part V, because we deal harshly with culturally accepted symbols of environmental problems, it is less likely that we will deal with the problems (and their causes) themselves. For anyone concerned about the correlation between social problems and the legal regimes we create to solve them, this phenomenon should be cause for concern.

#### Additionally, the Affirmative’s production centered focus impoverishes our understanding of the environmental crisis, diminishing our ability to understand and respond to the consumptive practices that create pollution.

Princen, 3 (Thomas, Global Environmental Politics, February)

Research within the economic strands of social science disciplines such as political science, sociology, and anthropology has been preponderantly in the "environmental improvement" category. Pollution control, environmental movements, and environmental organizations are common topics. At the same time that social science has focused on environmental improvement, those who chart biophysical trends say incremental change is not enough. Every time a "state of the environment" report comes out, authors call for a fundamental shift in how humans relate to nature. Some call for global citizenship, others for spiritual awakening. But nearly all call for a drastic overhaul of the current economic system, a system that is inherently and uncontrollably expansionist, that depends on ever-increasing throughput of material and energy, that risks life-support systems for humans and other species. They call, in short, for transformational change, what I have put in the category of sustainability. And, then, the best prescriptions these analysts, who largely are not students of human behavior, come up with are better information, greater efficiencies, more public participation and, for specific measures, new taxes and subsidies -- all classic marginal tinkering. If the social sciences are going to make a contribution that is commensurate with the severity of biophysical trends, it must do better than analyze environmental improvement measures. Social scientists must develop analytic tools for the analyst (biophysical and social alike) and an effective vocabulary for the policy maker and activist that allow, indeed encourage, an escape from well-worn prescriptions that result in marginal change at best. Among those tools are norms and principles consonant with critical environmental threats. To promote alternative normative goals -- e.g., human security through an economy that respects natural limits, an economy that is sensitive to overconsumption -- the focus must change from producing goods (goods are good so more goods must be better) to consumption, not just purchasing, so-called "demand," but to consuming*,* using up, diminishing regenerative capacity, engendering irreversibilities and non-substitutabilities. n3 Global water management illustrates the need for such a focus.

#### Consumption is the root cause of the Affirmative harms and constitutes a systemic harm that not only outweighs the case, but creates the possibility of extinction

Dauvergne, 5 (Peter, “Dying of Consumption: Accidents or Sacrifices of Global Morality?” Global Environmental Politics, August)

Private consumption expenditures are now more than 4 times higher than in 1960. The globalization of ever-more growth and consumption has come, however, at a price: global chains of cause-and-effect that obscure social, environmental and ethical responsibility. The result in practice is a global order that accepts the deaths of millions of young people in dangerous and unhealthy environments as tragic, but largely unavoidable, accidents of economic progress. The history of what most call traffic "accidents" is revealing. The hope at the 1896 inquest into the first "accidental death" was this would never happen again. But hope is not action. Today, traffic injures as many as 50 million and kills over one million people ever year. It is, however, no accident that tragedies like these are "accidents" rather than "sacrifices," as such language softens criticism of the moral, social and ecological crises arising from the current global consumptive order. Tales of the miracles of modern science could fill all of the world's cathedrals. Just four decades ago, to choose a random example, South African surgeon Christiaan Barnard performed the first human heart transplant on Louis Washkansky, turning the tragic death of 25-year old Denise Ann Darvall by a speeding car into what the December 1967 issue of Time magazine called her "great favor to humanity." n1 Who, meeting Mr. Washkansky days later, could dispute the wonders of our collective progress? Yet, in a world where surgeons now routinely transplant hearts, on average 19 children under the age of five still die every minute from preventable and treatable causes -- ticking to a grim total of over 10 million every year. Unhealthy environments aggravate illnesses that kill nearly half of these children each year. n2 Diarrhea alone kills more than one-and-a half million children a year. n3 Each year, millions of people also die violently: in 2000, there were over 800,000 suicides, 500,000 homicides and 300,000 deaths in wars. n4 The biggest cause of violent deaths, however, is the one behind Denise Darvall's favor to humanity: traffic collisions, which kill over one million people a year. . Why, with so many medical and technical advances over the last few decades, do so many people still die prematurely? Is it genetic fate? Or bad luck? No doubt some of these deaths are beyond our control, a simple result of living. Far too often, though, the direct causes are from utterly unnecessary dangers -- avoidable "accidents" or curable diseases. Why, it seems reasonable to inquire, are polities unable or unwilling to create safer environments for the world's young? Is this not the moral duty of mature adults? Should this not transcend religion? Ethnicity? Nationality? Sovereignty? The explanation for our collective failure, I think, lies not with the behavior of a few callous politicians and corporate executives. Such actions are mere symptoms of a system-wide failure. The explanation lies instead in the processes and structures of a globalizing political economy of ever-rising consumption. This economy feeds the luxuries of a wealthy minority by degrading the environments of the poor majority -- making these environments unsafe and unhealthy. It disproportionately transfers the ecological costs and social risks to vulnerable peoples and places (including consuming resources essential for the wellbeing of future generations). And it justifies a world where global governance focuses on the needs of capitalism and national security rather than on the safety of those truly at risk of dying young. The result in practice is a global morality that treats the loss of millions of young people every year as little more than tragic accidents, inevitable, natural even, a Darwinian outcome of choice, circumstance, and, ultimately, economic growth. These consequences are, in a possibly blasphemous metaphor muddling the language of the past and present, the sacrifices to the gods of progress in an era of globalization. There is, however, a reason we call these consequences "accidents" rather than "sacrifices," as such soft language helps avoid taking a hard look at the guts of global morality in an era of consumptive prosperity.

#### Reject the way the 1AC frames the problem in favor of an interrogation of consumptive practices — before we can go about fixing the world, we have to start off with an examination of the self, and how we are all personally implicated.

Nayar, 99 (Jayan, Warwick Law, Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall)

Rightly, we are concerned with the question of what can be done to alleviate the sufferings that prevail. But there are necessary prerequisites to answering the "what do we do?" question. We must first ask the intimately connected questions of "about what?" and "toward what end?" These questions, obviously, impinge on our vision and judgment. When we attempt to imagine transformations toward preferred human futures, we engage in the difficult task of judging the present. This is difficult not because we are oblivious to violence or that we are numb to the resulting suffering, but because, outrage with "events" of violence aside, processes of violence embroil and implicate our familiarities in ways that defy the simplicities of straightforward imputability. Despite our best efforts at categorizing violence into convenient compartments--into "disciplines" of study and analysis such as "development" and "security" (health, environment, population, being other examples of such compartmentalization) -- the encroachments of order(ing) function at more pervasive levels. And without doubt, the perspectives of the observer, commentator, and actor become crucial determinants. It is necessary, I believe, to question this, "our," perspective, to reflect upon a perspective of violence which not only locates violence as a happening "out there" while we stand as detached observers and critics, but is also one in which we are ourselves implicated in the violence of ordered worlds where we stand very much as participants. For this purpose of a critique of critique, it is necessary to consider the "technologies" of ordering

### Warming

#### No solvency—Cuba can’t displace emissions—1AC author

Specht ‘13(Jonathan, Louisiana State University, “Raising Cane: Cuban Sugarcane Ethanol’s Economic and Environmental Effects on the United States” April 24, 2013, <http://environs.law.ucdavis.edu/issues/36/2/specht.pdf>)

It must be stressed that sugarcane-based ethanol, from Cuba or anywhere else, is not the solution to the energy and climate change problems faced by the United States. Replacing just ten percent of global gasoline usage with sugarcane-based ethanol would require a tenfold increase in global sugarcane production. 209 To address the problems of both peak oil and climate change, the United States must do much more to reduce its fossil fuel consumption. It should primarily do this by using the strategies highlighted in the introduction of this Article: higher fuel efficiency standards, electric cars (powered with electricity from renewable energy sources, not coal), more public transportation, more walkable neighborhoods, and shorter commutes. To the extent to which there will inevitably still be high demand for liquid fuels for automobiles, ethanol from Cuban-grown sugarcane can, and should, be part of the solution to both problems

#### China makes the impact inevitable and they don’t model

Downs, 8

Eric, Fellow @ Brookings, China Energy Fellow, Foreign Policy, John L. Thornton China Center U.S.-China Economic & Security Review Commission, China’s Energy Policies and Their Environmental Impacts, http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2008/0813\_china\_downs.aspx

China suffers from a disconnect between the increasingly prominent position of energy issues on its domestic and foreign policy agendas and the capacity of the country’s institutions to manage the energy sector. Some Chinese commentators have even argued that the biggest threat to China’s energy security is posed by the very institutions responsible for enhancing it. Consequently, restructuring China’s energy policymaking apparatus has been a subject of intense debate in recent years as the country has grappled with an unexpected surge in energy demand, growing dependence on energy imports, rising global energy prices and periodic domestic energy supply shortages. Authority over China’s energy sector at the national level is fractured among more than a dozen government agencies, the most important of which is the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC). Within the NDRC itself, responsibility for energy is similarly scattered among multiple departments. Prior to the restructuring in March 2008, the key component was the Energy Bureau, which had a broad mandate but lacked the authority, tools and manpower to fulfill it. In 2005, the government added another cook to the kitchen with the establishment of the National Energy Leading Group, an advisory body headed by Premier Wen Jiabao. While the leading group’s creation reflected recognition of the need to strengthen energy sector management, it did not eradicate China’s energy governance woes. China’s fragmented energy policymaking structure has impeded energy governance because there is no single institution, such as a Ministry of Energy, with the authority to coordinate the interests of the various stakeholders. For example, the implementation of energy laws is hampered by the fact that those laws often do not specify the government agencies responsible for implementation because of disputes over who should be in charge. Similarly, the fuel tax that the NPC approved in 1999 has not been implemented because of the failure of the relevant stakeholders to reach an agreement. The policy paralysis within the energy bureaucracy stands in sharp contrast to the activism of China’s state-owned energy companies. These firms are powerful and relatively autonomous actors. Their influence is derived from their full and vice ministerial ranks, the membership of some top executives in the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, industry expertise, internationally listed subsidiaries and profitability (at least until recently). More often than not, it is China’s energy firms who initiate major energy projects and policies that are later embraced by the government, such as the West-East Pipeline and the acquisition of foreign energy assets. The companies also have some capacity to advance corporate interests at the expense of national ones. For example, oil and power generating companies have periodically reduced their output to pressure the government to raise the state-set prices of refined products and electricity, which have not kept pace with increases in the market-determined prices of crude oil and coal. Similarly, China’s national oil companies have ignored guidance from the central government about where they should invest overseas. II. China’s “new” energy policymaking structure The recent changes to China’s energy policymaking apparatus are the latest in a series of institutional reforms aimed at improving energy governance. In March 2008, the NPC approved two additions to China’s energy bureaucracy – the State Energy Commission (SEC) and the National Energy Administration (NEA). The SEC, a high-level discussion and coordination body whose specific functions, organization and staffing have not yet been determined, will replace the National Energy Leading Group. The daily affairs of the SEC will be handled by the NEA, a vice-ministerial component of the NDRC, which is the successor to the NDRC’s Energy Bureau. In addition to the Energy Bureau, the NEA is also comprised of other energy offices from the NDRC, the Office of the National Leading Group, and the nuclear power administration of the Commission of Science, Technology and Industry for National Defense. The NEA has a broad mandate, which includes managing the country’s energy industries, drafting energy plans and policies, negotiating with international energy agencies and approving foreign energy investments. The NEA, like its predecessor, will struggle to fulfill its mandate because it lacks the authority, autonomy, manpower and tools to deal with the country’s energy challenges. Although the NEA’s capabilities in each of these areas are greater than those possessed by the NDRC Energy Bureau, they still fall short of what the NEA needs to do its job. Authority: The NEA has more political clout than its predecessor, but not enough to mitigate the bureaucratic infighting that undermines energy decision-making. The NEA is a vice-ministerial body, which is a step above that of the Energy Bureau, which was a bureau-level organization. However, the NEA still does not have the authority it needs to coordinate the interests of ministries, commissions and state-owned energy companies. One of the frustrations of officials in the NDRC Energy Bureau was that the energy companies often undercut their authority by circumventing the Bureau to hold face-to-face discussions with China’s senior leadership. The authority of the NEA is somewhat enhanced by the appointment of Zhang Guobao, a Vice-Chairman of the NDRC with full ministerial rank, as head of the NEA. While it was widely expected that Zhang would retire, his new position is a reflection of his substantial energy expertise. Zhang, who has worked at the NDRC since 1983, is a smart and skillful bureaucrat with encyclopedic knowledge of China’s energy sector. He has overseen the development of some of the country’s major infrastructure projects, including the West-East Pipeline, the transmission of electricity from west to east, the Qinghai-Tibet Railway and the expansion of Beijing Capital International Airport. Autonomy: The NEA is a creature of the NDRC. Some Chinese media reports speculated that the fact that the NEA’s offices will be separate from those of the NDRC and that the NEA will have its own Party Group – which will give the NEA greater autonomy in managing its affairs, including personnel decisions – are signs of the NEA’s independence. However, the fact that Zhang Guobao – an NDRC “lifer” – is head of the NEA and its Party Group indicates that the NEA’s room to maneuver will be constrained by the NDRC. Moreover, the NEA’s independence is limited by the fact that key tools it needs to effectively manage the energy sector are in the hands of the NDRC. Tools: Arguably the greatest constraint on the NEA’s ability to fulfill its mandate is the fact that is does not possess the authority to set energy prices, which remain the purview of the NDRC’s Pricing Department. The issue of who would end up with the power to determine energy prices was, in the words of Zhang Guobao, a subject of “constant dispute” during the bureaucratic reorganization. Although the NEA can make suggestions about energy price adjustments and should be consulted by the NDRC on any proposed changes, the shots are still being called by the NDRC (and ultimately the State Council, whose approval is needed for any major energy price changes). The fact that the NDRC retained control over energy prices is hardly surprising. The power to set prices is one of the NDRC’s main instruments of macroeconomic control, which it understandably is reluctant to relinquish, especially to a subordinate component which might be tempted to adjust energy prices in ways that run counter to broader NDRC objectives, such as combating inflation. The NEA’s lack of authority over energy prices makes its task of mitigating the current electricity shortages, which are partly rooted in price controls, especially challenging. Electricity prices are set by the state, while coal prices are determined by the market. The failure of electricity price increases to keep pace with soaring coal prices has contributed to the national power shortage because some electricity producers can't afford coal while others are unwilling to operate at a loss. With no pricing power, the NEA has little choice but to resort to administrative measures to achieve an objective that would be more effectively realized by raising and ultimately liberalizing electricity prices. Personnel: The central government is still managing the energy sector with a skeleton crew. Contrary to rumors that the NEA’s staff would be as large as 200, it ended up with just 112 people. This staff quota is certainly larger than that of the NDRC Energy Bureau, which had only 50 people, but it does not represent a major increase in the number of people directly involved in managing the energy sector at the national level. Moreover, some Chinese media reports have speculated that the NEA may face the problem of “too many generals and not enough soldiers” because at least half of the 112 slots at the NEA are for positions at the deputy department head level and above. The Party organ that determines the functions, internal structure and staff quotas for government institutions probably resisted calls for more personnel out of concern that if it approved a large staff for the NEA, then other government bodies would also press for more manpower at a time when the State Council is trying to streamline the bureaucracy. In sum, China’s new energy administration is unlikely to substantially improve energy governance. The organizational changes are tantamount to rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic. Although the energy bureaucracy looks a bit different, its limited capacities remain largely unchanged. Consequently, we can expect to see a continuation of business as usual: conflicts of interest will impede decision-making; the energy companies will remain important drivers of projects and policies; state-set energy prices will continue to contribute to periodic domestic energy supply shortfalls; and the NEA, with no authority to adjust energy prices, probably will resort to “second best” administrative measures to try to eradicate those shortages. The modest tinkering to China’s energy policymaking apparatus unveiled during the March 2008 NPC meeting reflects the conflicts of interest that stymie energy decision-making. Despite widespread recognition among Chinese officials and energy experts of the need to get the country’s energy institutions “right” and the growing chorus of voices calling for the establishment of a Ministry of Energy (MOE), there are powerful ministerial and corporate interests that favor the status quo. The opposition to the creation of a MOE, a hot topic of debate in Chinese energy circles in recent years, was led by the NDRC and the state-owned energy companies. The mere specter of a MOE strikes fear in the heart of the NDRC because it would deprive the NDRC of a substantial portion of its portfolio and important tools of macroeconomic control. The NDRC’s aversion is shared by the energy firms who are reluctant to have another political master and afraid that a MOE would limit their direct access to China’s leadership. Such opposition helps explain why the government was unable to forge a consensus in favor of more robust changes to China’s energy policymaking apparatus. Implications for the United States First, US policymakers should recognize that China’s fractured energy policymaking apparatus may constrain the Chinese government from doing all that US policymakers would like it to do – and indeed what Chinese leaders themselves might want to do – to enhance international energy security and combat climate change. If China falls short of our expectations it may not reflect a conscious decision by Beijing to shirk its global responsibilities but rather the limited capacity of its national energy institutions to bend other actors, notably firms and local governments, to its will.

#### China key to solving emissions

Chen et al., 10Chen, Qian, Peridas, Qiu, Ho: Natural Resources Defense Council, Friedmann: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Li, Wei: Institute of Rock and Soil Mechanics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Sung, Fowler: Clean Air Task Force, Seligsohn, Liu, Forbes: World Resources Institute, Zhang: China Tsinghua University, Zhao: Institute of Engineering Thermophysics, Chinese Academy of Sciences (Jason Chen, Jingjing Qian, George Peridas, Yueming Qiu, Bruce Ho, Julio Friedmann, Xiaochun Li, Ning Wei, S. Ming Sung, Mike Fowler, Deborah Seligsohn, Yue Liu, Sarah Forbes, Dongjie Zhang, Lifeng Zhao, December 2010, “Identifying Near-Term Opportunities For Carbon Capture and Sequestration (CCS) in China,” <http://docs.nrdc.org/international/files/int_10121001a.pdf)//DR>. H

Coal—the most carbon-laden of the three major fossil fuels (i.e., natural gas, crude oil, and coal)—supplies nearly 70 percent of China’s energy. China’s heavy reliance on this fuel is reflected by the fact that during the last five years the country has accounted for nearly fourfifths of the global growth in coal consumption.8 In 2008, China consumed more coal than North and South America, the European Union, Russia, the Middle East, and Africa combined (see Figure 2.1). Heavy reliance on coal has sharply driven up China’s CO2 emissions. In 1994, China emitted 3.07 billion tons, or gigatons (Gt), of CO2. A decade later, in 2004, China’s CO2 emissions stood 60 percent higher, at over 5 Gt a year.9 As a result, China’s annual CO2 emissions now exceed those of the United States.10 With its CO2 emissions surging nearly eight times faster than in the rest of the world (see Figure 2.2), China has a pivotal role to play in the global effort to prevent the worst impacts of global warming from occurring.11

#### Increased sugarcane production causes massive deforestation and warming

Biofuelwatch, et. Al (Various) 2007

[*Agrofuels: Towards a Reality Check in Nine Key Areas,* Published by: Biofuelwatch, Carbon Trade Watch/TNI, Corporate Europe Observatory, Econexus, Ecoropa, Grupo de Reflexión Rural, Munlochy Vigil, NOAH (Friends of the Earth Denmark), Rettet Den Regenwald, Watch Indonesia June 2007//loghry]

Climate change: A primary concern is the potential for agrofuels to accelerate climate change, rather than combat it. Production involves considerable emission of greenhouse gases from soils, carbon sink destruction and fossil fuel inputs and is already causing significant deforestation and destruction of biodiversity. The clearance of Indonesia’s peat forests to plant oil palm plantations has caused massive outputs of CO2. Once forest removal reaches a certain ‘tipping point’, a process of self destruction may begin, particularly in the Amazon. Because so much remains unknown, a precautionary approach to developing agrofuels is necessary.

#### **GMOs turn the aff – cause overuse of herbicides causing environmental destruction**

Lehtonen, 9

Author Dr Markku Lehtonen , Sussex Energy Group University of Sussex, UK - PhD in environmental

economics University of Versailles Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines, France, 19 December 2009, Ethical-sugar (An organization that monitors the ethical use of pesticides in the sugar cane industry), “Status report on sugar cane agrochemicals management”, <http://www.sucre-ethique.org/IMG/pdf/agrochemicals_1_.pdf>

However, the public opinion in Brazil remains divided on the issue of GMOs. The development of herbicide resistant cane varieties is feared to increase the domination of sugarcane sector by large, vertically integrated conglomerates, thereby excluding small, independent farmers. A concern more specifically related to the theme of this paper is that herbicide-resistant sugarcane grown in large plantations may incite farmers to overuse herbicides, as seems to have happened with the ¶ introduction of herbicide-resistant soy varieties (Joensen 2007). Finally, the high amounts of herbicide applied may lead to the development of herbicide-resistant ¶ weeds. Such weeds have not yet been found in sugarcane cultivation, but the rapid increase of ¶ herbicide resistance in crops such as soybeans, cotton and corn suggests that this situation may ¶ change (FoE & CFS 2008; Smeets et al. 2008, 785; Center for Food Safety 2008). The industry’s suggestion to combating herbicide-resistant weeds – to genetically engineer a new generation of plants to resist even more toxic and persistent weed killers such as 2,4-D and dicamba (Robinson, E. 2008) – might lead to a never-ending ‘arms race’ between cane breeders who develop evermore herbicide-resistant varieties, and the weeds that respond by developing their own herbicide resistance.

#### Environmental apocalypticism causes eco-authoritarianism and mass violence against those deemed environmental threats – also causes political apathy which turns case

**Buell 3** (Frederick Buell, cultural critic on the environmental crisis and a Professor of English at Queens College and the author of five books; “From Apocalypse To Way of Life,” pg. 185-186)

Looked at critically, then, **crisis discourse** thus suffers from a number of liabilities. First, it seems to have become a **political liability** almost as much as an asset. It calls up a **fierce and effective opposition** with its predictions; worse, its more specific predictions are all too **vulnerable to refutation by events**. It also **exposes environmentalists to being called grim doomsters** and antilife Puritan extremists. Further, concern with crisis has all too often tempted people to try to find a “**total solution**” to the problems involved— a phrase that, as an astute analyst of the limitations of crisis discourse, John Barry, puts it, is all too reminiscent of the Third Reich’s infamous “**final solution**.”55 A total crisis of society—environmental crisis at its gravest—threatens to translate despair into **inhumanist authoritarianism**; more often, however, it helps keep merely dysfunctional authority in place. It thus leads, Barry suggests, to the belief that only elite- and expert-led solutions are possible.56 At the same timeit **depoliticizes people**, inducing them to accept their impotence as individuals; this is something that has made many people today feel, ironically and/or passively, that since it makes no difference at all what any individual does on his or her own, one might as well go along with it. Yet another pitfall for the full and sustained elaboration of environmental crisis is, though least discussed, perhaps the most deeply ironic. A problem with deep cultural and psychological as well as social effects, it is embodied in a startlingly simple proposition: the worse one feels environmental crisis is, the more one is tempted to turn one’s back on the environment. This means, preeminently, turning one’s back on “nature”—on traditions of nature feeling, traditions of knowledge about nature (ones that range from organic farming techniques to the different departments of ecological science), and traditions of nature-based activism. If nature is thoroughly wrecked these days, **people need to delink from nature** and live in postnature—a conclusion that, as the next chapter shows, many in U.S. society drew at the end of the millenium. Explorations of how deeply “nature” has been wounded and how intensely vulnerable to and dependent on human actions it is can thus lead, ironically, to **further indifference** to nature-based environmental issues, not greater concern with them. But what quickly becomes evident to any reflective consideration of the difficulties of crisis discourse is that all of these liabilities are in fact bound tightly up with one specific notion of environmental crisis—with 1960s- and 1970s-style environmental apocalypticism. Excessive concern about them does not recognize that crisis discourse as a whole has significantly changed since the 1970s. They remain inducements to look away from serious reflection on environmental crisis only if one does not explore how environmental crisis has turned of late from apocalypse to dwelling place. The apocalyptic mode had a number of prominent features: it was preoccupied with running out and running into walls; with scarcity and with the imminent rupture of limits; with actions that promised and temporally predicted imminent total meltdown; and with (often, though not always) the need for immediate “**total solution**.” **Thus doomsterism was its reigning mode; eco-authoritarianism** was a grave temptation; and as crisis was elaborated to show more and more severe deformations of nature, temptation increased to refute it, or give up, or even cut off ties to clearly terminal “nature.”

#### That causes mass wars

Brzoska 8 (Michael Brzoska, Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg; “The securitization of climate change and the power of conceptions of security,” Paper prepared for the International Studies Association Convention, 2008)

In the literature on securitization it is implied that when a problem is securitized it is difficult to limit this to an increase in attention and resources devoted to mitigating the problem (Brock 1997, Waever 1995). Securitization regularly leads to all-round ‘exceptionalism’ in dealing with the issue as well as to a shift in institutional localization towards ‘security experts’ (Bigot 2006), such as the military and police. Methods and instruments associated with these security organizations – such as more use of arms, force and violence – will gain in importance in the discourse on ‘what to do’. A good example of securitization was the period leading to the Cold War (Guzzini 2004 ). Originally a political conflict over the organization of societies, in the late 1940s, the East-West confrontation became an existential conflict that was overwhelmingly addressed with military means, including the potential annihilation of humankind. Efforts to alleviate the political conflict were, throughout most of the Cold War, secondary to improving military capabilities. Climate change could meet a similar fate. An essentially political problem concerning the distribution of the costs of prevention and adaptation and the losses and gains in income arising from change in the human environment might be perceived as intractable, thus necessitating the build-up of military and police forces to prevent it from becoming a major security problem. The portrayal of climate change as a security problem could, in particular, cause the richer countries in the global North, which are less affected by it, to strengthen measures aimed at protecting them from the spillover of violent conflict from the poorer countries in the global South that will be most affected by climate change. It could also be used by major powers as a justification for improving their military preparedness against the other major powers, thus leading to arms races.

#### Their apocalyptic warming focus trades off with environmentalism – turns its own end

**Crist, 7** (Eileen Crist, 2007, “Beyond the Climate Crisis: A Critique of Climate Change Discourse”, http://journal.telospress.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/content/2007/141/29.full.pdf+html)

While the dangers of climate change are real, I argue that there are even greater dangers in representing it as the most urgent problem we face. Framing climate change in such a manner deserves to be challenged for two reasons: it encourages the restriction of proposed solutions to the technical realm, by powerfully insinuating that the needed approaches are those that directly address the problem; and it detracts attention from the planet’s ecological predicament as a whole, by virtue of claiming the limelight for the one issue that trumps all others. Identifying climate change as the biggest threat to civilization, and ushering it into center stage as the highest priority problem, has bolstered the proliferation of technical proposals that address the specific challenge. The race is on for figuring out what technologies, or portfolio thereof, will solve “the problem.” Whether the call is for reviving nuclear power, boosting the installation of wind turbines, using a variety of renewable energy sources, increasing the efficiency of fossil-fuel use, developing carbon-sequestering technologies, or placing mirrors in space to deflect the sun’s rays, the narrow character of such proposals is evident: confront the problem of greenhouse gas emissions by technologically phasing them out, superseding them, capturing them, or mitigating their heating effects. In his The Revenge of Gaia, for example, Lovelock briefly mentions the need to face climate change by “changing our whole style of living.”16 But the thrust of this work, what readers and policy-makers come away with, is his repeated and strident call for investing in nuclear energy as, in his words, “the one lifeline we can use immediately.”17 In the policy realm, the first step toward the technological fix for global warming is often identified with implementing the Kyoto protocol. Biologist Tim Flannery agitates for the treaty, comparing the need for its successful endorsement to that of the Montreal protocol that phased out the ozone-depleting CFCs. “The Montreal protocol,” he submits, “marks a signal moment in human societal development, representing the first ever victory by humanity over a global pollution problem.”18 He hopes for a similar victory for the global climate-change problem. Yet the deepening realization of the threat of climate change, virtually in the wake of stratospheric ozone depletion, also suggests that dealing with global problems treaty-by-treaty is no solution to the planet’s predicament. Just as the risks of unanticipated ozone depletion have been followed by the dangers of a long underappreciated climate crisis, so it would be naïve not to anticipate another (perhaps even entirely unforeseeable) catastrophe arising after the (hoped-for) resolution of the above two. Furthermore, if greenhouse gases were restricted successfully by means of technological shifts and innovations, the root cause of the ecological crisis as a whole would remain unaddressed. The destructive patterns of production, trade, extraction, land-use, waste proliferation, and consumption, coupled with population growth, would go unchallenged, continuing to run down the integrity, beauty, and biological richness of the Earth. Industrial-consumer civilization has entrenched a form of life that admits virtually no limits to its expansiveness within, and perceived entitlement to, the entire planet.19 But questioning this civilization is by and large sidestepped in climate-change discourse, with its single-minded quest for a global-warming techno-fix.20 Instead of confronting the forms of social organization that are causing the climate crisis—among numerous other catastrophes—climate-change literature often focuses on how global warming is endangering the culprit, and agonizes over what technological means can save it from impending tipping points.21 The dominant frame of climate change funnels cognitive and pragmatic work toward specifically addressing global warming, while muting a host of equally monumental issues. Climate change looms so huge ever 1964 work, an entire socio-cultural-economic life—from (actual or aspired to) ways of eating and lodging, transportation, entertainment, or emoting and thinking—“binds the consumers more or less pleasantly to the producers and, through the latter, to the whole.” Herbert Marcuse, One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society (Boston: Beacon, 1991), p. 12. Horkheimer and Adorno traced the origins of the collective’s participation in its own domination to the “historical” moment that magical control over nature (and over the deities of nature) was relinquished to a specific elite or clique in exchange for self and social preservation. Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno, Dialectic of Enlightenment, trans. John Cumming (New York: Continuum, 1972), pp. 21–22. After the decisive turn when the social body became implicated in its own domination, “what is done to all by the few, always occurs as the subjection of individuals by the many: social repression always exhibits the masks of repression by a collective” (ibid.). And elsewhere: “The misplaced love of the common people for the wrong which is done them is a greater force than the cunning of the authorities” (ibid., p. 134). In light of such astute observations offered by critical theorists, neo-Marxist and anarchist analyses that indict corporate and/or state power for the troubled natural and social worlds are, at best, only partially true. 20. More than thirty years ago, environmental philosopher Arne Naess articulated the influential distinction between “shallow” and “deep” ecology, characterized by the focus on symptoms of the environmental crisis, on the one hand, versus critical attention to underlying causes of problems, on the other. Notwithstanding its unfortunate elitist overtones—implying that some environmental thinkers are capable of reflecting deeply, while others flounder with superficialities—the shallow-deep distinction has been significant for two compelling reasons. One, it clarified how “symptomology” leads merely to technical piecemeal solutions; and two, it showed how underlying causes, left unaddressed, eventually generate more nasty symptoms. In other words, shallow ecological thinking is technical and narrow: when we think about climate change as “the problem”—as opposed to confronting the limitless expansionism of the capitalist enterprise as the problem—we arguably become shallow in our thinking. Arne Naess, “The Shallow and the Deep, Long- Range Ecology Movements,” in George Sessions, ed., Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century (1973; Boston: Shambhala, 1995), pp. 151–55. on the environmental and political agenda today that it has contributed to downplaying other facets of the ecological crisis: mass extinction of species, the devastation of the oceans by industrial fishing, continued old-growth deforestation, topsoil losses and desertification, endocrine disruption, incessant development, and so on, are made to appear secondary and more forgiving by comparison with “dangerous anthropogenic interference” with the climate system. In what follows, I will focus specifically on how climate-change discourse encourages the continued marginalization of the biodiversity crisis—a crisis that has been soberly described as a holocaust,22 and which despite decades of scientific and environmentalist pleas remains a virtual non-topic in society, the mass media, and humanistic and other academic literatures. Several works on climate change (though by no means all) extensively examine the consequences of global warming for biodiversity, 23 but rarely is it mentioned that biodepletion predates dangerous greenhouse-gas buildup by decades, centuries, or longer, and will not be stopped by a technological resolution of global warming. Climate change is poised to exacerbate species and ecosystem losses—indeed, is doing so already. But while technologically preempting the worst of climate change may temporarily avert some of those losses, such a resolution of the climate quandary will not put an end to—will barely address—the ongoing destruction of life on Earth.

#### Only by rejecting security can we reconstitute our relationship to the environment through ethical and local justifications

Deudney 90 (Daniel Deudney, assistant professor of political science at John Hopkins’; “The Case Against Linking Environmental Degradation and National Security,” Millenium – Journal of International Studies 1990, http://people.reed.edu/~ahm/Courses/Reed-POL-372-2011-S3\_IEP/Syllabus/EReadings/07.2/07.2.Deudney1990The-Case.pdf, pg. 469)

Fortunately, environmental awareness **need not depend upon co-opted national security thinking**. Integrally woven into ecological concerns are a powerful set of interests and values—most notably human health and property values, religions and ethics, and natural beauty and concern for future generations. Efforts to raise awareness of environmental problems can thus connect directly with these strong, basic, and diverse human interests and values as **sources of motivation and mobilization**. Far from needing to be bolstered by national security mindsets, a "green" sensibility can make strong claim to being the master metaphor for an emerging postindustrial civilization. Instead of attempting to gain leverage by appropriating national security thinking, environmentalists can gain much more political leverage by continuing to develop and disseminate this immensely rich and powerful worldvie ¶ Earth Nationalism ¶ Transposing existing national security thinking and approaches to environmental politics is likely to be both **ineffective**, and to the extent effective, **counterproductive**. But the story should not end with this negative conclusion. Fully grasping the ramifications of the emerging environmental problems requires a **radical rethinking** and reconstitution of many of the major institutions of industrial modernity, including the nation. The nation and the national, as scholars on the topic emphasize, are complex phenomena because so many different components of identity have become conflated with or incorporated into national identities. Most important in Western constructions of national identity have been ethnicity, religion, language, and war memories. However, one dimension of the national—identification with place—has been underappreciated, and this dimension opens important avenues for reconstructing identity in ecologically appropriate ways. Identification with a particular physical place, what geographers of place awareness refer to as "geopiety" and "topophilia," has been an important component of national identity.35 As Edmund Burke, the great philosopher of nationalism, observed, the sentimental attachment to place is among the most elemental widespread and powerful of forces, both in humans and in animals. In the modern era the nation-state has sought to shape and exploit this sentimental attachment. ¶ With the growth of ecological problems, this sense of place and threat to place takes on a new character. In positing the "bioregion" as the appropriate unit for political identity, environmentalists are recovering and redefining topophilia and geopiety in ways that subvert the state-constructed and state-supporting nation. Whether the bioregion is understood as a particular locality defined by ecological parameters, or the entire planet as the only naturally autonomous bioregion, environmentalists are asserting what can appropriately be called "earth nationalism." 36 This construction of the nation has radical implications for existing state and international political communities. This emergent earth nationalism is radical both in the sense of returning to fundamental roots, and in posing a fundamental challenge to the state-sponsored and defined concept of nation now hegemonic in world politics. It also entails a **powerful and fresh way to conceptualize environmental protection** as the practice of national security.

The affirmative’s understanding of Cuba reduces it to an object of American desire. The affective depiction of Cuba as an indispensable tool for American interests has create a relationship defined by domination

Pérez 8 (Louis A., Ph.D. University of New Mexico, Professor of History at University of North Carolina, "Cuba in the American Imagination: Metaphor and the Imperial Ethos,")

Cuba came to the attention of the world at large principally by way of figurative depiction, more precisely, in the form of metaphors imbued with colonial meanings: in the sixteenth century as "the Key of the New World" ("la Llave del Nuevo Mundo"), "the Key to the Gulf" ("la Llave del Golfo"), and "the Bulwark of the West Indies" ("el Antemural de las Indias Occidentales"); in the nineteenth century as "the Queen of the Antilles," "the Pearl of the Antilles," "the Gem of the Antilles," and "the richest jewel in the royal crown," by which time, too, it had earned the designation of "the Ever Faithful Isle" ("la Siempre Fidelisima Isla"). Metaphorical representation also developed into the principal mode by which the Americans propounded the possession of Cuba as a matter indispensable to the future well-being of the United States. To advance a plausible claim to a territory governed by Spain, and to which its inhabitants presumed rightful succession to rule, required the Americans to create a parallel reality by which they persuaded themselves-and sought to persuade others-that Cuba rightfully belonged to them, not only, however, and indeed not even principally, as a matter of self-interest but as a function of providential purpose and moral propriety. Metaphorical constructs were central to the process by which national interest was enacted as idealized purpose: at once a combination of denial and dissimulation, a source of entitlement, and a means of empowerment. To understand the North American use of metaphor is to gain insight into the use of cultural models and social relationships in which the U.S. imperial project was conditioned. Metaphors of Cuba served to advance U.S. interests and were, in turn, mediated by racial attitudes and gender hierarchies, on one hand, and prescience of destiny, on the other. They worked best within those belief systems from which Americans obtained their cues concerning matters of civic duty and moral conduct and, indeed, were the principal means by which intent of purpose and reception of meaning were transacted. Figurative depiction drew into complicity all who shared a common cultural system from which collectively to receive the meaning desired of metaphor, what Herbert Clark and Catherine Marshall described as "mutual knowledge based on com- munity membership?"

Latin America will never adopt renewables – fossil fuels are too economically viable and oil lobby

Meisen and Krumpel 09– President of the Global Energy Network Institute / Research-Associate at GENI (Peter and Sebastian, “Renewable Energy Potential of Latin America”, December 2009; < http://www.geni.org/globalenergy/research/renewable-energy-potential-of-latin-america/Potential%20of%20Renewables%20in%20Latin%20America-edited-12-16%20\_Letter\_.pdf>)//Beddow

In reality the situation of renewable energies in Latin America is not as positive or optimistic as we might want to think, or as certain statistical data lead us to believe. There are many problems associated with the implementation of renewables as well as their impact on the environment and society. In this context, the main problem for renewable energies in Latin America is in the way energy and development policies have been construct ed. In most cases, energy policies and strategies in Latin America have excluded renewables and other alternatives as being too costly and technologically unfeasible, or by arguing that the country does not have the capabilities to implement them. The easiest explanation for this, and one which is usually mentioned, is the lack of incentive and foresight. Since the region has an abundance of resources such as oil, gas, and hydro, it is in general easier, cheaper and more technically feasible to keep exploiting conventional energy resources than to in vest in renewable energies or create appropriate renewable energy policies. Another common explanation is that the development of renewable energies clash wi th the interest of powerful players, particularly large energy companies, and, therefore, there are few incentives to promote them.

Renewables can’t solve warming – they supplement, not replace, dirty energy.

Angus 12– ecosocialist advocate, citing an extensive study by Richard York, professor at the University of Oregon with an MS in Environmental Studies from Bemidji State University (Iran, “Green energy won’t save the earth without social change”, 3/21/12; < http://climateandcapitalism.com/2012/03/21/green-energy-alone-wont-save-the-earth/>)//Beddow

The most popular techno-fix for global warming is green energy. If energy companies would only deploy wind, hydro, solar, geothermal or nuclear, then emission-intensive fossil fuels will eventually disappear. But will that actually work? A new study by Richard York of the University of Oregon shows that it isn’t that simple. **Rather than displacing fossil fuels, green energy sources have proven to be mostly additive.** “Do alternative energy sources displace fossil fuels?” published this month in Nature Climate Change, discusses what happened when alternative energy sources were introduced in countries around the world, over the past fifty years. Contrary to the accepted wisdom that new green energy replaces fossil-fuel use, York found that on average each unit of energy use from non-fossil-fuel sources displaced less than a quarter of a unit of energy use from fossil-fuel sources. The picture is worse with electricity, where **each new unit generated from green sources displaced less than one-tenth of a unit of fossil-fuel-generated electricity.** York writes: “Based on all of the results presented above, the answer to the question presented in the title of this paper – do alternative energy sources displace fossil fuels? – is yes, but only very modestly. **The common assumption that the expansion of production of alternative energy will suppress fossil-fuel energy production in equal proportion is clearly wrong**.” Why don’t the new sources replace the old? York identifies two key reasons: the inertia of a huge existing fossil-fuel infrastructure, and the power and influence of the coal and oil corporations. **“The failure of non-fossil energy sources to displace fossil ones is probably in part attributable to the established energy system where there is a lock-in to using fossil fuels as the base energy source because of their long-standing prevalence and existing infrastructure and to the political and economic power of the fossil-fuel industry**.” In other words, eliminating fossil-fuel as an energy source is at least as much a social and political problem as a technical one. “Of course all societies need energy. So, obviously, if societies are to stop using fossil fuels they must have other energy sources. However, the results from the analyses presented here indicate that the shift away from fossil fuel does not happen inevitably with the expansion of non-fossil-fuel sources, or at least in the political and economic contexts that have been dominant over the past fifty years around the world…. “The most effective strategy for curbing carbon emissions is likely to be one that aims to not only develop non-fossil energy sources, but also to find ways to alter political and economic contexts so that fossil-fuel energy is more easily displaced and to curtail the growth in energy consumption as much as possible. “A general implication of these findings is that polices aimed at addressing global climate change should not focus principally on developing technological fixes, but should also take into account human behaviour in the context of political, economic and social systems.” The evidence shows that simply introducing green energy isn’t enough: the introduction must be accompanied by “explicit policies aimed at reducing carbon emissions.” The article is published in a scientific journal, where political and social conclusions can only be expressed in muted form. But Richard York’s research and conclusions reinforce the argument that he and his co-authors (John Bellamy Foster and Brett Clark) made more explicitly in their recent book, The Ecological Rift: Capitalism’s War on the Planet. “We are confronting the question of a terminal crisis, threatening most life on the planet, civilization, and the very existence of future generations. … attempts to solve this through technological fixes, market magic, and the idea of a ‘sustainable capitalism’ are mere forms of ecological denial, since they ignore the inherent destructiveness of the current system of unsustainable development – capitalism.”
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#### **Deforestation turns biodiversity and warming**

Watson 6 Captain Paul Watson, Founder and President of Sea Shepherd Conservation Society. 9/17/06, ìThe Politics of Extinction.î http://www.eco-action.org/dt/beerswil.html

The destruction of forests and the proliferation of human activity will remove more than 20 percent of all terrestrial plant species over the next fifty years. Because plants form the foundation for entire biotic communities, their demise will carry with it the extinction of an exponentially greater number of animal species -- perhaps ten times as many faunal species for each type of plant eliminated. Sixty-five million years ago, a natural cataclysmic event resulted in extinction of the dinosaurs. Even with a plant foundation intact, it took more than 100,000 years for faunal biological diversity to re-establish itself. More importantly, the resurrection of biological diversity assumes an intact zone of tropical forests to provide for new speciation after extinction. Today, the tropical rain forests are disappearing more rapidly than any other bio-region, ensuring that after the age of humans, the Earth will remain a biological, if not a literal desert for eons to come. The present course of civilization points to ecocide -- the death of nature. Like a run-a-way train, civilization is speeding along tracks of our own manufacture towards the stone wall of extinction. The human passengers sitting comfortably in their seats, laughing, partying, and choosing to not look out the window. Environmentalists are those perceptive few who have their faces pressed against the glass, watching the hurling bodies of plants and animals go screaming by. Environmental activists are those even fewer people who are trying desperately to break into the fortified engine of greed that propels this destructive specicidal juggernaut. Others are desperately throwing out anchors in an attempt to slow the monster down while all the while, the authorities, blind to their own impending destruction, are clubbing, shooting and jailing those who would save us all. SHORT MEMORIES Civilized humans have for ten thousand years been marching across the face of the Earth leaving deserts in their footprints. Because we have such short memories, we forgot the wonder and splendor of a virgin nature. We revise history and make it fit into our present perceptions. For instance, are you aware that only two thousand years ago, the coast of North Africa was a mighty forest? The Phoenicians and the Carthaginians built powerful ships from the strong timbers of the region. Rome was a major exporter of timber to Europe. The temple of Jerusalem was built with titanic cedar logs, one image of which adorns the flag of Lebanon today. Jesus Christ did not live in a desert, he was a man of the forest. The Sumerians were renowned for clearing the forests of Mesopotamia for agriculture. But the destruction of the coastal swath of the North African forest stopped the rain from advancing into the interior. Without the rain, the trees died and thus was born the mighty Sahara, sired by man and continued to grow southward at a rate of ten miles per year, advancing down the length of the continent of Africa. And so will go Brazil. The precipitation off the Atlantic strikes the coastal rain forest and is absorbed and sent skyward again by the trees, falling further into the interior. Twelve times the moisture falls and twelve times it is returned to the sky -- all the way to the Andes mountains. Destroy the coastal swath and desertify Amazonia -- it is as simple as that. Create a swath anywhere between the coast and the mountains and the rains will be stopped. We did it before while relatively primitive. We learned nothing. We forgot. So too, have we forgotten that walrus once mated and bred along the coast of Nova Scotia, that sixty million bison once roamed the North American plains. One hundred years ago, the white bear once roamed the forests of New England and the Canadian Maritime provinces. Now it is called the polar bear because that is where it now makes its last stand. EXTINCTION IS DIFFICULT TO APPRECIATE Gone forever are the European elephant, lion and tiger. The Labrador duck, giant auk, Carolina parakeet will never again grace this planet of ours. Lost for all time are the Atlantic grey whales, the Biscayan right whales and the Stellar sea cow. Our children will never look upon the California condor in the wild or watch the Palos Verde blue butterfly dart from flower to flower. Extinction is a difficult concept to fully appreciate. What has been is no more and never shall be again. It would take another creation and billions of years to recreate the passenger pigeon. It is the loss of billions of years of evolutionary programming. It is the destruction of beauty, the obliteration of truth, the removal of uniqueness, the scarring of the sacred web of life To be responsible for an extinction is to commit blasphemy against the divine. It is the greatest of all possible crimes, more evil than murder, more appalling than genocide, more monstrous than even the apparent unlimited perversities of the human mind. To be responsible for the complete and utter destruction of a unique and sacred life form is arrogance that seethes with evil, for the very opposite of evil is live. It is no accident that these two words spell out each other in reverse. And yet, a reporter in California recently told me that "all the redwoods in California are not worth the life on one human being." What incredible arrogance. The rights a species, any species, must take precedence over the life of an individual or another species. This is a basic ecological law. It is not to be tampered with by primates who have molded themselves into divine legends in their own mind. For each and every one of the thirty million plus species that grace this beautiful planet are essential for the continued well-being of which we are all a part, the planet Earth -- the divine entity which brought us forth from the fertility of her sacred womb. As a sea-captain I like to compare the structural integrity of the biosphere to that of a ship's hull. Each species is a rivet that keeps the hull intact. If I were to go into my engine room and find my engineers busily popping rivets from the hull, I would be upset and naturally I would ask them what they were doing. If they told me that they discovered that they could make a dollar each from the rivets, I could do one of three things. I could ignore them. I could ask them to cut me in for a share of the profits, or I could kick their asses out of the engine room and off my ship. If I was a responsible captain, I would do the latter. If I did not, I would soon find the ocean pouring through the holes left by the stolen rivets and very shortly after, my ship, my crew and myself would disappear beneath the waves. And that is the state of the world today. The political leaders, i.e., the captains at the helms of their nation states, are ignoring the rivet poppers or they are cutting themselves in for the profits. There are very few asses being kicked out of the engine room of spaceship Earth. With the rivet poppers in command, it will not be long until the biospheric integrity of the Earth collapses under the weight of ecological strain and tides of death come pouring in. And that will be the price of progress -- ecological collapse, the death of nature, and with it the horrendous and mind numbing specter of massive human destruction.

#### Turn—sugarcane burning causes massive emissions

Tsao et al. ‘11 (C-C Tsao1, J. E. Campbell1\*, M. Mena-Carrasco2, S. N. Spak3, G. R. Carmichael3 and Y. Chen1, 1School of Engineering, University of California, Merced, California 95343, USA, 2Department of Environmental Engineering, Universidad Andres Belo, Santiago, 8370251, Chile, 3Center for Global and Regional Environmental Research, University of Iowa, “Increased estimates of air-pollution emissions from Brazilian sugar-cane ethanol”, 11 December 2011, http://www.ucmerced.edu/sites/www/files/public/documents/brazil.pdf)

Accelerating biofuel production has been promoted as an opportunity to enhance energy security, offset greenhouse gas emissions and support rural economies. However, large uncertainties remain in the impacts of biofuels on air quality and climate 1,2 . Sugar-cane ethanol is one of the most widely used biofuels, and Brazil is its largest producer 3 . Here we use a life-cycle approach to produce spatially and temporally explicit estimates of air-pollutant emissions over the whole life cycle of sugar-cane ethanol in Brazil. We show that even in regions where pre-harvest field burning has been eliminated on half the croplands, regional emissions of air pollutants continue to increase owing to the expansion of sugar-cane growing areas, and burning continues to be the dominant life-cycle stage for emissions. Comparison of our estimates of burning-phase emissions with satellite estimates of burning in São Paulo state suggests that sugar-cane field burning is not fully accounted for in satellite-based inventories, owing to the small spatial scale of individual fires. Accounting for this effect leads to revised regional estimates of burned area that are four times greater than some previous estimates. Our revised emissions maps thus suggest that biofuels may have larger impacts on regional climate forcing and human health than previously thought.

#### The plan destroys livelihoods and Cuban environment

Armando H. Portela, Ph.D. and Benigno E. Aguirre, Ph.D. July 27, 2007

(Armando H. Portela, Ph.D., a geographer from Miami and Benigno E. Aguirre, Ph.D., a sociologist from College Station, Texas “Air and Water Pollution in Cuba” July 27, 2013 <http://havanajournal.com/culture/entry/air-and-water-pollution-in-cuba/>)

Elsewhere, the Cauto River basin is also severely impacted¶ by pollution and environmental degradation (Gonzalez Otero et¶ al., 1989). The basin is the most extensive in the island, with¶ an area equivalent to eight percent of the entire country and¶ 9.3 percent of its agricultural land. One quarter of Cuba’s¶ rice is grown in it; the basin produces one tenth of the¶ national sugar output. The life of every tenth Cuban is¶ directly linked to the basin. The depletion of the¶ environmental quality of the Cauto River basin over the past¶ three or four decades is a serious national problem. The damage¶ covers a broad range of ecological issues:¶ \*One third of the basin suffers from severe erosion.¶ \*Salt-water intrusions have spoiled most of the¶ groundwater reservoirs.¶ \*The natural runoff has been reduced by 60 percent in¶ recent decades.¶ \*The forested areas have been nearly annihilated.¶ A survey of the basin found 652 “pollutant hubs,”¶ including industries, urban sewage systems and cattle farms that¶ produce impressive amounts of untreated waters that contribute¶ to further deterioration.¶ There are critical problems elsewhere too. A recent¶ report (Radio Rebelde, May 17, 1997) pointed out that eight¶ sugar mills in Camaguey province spill up to five cubic meters¶ of untreated waste water per second, or 77.8 million cubic¶ meters during the harvest period. It should be noted that the¶ reservoir capacity of the entire Camaguey province is 361.8¶ million cubic meters, so that only eight of its 14 sugar mills¶ could be polluting as much water in only a few months (Portela,¶ CubaNews, July 1997).¶ A fourth major area of water pollution is the Laguna del¶ Tesoro. It is the largest natural fresh water reservoir on the¶ island. Recent measurements in the Zapata Swamps, where the¶ lake is located, found that the lake water level has dropped 80¶ centimeters (31.5 inches) or roughly one fifth of the average¶ depth of the lake. The loss of water was put at 6.4 million¶ cubic meters (1.7 billion gallons). It is attributable to the¶ demolition of levees and the deepening and widening of channels¶ out of the lake by state owned rice farms located nearby. The¶ rice farms have been draining nearby swamps, which have also¶ reduced the level of the lake. Untreated wastewaters from at¶ least two sugar mills located near the lake are a source of¶ pollution, as are low levels of pesticides and fertilizers from¶ nearby farming operations. This pollution has begun to affect¶ the local fauna, especially the trout population of the lake.¶ The potential economic impact is enormous; after the popular¶ Varadero Beach resort, Laguna del Tesoro is the second most¶ popular tourist destination in Matanzas province (CubaNews,¶ March 1999).

#### Sugarcane production causes soil degradation—turns the grasslands I/L

Zuurbier and Vooren ‘08

Peter Zuurbier and Jos Van De Vooren. "Contributions to Climate Change Mitigation and the Environment." *Sugarcane Ethanol*. Wageningen Academic P U B L I S H E R S, 2008. Web. 6 July 2013. <http://www.baff.info/english/rapporter/SugarcaneBook\_Wageningen.pdf>.

Soil degradation through erosion and compaction are also considered a problem in sugarcane fields, which are under intense mechanization during soil cultivation and harvesting (Martinelli and Filoso, 2008). Soil compaction is a consequence of the traffic of heavy machinery in conjunction with the lack of implementation of best management cultivation practices (Naseri *et al.*, 2007). Compaction exacerbates erosion problems because soil porosity is reduced, which decreases water infiltration and increases runoff\_ (Oliveira *et al.*, 1995; Martinelli and Filoso 2008). The main periods when soil remains bare and subjected to erosive forces by rain and winds are (1) during the process of land conversion, (2) between crop harvesting and subsequent canopy closure, and (3) during re-planting of sugarcane fields every 5-6 years. !e conversion of natural vegetation and extensive pastures (which are less intensively managed) into sugarcane increases the risk soil degradation (Politano and Pissarra, 2005). Erosion rates of 30 Mg of soil/ha.year were estimated for sugarcane $elds in the São Paulo State in comparison with less than 2 Mg/ha.year for pastures and other natural vegetation (Sparovek and Schnug, 2001). Soil erosion in poorly managed sugarcane areas also causes sediment deposition into water reservoirs, wetlands, streams and rivers (Politano and Pissarra, 2005). !is is aggravated by the transport of fertilizer and agro-chemical residues that directly compromise water quality (Corbi *et al.*, 2006).

#### Sugarcane ethanol generates more pollution than previously thought

Campbell et al 11 (J. E. Campbell, S.N. Spak, G. R. Carmichael, UI College of Engineering alumni, an assistant professor with joint appointments in the UI Public Policy Center, School of Urban and Regional Planning, and the UI College of Engineering Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, “Sugarcane ethanol in Brazil a substantial pollution source”, Western Farm Press, an industry trade magazine that provides growers and agribusiness with in-depth coverage of the region's major crops plus the legislative, environmental and regulatory issues that affect their businesses, 12/29/11, <http://westernfarmpress.com/government/sugarcane-ethanol-brazil-substantial-pollution-source//>)

University of Iowa researchers and their colleagues have shown that ethanol fuel producers in Brazil — the world's top producer of ethanol from sugarcane as an alternative to petroleum-based fuel — generate up to seven times more air pollutants than previously thought.¶ The study, titled "Increased estimates of air-pollution emissions from Brazilian sugarcane ethanol," is featured in the Nature Highlights section and published in the Dec. 11 advance online publication of the journal Nature Climate Change.¶ The research team used agricultural survey data from Brazil to calculate emissions of air pollutants and greenhouse gases from the entire production, distribution, and lifecycle of sugarcane ethanol from 2000 to 2008.¶ The estimated pollutants were 1.5 to 7.3 times higher than those from satellite-based methods, according to lead author Elliott Campbell of the University of California, Merced.¶ Greg Carmichael, Karl Kammermeyer Professor of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering in the UI College of Engineering and co-director of the Center for Global and Regional Environmental Research (CGRER), and UI assistant professor Scott Spak note that the findings reflect continued practices and trends that are a part of the production of sugarcane ethanol. These include the practice of burning sugarcane fields before harvest, as well as the fact that sugarcane production in Brazil continues to grow.¶ "We found that the vast majority of emissions come from burning the sugarcane fields prior to harvesting, a practice the Brazilian government has been moving to end," says Spak. "However, the sugarcane industry has been expanding rapidly and moving into more remote areas, which makes it much more difficult to enforce new regulations over this growing source of air pollution and greenhouse gases.¶ "As people try to determine how to integrate biofuels into the global economy, Brazilian sugarcane ethanol has often been considered a more environmentally friendly fuel source than U.S. corn ethanol. In fact, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency considers sugarcane ethanol an 'advanced biofuel' with fewer greenhouse gas emissions than conventional biofuels like corn ethanol. These new findings help us refine those estimates and move closer to making more informed comparisons between different fuel sources, and ultimately make better decisions about how to grow and use biofuels," Spak says.¶ In addition to Campbell, Carmichael, and Spak, co-researchers include C.C. Tsao and Y. Chen of the University of California, Merced, and Marcelo Mena-Carrasco of Universidad Andrés Bello, Santiago, Chile.¶ Campbell and Mena are UI College of Engineering alumni. Spak is an assistant professor with joint appointments in the UI Public Policy Center, School of Urban and Regional Planning, and the UI College of Engineering Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering.

## Warming Offense

**2nc motivation fails**

The link turn is empirically denied - alarmism is high now and responses to warming are low

Foust and Murphy 2009 (Christina R. Foust is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver. William O’Shannon Murphy is a doctoral student in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver. "Revealing and Reframing Apocalyptic Tragedy in Global Warming Discourse" , Environmental Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture, 3:2, 151-167 )

Since the release of Al Gore's award-winning documentary, An Inconvenient Truth, the American public has been faced with steadily increasing amounts of communication regarding climate change. Leiserowitz (2007) concludes, "Large majorities of Americans believe that global warming is real and consider it a serious problem, yet global warming remains a low priority relative to other national and environmental issues" (p. 44). Though the USA emits a shockingly disproportionate amount of greenhouse gases, large-scale policy changes or even a precursory conversation about overhauling the energy economy have been slow in coming. Meanwhile, climate scientists and others concerned about global warming have continued to sound the alarm with increasing urgency (Moser & Dilling, 2004).

**Apocalyptic warming rhetoric depoliticizes the issue and makes it impossible for effective action to ever mobilize - particularly in the social sphere that debate attempts to create**

**Foust and Murphy 09**

Christina R. Foust, Assistant Professor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, & William O'Shannon Murphy, doctoral student in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, 12 Jun 2009 "Revealing and Reframing Apocalyptic Tragedy in Global Warming Discourse" Special Issue: Discursive Constructions of Climate Change: Practices of Encoding and Decoding Environmental Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture, Volume 3, Issue 2, 2009, pages 151-167

While frames "cannot guarantee how a reader will interpret or comprehend" an issue or text, they "play a fundamental role in structuring the range of likely decodings" (Greenberg & Knight, 2004, p. 157), often in ways that support dominant ideologies. For instance, Antilla (2005) found that US press coverage framed climate change in terms of controversy, skepticism, and uncertainty. Such framing upholds prevailing ideologies of "free-market capitalism and neo-liberalism" (Carvalho, 2005, p. 21). It has impacts beyond individual readers' interpretations, as Boykoff (2007b) argues, opening "spaces for US federal policy actors to defray responsibility and delay action regarding climate change" (p. 486). Given its power to shape interpretations, policy, and action, close attention to how the press frames the issue is crucial to building a political will to mitigate climate change.¶ Apocalyptic rhetoric, we argue, represents a mediating frame in global warming discourse. Certain versions of **this frame may stifle individual and collective agency, due to their persistent placement of "natural" events as catastrophic, inevitable, and outside of "human" control**. Analyzing them could help explain why some individuals take a fatalistic attitude toward, or consider their agency very small in comparison to, the challenge of climate change (Lorenzoni, Nicholson-Cole & Whitmarsh, 2007). Moreover, apocalyptic framing helps us understand two vocal minorities who might well stand in the way of building a collective will-the alarmists, who believe global warming's "catastrophic consequences" are veritably unstoppable, and the naysayers, who view global warming as a conspiracy created by environmentalists and the media (Leiserowitz, 2005, p. 1440).¶ In the Judeo-Christian religious tradition, the apocalypse refers to prophesying, revealing, or visioning the imminent destruction of the world (Zamora, 1982). Common connotations of apocalypse are influenced by pre-millennial theology, which foregrounds the world-ending moment that precedes the second coming of Jesus Christ. Brummett (1991) and O'Leary (1993) argue that apocalypse is so prevalent in secular as well as sacred discourse that it constitutes its own unique genre of rhetoric.¶ Apocalyptic rhetoric typically takes shape in narrative form, emphasizing a catastrophic telos (end-point) somewhere in the future (Brummett, 1991). A cosmic or natural force drives the linear temporality in apocalyptic rhetoric, such that "certain events and experiences are inevitable, unalterable, and determined by external forces beyond human control" (Wojcik, 1996, p. 298). The narrative in apocalyptic discourse typically posits a tragic ending-"a date or temporal horizon beyond which human choice is superfluous, a final Judgment that forecloses all individual judgments" (O'Leary, 1993, p. 409).¶ Apocalyptic rhetoric prophesies (directly or implicitly) a new world order, often accompanied by spectacular, (melo)dramatic, or fantastical images of the destruction of the current order (Brummett, 1984). Common apocalyptic discourses suggest that the social order is beyond repair. Given the "unrecuperably evil world" and "bankrupt society on the verge of imminent" collapse-as well as the cosmic force driving apocalyptic events-**there is seemingly no reason to attempt social change once an issue is framed apocalyptically** (Wojcik, 1996, p. 312). Like God's wrath or nuclear war, the apocalyptic scenario is so much greater than humanity (let alone individual human efforts), that there seems little hope for intervention.

**Apocalyptic warming rhetoric makes action impossible and emboldens naysayers**

**Foust and Murphy 09**

Christina R. Foust, Assistant Professor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, & William O'Shannon Murphy, doctoral student in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, 12 Jun 2009 "Revealing and Reframing Apocalyptic Tragedy in Global Warming Discourse" Special Issue: Discursive Constructions of Climate Change: Practices of Encoding and Decoding Environmental Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture, Volume 3, Issue 2, 2009, pages 151-167

Framing global warming as an apocalyptic event has several implications. Tragic apocalyptic framing in particular posits the issue of global warming as extra-human, driven by cosmic forces, and, as such, Fated. Oddly, this makes it difficult to hold humans accountable for pumping greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. We are dismayed by tragic discourse that attributes global warming to a simple "rise in temperatures" (Bacon & Watson, 1998, p. 3A), which alleviates humans of responsibility for creating, or at least contributing to, climate change; and decreases the sense of human responsibility for combating global warming.¶ Furthermore, apocalyptic framing diminishes the range of human agency possible in influencing the inevitable march of global warming. As Brummett (1991) explains, believers who have "lost control over events" are "reassured, not by regaining control, but by knowing that history is nevertheless controlled by an underlying order" (p. 37). Apocalyptic framing limits believers' agency to acting in accordance with prophetic directives, which typically involves intrapersonal activity (e.g., repentance) in the face of cosmic forces beyond individual control. **Rather than encouraging material action or behavioral change, being a true believer resigns the community to inaction**.¶ A second implication of the tragic apocalyptic frame is that it invites naysayers to discredit scientists as false prophets and label environmentalists as alarmists. As Gleiberman (2006) notes: "The right-wing strategy, which has been to paint global warming as a lofty hypothetical-an alarmist scenario pushed by pesky Chicken Littles-is a way of relegating it back to the era of '60s paranoia" (p. 65). Apocalyptic framing serves as fodder for naysayers to continue portraying global warming as "overblown" or arguing "that it may not exist" (Stevens, 1997, p. F1). Ultimately, such a discourse polarizes readers, who are forced to choose sides because they were not given more nuanced options for addressing the issue.

No long run solvency from fear appeals - best studies prove

O'Neill and Nicholson-Cole 2009 (Saffron O’Neill is a tutor at the University of East Anglia, and a research fellow with the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research. Sophie Nicholson-Cole is a senior research associate in the Tyndall Centre for Climate

Change Research at the University of East Anglia, United Kingdom. “Fear Won’t Do It” Promoting Positive Engagement With Climate Change Through Visual and Iconic Representations)

The laboratory studies reviewed by Hastings et al. (2004) often tell nothing of the long-term effectiveness of fear campaigns or about exposure to repeated fearful messages. There is also little literature examining longitudinal attitudes toward climate change and decarbonization-oriented behavior change. For example, Lowe et al. (2006) report that fear-inducing appeals are unlikely to have long-lasting impacts. Lowe et al. carried out a pre/post-test survey before and after watching the climate change disaster movie The Day After Tomorrow (Emmerich, 2004), with survey themes followed up a month later with focus groups. They found that although the majority of participants (67%) in the post-test agreed that “everybody has to do something” about climate change, this sense of urgency had substantially diminished by the time the focus groups took place.

### 2nc t/ case

**Securitization undermines cooperation – turns the environment**

**Trombetta 8** (Maria Julia Trombetta, postdoctoral researcher at the department of Economics of Infrastructures, Delft University of Technology; “Environmental security and climate change: analysing the discourse,” Outh Cambridge Review of International Affairs, Volume 21, Number 4, December 2008)

Opponents were quick to warn that the term 'security' **evokes a set of confrontational practices** associated with the state and the military which **should be kept apart from the environmental debate** (Deudney 1990). Concerns included the possibilities of **creating new competencies for the military—militarizing the environment rather than greening security** (Kakonen 1994)—or the rise of **nationalistic attitudes** in order to protect the national environment (Deudney 1999, 466-468). Deudney argued that not only are practices and institutions associated with national security inadequate to deal with environmental problems, but security can also **introduce a zero-sum rationality** to the environmental debate that can create winners and losers, and **undermine the cooperative efforts** required by environmental problems. Similar objections came from a southern perspective: environmental security was perceived as a discourse about the security of northern countries, their **access to resources** and the **protection of their patterns of consumption** (Shiva 1994; Dalby 1999; Barnett 2001). Although the debate waxed and waned, the concept slowly gained popularity. In April 2007 the security implications of climate change were discussed by the United Nations (UN) Security Council but the state representatives remained divided over the opportunity of considering climate change and, more generally, environmental degradation as a security issue (United Nations Security Council 2007).

The divide between those who oppose the use of the term environmental security by arguing that the logic of security is fixed and inflexible and those who support it by suggesting that the logic of security should be changed distracts attention away from the question of whether practices associated with providing security have been transformed by environmental security discourses. In the literature there is a debate about whether and how **security language transforms the method of dealing with an issue**—the debate focuses 'on the implications of using security language for the definition and governance of migration and the environment' (Huysmans 2006, 16)—but there is little on the reverse process or on the implications of using environmental language for the definition and governance of security. This article is an attempt to develop the latter type of analysis by exploring the meaning and function of environmental and climate security. The purpose is to consider how the use of a word in different contexts challenges and transforms the practices and meanings associated with it. It aims to explore 'what the practices of definition and usage do to a concept, and what the concept in turn does to the world into which it is inscribed' (Bartelson 2000,182). To undertake this analysis it is necessary to explore how different discourses about environmental and climate security have developed and **'conditioned the possibility of thought and action'** (181).

The article is presented in three parts. The first explores why the environment has been excluded from security considerations. By adopting a perspective that is **attentive to the social construction of security issues** and its implications, the article assesses the potential of a **discursive approach in transforming existing security practices**. The analysis draws on the theory of securitization elaborated by the Copenhagen School (inter alia Buzan and Waever 1998) and integrates it with elements borrowed from Beck's work (inter alia 1992, 1999, 2006) on risk society to provide a framework that accounts for transformation. It argues that the securitization of environmental issues can reorient security logics and practices. The second and third parts apply this framework to explore the development of environmental security and climate security discourses respectively.

**2nc authoritarianism**

Furthermore, political scapegoating ensures targeting of the third world

Gilbert 12

Emily Gilbert, Canadian Studies and Geography University of Toronto, 2012, "The Militarization of Climate Change," ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies, 11 (1), 1-14 7

First, the military’s interest in climate change resurrects a narrow concept of security. Although the 2010 QDR recognizes impending concerns associated with human security (eg migration, disease and food security), it models the anticipated conflict through a traditional state-to-state war scenario, refracted through a neo- Malthusian conflict over resources (Dalby, 2009; Homer-Dixon, 1999). Resource conflict and other climate change impacts are mapped onto already vulnerable places in Sub Saharan Africa, the Middle East, and South and Southeast Asia (Broder, 2009; CNA, 2007; Podesta and Ogden, 2007-08; Werz and Manlove, 2009), where, it is argued, they will act as ‘threat multipliers’ that will escalate into ‘failed state’ scenarios. This perpetuates a model whereby the enemy to the nation is elsewhere, and that ‘environmental threats are something that foreigners do to Americans or to American territory,’ not as a result of domestic policies (Eckersley 2009: 87). In this vein, the CIA has established a Center on Climate Change and National Security to collect foreign ‘intelligence’ on the national security impact of environmental change in other parts of the world.6

The bifurcation of domestic security and external threat reinforces a fiction of territorial and nationalist integrity, and works against thinking about climate change as a global problem with a need for global responsibility and global solutions (Dalby 2009: 50; Deudney 1999: 189).7 Moreover, the model of external threats coheres easily with the competitive frame that has been established between China and the US, as they vie not only for economic ascendency and resource- acquisition, but also for energy security and environmental policies and initiatives.8 In this vein, Thomas Freidman has proposed a militant green nationalism, something along the lines of a triumphalist Green New Deal that will recapture US global hegemony (Friedman, 2009).9 Achieving this result requires, however, more political agreement across US Democrats and Republicans, and it is precisely here that reframing climate change as a military issue seems to be an effective strategy for cross-partisan agreement.10 But what are the costs when militarization becomes necessary to legitimize climate change action?

The upshot is that the military is also legitimized, to the detriment of formal and informal politics. In a secretive and hierarchical military framework there is limited scope for public participation or legislative debate (UNEP 2007: 403). Militaries are about the ‘maintenance of elite power’ (Barnett 2001: 25). Issues regarding social justice are disregarded in favour of national objectives, while the vulnerabilities institutionalized through climate change are perpetuated (Barnett, 2006). This is particularly apparent vis-à-vis environmental refugees, which the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates will swell to 150 million by 2050 (Reuveny, 2007). Militarism encourages the use of force against foreigners, with barriers erected to exclude those who bear the immediate impact of climate change, even though they are usually the least responsible for climate change. As Paul Smith notes, Operation Seal Signal, which the US deployed in 1994 to deal with 50,000 refugees from Haiti and Cuba, offers an instructive example of how the military addresses refugees, most of whom were held at Guantanamo Bay while their cases were processed (Smith, 2007). The responses to human tragedy in Haiti and Hurricane Katrina, when military priorities took hold over the immediate needs of the racialized, impoverished victims, speaks to the dangers of concocting security threats so that abandonment is prioritized over assistance (Giroux, 2006; Hallward, 2010). This is part of a worrisome trend of the rise of an ‘aid-military complex’ and military ‘encroachment’ on civilian-sponsored development (Hartmann 2010: 240).

## 1NR
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### 2NC AT: FW

**Interp: judge is an intellectual who role is to evaluate the best way for students to engage the environment issue**

**Focusing on policy-making first absolves individual contribution and cedes the political – ensures their impacts are inevitable and provides an independent reason to vote negative**

**Trennel 6** (Paul Trennel, Ph. D from the University of Wales, Department of International Politics; “The (Im)possibility of Environmental Security,” September 2006, http://cadair.aber.ac.uk/dspace/bitstream/handle/2160/410/trenellpaulipm0060.pdf?sequence=2)

Thirdly, it can be claimed that the security mindset channels the obligation to address environmental issues in an unwelcome direction. Due to terms laid out by the social contract “security is essentially something done by states…there is no obligation or moral duty on citizens to provide security…In this sense security is essentially empty…it is not a sign of positive political initiative” (Dalby, 1992a: 97-8). Therefore, casting an issue in security terms puts the onus of action onto governments, creating a docile citizenry who await instructions from their leaders as to the next step rather than taking it on their own backs to do something about pressing concerns. This is unwelcome because governments have limited incentives to act on environmental issues, as their collectively poor track record to date reveals. Paul Brown notes that “at present in all the large democracies the short-term politics of winning the next election and the need to increase the annual profits of industry rule over the long term interests of the human race” (1996: 10; see also Booth 1991: 348). There is no clearer evidence for this than the grounds on which George W. Bush explained his decision to opt out of the Kyoto Protocol: “I told the world I thought that Kyoto was a lousy deal for America…It meant that we had to cut emissions below 1990 levels, which would have meant I would have presided over massive layoffs and economic destruction” (BBC: 2006). The short-term focus of government elites and the long-term nature of the environmental threat means that any policy which puts the burden of responsibility on the shoulders of governments should be viewed with scepticism as this may have the effect of breeding inaction on environmental issues. Moreover, governmental legislation may not be the most appropriate route to solving the problem at hand. If environmental vulnerabilities are to be effectively addressed “[t]he routine behaviour of practically everyone must be altered” (Deudney, 1990: 465). In the case of the environmental sector it is not large scale and intentional assaults but the cumulative effect of small and seemingly innocent acts such as driving a car or taking a flight that do the damage. Exactly how a legislative response could serve to alter “non-criminal apolitical acts by individuals” (Prins, 1993: 176- 177) which lie beyond established categories of the political is unclear. Andrew Dobson has covered this ground in claiming that the solution to environmental hazards lies not in piecemeal legislation but in the fostering of a culture of “ecological citizenship”. His call is made on the grounds that legislating on the environment, forcing people to adapt, does not reach the necessary depth to produce long-lasting change, but merely plugs the problem temporarily. He cites Italian “car-free city” days as evidence of this, noting that whilst selected cities may be free of automobiles on a single predetermined day, numbers return to previous levels immediately thereafter (2003: 3). This indicates that the deeper message underlying the policy is not being successfully conveyed. Enduring environmental solutions are likely to emerge only when citizens choose to change their ways because they understand that there exists a pressing need to do so. Such a realisation is unlikely to be prompted by the top-down, state oriented focus supplied by a security framework.

Affirmative cannot win that they have any practical effects

Schlag 90 (Pierre, Stanford LR, November, Lexis)

In fact, normative legal thought is so much in a hurry that it will tell you what to do even though there is not the slightest chance that you might actually be in a position to do it. For instance, when was the last time you were in a position to put the difference principle n31 into effect, or to restructure [\*179] the doctrinal corpus of the first amendment? "In the future, we should. . . ." When was the last time you were in a position to rule whether judges should become pragmatists, efficiency purveyors, civic republicans, or Hercules surrogates? Normative legal thought doesn't seem overly concerned with such worldly questions about the character and the effectiveness of its own discourse. It just goes along and proposes, recommends, prescribes, solves, and resolves. Yet despite its obvious desire to have worldly effects, worldly consequences, normative legal thought remains seemingly unconcerned that for all practical purposes, its only consumers are legal academics and perhaps a few law students -- persons who are virtually never in a position to put any of its wonderful normative advice into effect.

**Representations come first in the context of climate change**

**Foust et al. 8** (Christina R. Foust, Assistant Professor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, et al., with William O. Murphy, Doctoral Student and Graduate Teaching Instructor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, and Chelsea Stow, Doctoral Student and Graduate Teaching Instructor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, 2008, “Global Warming and Apocalyptic Rhetoric: A Critical Frame Analysis of US Popular and Elite Press Coverage from 1997-2007,” Paper Submitted to the Environmental Communication Division of the National Communication Association Convention in San Diego, 11/20, p. 22-23)

Along with critiquing the misinformation created through poorly educated reporters, “balance-as-bias,” and media-corporate ties; and parsing out the complexities which render climate change so difficult to sustain on the public agenda; communication scholars have employed frame analysis to identify the peculiar constructions of climate change in the press. Following Entman (1993), Jones (2006) defines frames as “clusters of messages” which draw “attention on some aspects of reality while ignoring others” (pp. 14-15). As such, frames can create “subtle alterations” in the way that readers judge an event or issue (Iyengar, 1991, p. 11). Frames structure an event’s or issue’s meaning through partial and selective views, with consequences that stretch beyond readers’ interpretations. For example, the persistent tragic framing of the Matthew Shepard murder case relieved the public from a sense of responsibility, which in turn stalled the passage of hate crime prevention legislation (Ott & Aioki, 2002). Frame analysis proves important for the present analysis of global warming discourse, permitting us not only to consider the appearance of an underlying structure, but also to interrogate its possible impacts in terms of public agency, public opinion, policy, and democratic discourse. Though the general framing of climate change in American, European, and global news outlets has been explored, the apocalyptic frame remains underrepresented in the conversation. As noted in the introduction, Killingsworth and Palmer (1996) associate global warming with apocalyptic narratives, but do not fully consider the consequences of this frame on environmental issues. Likewise, Leiserowitz mentions a link between climate change and apocalypse without fully developing how this link is created, or what the full extent of its consequences might be. Leiserowitz (2007) concludes his analysis of the public’s affective images of climate change by cautioning us against taking an “alarmist” stance, as apocalyptic responses (such as “predicting ‘the end of the world’ or ‘the death of the planet’”) could “lead some to a sense of resigned fatalism” (p. 60). Because of its potential to stifle agency, as we elaborate below, a full exploration of apocalyptic frame in elite and popular press accounts of global warming is warranted.

### 2NC Must read – Bobertz

**Environmental reformism seeks to pacify our collective guilt over the destruction of the environment—it is ultimately futile because it deflects attention away from resolving the real reason why environmental problems exist, which is individual consumption**

Bobertz 95 (Bradley, Nebraska Law, Legitimizing Pollution Through Pollution Control Laws: Reflections on Scapegoating Theory, 73 Tex. L. Rev. 711) \*\*\*gender modified noted by [ ]

To date, explanations for the intellectual bedlam of environmental law have included analyses of the byzantine organizational and jurisdictional structures of congressional subcommittees, [n10](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n10) models of public choice and game theory, [n11](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n11) lessons from evolutionary biology, [n12](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n12) and visions of  [\*714]  impersonal institutionalized corruption. [n13](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n13) This Article offers an alternative theory for understanding both the convolutions and the failures of environmental law. Drawing on insights from the fields of anthropology, psychology, and media studies, I examine the phenomenon of societal scapegoating as a means for developing collective solutions to complex, poorly understood problems. My thesis is straightforward: Environmental lawmaking provides an important avenue for alleviating what we -- individually and collectively -- experience at some level as guilt or shame for the environmental degradation we witness through a world view shaped, in large measure, by the media. By offering this scapegoating or guilt-redemption theory, I do not attempt to provide a full explanation of environmental law and its genesis, and I certainly do not purport to diagnose the American psyche. However, I do attempt to explore some of the most basic, yet least understood, questions of the field: Why have we chosen to control pollution through the particular means we have, and why do we create legal responses to some environmental problems but not to others? [n14](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n14) The theory advanced in this Article relocates federal environmental law, a relative newcomer to the legal scene, to a more traditional place in the geography of social reform legislation. Rather than manifesting an unprecedented legal experiment, environmental law simply reflects a recent iteration of an old problem -- the attempt to influence mass behavior through the instruments of the legal system. In environmental law, one witnesses the same issues that for decades have provided grist for reform-minded lawmakers: struggles to define desirable and undesirable behavior; debates over incentives, deterrence, and punishment; and questions about who makes the rules and when these rules might violate other aims and values of society. As with other areas of the law, these issues all emerge in the context of a complex, multitiered system of delegated collective power and individual liberty.  [\*715]  In contrast to other areas of social reform, however, environmental law presents some unique problems. While the causes of crime, poverty, and other social problems can, without too much intellectual turmoil, be attributed to individual behavior, environmental degradation appears to implicate all of us. Pollution can strike observers as the integral by-product of the relatively comfortable lifestyle enjoyed by a majority of Americans in the late twentieth century. Yet, with images of smokestacks, dying lakes, and oil-drenched otters constantly intruding on the public consciousness, we are forced to live out Pogo's dilemma: We have met the enemy, and ~~he~~ [it] is us. [n15](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview#n15) Because the deep-seated causes of pollution tend to implicate us all, we feel the desire for psychological guilt release or redemption with special force. Thus, laws that externalize blame to outside forces allow us to preserve a way of life to which we have grown accustomed and one that we are reluctant to change -- the very way of life that generates pollution in the first place. Environmental laws help us escape this psychological dilemma. They establish clear lines between the perpetrators and the victims, maintaining our position safely on the side of the innocent by treating pollution not as a natural, expected outcome of industrialization, but instead as an aberration from a norm of cleanliness. Environmental laws and the social patterns they reflect raise troubling questions. If we reduce the purpose of environmental law to merely stopping end-point pollution, we inevitably discourage scrutiny of our basic habits and ways of life. With pollution being "taken care of" by the government, only the most guilt-sensitive will take action to change their own behavior, and only the most fervently committed will press for deeper changes in our systems of production and waste disposal. Unfortunately, these ardent few occupy a marginalized position in mainstream America, and as the process of environmental lawmaking marches onward -- identifying and punishing its scapegoats -- the underlying causes of pollution are rarely mentioned, let alone acted upon. [n16](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxygsu-wgc1.galileo.usg.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.453078.1478331385&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1236223023921&returnToKey=20_T5953416716&parent=docview" \l "n16) Thus, environmental legislation presents a striking example of how the law can legitimize an existing state of affairs while simultaneously creating the appearance of reforming it.

### 2NC AT: CTP

**They ignore all of the other avenues for social change in a myopic rush to seek state-centered solutions**

Weissberg 4 (Professor of Political Science Emeritus at the University of Illinois-Urbana Robert Weissberg is., Society “Abandoning Politics,” May/June,http://transactionpub. metapress.com/app/home/content.asp)

The conventional wisdom tells us that Americans are generally politically apathetic and, judging by re- cent voting trends this situation may be deteriorating. **Self-appointed civic guardians predictably express profound unease about this disengagement and offer up a plethora of remedies**, everything from user-friendly ballots to electronic versions of democracy to reenergize political life. **Academics seem especially alarmed that apathy will impede impoverished minorities** from climbing up the socio-economic ladder **while allowing “special interest” to ride roughshod over the common good. Alas, these discussions are quite superficial and misdirected**. At most, those damning apathy glibly offer unproven clichés about “rising alienation” and similar banalities as if Americans were suddenly paralyzed to shape the world around them. Laments about lethargy fail to grasp that this disengagement only reflects a shift in choice of weapons, not laziness. **Those grumbling about idle parents reluctant to pressure government for better schools incorrectly assume that rejecting politics will necessarily guarantee shoddy education**. Ditto for those who seem “indifferent” about crime, the environment, high taxes and just about all other maladies—misery awaits those who sit on the sidelines. Reality is more nuanced and, critically, this reflexive bewailing of apathy reflects a state centered view of progress so, ipso facto, political disengagement preordains failure. **Fortunately, the United States is not a totalitarian system in which the government is the only game in town. This myopic focus on state-centered solutions also obscures an important emerging fact. To the extent that abandoning politically directed remedies is not ideologically uniform, the civic landscape will soon be profoundly altered.** In a nut- shell, the Left with its deep commitment to political solutions will continue to dominate policy-making while the nation as a whole quietly moves rightward.