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#### First the links, Production focus to problems fails—the only solutions it engenders are more production

Princen et al, 2002

[Thomas, Ph.D., Political Economy and Government, 1988, Harvard University and Associate professor at the Univ. of Michigan school of natural resources and environment, Michael Maniates, Professor of Political and Environmental Science at Allegheny College, and Ken Conca, Program Director the School of Global Environmental Politics at American University, Confronting Consumption, “Confronting Consumption.” Pg. 1-20. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

Combining the elements of socially embedded consumers and linked chains of resource-use decisions leads to a third theme of our provisional framework: that ‘‘consuming’’ occurs all along the chain, not just at the downstream node of consumer demand. Nodes of raw-material extraction and manufacturing, for example, represent not just production and value added, but also consumption and value subtracted. Producers are consumers; production is consumption. An important implication of this idea is that what is being consumed at each node is not obvious. At the node of primary resource extraction it might be the tree or the fish, or it might be the ecosystem integrity of the forest or the fishery. At the node of final purchase it might be an apple, or a person’s attention, or a community’s social fabric. Another implication of this view is that responsibility shifts from the individuated consumers-as-final-demanders to actors at all nodes of the chain. Producers may add value as they satisfy downstream demand, but they also risk value depletion; they consume value by producing. In using up resources both natural and social, they impose costs on the environment and on people— be they purchasers, workers, caregivers, neighbors, or citizens. This consumption angle on resource use offers a corrective to the production-centered perspective that dominates contemporary discussions of economic affairs, including environmental protection. In that perspective, raw materials feed manufacturing and distribution to produce what people want. It follows that, because goods are good and would not be produced if people did not want them, more goods— and more production— must be better. A productive economy is, as a result, one that produces more goods for a given input (thus increasing the economy’s ‘‘productivity’’), yields more choices for consumers, and increases output. When production creates problems such as pollution, the productive answer is to produce correctives such as scrubbers, filters, and detoxifiers. So goes the logic of production, productiveness, productivity, and products— construing all things economic as producing, as adding value, as, indeed, progress. The consumption angle turns this around to self-consciously construe economic activity as consuming, as depleting value, as risking ecological overshoot, as stressing social capacity.

#### The impact to the mass consumption politics of the affirmative is planetary destruction, loss of value to life, and mass poverty and dehumanization—the alternative’s criticism of consumption is key to ethical engagement with the planet

Alexander, 2011

[Samuel, University of Melbourne Office for Environmental Programs and Simplicity Institute, Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence, Online] /Wyo-MB

As noted in the introduction, consumption presents itself as an area of ethical concern in at least three ways: first, because Western-­‐style consumption is putting an immense and unsustainable burden on the planet’s ecosystems, so much so that contemporary cultures of consumption are diminishing the capacity of the planet to support life as we know it in the future;50 second, because the high consumption, resource-­‐intensive lifestyles enjoyed by most people in the richest nations coexist in a world where great multitudes live lives oppressed by material deprivation;51 and thirdly, because there is a large and growing body of sociological and psychological literature indicating that once our basic material needs for food, shelter, clothing, etc. are met, the limitless pursuit of more money and possessions neither produces any lasting happiness nor satisfies the human need for meaning.52 Far from representing the peak of civilization, cultures of mass consumption are showing distinct signs of widespread social, even spiritual, malaise.53 Any one of these issues, it could be argued, would be sufficient for consumption to become a proper subject for ethical engagement, in the Foucauldian sense of ethics as ‘the self engaging the self.’ When the three issues are considered together, the case for ethical engagement is compelling. At once, however, we are confronted with a strange incongruity, even a contradiction, of sorts, one that seems to tear the present analysis apart. In an age when the facts of ecological degradation, extreme poverty, and consumer malaise lie quite plainly before our eyes, one might have thought that First World consumption practices were already a subject of widespread ethical engagement. That is, one might have expected consumption practices to be a domain of constant and dedicated ethical attention, given that overconsumption seems to be driving several of the world’s most pressing problems (including the problem of consumer malaise). And yet, it can hardly be denied that any ethical engagement that takes place within consumer cultures does not, as a rule, seek to reduce or moderate consumption but rather encourage, glorify, and increase consumption – and increase it without apparent limit.54 And here is the contradiction: consumption is at once an extremely obvious realm for ethical engagement, for the three reasons stated above, and, at the same time, engaging the self by the self for the purpose of deliberately reducing or moderating consumption seems to be more or less unthinkable within modern consumer societies. Indeed, there seems to be an almost unquestioned assumption throughout consumer societies that consumption practices are somehow ‘beyond ethics,’ in the sense that how much we consume does not really need to inform the answer we give to the question of ‘how one ought to live.’ On the contrary, it is presumed that everyone is justified seeking as high a material standard of living as possible, a pursuit that is limited, it would seem, only by the laws of a free market economy.

#### The alternative is to reject the production based approach of the affirmative in favor of the 1NC criticism of consumption.

#### The purpose of debate should be to fashion ourselves, the alternative opens up space for ethical engagement with the problem of consumption and the embrace of voluntary simplicity, this changes our subjectivity as consumers

Alexander, 2011

[Samuel, University of Melbourne Office for Environmental Programs and Simplicity Institute, Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence, Online] /Wyo-MB

The aim of this paper, however, is not to present a thorough analysis of Foucault’s notion of an aesthetics of existence. Several such analyses have appeared in recent times (after years of unfortunate scholarly neglect), and much of this emerging commentary is very probing and insightful.12 But this is not the time to focus on furthering that critical discussion or even providing a comprehensive literature review of it. Instead, after providing a brief exposition of Foucault’s ethics, this paper will undertake to actually apply the idea of an aesthetics of existence to a particular subject of ethical concern, namely, to our role as ‘consumers’ in the context of First World overconsumption. This is an area that raises ethical questions concerning how we ought to live for two main reasons: firstly, due to the impact Western-­‐style consumers are having on the natural environment; and secondly, due to the continued existence of poverty amidst plenty. There is, however, another perspective to consider also. A large body of sociological and psychological literature now exists indicating that Western-­‐style consumption practices are often failing to provide meaning and fulfillment, even to those who have ‘succeeded’ in attaining a high material standard of living.13 These three consumption-­‐related issues – ecological degradation, poverty amidst plenty, and consumer malaise – provide ample grounds for thinking that consumption is a proper subject for ethical engagement, in the Foucauldian sense of ethics as ‘the self engaging the self.’ If it is the case that our individual identities have been shaped, insidiously perhaps, by a social system that celebrates and encourages consumption without apparent limit – and it would not be unfair to describe consumer societies in these terms14 – then it may be that ethical practice today calls for a rethinking of our assumptions and attitudes concerning consumption, which might involve a deliberate reshaping of the self by the self. This paper will explore the possibility of such an ethics of consumption in the following ways. First, by explaining how neoclassical economics, which is arguably the most influential paradigm of thought in the world today, conceptualizes consumption as something that benefits both ‘self’ and ‘other’ and, therefore, as something that should be maximized. To the extent that modern consumers have internalized this conception of consumption, an ethics of consumption might involve engaging the self for the purpose of changing the self and creating something new. The second way an ethics of consumption will be explored will be through an examination of the theory and practice of ‘voluntary simplicity,’ a term that refers to an oppositional living strategy or ‘way of life’ with which people, somewhat paradoxically, perhaps, seek an increased quality of life through a reduction and restraint of one’s level of consumption.15 The paradox, so-­‐ called, consists in the attempt to live ‘more with less.’ Since voluntarily living simply means heading in the opposite direction to where most people in consumer societies (and increasingly elsewhere) seem to want to go, one would expect living simply to require a fundamentally creative engagement with life and culture, especially in contemporary consumer societies that seem to be predicated on the assumption that ‘more consumption is always better.’ This need for a fundamentally creative engagement with life is what prompted the present attempt to elucidate the idea of ‘voluntary simplicity as aesthetics of existence,’ and it is this attempt to infuse Foucauldian ethics with an emerging post-­‐consumerist philosophy of life that constitutes the original contribution of this paper. It is hoped that this practical application of Foucault’s ethics might also prompt others to consider how ethical engagement might produce new ways of being that are freer, more fulfilling, and yet less resource-­‐intensive and damaging than the modes of being which are dominant in consumer societies today. Could it be, for example, that the ‘Death of Man,’ to use Foucault’s phrase, was actually the first (and a necessary) phase in the demise of what one might call ‘homo consumicus’? And what forms of life, what modes of being, would or could materialize with the voluntary emergence of ‘homo post-­‐consumicus’? These are the large questions that motivated this study and in the following pages a preliminary attempt is made to grapple with them. The aim, however, is not to legitimate ‘what is already known,’16 since that would not be a very Foucauldian endeavor; rather, the aim is to explore whether or to what extent it is possible to ‘free thought from what it silently thinks,’17 in the hope that this might open up space to ‘think differently,’18 to think otherwise.

## DA

**Water scarcity on the brink in the United States- increasingly becoming a paramount issue in 2013**

**Reichardt 1/10**

[Klaus, Waterless Co. CEO, the pioneer and originator of this most water and maintenance conserving fixture. “Water Scarcity a ‘Paramount Issue’ in 2013” 1.10.2013. <http://www.environmentalleader.com/2013/01/10/water-scarcity-a-paramount-issue-in-2013/>//wyo-hdm]

**The US water shortage is turning out to be even more pressing than** the General Accounting Office **predicted,** according to urinal maker Waterless Co. In 2003, **the GAO issued a** [**report**](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CDcQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.gao.gov%2Fnew.items%2Fd03514.pdf&ei=uMDtUI3XOYHoiQLy1IDYAg&usg=AFQjCNEr4HQBWZH86jCtJOK6Dtg2Eg2tKA&sig2=ZRZQPIQJmlMjztRJ0rP52w&bvm=bv.1357316858,d.cGE) **warning that by 2013 at least 36 states could face water shortages.** But by 2008 at least 36 states were already dealing with periodic if not chronic water shortages, **with California, New Mexico, and Arizona at the top of the list**, Waterless says. The company makes no-water urinal systems and other restroom-related products. CEO and founder Klaus Reichardt says there has been some good news but predicts that **water scarcity and related water concerns will likely become paramount issues in 2013**. Among Reichardt’s water predictions for 2013: **Lake Michigan/Huron water systems will be at great risk of all-time low water levels, impacting lifestyles and a number of industries in the region**. **Water and sewer rates in the US will** [**continue**](http://www.environmentalleader.com/2013/01/10/water-scarcity-a-paramount-issue-in-2013/) **to rise in most areas because of the increased costs of electricity** (to transport water to and from locations), **chemical treatments, and infrastructure upgrades. Water availability in many parts of the world will fall because of droughts, inefficient use of water, chemical runoff**, and/or salt water infiltration in water systems. There will be new requirements for [water purification](http://www.environmentalleader.com/2013/01/10/water-scarcity-a-paramount-issue-in-2013/) in many areas of the world, but this may also cause water rates to increase. We will see more advocacy groups emerge, urging people to conserve water and use it more efficiently. As a result of these factors, finding ways to use water more efficiently in homes, offices, and especially in agriculture and industry will become the “new normal” in 2013. Water demand is falling in much of the US, according to Sharlene Leurig, a water-financing expert at Ceres, writing in [The Guardian](http://www.guardian.co.uk/sustainable-business/blog/us-water-paradox-demand-infrastructure). Leurig says that from the 1970s on, the amount of water used by American households decreased across the country, by amounts varying from tens of thousands of gallons each year in Louisville, Kentucky, to nearly 100,000 gallons a year in Las Vegas. But this declining demand, Leurig says, has created [funding](http://www.environmentalleader.com/2013/01/10/water-scarcity-a-paramount-issue-in-2013/) problems for systems that rely on volume sales to repay infrastructure costs. Earlier this month, the US Army Corps of Engineers said it will begin issuing permits for industrial and municipal uses of Missouri River water, and is [considering charging for surplus river water](http://www.environmentalleader.com/2013/01/07/army-corps-could-charge-for-missouri-river-water/) in the future. **Additionally, low water levels — caused by the** [**worst US drought in 50 years**](http://www.environmentalleader.com/2012/08/13/worst-us-drought-in-50-years-drives-up-grain-prices-ethanol-under-pressure/) **— could** [**shut down commerce**](http://www.environmentalleader.com/2013/01/02/key-stretch-of-mississippi-could-shut-this-week/) **on the Mississippi River this month, disrupting shipments worth billions of dollars.**

**Solar power uses large amount of water for electricity production**

**Price, 11**

James E. McMahon and Sarah K. Price Energy Analysis Department, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley “Water and Energy Interactions” Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour. 2011. 36:163–91, accessed 10/12/12.WYO/JF

**Central solar power plants concentrate solar energy to heat fluids that generate electricity** using steam engines, gas turbines, or Stirling engines (78). **Once used in the turbines, the steam must go through a cooling process similar to that for all thermoelectric power plants**. The most-developed solar thermal technology is the parabolic trough. **For the past 15 years, nine solar thermal power plants, with a total capacity of 350 MW, have used this technology in the Mojave Desert**, California. If a dry cooling system is used for a parabolic trough, **roughly 80 gallons of water per megawatt hour are required for mirror washing and cycle makeup**, **whereas a plant that uses wet-cooling consumes roughly 800 gallons (3,000 liters) of water per megawatt-hour generated**. However, **dry-cooling technologies are less efficient, more costly, and have higher requirements for auxiliary operating power (2, 79).** Three other types of solar thermal production facilities are those with power towers, linear fresnels, and a dish/engine system. Power towers and linear fresnels rely on heat from the sun to generate steam and power Rankine steam cycles. Dish/engine systems are air-cooled, rely on water only for mirror cleaning, and can generate energy only during hours of direct sunlight because they lack thermal storage. Power towers capture energy from the sun reflected from a field of tracking mirrors to a receiver located on top of a tower where water or molten salt is flowing to absorb the solar energy. **These systems consume approximately 600 gallons of water for each megawatt-hour they generate. Spain is home to a power tower with a capacity of 10 MW and is in the process of developing more (79).**

**Drought will cause massive energy shut down, blackout’s**

**Michael Webber, 12**

“Will Drought Cause the Next Blackout?” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/24/opinion/will-drought-cause-the-next-blackout.html?_r=0>, accessed 10/12/12,WYO/JF

**WE’RE** now **in the midst of the nation’s most widespread drought** in 60 years, **stretching across 29 states and threatening farmers, their crops and livestock**. But **there is another risk as water becomes more scarce. Power plants may be forced to shut down**, and oil and gas production may be threatened. **Our energy system depends on water**. **About half of the nation’s water withdrawals every day are just for cooling power plants.** In addition, the oil and gas industries use tens of millions of gallons a day, injecting water into aging oil fields to improve production, and to free natural gas in shale formations through hydraulic fracturing. **Those numbers are not large from a national perspective, but they can be significant locally.** All told, we withdraw more water for the energy sector than for agriculture. Unfortunately, this relationship means that water problems become energy problems that are serious enough to warrant high-level attention. **During the 2008 drought in the Southeast, power plants were within days or weeks of shutting down because of limited water supplies**. In Texas today, some cities are forbidding the use of municipal water for hydraulic fracturing. The multiyear drought in the West has lowered the snowpack and water levels behind dams, reducing their power output. **The United States Energy Information Administration recently issued an alert that the drought was likely to exacerbate challenges to** California’s **electric power market this summer,** with higher risks of reliability problems and scarcity-driven price increases. And in the Midwest, power plants are competing for water that farmers want for their devastated corn crops. Unfortunately, trends suggest that this water vulnerability will become more important with time.

**Blackouts cause nuclear meltdowns**

**Huffington Post, 11**

“Long Blackouts Pose Risk To U.S. Nuclear Reactors” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/03/29/blackout-risk-us-nuclear-reactors_n_841869.html>, accessed 10/12/12,WYO/JF

**Long before the nuclear emergency in Japan**, **U.S. regulators knew that a power failure lasting for days at an American nuclear plant, whatever the cause, could lead to a radioactive leak**. Even so, they have only required the nation's 104 nuclear reactors to develop plans for dealing with much shorter blackouts on the assumption that power would be restored quickly. In **one nightmare simulation** presented by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in 2009, **it would take less than a day for radiation to escape from a reactor at a Pennsylvania nuclear power plant** after an earthquake, flood or fire knocked out all electrical power and there was no way to keep the reactors cool after backup battery power ran out. That plant, the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station outside Lancaster, has reactors of the same older make and model as those releasing radiation at Japan's Fukushima Dai-ichi plant, which is using other means to try to cool the reactors. **And like Fukushim**a Dai-ichi, the Peach Bottom **plant has enough battery power on site to power emergency cooling systems for eight hours**. In Japan, that wasn't enough time for power to be restored. **According to the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Nuclear Energy Institute trade association, three of the six reactors at the plant still can't get power to operate the emergency cooling systems**. Two were shut down at the time. In the sixth, the fuel was removed completely and put in the spent fuel pool when it was shut down for maintenance at the time of the disaster. **A week after the March 11 earthquake, diesel generators started supplying power to two other two reactors**, Units 5 and 6, the groups said. **The risk of a blackout leading to core damage,** while extremely remote**, exists at all U.S. nuclear power plants, and some are more susceptible than others, according to an Associated Press investigation**. While regulators say they have confidence that measures adopted in the U.S. will prevent or significantly delay a core from melting and threatening a radioactive release, the events in Japan raise questions about whether U.S. power plants are as prepared as they could and should be.

**Meltdowns cause extinction**

**Lendman, 2011**

(Stephen, Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization, 03/ 13, “Nuclear Meltdown in Japan,”, The People’s Voice <http://www.thepeoplesvoice.org/TPV3/Voices.php/2011/03/13/nuclear-meltdown-in-japan>, accessed 10/12/12,WYO/JF

Reuters said **the 1995 Kobe quake caused $100 billion in damage**, up to then the most costly ever natural disaster. This time, **from quake and tsunami damage alone, that figure will be dwarfed**. Moreover, **under a worst case core meltdown, all bets are off as the entire region and beyond will be threatened with permanent contamination**, making the most affected areas unsafe to live in. On March 12, Stratfor Global Intelligence issued a "Red Alert: Nuclear Meltdown at Quake-Damaged Japanese Plant," saying: **Fukushima Daiichi "nuclear power plant in Okuma, Japan, appears to have caused a reactor meltdown."** Stratfor downplayed its seriousness, adding that such an event "does not necessarily mean **a nuclear disaster," that already may have happened - the ultimate nightmare short of nuclear winter.** According to Stratfor, "(**A)s long as the reactor core**, which is specifically designed to contain high levels of heat, pressure and radiation, **remains intact, the melted fuel can be dealt with. If the (core's) breached but the containment facility built around (it) remains intact, the melted fuel can be....entombed within specialized concrete"** as at Chernobyl in 1986. In fact, **that disaster killed nearly one million people** worldwide from nuclear radiation exposure. In their book titled, "Chernobyl: Consequences of the Catastrophe for People and the Environment," Alexey Yablokov, Vassily Nesterenko and Alexey Nesterenko said: "For the past 23 years, it has been clear that there is a danger greater than nuclear weapons concealed within nuclear power. **Emissions from this one reactor exceeded a hundred-fold the radioactive contamination of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki."** "No citizen of any country can be assured that he or she can be protected from radioactive contamination. **One nuclear reactor can pollute half the globe.** Chernobyl fallout covers the entire Northern Hemisphere." Stratfor explained that if Fukushima's floor cracked, "it is highly likely that the melting fuel will burn through (its) containment system and enter the ground. **This has never happened before,**" at least not reported. If now occurring, "**containment goes from being merely dangerous, time consuming and expensive to nearly impossible**," making the quake, aftershocks, and tsunamis seem mild by comparison. Potentially, **millions of lives will be jeopardized**. Japanese officials said Fukushima's reactor container wasn't breached. Stratfor and others said it was, making the potential calamity far worse than reported. Japan's Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency (NISA) said the explosion at Fukushima's Saiichi No. 1 facility could only have been caused by a core meltdown. In fact, 3 or more reactors are affected or at risk. Events are fluid and developing, but remain very serious. **The possibility of an extreme catastrophe can't be discounted**. Moreover, independent nuclear safety analyst John Large told Al Jazeera that by venting radioactive steam from the inner reactor to the outer dome, a reaction may have occurred, causing the explosion. "When I look at the size of the explosion," he said, "it is my opinion that there could be a very large leak (because) fuel continues to generate heat." Already, Fukushima way exceeds Three Mile Island that experienced a partial core meltdown in Unit 2. Finally it was brought under control, but coverup and denial concealed full details until much later. According to anti-nuclear activist Harvey Wasserman, Japan's quake fallout may cause nuclear disaster, saying: "**This is a very serious situation**. If the cooling system fails (apparently it has at two or more plants), **the super-heated radioactive fuel rods will melt, and** (if so) **you could** conceivably **have an explosion**," that, in fact, occurred. As a result, massive radiation releases may follow, impacting the entire region. "It **could be, literally, an apocalyptic event.** The reactor could blow." If so, Russia, China, Korea and most parts of Western Asia will be affected. Many thousands will die, potentially millions under a worse case scenario, including far outside East Asia.

## States

#### Text: The 50 states, Washington D.C., and relevant territories should remove states’ and Homeowner’s Associations’ restrictions on community solar siting.

**States solve decentralization: CSI proves**

**Woody, 12**

[Todd, Forbes Staff, “How California is Democratizing Solar for the 99%,”Forbes, July 3, 2012, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/toddwoody/2012/07/03/how-california-is-democratizing-solar-for-the-99/> //uwyo-baj]

**But that milestone is less notable than the trend toward democratizing solar in the Golden State** as **the California Solar Initiative, or CSI,** hits the midpoint of the program’s decade-long run. Launched in 2007, the initiative **seeks to install 1,940 megawatts of rooftop solar by 2017 by offering incentives for customers of the state’s three big investor owned utilities** – Pacific Gas & Electric, Southern California Edison and San Diego Gas & Electric. (The solar initiative is **part of a larger $3.3 billion effort to bring 3,000 megawatts of distributed renewable energy online by 2017.** **In the** solar initiative’s **early years, Californians going solar tended to be affluent homeowners** who could fork over the five-figure cost of a typical photovoltaic system. **Now the big growth in the market is coming from lower and middle incomes residents.** According to the report, **solar program applications in areas with a medium income of less than $50,000 has grown 364% since 2007 while applications from neighborhoods with median incomes between $50,000 and $100,000 spiked 445%. Falling prices for solar systems have** surely **helped** – the cost of solar arrays installed under the California program has declined 28% since 2007, according to the public utilities commission. **But the game changer has been a financial innovation – leases offered by installers such as SolarCity, Sungevity and SunRun that let homeowners avoid the steep upfront costs of a photovoltaic array and instead pay a monthly fee** that **often** will be **less than the cost of the electricity generated by the solar system.** Those **leases are financed by banks and other institutions that create funds for the solar installers and** which in turn **receive state and federal tax breaks and incentives**. “The upward trend in CSI participation [in] lower and middle income areas is likely due to a sharp increase in third party owned systems that have received CSI incentives,” the report states. “**Third party ownership models, such as solar leases and power purchase agreements (PPAs), allow households who cannot afford to own a PV system to go solar.”** The change has been dramatic. In 2007, 93% of residential solar systems in California were purchased by homeowners; by 2011 nearly two-thirds of new solar arrays were leased. **Also spreading solar to the masses are state policies designed to provide bigger incentives for low-income residents and to put solar on apartment buildings and other multi-family dwellings so tenants can participate in the program**. Through “virtual net metering,” for instance, tenants living in an apartment complex the sports a solar array can receive a credit on their utility bill for the electricity generated. “The intent of [virtual net metering] is to help low income multifamily residents receive direct benefits of the building’s solar system, and is available to all tenants and meters in a defined affordable housing property,” according to the report. **Despite a rocky year for solar manufacturers and California’s struggling economy, the number of solar installations continues to soar. Installations jumped nearly 60%** **in 2011 from the previous year** to a record 311 megawatts **and just in the first quarter of this year 97 megawatts of rooftop solar have been installed.**

## DA

#### Republicans will make deals on sequester now, calculus has changed post Obama’s reelection, but his political capital is key

Kaletsky, 1/23

[Anatole, Economist and journalist, “Cooperation isn’t coming to Washington – it’s already arrived,” Reuters, January 23, 2013, <http://blogs.reuters.com/anatole-kaletsky/2013/01/23/cooperation-isnt-coming-to-washington-its-already-arrived/> //uwyo-baj]

Before the election, Republicans and their business backers had two overriding reasons to obstruct any deals with Obama on borrowing, spending or taxes. First, most Republicans genuinely expected to win the presidential election and therefore had every incentive to defer important decisions until their man was in power. Secondly, they calculated that any collateral damage inflicted on the economy through fiscal warfare would harm the incumbent president, whose Achilles’ heel was economic policy. Once the election was over, this calculus completely changed. Having failed to unseat Obama, Republicans were suddenly in a situation where sabotaging the economy was no longer in their interests. As I argued immediately after the election, and again during the fiscal cliff negotiations, the GOP had few incentives after Nov. 7 to just thwart Obama. Republicans now had to persuade voters that their policies would promote jobs and growth — and would do so immediately, not in some distant future when budgets would have to balance or else the United States would turn into Greece. The election also changed motivations for the Republicans’ business supporters. Instead of viewing Washington gridlock as a weapon for defeating Obama, American businesses after the election had to accept the inevitable. They would have to live with Obama and his policies, however much they disliked them. For most U.S. businesses, the primary political consideration was no longer the ideological debate over taxing and spending, but a purely economic issue: How would the economic policies negotiated between the White House and Congress affect business conditions in the four years leading to 2016? This gestalt shift implies that Republicans are unlikely to press very hard for large-scale spending cuts, government layoffs or fiscal tightening that could be seen as harming economic recovery. Instead the focus should move to long-term budget reforms, designed to take effect only after the economy has largely recovered in 2015 or so – conveniently beyond the next congressional elections. The president will have strong incentives to cooperate with such gradual fiscal consolidation, with major budget cuts backloaded to the last years of his administration and beyond. He would rather go down in history as the man who delivered universal healthcare, saved the U.S. economy from its worst crisis since the Great Depression, and put U.S. fiscal policy on a sustainable footing than waste his entire second term haggling over budgets – especially since achieving fiscal austerity does not require any major cuts or austerity, except in the very long term. In fact, the White House has already said it will offer some long-term entitlement reforms as part of the bipartisan budget deal that now looks eminently attainable. This may infuriate left-wing Democrats, but Obama is unlikely to care much, now that he has been reelected. In any case, grassroots Democratic voters will probably care more about presidential efforts on gun control, immigration and climate change than about wonkish arguments over Chained CPI and Medicare spending caps in the next decade. Why then has there been little discussion of this change in political dynamics? Probably because the media mostly see it as their role to magnify political drama rather than to analyze how they are likely to be resolved. The same applies to many professional politicians. Extreme statements from both parties will always attract the most media attention. The congressional arithmetic, however, means that the views of radicals, highlighted by the media, are no longer very important. In the House, the minority Democrats can pass important votes, such as a budget compromise, with just 20 votes from moderate Republicans eager to compromise. The same applies in the Senate, where the Democrats can lose several of their left-wing caucuses but still easily pass a compromise bill. What matters in this situation is not how most Republicans vote but whether 20 moderates can be found to back a bill to raise taxes, passed mainly by the Democrats. Most likely the Republican leadership would tacitly even encourage and support this handful of defectors, who would allow their party to foster an image of reasonableness and compromise while forcing the Democrats to carry the entire responsibility for higher taxes.

#### Obama will prevail on sequestration now but his political capital is finite- it is key to both keep dems in line and prevent a unified GOP opposition

Tobin, 1/18

[Jonathan S., senior online editor of Commentary magazine, “Time-Out May Be the GOP’s Best Option,” Commentary, January 18, 2013, <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2013/01/18/time-out-may-be-the-gop-best-option-debt-ceiling/> //uwyo-tjc]

The top news out of the House Republican retreat in Williamsburg, Virginia is that the party is considering a short-term extension of the debt limit in order to give the party more time to try and convince their Democratic antagonists to start cutting spending. The proposal, which according to the New York Times, is being floated by Rep. Paul Ryan, could wind up connecting the debt ceiling issue with the deadline for the implementation of sequestration that would mandate devastating across-the-board spending cuts. That would theoretically give the GOP some room to maneuver in order to avoid a confrontation with President Obama that few think they would win. But it is hard to avoid the impression that the main object of a delay would be to deal with the Republicans’ biggest problems: a lack of unity. Like a sports team in disarray, the GOP needs a time out where they can catch their breath and somehow get on the same page with each other. As the votes over House Speaker John Boehner’s Plan B and then the final fiscal cliff deal revealed, the party is badly split between those who don’t want to give an inch on spending and taxes, those who think that compromise with the president is inevitable and those who believe the best the party can do is to speak out for its principles and oppose tactics that will blow up the economy and help demonize the party. But the problem for the Republican leadership is that even if they can buy themselves some more time to get their fractious caucus in line, the likelihood that a confident and aggressive President Obama will either accept a short-term extension or deal honestly with them on the issues. The argument for a time out is that in its current condition with a leadership that can’t count on its members to agree to back a unified strategy on fiscal issues, Republicans are doomed to defeat no matter what option they choose. The president is counting on the GOP splintering into warring factions and has done his best to help that process along by goading his opponents whenever possible including his stunning attack on them even as the two sides were negotiating a deal to prevent the nation from going over the fiscal cliff earlier this month. As Robert Costa and Andrew Stiles noted in their sum up from the retreat, even though Republicans remain in control of the House, the tone of the gathering was that of a defeated party searching for answers. Given the shock felt by many in the party over the president’s re-election and the beatings they’ve received over the debt ceiling and the fiscal cliff, that’s understandable. But Bill Kristol’s advice to them to “suck it up,” is exactly what they need to hear. I think those Republicans who want to make a stand on the debt ceiling are right. Even though the odds are against them prevailing in such a battle, the party can’t simply stand by and let President Obama off the hook without at least trying to stop him by whatever means are at their disposal. That sort of surrender would split the GOP and make it harder for them to recover at the next midterm. But the one given in this equation is that without a united caucus, House Republicans haven’t a prayer of doing anything effective to halt the country’s drift toward insolvency and to head off new taxes. For all of their pessimism, the GOP still controls the power of the purse. President Obama may have the wind at his back right now but his political capital is finite. So is his time. If conservatives can use the coming weeks to agree on a strategy to exploit his weaknesses — such as the division among Democrats and the president’s refusal to deal with entitlement reform — their position could be stronger than they think. The question is do Boehner, Eric Cantor or even Paul Ryan have the ability to convince their colleagues that if they don’t hang together, their hopes of stopping Obama from worsening the nation’s problems are nonexistent.

#### Solar sap capital – republican opposition, fossil fuel interests, and Solyndra scandal

NYT, New York Times, “End of Clean Energy Subsidies?” May 5, 2012

The federal government has given generously to the clean energy industry over the last few years, funneling billions of dollars in grants, loans and tax breaks to renewable power sources like wind and solar, biofuels and electric vehicles. “Clean tech” has been good in return. ¶ During the recession, it was one of the few sectors to add jobs. Costs of wind turbines and solar cells have fallen over the last five years, electricity from renewables has more than doubled, construction is under way on the country’s first new nuclear power plant in decades. And the United States remains an important player in the global clean energy market. ¶ Yet this productive relationship is in peril, mainly because federal funding is about to drop off a cliff and the Republican wrecking crew in the House remains generally hostile to programs that threaten the hegemony of the oil and gas interests. The clean energy incentives provided by President Obama’s 2009 stimulus bill are coming to an end, while other longer-standing subsidies are expiring. ¶ If nothing changes, clean energy funding will drop from a peak of $44.3 billion in 2009 to $16 billion this year and $11 billion in 2014 — a 75 percent decline. ¶ This alarming news is contained in a new report from experts at the Brookings Institution, the World Resources Institute and the Breakthrough Institute. It is a timely effort to attach real numbers to an increasingly politicized debate over energy subsidies. While Mr. Obama is busily defending subsidies, the Republicans have used the costly market failure of one solar panel company, Solyndra, to indict the entire federal effort to encourage nascent technologies.

#### Sequestration devastates the economy, collapses heg, and culminates in Middle Eastern war

Hutchison 9/21

[Kay Bailey Hutchison,, U.S. Senator from the great state of Texas, 9/21/2012 “A Looming Threat to National Security,” States News Service, Lexis]

Despite warnings of the dire consequences, America is teetering at the edge of a fiscal cliff, with January 1st, 2013 as the tipping point. On that date, unless Congress and the White House can reach agreement on how to cut the federal deficit, all taxpayers will be hit with higher taxes and deep cuts - called "sequestration" - will occur in almost all government spending, disrupting our already weak economy and putting our national security at risk. According to the House Armed Services Committee, if sequestration goes into effect, it would put us on course for more than $1 trillion in defense cuts over the next 10 years. What would that mean? A huge hit to our military personnel and their families; devastating cuts in funding for critical military equipment and supplies for our soldiers; and a potentially catastrophic blow to our national defense and security capabilities in a time of increasing violence and danger. All Americans feel a debt of gratitude to our men and women who serve in uniform. But Texas in particular has a culture that not only reveres the commitment and sacrifice they make to protect our freedom, we send a disproportionate number of our sons and daughters to serve. The burden is not borne solely by those who continue to answer the call of duty, but by their families as well, as they endure separation and the anxiety of a loved one going off to war. These Americans have made tremendous sacrifices. They deserve better than to face threats to their financial security and increased risks to their loved ones in uniform, purely for political gamesmanship. Sequestration would also place an additional burden on our economy. In the industries that support national defense, as many as 1 million skilled workers could be laid off. With 43 straight months of unemployment above 8 percent, it is beyond comprehension to add a virtual army to the 23 million Americans who are already out of work or under-employed. Government and private economic forecasters warn that sequestration will push the country back into recession next year. The recent murder of our Ambassador to Libya and members of his staff, attacks on US embassies and consulates and continued riots across the Middle East and North Africa are stark reminders that great portions of the world remain volatile and hostile to the US. We have the mantle of responsibility that being the world's lone super-power brings. In the absence of U.S. military leadership, upheaval in the Middle East would be worse. As any student of history can attest, instability does not confine itself to national borders. Strife that starts in one country can spread like wildfire across a region. Sequestration's cuts would reduce an additional 100,000 airmen, Marines, sailors and soldiers. That would leave us with the smallest ground force since 1940, the smallest naval fleet since 1915 and the smallest tactical fighter force in the Air Force's history. With the destabilization in the Middle East and other areas tenuous, we would be left with a crippled military, a diminished stature internationally and a loss of technological research, development and advantage - just as actors across the globe are increasing their capabilities. Sequestration can still be avoided. But that will require leadership from the President that has thus far been missing. Congress and the White House must reach a long-term agreement to reduce $1 trillion annual budget deficits, without the harsh tax increases that could stall economic growth and punish working families.

#### Middle East goes nuclear

Russell 9

[James A. Russell, Senior Lecturer, National Security Affairs, Naval Postgraduate School, ‘9 (Spring) “Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East” IFRI, Proliferation Papers, #26, http://www.ifri.org/downloads/PP26\_Russell\_2009.pdf]

Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors: (1) asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors; (2) the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists; (3) incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable; (4) perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack; (5) the prospect that Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States; (6) the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants. These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of miscalculation or the pressures of wartime circumstance. Given these factors, it is disturbingly easy to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the context of an unstable strategic framework. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent such an outcome, which would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with substantial risk for the entire world.

### CASE

**Solar manufacturing bad for environment: mining, energy intensive and produces pollution and GHGs**

**De Decker 8**

[Kris, freelance writer, “The ugly side of solar panels,” Low-tech Magazine, March 3, 2008, <http://www.lowtechmagazine.com/2008/03/the-ugly-side-o.html> //uwyo-baj]

**Solar panels** don’t come falling out of the sky – they **have to be manufactured**. [Similar to computer chips](http://www.lowtechmagazine.com/2009/06/embodied-energy-of-digital-technology.html), this is **a dirty and energy-intensive process**. First, **raw materials have to be mined: quartz sand for silicon cells, metal ore for thin film cells.** Next, these **materials have to be treated**, following different steps (in the case of silicon cells these are purification, crystallization and wafering). Finally, these **upgraded materials have to be manufactured into solar cells, and assembled into modules. All these processes produce air pollution and heavy metal emissions**, **and** they **consume energy - which brings about more air pollution, heavy metal emissions and also greenhouse gases.**

**Renewables not inevitable. Solar power is inefficient—all the solar in the world is about two coal plants**

**Duthel 8**

[Duthel, Heinz: German University Bielefeld. *From the Caves, to the Moon, to the Caves - the End Is Near*. 2008. 40. Web. //Wyo-BF]

The numbers for solar are ever poorer. For instance, on page 191 of his 2004 book "The End of Oil: On the Edge of a Perilous New World", **author Paul Roberts writes: . . . “if you add up all the solar photovoltaic cells now running worldwide the combined output** - around 2,000 megawatts **-barely rivals the output of two coal-fired power plants.**” Robert's calculation assumes the solar cells are operating at 100% of their capacity. In the real world, the average solar cell operates at about 20% of its maximum capacity. This means the combined output of all the solar cells in the world is equal to less than 40% of the output of a single coal fired power plant. UPDATE:By end of last year, there was just over 5,000 megawatts of solar pv cells installed worldwide. Operating at average efficiency of 20%, the combined output of all the pv cells in the world is now equal to the output of a single coal fired power-planet.

#### Extinction of the species is the most horrible impact imaginable, putting rights first is putting a part of society before the whole

**Schell 1982**

(Jonathan, Professor at Wesleyan University, *The Fate of the Earth*, pages 136-137 uw//wej)

Implicit in everything that I have said so far about the nuclear predicament there has been a perplexity that I would now like to take up explicitly, for it leads, I believe, into the very heart of our response-or, rather, our lack of response-to the predicament. I have pointed out that **our species is the most important of all the things that,** as inhabitants of a common world, **we inherit from the past generations**, but it does not go far enough to point out this superior importance, as though in making our decision about extinction we were being asked to choose between, say, liberty, on the one hand, and the survival of the species, on the other. For **the species not only overarches but contains all the benefits of life in the common world, and to speak of sacrificing the species for the sake of one of these benefits involves one in the absurdity of wanting to destroy something in order to preserve one of its parts, as if one were to burn down a house in an attempt to redecorate the living room,** or to kill someone to improve his character. ,but even to point out this absurdity fails to take the full measure of the peril of extinction, for mankind is not some invaluable object that lies outside us and that we must protect so that we can go on benefiting from it; rather, it is we ourselves, without whom everything there is loses its value. To say this is another way of saying that extinction is unique not because it destroys mankind as an object but because it destroys mankind as the source of all possible human subjects, and this, in turn, is another way of saying that extinction is a second death, for one's own individual death is the end not of any object in life but of the subject that experiences all objects. Death, however, places the mind in a quandary. One of-the confounding characteristics of death-"tomorrow's zero," in Dostoevski's phrase-is that, precisely because it removes the person himself rather than something in his life, it seems to offer the mind nothing to take hold of. One even feels it inappropriate, in a way, to try to speak "about" death at all, as. though death were a thing situated somewhere outside us and available for objective inspection, when the fact is that it is within us-is, indeed, an essential part of what we are. It would be more appropriate, perhaps, to say that death, as a fundamental element of our being, "thinks" in us and through us about whatever we think about, coloring our thoughts and moods with its presence throughout our lives.

#### Scenario planning is possible in a catastrophe-ridden world—it’s vital to make predictions about the future.

Kurasawa, 04

(Professor of Sociology, York University of Toronto, Fuyuki, Constellations Volume 11, No 4, 2004).

Independently of this contractualist justification, global civil society actors are putting forth a number of arguments countering temporal myopia on rational grounds. They make the case that no generation, and no part of the world, is immune from catastrophe. Complacency and parochialism are deeply flawed in that even if we earn a temporary reprieve, our children and grandchildren will likely not be so fortunate unless steps are taken today. Similarly, though it might be possible to minimize or contain the risks and harms of actions to faraway places over the short-term, parrying the eventual blowback or spillover effect is improbable. In fact, as I argued in the previous section, all but the smallest and most isolated of crises are rapidly becoming globalized due to the existence of transnational circuits of ideas, images, people, and commodities. Regardless of where they live, our descendants will increasingly be subjected to the impact of environmental degradation, the spread of epidemics, gross North-South socioeconomic inequalities, refugee flows, civil wars, and genocides. What may have previously appeared to be temporally and spatially remote risks are ‘coming home to roost’ in ever faster cycles. In a word, then, procrastination makes little sense for three principal reasons: it exponentially raises the costs of eventual future action; it reduces preventive options; and it erodes their effectiveness. With the foreclosing of long-range alternatives, later generations may be left with a single course of action, namely, that of merely reacting to large-scale emergencies as they arise. We need only think of how it gradually becomes more difficult to control climate change, let alone reverse it, or to halt mass atrocities once they are underway. Preventive foresight is grounded in the opposite logic, whereby the decision to work through perils today greatly enhances both the subsequent room for maneuver and the chances of success. Humanitarian, environmental, and techno-scientific activists have convincingly shown that we cannot afford not to engage in preventive labor. Moreover, I would contend that farsighted cosmopolitanism is not as remote or idealistic a prospect as it appears to some, for as Falk writes, “[g]lobal justice between temporal communities, however, actually seems to be increasing, as evidenced by various expressions of greater sensitivity to past injustices and future dangers.”36 Global civil society may well be helping a new generational self-conception take root, according to which we view ourselves as the provisional caretakers of our planetary commons. Out of our sense of responsibility for the well-being of those who will follow us, we come to be more concerned about the here and ‘
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## State CP

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### -- States are first-movers

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

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

**State action is better than the fed**

**Pursley and Wiseman 11** (Garrick, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Toledo College of Law, and Hannah, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Tulsa College of Law, “Local Energy”, Emory Law Journal, 60 Emory L.J. 877)

**The familiar idea that empowering subnational governments allows for a greater influence of state or local preferences in policy and enhances the democratic responsiveness of the federal system is also relevant here**. 325 In federalism scholarship, it is commonly claimed that **state governments are "closer"** - that is, more accessible and accountable - **to citizens than the federal government**. 326 The characteristics of state governments that support this claim - their **smaller electorates, greater transparency and access to elected officials, and greater opportunities for citizen participation in governance** - suggest that local governments are closest to the people. 327 Local "elected officials tend to be more responsive to voter demands because it is easier ... to monitor politicians and it is easier for new politicians to challenge unpopular incumbents[,] ... smaller political units allow for more deliberation and consensus building among members," and "**politics on a small scale ... enables less affluent grassroots organizations to promote their interests through marches, speeches, and creative forms of activism that would not work on a national or regional scale."** 328 **In the distributed renewables area, this means that yet another argument against primarily federal-level action is that people in different locations may have different ideas about how much and what kind of renewable energy they want, and, as far as our broad energy** [\*939] **transition goals and the need to encourage citizens to do their part will allow, we should do what we can to honor those preferences.** 329

States ideally suited to support small-scale renewables

Salkin, 12

(Law Prof-Albany, “The Key to Unlocking the Power of Small Scale Renewable Energy: Local Land Use Regulation,” http://digitalcommons.tourolaw.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1564&context=scholarlyworks)

The states have also devised numerous financial incentives for small-scale alternative energy development. For example, in Colorado, independently-owned residential solar electric generation systems that are not used for income production are exempt from property taxes. Another Colorado law authorizes counties to offer property tax or sales tax incentives for residential and commercial property owners who install renewable energy fixtures. The Illinois Renewable Energy Resource Solar and Wind Energy Rebate Program offers a rebate of up to $30,000 for the construction and use of solar and wind energy sources for homeowners, businesses, public agencies, and non-profit entities. Massachusetts has established a Renewable Energy Trust Fund to make grants, loans, equity investments, rebates, and provide other types of financial assistance for the development and increased use of renewable energy resources. The Fund, in operation with the Massachusetts Clean Energy Center, offers numerous financial incentives, such as the Micro Wind Initiative, which has assisted more than seventy projects to date and “provides rebates for the installation of small wind projects with power capacities from 1 kW to 99 kW and located at residential, commercial, industrial, institutional, and public facilities.” The New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) provide incentives for on-site wind energy systems based on their annual energy output. A previous NYSERDA program, which is now closed, provided incentives of approximately 40% to 45% of the installation costs for residential and commercial solar electric systems. Residents in Oregon are eligible for income tax credits for adding solar energy systems to their homes, as well as for installing solar water heating equipment and solar pool heating equipment.

**States can solve for distributed generation, rps standards, grid initiatives**

**Committee on Energy and Natural Resources , 09**

“NET METERING” COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE, <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-111shrg50740/html/CHRG-111shrg50740.htm>, accessed 7-5-12,WYO/JF

Mr. Brown. Thank you. In addition to being the chair of the New York State Public Service Commission, I am also chair of the NARUC, National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners' Committee on Electricity. So in both these roles, I think like much of the Nation, I have been following the energy and carbon debate that has been happening in Washington, and I have frequent interaction with my regulatory colleagues from around the Nation. I am struck by one thing. **Almost everything currently being discussed and contemplated in the Federal venue, whether it is energy efficiency standards, renewable portfolio standards, smart grid initiatives, carbon reduction, net metering, fair interconnection standards, incorporation of distributed generation, and more, has really been dealt with at the State level to some degree or other**. In fact, **in New York State, we** have **addressed every one of these issues or at least started an initiative to address every one of these issues**. So I think **there has been considerable experience** that has been gained **at the State level**. All States have not taken the exact same approach at the same exact speed. That is not necessarily a bad thing. States are not always the same and circumstances are not always the same. Our record has been, I think, on the most part, very supportive of increasing the diversity of supply in the electricity supply mix. **So as you move forward with potential Federal legislation**, I would ask you to please attempt to **balance the need for Federal leadership and consistency with an awareness that there are many successful efforts at the State level that could be jeopardized by things that perhaps are overly restrictive or overly rigid rules that do not fit into a State's or region's circumstances.** Specifically on the issues that are the subjects of this hearing, over 40 States and the District of Columbia have already adopted net metering rules for distributed generation. **Over 25 States have a renewable portfolio standard, with 14 of those containing specific provisions for solar in distributed generation. Thirty-five States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have adopted revised interconnection standards to ease the burden of safe interconnection into the electricity grid.**

**States can solve for distributed generation, New York Proves**

**Science Applications International Corporation, 2**

“Distributed Generation Primer” U.S. Department of Energy Office of Fossil Energy National Energy Technology Laboratory <http://www.casfcc.org/2/StationaryFuelCells/PDF/Distributed%20Generation%20Primer.pdf>, accessed 7-8-12,WYO/JF

Incentive Programs. **Some states offer programs to assist with DG projects. These programs include grant money to subsidize the cost of feasibility studies, and demonstration projects combined with grant money for product development**. For example, **the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) has offered competitive grants up to $1,000,000 for cost-shared demonstration projects**. The state of California runs a grant program that offers to cover 10% of costs for small DG systems. **For some “emerging renewables”** (solar PV, wind turbines, fuels cells, and solar thermal), **the state offers cash rebates up to $4500 per kW. Similar programs are available in other states.**

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

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

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

#### Overlap leads to policy failure

Rivlin, 12

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

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

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

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

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

## CASE

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

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

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

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

Lillehammer, 2011

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

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