# Shell

#### Link - The Affirmative externalizes blame for the environment by beginning with an examination of what the government should do to fix transportation infrastructure - Externalization absolves us of the responsibility to change our habits of consumption while only making environmental harms worse

Rees, School of Community and Regional Planning, University of British Columbia, 10

(William, “Whats blocking sustainability? Human nature, cognition, and denial”, Sustainability: Science, Practice, & Policy 6(2):13-25, <http://sspp.proquest.com/archives/vol6iss2/1001-012.rees.html>, accessed 7/11/12)

Just what is going on here? Humans are the self-proclaimed “best evidence for intelligent life on Earth.” Yet when the world’s top physicists, ecologists, and climatologists warn repeatedly that current development strategies are undermining global life support systems and risking catastrophe for billions, the responses range from negligible to ineffective. True, “triple bottom-line” corporate planning is now fairly commonplace; various protocols for “green-building” compete to influence building codes; “new urbanism,” “smart growth,” and the ecocities movement are gaining ground everywhere; hybrid and electric vehicles are increasing their market share; and green consumerism is becoming mainstream in many developed countries—but none of this activity has made much difference (apart from fostering the illusion of progress) (Rees, 2009a). Almost all mainstream sustainability measures implicitly assume that the problem can be solved through greater material and economic efficiency and technological “fixes,” ignoring the evidence that, to date, such strategies have actually increased the human ecofootprint.1 Few challenge the fundamental beliefs, values, and assumptions underpinning market-based consumer societies or examine the hidden motivators of human individual or group behavior. On the contrary, all major governments and international development agencies are committed to maintaining the growth in per capita income that has characterized industrial countries for more than a century and to extending consumer culture to the three-quarters of the world’s people who have yet to join the party (see Stutz, 2010 in this issue).2 Efficiency gains are thus overwhelmed by a combination of material growth and the rebound effect in even the world’s most efficient economies (Layke et al. 2000). With no government or mainstream international agency willing openly to contemplate, let alone articulate in public, the revolutionary policy responses evoked by our best science, the modern world remains mired in a swamp of cognitive dissonance and collective denial (Pratarelli, 2008; Pratarelli & Aragon, 2008; Rees, 2009a). Meanwhile, the loss of ecosystem integrity accelerates around the world.

#### Impacts- This denial of individual Agency outweighs all other impacts – it is the foundation of all value

Lang, American University in Cairo, Assistant Professor of Political Science 99

(Anthony F., Jr., “Responsibility in the International System: Reading US Foreign Policy in the Middle East,” European Journal of International Relations, Volume 5, Number 1, p. 78-79)

Following these three thinkers, I assume the following meaning for agency — agency is the ability to act and speak publicly with meaningful intentions in such a way as to have an effect on the world. It requires the ability to interpret those actions in ways that may not always be communicable at first, but do presume some sense of shared meaning (Taylor, 1985: 25).18 Furthermore, following Arendt, the ability to act is central to the creation of the political sphere. Without action, politics could not take place, for it is through actions that communities are constituted. Finally, following Flathman, strong notions of agency are necessary for liberal and democratic citizenship. Unless individuals can think and act *qua* individuals, they will be unable to create a political community in which their rights are protected. Agency is a necessary, although not sufficient, condition for creation of a community that respects civil and political rights. While this definition cannot be considered final, the elements of meaningfulness, publicness and willfulness are all central to the understanding of agency I am using here. How does the attribution of state responsibility undermine individual agency? Because the attribution of state responsibility does not depend on the responsibility of individuals within the state, there is a prima facie sense in which individual agency is irrelevant to considerations of international responsibility. While being irrelevant does not cause something to disappear, it certainly does not help in making that thing an important consideration. But even more importantly, certain manifestations of state responsibility tend to undermine individual responsibility and agency. This article focuses on three aspects of agency — physical, legal and political. Each one of these aspects of agency is necessary to be an active citizen as opposed to simply a pliant subject of a community. Physical agency means having a level of health and welfare that would allow one to pursue political activity. Legal agency means having the legal status as a citizen necessary to protect one’s civil rights. Political agency, perhaps the most difficult to identify, is the set of political beliefs and ideas that prompt an individual to act on behalf of his or her own interests in the public sphere. Again, Arendt’s work on political action captures the idea suggested here — the idea that political action is not just an addition to our daily lives, but something which distinguishes us from animals and which is necessary for our happiness. To inculcate the idea that political action is a value in and of itself is a necessary step in the creation of a true democracy (Arendt, 1958).

#### Alternative – Reject the affirmatives external framing of environmental harms in favor of individual accountability

Princen, University of Michigan, School of Natural Resources and Environment, 1

(Thomas, “Consumption and its Externalities: Where Economy Meets Ecology”, Global Environmental Politics 1:3, August, EBSCO, p.27)

In short, the consumption angle is a means of “rethinking how humans relate to nature.” It is a way to, in effect, wipe the slate clean with respect to how analysts, policy-makers, and citizens understand social organization for resource use. It puts aside, or goes back to the origins of, the neoclassical economic model and asks what model would have been most useful given ecological constraint, given the lack of unending frontiers and infinite waste sinks, and given the inability to find a technical substitute for everything from petroleum to the ozone layer. The consumption angle not only allows for consideration of “full world,” ecologically constrained conditions, but places ecosystem functioning up front and central. It does so by generating questions that ask what is consumed, what is put at risk, what is lost. And it does so without restricting the questions to consumer products or even industrial inputs but by going all the way back up the decision chain to organisms and ecosystems and biogeochemical processes. It also does so by drawing attention to behaviors and movements that otherwise tend to escape those who hold sacrosanct the production angle: restraint and resistance with respect to ever-increasing demand, simple living, home power and local currencies with respect to lifestyle and economic life. Finally, the consumption angle lends itself to explicit assignment of responsibility for excess throughput. This stands in marked contrast to the production angle where actors routinely escape responsibility via distanced commerce and the black box of consumer sovereignty.

# Links

### Generic

#### Focus on government reforms trades off with individual responsibility

Bobertz, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Nebraska College of Law, 95

(Bradley C., March 1995, Texas Law Review, LexisNexis, “Legitimizing Pollution Through Pollution Control Laws: Reflections on Scapegoating Theory”, 7/2/12, pg 2-3, lexis, EP)

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 is us. 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/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1341283661857&returnToKey=20_T15044390478&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.724930.0153511422" \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.

#### Humans scapegoat big entities as evil and polluters, absolves individual responsibility

Bobertz, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Nebraska College of Law, 95

(Bradley C., March 1995, Texas Law Review, “Legitimizing Pollution Through Pollution Control Laws: Reflections on Scapegoating Theory”, LexisNexis pg 3, 7/2/12, EP)

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 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 family psychology, n19 and mass sociology, n20 but is not often associated with law and legal scholarship. Nevertheless, parallels appear to exist between the general scapegoat phenomenon and environmental lawmaking.

### Climate Change

#### Individual driving habits are morally responsible for climate change

Hiller, Portland State University, Assistant Professor Philosophy, 11

(Avram, “Climate Change and Individual Responsibility”, The Monist, vol. 94, no. 3, <http://philpapers.org/archive/HILCCA-4.2.pdf>, p.354, accessed 7/11/12)

Whether or not Sinnott-Armstrong's precise argument withstands scrutiny, there is still a substantive question about the truth of (4). Let's assume, for reductio, that (4) is true. Since the case of the Sunday drive is just a random example, we can generalize (4): no drive which emits GHGs at the same level as a Sunday drive makes any difference in AGCC. This, however, is metaphysically untenable, on the assumption, which all parties in the current debate accept, that there is AGCC due to everyone '$ driving. If individual drives do not make any difference in AGCC, but everyone's driving does, then everyone's driving would have to be some odd emergent entity that is not reducible to individual acts of driving. But this is farfetched, metaphysically.

### Emissions/Climate Change

#### Because of global stagnation, individuals must take action now to manage their own greenhouse gas emissions

Lenzen, Dept. of Applied Science at University of Melbourne, 97

(Manfred, 1-3 October, “Individual responsibility and climate change”, Presented at International Academic Conference on Environmental Justice, The University of Melbourne, Pg. 12, <http://www.isa.org.usyd.edu.au/publications/documents/Greenhouse_Responsibility.pdf>, accessed 7/2012, SD)

Because of its uncertainty, complexity, global scope, irreversibility, long-term effect and regional variability, climate change is posing considerable problems for impact analysis and decision making. Technological improvements and policy instruments do not appear to be achieving a sustainable and equitable situation within the following decades. This is reflected in the difficulties, which Annex I signatory countries are facing in meeting reduction targets set within the FCCC. It is in this context that the important role of changes in individual consumption in industrialised countries must be emphasised. Especially in Australia, the general public has so far been insufficiently addressed about this issue (see for example Reference 55). As a consequence, even though awareness and concern about climate change as well as perceived responsibility are relatively widespread, these are rarely translated into consistent, adequate action and significant emission reductions. In addition, only a limited sphere of responsibility is generally identified, in which reducing the usage of household energy and cars, and the recycling of some materials are recognised as pro-environmental behaviour. Changing the pattern, or even reducing the consumption of goods and services is, however, always almost ignored. It is proposed here that the concept of a personal greenhouse gas budget should be applied in communicating pro-environmental consumer behaviour to the general public. If designed as shown in the previous section, this budget is comprehensive in the sense that it contains both direct and embodied greenhouse gas emissions, including both domestically produced as well as imported commodities. Budgeting greenhouse gas emissions in this way clearly reveals that, in order to live an ecologically sustainable and globally equitable lifestyle, it is necessary to adjust to far lower levels of personal consumption. This reduction in ’standard of living’ does not necessarily correspond to a lower ’quality of life’. Instead, it is possible to live well in a less affluent society with a much lower material output and hence, without the present waste of resources. It is the sustainable and equitable situation, in which the needs of people in industrialised countries are still met, but without compromising the ability of both people in developing countries and future generations to meet their own needs.

### Pollution

#### Individual pollution leads to health and ecological damage greater than distant sources

Vandenbergh, Associate Professor of Law at Vanderbilt University Law School, 5

(Michael P. Vandenbergh, “The Individual as Polluter”, Environmental Law Reporter, November 2005

Vanderbilt Public Law Research Paper No. 05-38, <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=847804> pg 11-12, accessed 7/6/12 CW)

Third, individuals’ toxic chemical releases may be more likely to occur in locations that create exposure to sensitive subpopulations or ecosystems. For example, children and other sensitive subpopulations may be more likely to breathe indoor air or the air inside a motor vehicle than to breathe air contaminated by air toxics released from a distant factory.94 Toxic releases by individuals also often occur in areas of particular ecological sensitivity. The 2003 NRC report concluded that although not all petroleum releases are likely to have adverse effects, the petroleum released from two sources that include large individual contributions—land runoff and two-stroke engines—“is particularly significant because, by their very nature, these activities are almost exclusively restricted to coastal waters. In fact, the estuaries and bays that receive the bulk of the load are often some of the most sensitive ecological areas along the coast.”95 Household pesticides and fertilizers in runoff also may present particular risks to sensitive ecosystems.96 Thus, many releases from individuals may have a greater effect on human health and environmental quality than releases of similar quantities from other sources.

### Species Loss/Biodiversity

#### If there is no one person to blame for the “tipping point”, we look to big agents to take the fall

Oksanen Department of Social Policy and Social Psychology, University of Kuopio 2007 (Markku Oksanen, 2007, “Species Extinction and Collective Responsibility” http://secure.pdcnet.org/852577FF0052468E/file/93505718BF4DA76F85257833006E898F/$FILE/wcp21\_2007\_0003\_0000\_0193\_0197.pdf, 7-5-12, ET)

I think that this intuition of the innocence of the last dodo's killer is mainly correct. Although his act completed the tendency towards extinction, the omission of this particular act would by no means have implied that the species was saved: a population presumably consisting of one individual is doomed to extinction anyway. In brief, even though there is a causal relationship between the killing of the last known member of a species and the extinction, this act of killing is rather insignificant in comparison to the aggregate of preceding acts directly or indirectly accelerating the downfall of the population. However, this blamelessness seems to lead to a repugnant conclusion, as this moral evaluation should be universalisable, and then no one act is worse than "the fatal blow". It leads to a regression: if each individual act of killing a member of the species preceding its extinction is of equal moral and causal significance and if none of the hunters is solely responsible for it, then no one is responsible for the extinction. Put in this way it seems somewhat wanting: certainly we must be able to identify an actor (or a group of actors) that can be blamed for the extinction; otherwise there is a risk that the value of species is totally neglected, as persons cannot be obliged to preserve them. As a solution to this evidently unfortunate logical conclusion I want to suggest that in most cases like this there is a party that ought be regarded as blameworthy.

### Economy Advantage

#### Their economy advantage doubleturns their environment claims – it is this economic growth that drives consumer environmental harms and ignores individual responsibility

Conca, American University, Professor, School of International Service, et al 1

Ken Conca, Thomas Princen, University of Michigan, School of Natural Resources and Environment and Michael F. Maniates, Allegheny College, Professor of Political Science “Confronting Consumption”, Global Environmental Politics 1:3, August, EBSCO, p.2-3)

How might ordinary people living in high-consumption societies begin to clarify and act on these unsettling intuitions? Where can they turn for insights, systematic analysis, support, intervention strategies, or hope of effective action? Certainly not to the policy-making arena. There one finds processes of thought and decision dominated, perhaps as never before, by two forces: a deeply seated economistic reasoning and a politics of growth that cuts across the political spectrum. According to prevailing economistic thought, consumption is nothing less than the purpose of the economy. Economic activity is separated into supply and demand; and demand—that is, consumer purchasing behavior—is relegated to the black box of consumer sovereignty. The demand function is an aggregation of individual’s preferences, each set of which is unknowable and can only be expressed in revealed form through market purchases. Thus analytic and policy attention is directed to production, that is, to the processes of supplying consumers with what they desire. Getting production right means getting markets to clear and the economy to grow. If a problem arises in this produc-tion-based, consumer-oriented economy, corrections are naturally aimed at production, not consumption.

Running in tandem with this reasoning is a simple but compelling political fact: expanding the stock of available resources and spreading the wealth gains among everyone carry a much lower political price tag than trying to redistribute resources from the haves to the have-nots. Economic growth, facilitated at every turn by public policy, becomes the lubricant for civic processes of democratic planning and compromise. The dominance of economistic reasoning and the pragmatism of growth politics conspire to insulate from scrutiny the individual black boxes in which consuming is understood to occur. As a result, no one in public life dares—or needs—to ask why people consume, let alone to question whether people or societies are better off with their accustomed consumption patterns.

# Impacts

## Solvency

### Turns Case/No Solvency

#### The affirmative scapegoats the external manifestations of environmental harms instead of our personal behavior which allows the destruction of the environment to continue in a covert fashion and prevents future environmental reform. This turns the case and proves that they don’t solve.

Bobertz, Professor of Law at University of Nebraska College of Law, 95

(Bradley C, March, Texas Law Review, “Legitimizing Pollution through Pollution Control Laws: Reflections on Scapegoating Theory”, Lexis)

Without commonly accepted religious ceremonies to expiate guilt, Americans turn instead to the sanctifying rituals of lawmaking. The ritualistic elements of legislative action are difficult to dismiss. In environmental law, we have our own sacred clerics, scapegoats, and rites of redemption, even though they inhabit the seemingly a sectarian world of law and politics. Indeed, the inherent spiritualism associated with nature provides a special religiosity to environmental lawmaking, as twenty-five years of incantatory rhetoric from the mouths of our leaders amply prove. 205 Unfortunately**, when society retrofits the simple calculus of blame,** sacrifice, **and redemption to resolve complex social problems, it leaves a legacy of legislative overbuilding and conceptual chaos** -- precisely the condition of environmental law to day. **The enactment of environmental laws also includes a less virtuous tendency to return with one hand what is taken away by the other. We wish to exorcise our demons, but still retain the pleasures of their company. A law that strikes at the external manifestations of an environmental problem satisfies the common desire for identifying and banishing the guilty. On a personal level, however, no one wants her own habits exposed to the same harsh light. By acting with righteous vehemence against the visible end-products of pollution, we avoid asking harder questions about global resource allocation and the sustainability of existing industrial, agricultural, and personal patterns of behavior. Enactment of environmental laws not only releases us from guilt -- or the state of being "part of the problem" -- but also enables us to avoid scrutinizing deeper patterns that implicate our personal habits and appetites**. **Few would like to admit that these habits**, and not simply the immediate targets of environmental law, **create the very problems the law appears to address. In this manner, laws aimed at curtailing pollution can ultimately create barriers to lasting reform by legitimizing the more deeply rooted causes of pollution that the very process of lawmaking has exonerated from blame**. Except for the environmental scapegoats -- duly shamed and punished -- the rest of society is liberated, free to pursue its old ways without fear of reprisal.

### No Aff Solvency –

#### Environmental externalities simply tradeoff

Rodrigue, Hofstra University Professor of Global Studies and Geography and Comtois, University of Montreal Professor of Geography, 9

(Dr. Jean-Paul Rodrigue and Dr. Claude Comtois, “The Environmental Impacts of Transportation”, in The Geography Of Transport Systems, <http://people.hofstra.edu/geotrans/eng/ch8en/conc8en/ch8c1en.html>, Access date 7/5/12)

The costs of environmental externalities can be considered from economic, social and environmental dimensions. The basic types of transportation externalities attributed to the environment fall within air pollution, water pollution, noise, and hazardous materials. Establishing and quantifying environmental externalities is a complex undertaking. Quantification is only at its preliminary stage and many have used this argument to differ the application of several environmental policies by lobbying governments (e.g. acid rain, CFCs and most importantly, climate change). Additionally, the wider the geographical scale the more complex the environmental problem becomes, mainly due to cross-jurisdictional issues. Recent attempt to reach a consensus about climate change have underlined that multilateral environmental agreements are close to be an impossibility.

The sources / emitters of pollutants rarely bear the consequences of their impacts. This has several implications. First, when specific sources are concerned, like road transportation, users only take account of the direct costs of modal ownership like a car (vehicle, fuel, insurance, etc.). Ownership is often the only entry and utilization cost for several transportation modes. The society generally assumes the role of providing and maintaining infrastructure and any indirect costs like damage to structures and infrastructure, losses in productivity (agriculture and labor), cleanup, health services and damage to ecosystems. Second, the geographic separation between sources and recipients is often acute. Acid rains and climate change are obvious examples. On a local level, a community may be affected by noise levels well over its own contribution (notably near major highways), while another (suburbs) may be affected in a very marginal way and still significantly contributes to noise elsewhere during commuting.

There is a tendency towards a shift from direct to indirect consequences for environmental externalities, as of total costs involved. For instance, the absolute levels of air pollutants emissions have considerably dropped in developed countries such as the United States. The problem of source reduction by vehicles was addressed because it was a straightforward cause of air pollutants emissions. This has tended to displace problems elsewhere and developed new types of externalities. Thus, the relative share of air pollution impacts is lessening, but not the number of vehicles, investment in infrastructure or noise levels, which have their own externalities. Reductions in the relative importance of one type of externality redirect the focus on other types that were less addressed, but probably as important in the overall impacts of transport over the environment.

## Agency

### Loss of Agency Outweighs

#### Surrender of our individual capacity to change the world reduces us to serviceable instruments of the state which authorizes war and genocide

Beres, Purdue University, Professor of International Law, 94

(Louis Rene, “Self-Determination, International Law and Survival on Planet Earth”, Arizona Journal of International and Comparative Law, 11 Ariz. J. Int'l & Comp. Law 1, lexis)

The State requires its members to be serviceable instruments, suppressing every glimmer of creativity and imagination in the interest of a plastic mediocrity. Even political liberty within particular States does nothing to encourage opposition to war or to genocide in other States. Since "patriotic self-sacrifice" is demanded even of "free" peoples, the expectations of inter-State competition may include war and the mass killing of other peoples. In the final analysis, war and genocide are made possible by the surrender of Self to the State. Given that the claims of international law 35 are rendered [\*14] impotent by Realpolitik, this commitment to so-called power politics is itself an expression of control by the herd. Without such control, individuals could discover authentic bases of personal value inside themselves, depriving the State of its capacity to make corpses of others. The herd controls not through the vulgar fingers of politics but by the more subtle hands of Society. Living without any perceptible rewards for inner direction, most people have discovered the meaning of all their activity in what they seek to exchange for pleasure. Hence, meaning is absorbed into the universal exchange medium, money, and anything that enlarges this medium is treated as good. According to this model, finality of life is not, as Miguel de Unamuno wrote, "to make oneself a soul," 36 but rather to justify one's "success" to the herd. Instead of seeking to structure what Simone Weil, who was strongly influenced by Unamuno, calls "an architecture within the soul," we build life upon the foundations of death. Thus does humankind nurture great misfortune.

# Alternative

## Alt Solves

### Alt Solves – Emissions/Climate Change

#### Individuals on Earth needs to cut their emissions by at least 50%

Lenzen, Dept. of Applied Science at University of Melbourne, 97

(Manfred, 1-3 October, “Individual responsibility and climate change”, Presented at International Academic Conference on Environmental Justice, The University of Melbourne, Pg. 3-4, <http://www.isa.org.usyd.edu.au/publications/documents/Greenhouse_Responsibility.pdf>, accessed 7/2012, SD)

In the previous years, global greenhouse gas emissions totalled about 42 Gigatonnes of CO2 equivalent (Gt CO2-e; 1 Gt = 109 t) per year, while the global population was almost 6 billion, both figures rising steadily . Applying the concept of international equity in greenhouse gas emissions on a per capita basis means that a sustainable situation is reached if everyone on the planet caused an amount of emissions of not more than 50% of the present world average, given the results of climate models mentioned at the end of the first section. Hence, apportioning the same amount of pollution to everybody on the planet and at the same time reducing emissions by 50% leaves about 3.5 t CO2-e emissions per year and per capita to be released. This “greenhouse gas budget” is both ecologically sustainable and globally equitable and will be referred to in the following as the “sustainable level”. Given the disparities in per capita emissions between industrialised and developing countries shown in Figure 1, a sustainable and equitable situation implies that industrialised countries would have to cut down emissions by 85%, while developing countries could more or less remain at the present levels. It is to ask how such reductions can be achieved. Commonly suggested means of curbing greenhouse gas emissions are (1) technological changes such as efficiency measures for the supply and end-use of energy and the introduction of renewable energy sources, and (2) political incentives such as tradeable emission permits, taxation and subsidisation, resource pricing, efficiency standard regulations, stimulation of research and development, encouragement of changes in consumer behaviour, and community education.

#### Political and Technological Measures will not solve, only individual action will

Lenzen, Dept. of Applied Science at University of Melbourne, 97

(Manfred, 1-3 October, “Individual responsibility and climate change”, Presented at International Academic Conference on Environmental Justice, The University of Melbourne, Pg. 7-8, <http://www.isa.org.usyd.edu.au/publications/documents/Greenhouse_Responsibility.pdf>, accessed 7/2012, SD)

From the previous sections, two conclusions can be drawn, which are (1) that personal consumption in industrialised countries like Australia is the main constituent in both total global emissions and their growth rate, and (2) that it is unlikely that emissions in industrialised countries will be reduced to an equitable and sustainable level by technological and political measures. In view of political inertia and the limited technical potential of curbing greenhouse gas emissions, these conclusions point to an alternative, individual response. This is to change the pattern as well as to reduce the amount of personal consumption. The motivation for such an individual response emerges from the recognition of the individual's entanglement in the global crisis and hence personal responsibility. Adjusting to an environmentally sustainable and globally equitable level of consumption can be an ethical option for people in industrialised countries who are concerned about global unfairness and environmental degradation, but disappointed about adequate political movement. Moreover, comparing personal consumption with the previously mentioned sustainable level of 3.5 t CO2-e per year can be quite enlightening and it questions, who is actually willing to make the sacrifices that an environmentally rigorous policy would entail. Finally, changes in consumer behaviour can gradually become more widespread, and then have a significant influence on global greenhouse gas emissions, and effectively supplement political and technological measures.

### Alt Solves – Pollution

#### Focus on individual pollution leads to better regulation and solutions to pollution everywhere

Vandenbergh, Associate Professor of Law at Vanderbilt University Law School 2005

(Michael P. Vandenbergh, “The Individual as Polluter”, Environmental Law Reporter, November 2005

Vanderbilt Public Law Research Paper No. 05-38, <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=847804> pg 23 7/6/12 CW)

At least three implications arise from treating individual behavior as a discrete source of pollution. The first involves regulatory changes. EPA and other federal agencies will need to refocus data gathering and analysis in ways that enable regulators and the public to understand the individual contribution to environmental risks. EPA and other agencies also will need to place greater emphasis on developing the regulatory tools that can influence individual behavior, as well as the staffing, resources, and organizational structure necessary to design and implement those tools. If misuses of information are to be avoided, a better understanding will be required of the appropriate role of government in creating and activating norms. A deep ambivalence about whether government should be in the business of norm shaping or norm activation is probably healthy. Certainly history pro- vides examples of egregious uses of norm campaigns. The Administrative Procedure Act (APA) constrains agency behavior when an agency engages in notice-and-comment or adjudicatory rulemaking, but information disclosure and norm campaigns often are not subject to APA procedural protections.199 Amendments may be required to extend APA procedural protections to agency efforts that use information to change behavior. Second, understanding individual environmental behavior may be a predicate to addressing unsustainable levels of consumption. Ultimately, environmental scholars and policymakers will need to grapple with the relationship between consumption and environmental risks. Interest in this topic has been largely displaced by more urgent efforts to regulate large industrial sources over the last three decades, but it is beginning to reemerge in the legal literature and in other fields.200 Whether the resource involves fisheries, wetlands, arable land, fresh water, or energy, viewing individuals as a source of environmental risks will facilitate the development of the behavioral models and regulatory measures necessary to achieve sustainable levels of consumption. Finally, the focus on individual behavior may enhance efforts to change the behavior of other sources of pollution. Private firms behave largely as profit-maximizers, but they function through owners, directors, managers, and employees, all of whom are influenced by personal and social norms.201 Many small businesses, small farmers, and other new generation sources may behave in ways that more closely resemble individuals than large industrial firms. The effort to understand the social influences on individual behavior may generate more cost-effective—and therefore of- ten more rational—measures for regulating these other sources as well.

### Alt Solves – Mass Transit

#### Individual are responsible for mass transit usage decision

Kay and Cabanatuan, San Francisco Chronicle, 2

(Jane Kay and Michael Cabanatuan, Chronicle Staff Writers, “Transit agencies lash back at EPA / Environmentalists blame Bay Area's air quality planning”, <http://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/Transit-agencies-lash-back-at-EPA-2880730.php>, accessed 7/5/12)

The suspension of federal funding for Bay Area transportation projects touched off a new round of skirmishing yesterday between environmentalists and regulators over the region's efforts to improve air quality.

Environmentalists said the Bay Area could have avoided the "embarrassment" of a suspension if transportation and air quality officials had come up with an adequate plan a year ago to cut air pollution.

If the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District had proposed sound strategies to reduce traffic and factory pollution, the region wouldn't be in the mess it is, environmentalists said.

But MTC officials, along with Rep. Ellen Tauscher, D-Walnut Creek, blamed bureaucratic delays by the Environmental Protection Agency, which has final approval over the plan to cut smog.

"Typical bureaucratic foot-dragging like we are witnessing from the EPA is not only unacceptable, but downright ludicrous," Tauscher said. "For several weeks, the EPA has stalled on taking action on the Bay Area's regional plan to curb ozone emissions."

Air district and MTC officials argue that air quality has improved and that regulators are doing more in curbing pollution and investing in transit than other parts of the country.

On Monday, the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration suspended approval of new highway and transit projects in the nine counties because of a lack of a clean air plan. The MTC estimates that more than 60 projects costing $716 million will be affected.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency requires such a plan, which describes how the region will curtail future car and industrial emissions. Seven times in the last three years, the Bay Area has exceeded federal standards for ozone, the main ingredient in smog.

But federal and state agencies rejected the plan several times in the past year, complaining that there weren't enough measures, such as improving mass transit, to sufficiently reduce smog by 2006. In July, the EPA called the Bay Area's plan "inferior both quantitatively and qualitatively to what has been required and submitted elsewhere in the country."

The EPA has been evaluating the proposed final plan since Jan. 7.

Amy Zimpzer, deputy director of the air division in EPA's San Francisco office, said her agency would rule on the part of the plan dealing with transportation within several weeks, although review of the overall plan might take four or five months.

Nine other regions in the United States are in the same situation, and seven corrected their plans last year.

While transportation officials chafe at the wait for a decision, environmental groups say it's their own fault.

"I think it's an embarrassment," said Deborah Reames, attorney for Earthjustice Legal Defense. "For a major metropolitan area with our pride in our environment here to still be out of compliance with health-based ozone standards and to have less people riding transit is just embarrassing."

"We spent years in the courts," Reames added. "MTC and the local agencies lost, but here we are 10 years later. The agencies have refused over and over to take the steps they need to clean up our air."

Judge Thelton Henderson ruled last year in favor of seven environmental and community groups represented by Earthjustice, writing that MTC had failed to increase its 1983 ridership by 15 percent as it was required to do in an earlier plan.

Based on the Federal Transit Database, between 1983 and 1999, Portland, Ore. , raised ridership by 73 percent, Boston by 41 percent and Washington by 28 percent, according to the lawsuit.

Randy Rentschler, a spokesman for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, said the MTC can't force people to use mass transit. "Every morning people in the Bay Area wake up and decide how they're going to get to work -- walk, drive, take transit or bike," he said. "We can't decide for them. "

### AT: Individual Change Doesn’t Solve

#### Individual citizens aggregate as majority

Babcock, Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, 9

(Babcock M. Hope, 2009, <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/elr/vol33_1/Babcock.pdf>, ASSUMING PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT: MOVING TOWARD A NEW ENVIRONMENTAL NORM pg 119-120, accessed 7/8/12, CW)

One of the serious challenges to changing behavior is the perception that individual contributions to environmental problems are small and, there- fore, inconsequential. People’s misapprehension of their role as a causative factor in environmental degradation leads them to resist changing their behavior, especially when behavior change is costly or inconvenient.10 Over a decade ago, former Environmental Protection Agency Administrator William Ruckelshaus recognized that fact: “[T]he most significant threats to our environment now seem to lie, not with major industrial sites, but in the habits of ordinary Americans: we like to drive big powerful cars, use a lot of electricity, generate a lot of waste, enjoy cheap food, live in grassy suburbs, and collectively send pollution in massive amounts to often distant waterways and airsheds.11” Each one of us pollutes “when we drive our cars, fertilize and mow our yards, pour household chemicals on the ground or down the drain, and en- gage in myriad other common activities. Although each activity contributes minute amounts of pollutants, when aggregated across millions of individuals, the total amounts are stunning.”12 The result is that while industrial sources continue to be a major cause of pollution, individuals are now the largest remaining source of many pollutants.

### AT: Individual Change Can’t Effect Climate

#### Average American emissions do make a substantial difference in climate change

Hiller, Portland State University, Assistant Professor Philosophy, 11

(Avram, “Climate Change and Individual Responsibility”, The Monist, vol. 94, no. 3, <http://philpapers.org/archive/HILCCA-4.2.pdf>, p.354, accessed 7/11/12)

Importantly, John Nolt has done something very much like this calculation, though he does so in analyzing the consequences of individuals' entire lives.12 The number Nolt arrives at is not insignificant. He argues, using data from the IPCC's "Climate Change 2007: Synthesis Report,"13 that on average, an American's lifetime GHG-emitting activities cause serious harm to one or two people, typically in the developing world. If Nolt is correct, then the average American, over the course of her or his lifetime, does make a difference.

Interestingly, Nolt is explicit that he is not interested in calculating the effects of a single individual action and that it is the habit of driving that is relevant.14 So defenders of ICI may still wonder: I may in my whole life harm one or two people, but what harm can one drive cause? However, the answer to this question is quite simple, given the result of Nolt's calculation. As I discuss elsewhere using data from the National Academy of Sciences,15 the emissions from a twenty five-mile car ride amounts to approximately 1/4 of a day's worth of emissions for an average American.16 Thus if the actions of a full life of an American seriously harm the full life of one person (taking the more conservative of Nolt's estimates), then 1/4 of a day's worth of emissions causes 1/4 of a day's worth of serious harm. In other words, going on a Sunday drive is the moral equivalent of ruining someone's afternoon. Since ruining someone's afternoon is, to use nontechnical vocabulary, not a very nice thing to do, if Nolt's assumptions are correct then one Sunday drive is indeed prima facie wrong to a not-insignificant extent.

### AT: Individuals Can’t Solve Global Environment

#### This argument ignores potential power of international, collective non-state solutions

Biswas, Whitman, Professor of Politics 7

(Shampa, December, “Empire and Global Public Intellectuals: Reading Edward Said as an International Relations Theorist,” Millennium: Journal of International Studies, Vol. 36, No. 1, p. 125-126)

In making a case for the exilic orientation, it is the powerful hold of the nation-state upon intellectual thinking that Said most bemoans. 31 The nation-state of course has a particular pride of place in the study of global politics. The state-centricity of International Relations has not just circumscribed the ability of scholars to understand a vast ensemble of globally oriented movements, exchanges and practices not reducible to the state, but also inhibited a critical intellectual orientation to the world outside the national borders within which scholarship is produced. Said acknowledges the fact that all intellectual work occurs in a (national) context which imposes upon one’s intellect certain linguistic boundaries, particular (nationally framed) issues and, most invidiously, certain domestic political constraints and pressures, but he cautions against the dangers of such restrictions upon the intellectual imagination. 32 Comparing the development of IR in two different national contexts – the French and the German ones – Gerard Holden has argued that different intellectual influences, different historical resonances of different issues, different domestic exigencies shape the discipline in different contexts. 33 While this is to be expected to an extent, there is good reason to be cautious about how scholarly sympathies are expressed and circumscribed when the reach of one’s work (issues covered, people affected) so obviously extends beyond the national context. For scholars of the global, the (often unconscious) hold of the nation-state can be especially pernicious in the ways that it limits the scope and range of the intellectual imagination. Said argues that the hold of the nation is such that even intellectuals progressive on domestic issues become collaborators of empire when it comes to state actions abroad. 34 Specifically, he critiques nationalistically based systems of education and the tendency in much of political commentary to frame analysis in terms of ‘we’, ‘us’ and ‘our’ - particularly evident in coverage of the war on terrorism - which automatically sets up a series of (often hostile) oppositions to ‘others’. He points in this context to the rather common intellectual tendency to be alert to the abuses of others while remaining blind to those of one’s own. 35

### AT: Companies pollute more

#### Increase in human population and activity exponentially increase the amount of pollution, making individuals, the largest source of environmental problems

Babcock, Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, 9

(Babcock M. Hope, 2009, <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/elr/vol33_1/Babcock.pdf>, ASSUMING PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT: MOVING TOWARD A NEW ENVIRONMENTAL NORM pg 121-122, accessed 7/8/12, CW)

The individual’s share of the total pollutant load appears “to be growing as population, consumption, and activity levels increase, and as command and control and other regulatory instruments reduce emissions from large industrial sources.”26 For example, the relatively stable percentage of total nitrogen oxide (NOx) and volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions contributed by on-road motor vehicles comes from substantial reductions in per- vehicle tailpipe emissions being offset by the increasing popularity of larger, more polluting pickup trucks and SUVs.27 Increased population and activity levels and greater population dispersal have also resulted in the number of vehicles on the road and the vehicle miles traveled more than doubling since 1970,28 neutralizing gains in emission reductions.29 A single discharge of pollution into a river or a lake may be barely detectable, but “the cumulative impact of numerous, smaller discharges can destroy ecosystems, render water unusable, and jeopardize public health.”30 Similarly, environmental injury from the random dumping of household trash, dilapidated furniture, shopping carts, plastic bags and bottles, car batteries, tires and even entire cars into rivers can be as severe in the long run as a steady stream of pollution from an industrial or wastewater pipe.31

## Framing

### Framing of Sustainability

#### This debate should be about the rhetorical narrative of environmental sustainability - Must construct a new narrative of environmental sustainability that breaks with cognitive dissonance

Rees, School of Community and Regional Planning, University of British Columbia, 10

(William, “Whats blocking sustainability? Human nature, cognition, and denial”, Sustainability: Science, Practice, & Policy 6(2):13-25, <http://sspp.proquest.com/archives/vol6iss2/1001-012.rees.html>, accessed 7/11/12)

The lesson here is that any attempt to engineer a social transition must confront the fact that humans are naturally behaviorally conservative. We are indeed creatures of habit. Once an individual’s synaptic pathways and associated behaviors are well entrenched, it is difficult for that person to adapt to significant changes in either the sociocultural or biophysical environments. To re-establish cognitive consonance between programmed perceptions and new environmental realities requires that the affected parties engage in the willful restructuring of their own neural pathways and associated belief systems. This requires conscious effort and will not always be successful. Even when people accept that such “reprogramming” is necessary, the process can be lengthy, difficult, and unpredictable (Wexler, 2006). That said, the human brain, even when damaged, has proved to be remarkably plastic and responsive to determined effort (e.g., Doidge, 2007).

It seems to boil down to this: Modern society has been paralyzed by deep-seated cognitive dissonance, collective denial, and political inertia in dealing with the unsustainability conundrum. The problem has roots in both innate behaviors and socially constructed beliefs that seem literally to program the brain. What individuals hear and pay attention to (or ignore) can thus be understood only within the context of both social norms and the broader political-economic environment (Norgaard, 2009).

Mere information, including scientific analysis of a problem, is generally not enough to stimulate policy reform or effective action. However, assuming a sufficient level of fear, international agreement on the nature of the problem, general commitment to a collective solution, unprecedented political will, and the creative engagement of modern communication technologies, the world community could theoretically choose to educate the next generation from scratch in a whole new sociocultural paradigm for survival. This new narrative is essential to override humanity’s now maladaptive expansionist tendencies and to enhance other behaviors and predispositions regarding our present cultural fitness. It is even conceivable that cooperative action at the highest levels through something like the “Survival 2100” project would inscribe the new narrative on the resistant psyches of the present generation. Arguably, success in this endeavor is the only way to bring global sustainability within our grasp.

# Answers to 2AC Arguments

### AT: Permutations

#### Perm won’t solve - Combining state focus with individual action creates resistance

Babcock, Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, 9

(Babcock M. Hope, 2009, <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/elr/vol33_1/Babcock.pdf>, ASSUMING PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT: MOVING TOWARD A NEW ENVIRONMENTAL NORM pg 123, accessed 7/8/12, CW)

Even if there were laws that reached these activities, there would be serious problems enforcing them. Efforts to detect and ultimately enforce against individual activities that usually occur at home or in the immediately surrounding area would trigger enormous political resistance, as they would be seen as an interference with individual liberty and an invasion of privacy. Such initiatives would also be resource-intensive for the government to carry out. Moreover, the questionable behavior may be perfectly legal (driving a gas-guzzling, pollutant-emitting Hummer) or publicly acceptable (littering). It is unlikely that Congress will amend our environmental laws to reach individual actions. “A formal change in statutory or regulatory law . . . requires concerted collective action; large numbers of people must see a problem, agree that it needs quick action, and commit their time and re- sources to providing that action.”45 This inertia “is even more pronounced when regulation is sought in an area where unrestricted individual choice has been (or is perceived to have been) the norm.”46

#### We are too focused on blaming others to see that we as humans are the problem

Berry Jefferson, Lecturer in the Humanities, 1979

(Wendell Barry, June 1979, “A Continuous Harmony: Essays Cultural & Agricultural“, https://www.msu.edu/~kikbradl/little.html, 7-5-12, ET)

To me, one of the most important aspects of the environmental movement is that it brings us not just to another public crisis, but to a crisis of the protest movement itself. For the environmental crisis should make it dramatically clear, as perhaps it has not always been before, that there is no public crisis that is not also private. To most advocates of civil rights, racism has seemed mostly the fault of someone else. For most advocates of peace the war has been a remote reality, and the burden of the blame has seemed to rest mostly on the government. I am certain that these crises have been more private, and that we have each suffered more from them and been more responsible for them, than has been readily apparent, but the connections have been difficult to see. Racism and militarism have been institutionalized among us for too long for our personal involvement in those evils to be easily apparent to us. Think, for example, of all the Northerners who assumed - until black people attempted to move into their neighborhoods that racism was a Southern phenomenon. And think how quickly - one might almost say how naturally ­ among some of its members the peace movement has spawned policies of deliberate provocation and violence. But the environmental crisis rises closer to home. Every time we draw a breath, every time we drink a glass of water, every time we eat a bite of food we are suffering from it. And more important, every time we indulge in, or depend on, the wastefulness of our economy-and our economy's first principle is waste-we are causing the crisis. Nearly every one of us, nearly every day of his life, is contributing directly to the ruin of this planet. A protest meeting on the issue of environmental abuse is not a convocation of accusers, it is a convocation of the guilty. That realization ought to clear the smog of self-righteousness that has almost conventionally hovered over these occasions, and let us see the work that is to be done.

### AT: Perm – Vote for Plan W/Out Advantage

#### 1. Plan focus bad- the outcome is a small part of the strategy, the focus should be on the 1AC as a whole.

#### 2. Severance – the aff severs out of the representations of the plan.

#### 3. Most real world- representations dictate how we view issues in the first place.

#### 4. Time skew- kicking advantages moots the 1NC.

#### 5. Education- justifications encourage a more in-depth debate.

#### 6. Encourages bad advantages that are shallow and poorly researched.

#### 7. Destroys fairness- they can spike out of any net benefit by kicking out of strategic areas of case.

#### 8. Predictability- plan is constrained by the resolution, the advantages are not.

### AT: Case Outweighs

#### Environmental media also externalizes guilt on pollution

Bobertz, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Nebraska College of Law, 95

(Bradley C., March 1995, Texas Law Review, “Legitimizing Pollution Through Pollution Control Laws: Reflections on Scapegoating Theory”, LexisNexis”, 7/2/12, EP)

The idea that the media simply reports news in an objective, mirror-like fashion retains few adherents. n35 Media scholars have shown that news reports, like most forms of storytelling, rely on predictable narrative structures and beliefs about heroism and villainy, causation and desert. n36 The news has become a form of cultural mythology, n37 a way for society to converse with itself and reinforce its essential beliefs, world views, and ideologies. n38 One observer calls television, including the news, a "consensus narrative" -- a set of assumptions used "to articulate the culture's central mythologies, in a widely accessible 'language,' an inheritance of shared stories, plots, character types, cultural symbols, [and] narrative conventions."

Given its basis in the seemingly objective world of science, the reporting of environmental issues would seem to present an exception to the rule. Scholars of environmental journalism have, if anything, found the opposite to be true. n40 Typically, news about environmental issues is decontextualized and presented as a series of discrete events that are [\*720] fraught with drama, rather than as ongoing problems or predictable malfunctionings of complex technologies. n41 Environmental problems (particularly those of a catastrophic nature) are reported as aberrations from a norm of health and safety.

#### Environmental disasters, albeit terrible, should be viewed as normal and should not be misconstrued as the evils of industry, rather the result of humanity.

Bobertz, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Nebraska College of Law, 95

(Bradley C., March 1995, Texas Law Review, “Legitimizing Pollution Through Pollution Control Laws: Reflections on Scapegoating Theory”, LexisNexis”, 7/2/12, EP)

Charles Perrow's work, Normal Accidents, n42 effectively dispels the idea that environmental problems should be viewed as aberrational. Perrow presents a convincing case that "accidents" like airline crashes, n43 explosions at petrochemical plants, n44 and marine mishaps n45 should be considered "normal" aspects of living in a risky world. Despite our best efforts to prevent catastrophes, technological disasters are inevitable given the unpredictability of multiple failures in complex systems. n46 Every effort may be made to protect against foreseeable breakdowns, both human and technological, but combinations of failures in all their possible iterations may simply be impossible to predict. n47 As one observer summed it up, environmental stories "are part of a modern myth that focuses attention on natural powers beyond our control and on the blundering efforts of humans to deal with the fruits of the industrial revolution." n

### AT: Green Tech Solves

#### Energy consumption unsolvable by “green” tech

Babcock, Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, 2009

(Babcock M. Hope, 2009, <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/elr/vol33_1/Babcock.pdf>, ASSUMING PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT: MOVING TOWARD A NEW ENVIRONMENTAL NORM pg 122, accessed 7/8/12, CW)

Personal consumption is also a serious source of environmental problems. For example, in 1998, the automobile industry produced thirty- eight million cars, raising the global fleet from fifty-three million in 1950 to 508 million.32 At the same time, the number of people per car declined by almost 80% over the past fifty years.33 “In the aggregate, global consumption achieved a level that is almost historically inconceivable: Measured in constant dollars, the world’s people have consumed as many goods and ser- vices since 1950 as all previous generations put together.”34 According to Gro Harlem Brundtland, former Prime Minister of Norway, “[i]t is simply impossible for the world as a whole to sustain a Western level of consump- tion for all. In fact, if seven billion people were to consume as much energy and resources as we do in the West today we would need ten worlds, not one, to satisfy all our needs.”35 Many of the decisions that individual consumers make reflect highly personal lifestyle decisions, such as where they want to live, work, drive, and shop, even when people buy “green.”3

### Floating PIKs Good

#### Education-focus on justification allows more in depth discussion on the 1AC. Plan focused debate is inevitable, long season and recycled affs.

#### Real World-Policy makers have to defend the justifications of their plans as well as the plan itself. Disallowing floating PIK from the debate leads to policy makers who don’t know how to defend their actions.

#### Predictability- the affirmative chooses the advantage and the justifications for it, they should be able to defend their reps

#### It’s functionally competitive- the floating PIK results in the endorsement of a different set of justifications, not the exact same thing as the 1AC

#### Representations matter-Reps and discourse shape how we perceive the world and benefits of policy action. The exclusion of floating PIKs would allow teams to spend half their speech saying racist slurs and force the judge to align themselves with that.

#### Reject the Argument not the team. We’re not uniquely abusive.

### Judge Choice Bad

#### 1. Affirmative irresponsibility- encourages affirmative’s to read shallow advantages that don’t link to the kritik in the 2AC2. Severance- the affirmative severs out of the representations of the 1AC3. More real world- justifications shape how policymakers interpret knowledge and what courses of action they take4. Reciprocity- affirmative can critique our representations, we should hold the affirmative to their representations too

# Affirmative Answers

### Permutation – Do Both

#### Only a combination of infrastructure and individual action can solve

Fahlquist, Department of Philosophy, Delft University of Technology, 8

(Jessica Nihle´n Fahlquist, November 22, 2008, J Agric Environ Ethics, “Moral Responsibility for Environmental Problems—Individual or Institutional?,” <http://www.ethicsandtechnology.eu/images/uploads/jes.pdf> , Springer, pg 8-9, EP)

What, then, can be said about the reasonableness of alternatives? When does an individual consumer or citizen have reasonable alternatives? As mentioned above, Aristotle argued that an individual should be excused from (backward-looking, in my terms) responsibility (blame) when she did not act voluntarily, i.e., acted under compulsion or due to ignorance. The lack of reasonable alternatives can be stated in similar terms. Although consumers are not coerced into buying food that was produced using unnecessarily high levels of energy, if organic or climate-smart food is very expensive compared to regular food, the alternative to buy the environmentally less damaging food is not really an option unless the consumer is wealthy. This is an example of how the cost of choosing the ‘‘right’’ option is highly relevant. In addition to cost, the availability of good options is relevant. If 99% of the products in grocery stores are not climate-smart products, this is obviously an obstacle to people who want to reduce their carbon footprint even if they can afford to buy those products. Similarly, unless there are safe and extensive bicycle lanes, the alternative to ride a bike instead of driving a car is not a realistic option for people who drive to work. The latter is an example of how culture, tradition, and political decisions affect how people choose to act. They may choose to drive their car because they grew up and live in a society that treats cars and highways as very important parts of life and society. On the other hand, they may resist that cultural pressure and want to ride a bicycle or use public transport instead, but if the infrastructure makes it difﬁcult or too inconvenient to choose those options, the conscientious citizen may, very reluctantly, continue to drive their car to work. In real life, compulsion appears to be a matter of degree and although nobody is forcing people, it may be very difﬁcult to choose the environmentally friendly option. It is obviously difﬁcult to draw a line between what is reasonable and what is not in individual cases. On the political and general level, it is clear that some infrastructural, cultural, socio-economic, and political features of modern societies are questionable from an environmental perspective and that these features affect what alternatives individuals have to act in ways that promote solutions to environmental problems. The most obvious problem is likely to be the car-dependency of industrialized nations. A second problem may be the extent to which people in Western societies are used to eating meat products. A third problem is the overuse of packaging and plastic bags. In addition to cost and the availability of good options, information about the environmental footprints we leave is obviously crucial. However, the question of what information there is, is not as straightforward as one might think. In most well-ordered societies there is information available, which means that most people have the opportunity to know how their behavior affects the environment. Even if there is a lot of information, it is sometimes too expensive to do the environmentally right thing. In many cases, the information does not reach all groups of people in society. Furthermore, all these factors, cost, substantial inconvenience, availability, and information problems, affect the reasonableness of the alternatives individual consumers and citizens have when they ‘‘choose’’ to act in environmentally friendly or environmentally unfriendly ways. Because these are highly prevalent problems in most societies today, it is not fair or fruitful to ascribe backward-looking responsibility neither to individuals taken separately nor to the group of individual consumers or citizens in these societies.

#### Institutions are the most powerful- individuals can’t solve

Fahlquist, Department of Philosophy, Delft University of Technology, 8

(Jessica Nihle´n Fahlquist, November 22, 2008, J Agric Environ Ethics, “Moral Responsibility for Environmental Problems—Individual or Institutional?,” <http://www.ethicsandtechnology.eu/images/uploads/jes.pdf> , Springer, pg 12, EP)

The long-term goal should be to encourage virtuous individuals, as citizens and consumers, i.e., for example to have people embrace green virtues.23 It would, of course, be nice if people in general start to care about the environment more naturally and every day. However, from the short-term perspective we need to add that this distribution of responsibility should also be effective and efﬁcient, i.e., contributing to a solution to the problem. That is why the greatest share of responsibility for environmental problems should be ascribed to the most powerful, resourceful, and capable actors, i.e., governments and corporations, because they can create systems that make it easier and less costly for people to choose the environmentally friendly option than to choose the environmentally harmful option. As argued by Henry Shue, some duties should be assigned to institutions instead of individuals because that is likely to be more efﬁcient. Institutions can make possible the coordination and cooperation that are needed for those duties to be fulﬁlled. A second reason is that it would be to demand too much of people to assign such duties to individuals because individuals have rights as well as duties and should be allowed some time outside of their role as duty-bearers. Thus, for reasons of efﬁciency as well as for reasons of fairness institutions as opposed to individuals should be considered the main duty-bearers. However, this does not mean that individuals are completely exempted. On the contrary, it is their duty to make sure there are adequate institutions to implement the duties in question.24

Only institutions can work to change the environment- humans not key

Fahlquist, Department of Philosophy, Delft University of Technology, 8

(Jessica Nihle´n Fahlquist, November 22, 2008, J Agric Environ Ethics, “Moral Responsibility for Environmental Problems—Individual or Institutional?,” <http://www.ethicsandtechnology.eu/images/uploads/jes.pdf> , Springer, pg 13, EP)

Whereas, Shue argues that the role of institutions is to implement the duties, Michael Green argues that the responsibility of institutions is even greater than the responsibility of individuals. He argues that while it is reasonable to keep the restrictive version of responsibility, i.e., the responsibility that always traces behavior to harm for individuals, a more comprehensive kind of responsibility should be assigned to institutions because they constitute a different kind of agent. Institutions have more power and can alter mass behavior, they are better at collecting and processing information about direct and indirect consequences of their actions and they can spread the cost through taxation. Essentially, institutional agents have more capacity; hence a greater share of responsibility is justiﬁed. 25 Similarly, Walter Sinnott-Armstrong argues that whereas individuals do not have amoral obligation not to waste gas, governments have a moral obligation to ﬁght global warming, primarily due to the scale of the problem.26Thus, due to the urgency and scale of environmental problems, it appears a good casecan be made to include institutions into the discussion on how to distribute responsibilityfor such problems. Having said that, the fundamental unit in society is the individualcitizen and institutions are created and upheld by individuals acting together. Hence, itappears reasonable to expect individuals with capacity, resources, and knowledge to createenvironmentally friendly institutions. In addition to voting, this also involves creating, supporting, and joining organizations that work to improve the environment.27This, inturn, could entail different activities, for example working to directly improve the status of the environment, working to improve consumers’ options and increase their information, working to raise people’s awareness and working to change the more traditional organizations (trade unions, culture and sports associations, and so forth). As argued by Sinnott Armstrong, instead of just withdrawing from society and adjusting one’s own lifestyle tocreate as little environmental damage as possible, it is even more important to be proactive and work to change government policies and laws.28

### Perm – Do Both: Solves Climate Change

#### Must hold individual and infrastructure system accountable

Hiller, Portland State University, Assistant Professor Philosophy, 11

(Avram, “Climate Change and Individual Responsibility”, The Monist, vol. 94, no. 3, <http://philpapers.org/archive/HILCCA-4.2.pdf>, p.354-5, accessed 7/11/12)

However, it might not be completely implausible for a reason I mentioned earlier. Individual drives would not exist except insofar as there is a large system of cars, roads, laws, oil drilling, gas stations, etc. So perhaps there is a higher-order entity, the system of driving, which is not reducible simply to individual drives, and it is this entity that is responsible for climate change. Still, it would be metaphysically odd to claim that this entity is totally irreducible. For though it would not be reducible to individual drives alone, it would be reducible to individual drives plus all the actions which create and maintain the system of driving, such as building roads, drilling for oil, etc. Each of these actions plays some causal role in AGCC. And this seems correct: we do believe that oil companies, for example, are at least partly causally responsible for AGCC even aside from the ways in which they directly emit GHGs. We should still attribute to individual drives some partial causal role in AGCC.

### Permutation – State Action Necessary

#### The Aff solves- the government makes it easier for individuals to change

Fahlquist, Department of Philosophy, Delft University of Technology, 8

(Jessica Nihle´n Fahlquist, November 22, 2008, J Agric Environ Ethics, “Moral Responsibility for Environmental Problems—Individual or Institutional?,” <http://www.ethicsandtechnology.eu/images/uploads/jes.pdf> , Springer, pg 14,15 EP)

Although it is questionable to hold individuals responsible in the backward-looking sense, it is reasonable to hold individuals responsible in a forward-looking sense. Again, the different contexts and the different extent to which individuals have the capacity and resources to assume such responsibility should be taken into account. The most important conclusion is that governments and corporations have a great forward-looking responsibility to create opportunities for individuals to behave responsibly and act in environmentally friendly ways. Although acknowledging individual responsibility is beneﬁcial, we should make sure that institutional responsibility is not overlooked or ignored as a consequence. There are good reasons to argue that responsibility ascriptions and distributions should be both i) fair and ii) efﬁcient. They should be fair for reasons of social cooperation and humanity. Cooperation is easier to achieve in a society where the norm is to hold someone responsible only when it is fair to do so and such a society is arguably more humane. Of course there is no simple answer to the question when it is fair to hold someone responsible. However, it is common both in social practice and philosophical discussions to apply a number of conditions when ascribing responsibility. For instance, an agent should only be held responsible if she is eligible for normative assessment, meaning she is a mentally well grown-up, she contributed causally to the event, she knew what she was doing, she did it voluntarily, and what she did was wrong according to some set of norms.30 Of course, there is disagreement on the content of these conditions as well as how important each one of them is. The point is that we commonly use some set of conditions when ascribing responsibility and this can be seen as a way to make sure that responsibility is ascribed and distributed fairly. The efﬁciency aim is about the way in which ascriptions and distributions of responsibility contribute to solving societal problems. Whether it be public health, poverty, education, or the environment—when discussing to whom we should ascribe responsibility and the question how responsibility should be distributed between different actors (individuals, governments, corporations, teachers, parents, and so forth) we do not merely care about what is fair, but also who is best apt at solving the problem. To use this notion, my conclusion can be stated as follows. It is not fair to ascribe responsibility in the backward-looking sense, i.e., to blame individuals, for environmentally destructive actions unless they have reasonable alternatives and resources to act in environmentally friendly ways. However, it is fair to ascribe forward-looking responsibility to individuals, based on their capacity to contribute to solutions to environmental problems. Furthermore, a considerable share of forward-looking responsibility should be ascribed to governments and corporations because they can make the group of capable, hence responsible, individuals larger. The urge to ascribe forward-looking responsibility to institutional agents is motivated by the efﬁciency aim of responsibility distributions. Simply put, if we ascribe responsibility to governments and corporations we have a better chance of creating a society in which the opportunities to act in an environmentally friendly way increase.

### Perm – Vote for Plan w/out Advantage

#### 1. Plan focus good- sets a stable focus for the debate.

#### 2. Reciprocity- if the neg is allowed to kick justifications for rejecting the plan, we should be allowed to kick our justifications.

#### 3. Real world- in actual policy making, the focus is on the outcomes rather than the justifications.

#### 4. Not severance- the plan doesn’t mandate justifications, just the outcome.

#### 5. The judge should act as a dynamic policy maker who decides the best policy option.

#### 6. If the neg wins that the plan is a bad idea you should vote neg, if they win that our justifications are bad, you should just reject those.

#### 7. Representations don’t matter- if good ideas are considered beneficial then the outcome is what should be preferred, not the justifications.

#### 8. Not a reason to vote neg- doesn’t provide a forced choice.

### Economy Adv Outweighs

#### Alternative can’t solve economic recovery advantage – net benefit to the permutation

Biondo, Publisher Inbound Logistics Magazine, 5

(Keith G., December 2005, *Inbound Logistics* magazine is an information leader in supply chain and logistics management, “Environmentalists: 'It's My Way, Not the Highway'”

<http://www.inboundlogistics.com/cms/article/environmentalists-its-my-way-not-the-highway/>, accessed 7/5/12)

While overseas missions to build trade opportunities generate press coverage, and blue ribbon commissions study what makes companies such as Nissan move its North American headquarters from Carson, Calif., to Nashville, Tenn., 1,500 jobs lost, some policy-makers are missing-in-action on the real mission—modernizing transport infrastructure in California and all across America.

On one hand, politicians and public administrators need the tax revenues and jobs that real transport infrastructure improvements create. But on the other hand, environmentalists and the usual media suspects, along with some fringe politicians, cow those same policy-makers into defeating or deflecting many important actions that would expand and improve infrastructure.

Here's one example. Environmentalists and labor interests recently opposed a plan for the Port of Oakland to answer its urgent need for expansion by using the long-ailing Port of Sacramento's under-utilized facilities. Fuel savings to transport goods to large DCs in the area could be tenfold, according to Wilson Lacy, the Port of Oakland's director of maritime operations.

That would make for better air quality, wouldn't it? More jobs and tax revenues? Lower supply chain costs for companies and their consumers all across the United States?

Why labor interests joined the environmental industrial complex and opposed this initiative is beyond me. Expanding port capacity creates well-paying jobs. If you don't do it in California, companies will just take their business elsewhere—maybe to Alabama, for example.

Why do some environmental groups oppose improving transportation infrastructure? It's likely that even the most rapacious industrialists among us don't really want to be environmental evil-doers. We all breathe. We all want to hand off a nice looking, nice smelling country to the next generation.

Yet my California trip makes me think that some enviro-activists don't want any transportation improvement.

Example? For years, California enviros have been extolling the virtues of intermodalism to take trucks off overcrowded highways. They actually call the busiest lanes "diesel death zones."

Yet in a complete about-face to the pro-intermodal position, they recently succeeded in blocking expansion of intermodal facilities in the region. Working with enviros is like taking a swing at fog; you can see their position but you just can't get your hands on it.

I don't want to pick on the Left Coast. Improving transportation infrastructure is a national issue. To be fair, though, it is more magnified in California because of the product volume its infrastructure must bear.

In Choctaw Point, Mobile, Ala., the enviros at Mobile Bay Watch waged a three-year legal and media battle to prevent investment in transportation infrastructure. The fight is over, and it happily ended with a new container terminal project that may create up to 500 new jobs, many paying up to $65,753 per year. Capacity could increase from 75,000 to 750,000 containers over 10 years.

Announcing the Mobile Container Terminal deal, Gov. Bob Riley said, "the Port is more important than it has ever been." Leaders of both parties agreed, and took action. That's how they do it in Alabama.

That kind of action is anathema to some, with luxury housing and another waterfront shopping mall being more acceptable to the Bay Watch crowd.

Not far away in New Orleans, environmental lawsuits over the past 30 years stopped several planned improvements to the lock systems protecting the city. I wonder what the result of Hurricane Katrina would have been if U.S. District Judge Charles Schwartz, Jr., never issued that 1977 injunction against the Army Corps of Engineers' project to install floodgates on Lake Pontchartrain.

"Plaintiffs herein have demonstrated that they, and in fact all persons in this area, will be irreparably harmed if the barrier project...is allowed to continue," he wrote.

While that kind of lawsuit helped produce catastrophic results visible to all, many irrational environmental lawsuits create catastrophic economic results almost to the same monetary scale when taken in the aggregate—just not all at once, and therefore not as visible.

Federal, state, and local community leaders should look to our industry and the improvements it needs to fill the current job-gap breech that will only grow wider. Policy-makers have a need to feed the voracious tax machines that have been created over the past four decades. Economic growth is the result of transport infrastructure investment and expansion, an environmental bad thing to a small and powerful few, but a good thing to most of us.

When it comes to balancing environmental concerns with the need to improve and expand the U.S. transport infrastructure, there is a right way, a wrong way, and maybe even a SmartWay (www.epa.gov/smartway). Public/ private partnerships such as the EPA's SmartWay Transport program—alliances between business and government to responsibly improve, expand, and upgrade transport infrastructure—are needed.

### Turn – Alt Increases Environmental Harms

Maniates, Allegheny College, Professor of Political Science, 1

(Michael F., “Individualization: Plant a Tree, Buy a Bike, Save the World?”, Global Environmental Politics, August 1, EBSCO, p. 33-34)

For the lack of a better term, call this response the individualization of responsibility. When responsibility for environmental problems is individualized, there is little room to ponder institutions, the nature and exercise of political power, or ways of collectively changing the distribution of power and influence in society—to, in other words, “think institutionally.”4 Instead, the serious work of confronting the threatening socio-environmental processes that The Lorax so ably illuminates falls to individuals, acting alone, usually as consumers. We are individualizing responsibility when we agonize over the “paper or plastic” choice at the checkout counter, knowing somehow that neither is right given larger institutions and social structures. We think aloud with the neighbor over the back fence about whether we should buy the new Honda or Toyota hybrid engine automobile now or wait a few years until they work the kinks out, when really what we wish for is clean, efficient, and effective public transportation of the sort we read about in science fiction novels when we were young—but which we can’t vote for with our consumer dollars since, for reasons rooted in power and politics, it’s not for sale. So we ponder the “energy stickers” on the ultra-efficient appliances at Sears, we diligently compost our kitchen waste, we try to ignore the high initial cost and buy a few compact-fluorescent lightbulbs. We read spirited reports in the New York Times Magazine on the pros and cons of recycling while sipping our coffee,5 study carefully the merits of this and that environmental group so as to properly decide upon the destination of our small annual donation, and meticulously sort our recyclables. And now an increasing number of us are confronted by opportunistic green-power providers who urge us to “save the planet” by buying their “green electricity”—while doing little to actually increase the quantity of electricity generated from renewable resources.

The Lorax is not why the individualization of responsibility dominates the contours of contemporary American environmentalism. Several forces, described later in this article, are to blame. They include the historical baggage of mainstream environmentalism, the core tenets of liberalism, the dynamic ability of capitalism to commodify dissent, and the relatively recent rise of global environmental threats to human prosperity. Seuss’s book simply has been swept up by these forces and adopted by them. Seuss himself would probably be sur-prised by the near deidication of his little book; and his central character, a Lorax who politely sought to hold a corporate CEO accountable, surely would be appalled that his story is being used to justify individual acts of planting trees as the primary response to the threat of global climate change.6

Mark Dowie, a journalist and sometimes historian of the American environmental movement, writes about our “environmental imagination,” by which he means our collective ability to imagine and pursue a variety of productive responses (from individual action to community organization to whole-scale institutional change) to the environmental problems before us.7 My claim in this is that an accelerating individualization of responsibility in the United States is narrowing, in dangerous ways, our “environmental imagination” and undermining our capacity to react effectively to environmental threats to human well-being. Those troubled by overconsumption, consumerism and commodification should not and cannot ignore this narrowing. Confronting the consumption problem demands, after all, the sort of institutional thinking that the individualization of responsibility patently undermines. It calls too for individuals to understand themselves as citizens in a participatory democracy first, working together to change broader policy and larger social institutions, and as consumers second. By contrast, the individualization of responsibility, because it characterizes environmental problems as the consequence of destructive consumer choice, asks that individuals imagine themselves as consumers first and citizens second. Grappling with the consumption problem, moreover, means engaging in conversation both broad and deep about consumerism and frugality and ways of fostering the capacity for restraint. But when responsibility for environmental ills is individualized, space for such conversation disappears: the individually responsible consumer is encouraged to purchase a vast array of “green” or “eco-friendly” products on the promise that the more such products are purchased and consumed, the healthier the planet’s ecological processes will become. “Living lightly on the planet” and “reducing your environmental impact” becomes, paradoxically, a consumer-product growth industry.

### Alt Fails – No Individual Change

#### Individuals just give lip service to environment, won’t change behavior

Babcock, Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, 9

(Babcock M. Hope, 2009, <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/elr/vol33_1/Babcock.pdf>, ASSUMING PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT: MOVING TOWARD A NEW ENVIRONMENTAL NORM pg 132, accessed 7/8/12, CW)

People have trouble conforming their consumer preferences to their general support for environmental laws. Michael Vandenbergh calls this a “citizen-consumer distinction” and says it “may help explain the disconnect between citizen support for environmental laws and consumer behavior that often does not reflect a concern for the environment.”104 An example of this phenomenon is a “Save the Whales” sticker on the window of an SUV — a vehicle that excessively consumes fuel, the production of which is threatening the continued viability of the species the sticker purports to protect. Individuals in their capacity as citizens may seek results that do not reflect their market behavior and vice-versa. Where “individual consumer behavior is the source of the problem . . . and external sources subject to traditional regulation are not implicated, policymakers may face a particularly difficult challenge.”

#### Mass individual change improbable due to personal habits

Babcock, Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, 9

(Babcock M. Hope, 2009, <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/elr/vol33_1/Babcock.pdf>, ASSUMING PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT: MOVING TOWARD A NEW ENVIRONMENTAL NORM pg 130)

Personal habits, which arise from “repeated interactions”91 and are very hard to change, present another serious obstacle to changing personal behavior.92 For example, the practice of solo commuting “is so deeply ingrained in people’s behavioral patterns that efforts to affect those norms via the con- tent of the law are doomed.”93 “By circumventing decisional processes, habits save cognitive time and energy” and continue to control behavior, even when it is expensive to maintain them.94 Thus, people continue to drive alone or waste electricity by leaving lights on in rooms, even though these are increasingly costly habits to maintain. Habits become even harder to overcome if the new behavior is inconvenient, requires significant effort or is costly, like disposing of used car batteries at a hazardous waste collection site rather than dumping them on the side of a road.95 It is hard to internalize a norm of personal environmental responsibility when complying with such a norm requires the abandonment of ingrained personal habits.

#### Mass individual change improbable. Environmental norm already established

Babcock, Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, 9

(Babcock M. Hope, 2009, <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/elr/vol33_1/Babcock.pdf>, ASSUMING PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT: MOVING TOWARD A NEW ENVIRONMENTAL NORM pg 125-129)

The challenge in creating a new environmental norm is “particularly great because the American public believes a number of environmental myths,” one of which “incorrectly attribute[s] the causes of many remaining environmental problems to industrial point sources, rather than to individual behavior.”55 People “consistently underestimate their relative share of emissions as compared to industrial sources.”56 In fact, individuals may be unaware that they are contributing to the remaining environmental problems at all.57 Environmental surveys infrequently inquire about what people think the sources of environmental harms are; those that do reveal that people rarely attribute the problems to their own behavior.58 For example, a 1974 poll showed that people’s concerns about cars were focused on manufacturers, not the people who drive cars.59 One reason for the tenacity of these myths may be the government’s failure to address individual sources of environmental harm. The problems the government has in identifying and quantifying the impacts of individual sources on the environment and in designing responsive requirements and enforcement mechanisms reinforce the belief that individuals are not responsible for environmental harm.60 The lack of general public understanding about human health and ecological sys- tems may also lead individuals to underestimate their part in causing pollution.61

The regulatory command and control system that is reflected in most of our major environmental laws may have contributed to the persistence of this myth by indirectly conveying “a second social meaning,” namely that industrial polluters are the source of environmental problems, and individuals “are part of the solution.”62 These laws principally target industrial and manufacturing sources and impose regulatory requirements and penalties on those sources. Individuals, on the other hand, are authorized to help enforce these laws under citizen suit provisions.63 Even “[p]rograms directed at second generation problems, such as the [Clean Air Act’s] Employee Commute Options Program . . . have been interpreted to provide for enforcement against employers, not individuals.”64 The implicit message sent to the public by those early environmental laws “may have facilitated public myths about the role of second generation sources, [which] . . . in turn may have impeded the development of norms regarding individual responsibility for environmental problems.”65

Another reason for the persistence of these myths may be a form of cognitive dissonance, the “inability to hold contradictory views of oneself at the same time.”66 When people are subject to inconsistent thoughts or discrepancies between their thoughts and actions, they usually try to resolve those contradictions. However, if this cannot be easily done, then people are inclined to wall off or sidestep information that makes them feel bad about themselves or the actions they are taking.67 This problem appears to be par-ticularly acute when environmental values68 are at issue because it is difficult for a person who supports environmental protection to recognize that her actions may actually be degrading the environment.69 Cognitive dissonance, therefore, can lead people to blame “corporate polluters as the only important sources of environmental harms . . . [because that gives them] someone else to blame.”70 Additionally, when the task is difficult or inconvenient, like bringing used solvents to a household hazardous waste collection center or avoiding driving, “the easier solution is to . . . avoid any inquiry into the effects of our behavior.”71 Cognitive dissonance affects not only a person’s understanding of where pollution is coming from, but also her estimate of the harm it may cause.72

The way people process information creates its own problems. The common errors that people make when they do this are legion, especially with regard to information about potential harms.73 For example, people consistently “overestimate their knowledge about a decision, evaluate information and attribute causality in very different ways based upon the framing of the information . . . . [They] make stereotypical decisions and select information to support them based on conclusions reached before receiving data about those decisions.”74 Most people also “prefer [information that

is] black-and-white over shades of gray” and have a tendency “to hold oversimplified beliefs and to hold them with excessive confidence.”75 Given that environmental issues are frequently in shades of gray, this cognitive problem could be significant and may explain why it has taken so long for people to absorb the complexity of environmental problems like global climate change.76 The fact that people are also inclined “to anchor their decisions stereotypically based upon their earlier conclusions, and use information gained thereafter selectively to support those decisions”77 makes it harder to persuade them to let go of their earlier impressions.78 The fact that people are inclined to suffer from an “alarmist bias” on the one hand and an “optimistic bias” on the other can affect how they perceive their own role as contributors to environmental problems. The alarmist bias is reflected in the difficulty “many people have in evaluating low probability events [and in] . . . the fact that frightening information is more salient and potent than comforting information.”79 An optimistic bias, on the other hand, leads people “to underestimate their likelihood of having accidents or contracting diseases,” enabling people to distance themselves from the personal impact of using toxic substances in their houses or gardens80 or to overestimate the capacity of the Earth to absorb environmental harm.81 These two biases may account for the length of time it took people to grasp the significance of global climate change, why events like Hurricane Katrina have helped people to understand the problem, and why they were reluctant to see themselves as contributors to the problem. Richard Lazarus attributes this behavior to “myopia,” saying that people think “ ‘mostly in physiological time’ and ‘natural selection favors the forces of psychological denial.’” 82

People also have excessively steep discount rates, which induce them to under-value the benefits of changes in behavior that will not accrue for several years . . . [and which] may affect a wide variety of environmentally significant behaviors such as investments in energy efficient (hence generally less polluting) cars, furnaces, and other equipment.83

A final cognitive barrier that may prevent people from focusing on their own polluting activities is that people “are not wired to care about, or even to notice, the ordinary.”84 Because so many things compete for attention, people develop “a variety of filtering mechanisms to help [them] focus effectively on some things by more or less shutting out others.”85 One thing that gets edited out is the environment in which we all function on a daily basis, unless there is something in that background that is a distinguishing feature, “a focal point that differentiates [it] from the background. The ordinary, which constitutes the background itself, provides a poor focal point.

### Alt Fails - Institutions Key

#### Individuals cannot solve alone- institutions stand in the way of solvency

Fahlquist, Department of Philosophy, Delft University of Technology, 2008

(Jessica Nihle´n Fahlquist, November 22, 2008, J Agric Environ Ethics, “Moral Responsibility for Environmental Problems—Individual or Institutional?,” <http://www.ethicsandtechnology.eu/images/uploads/jes.pdf> , Springer, pg 11, EP)

We now have the conceptual and normative tools to say in virtue of what institutional agents like governments and corporations are responsible for environmental problems and how their responsibility is related to individual responsibility. Governments and corporations are responsible because it is in their power to create reasonable alternatives for individuals. They have it in their power to make it easier and less expensive for individuals to choose the environmentally friendly option and they can provide information that is easily accessible and as straight-forward as possible. In essence, they are responsible because they have the power to create opportunities for individuals to do what is right. Another way of phrasing it is to say that institutions can make it easier for individuals to assume forward-looking responsibility. This could be done by making information accessible, subsidizing organic food while taxing non-organic food, by product development and presentation of products and so forth.20

The greater the extent to which these actors have done that, the greater the extent of individual responsibility. The greater the extent to which institutional agents have taken their forward-looking responsibility, the greater the extent to which it is reasonable to ascribe both backward-looking and forwardlooking responsibility to individuals when they do not choose the environmentally friendly option. First, the greater the availability and affordability of good options, the more reasonable it is to blame those individuals who still do not adjust their behavior. Second, the greater the extent to which, e.g., governments have assumed their responsibility, the larger the group of individuals with enough capacity and resources to assume their forwardlooking responsibility. For example, if the government has invested in an extensive public transport system, the degree of individual responsibility for choosing to drive a car instead of using public transport is higher than it would have been if the public transport system had been underdeveloped and unreliable. If a corporation can provide environmentally friendly products at a reasonable cost it is their responsibility to do so. For example, restaurants should be able to provide customers with food that has been produced in environmentally friendly ways and not transported across the globe.

#### Individuals can never solve- too many obstacles

(Jessica Nihle´n Fahlquist, November 22, 2008, J Agric Environ Ethics, “Moral Responsibility for Environmental Problems—Individual or Institutional?,” <http://www.ethicsandtechnology.eu/images/uploads/jes.pdf> , Springer, pg 13,14 EP)

I have criticized the increasing tendency to hold individuals responsible for environmental problems in a backward-looking sense. I have argued that individuals are not appropriate targets of blame when acting in environmentally destructive ways unless they have reasonable alternatives. Today, many individuals lack such options or do not have the resources to do the environmentally friendly thing. Here are just a few general or structural obstacles to individuals in modern societies that make unreasonably difﬁcult to act in environmentally friendly ways. • The infrastructure in many societies encourages people to drive instead of using public transport or bicycles. Individuals need to drive to the supermarket, to work and to school. If they do not need to drive, it is often easier and/or less expensive to drive than to take the train. • It is assumed in many industries that people need to meet face to face, hence extensive business traveling. • The information about the origin and energy cost of producing certain consumer goods, e.g., food, is often inadequate. • Government information is sometimes unclear, or even conﬂicting. Food products that are encouraged for health reasons are sometimes discouraged from an environmental perspective.29 • Climate-smart food is often substantially more expensive than regular food. These are just a few general structural problems and there are also individual differences that should be taken into account. What options an individual has or the cost of acting in an environmentally friendly way should be seen as interplay between the individual and her surrounding socio-economic, political, and cultural environment.

### State Good – Movements

#### Turning away from the state prevents mobilization for good causes

Goble, Radio Free Europe, 98

(Paul, “The Consequences Of Depoliticization,” Radio Free Europe, October 12, <http://www.friends-partners.org/friends/news/omri/1998/10/981012I.html>, accessed 7/11/12)

First, as people turn away from the state as the source of support, they inevitably care less about what the state does and are less willing to take action to assert their views. That means that neither the state nor the opposition can mobilize them to take action for or against anything. As a result, the opposition cannot easily get large numbers of people to demonstrate even if the opposition is taking positions that polls suggest most people agree with. And the government cannot draw on popular support even when it may be doing things that the people have said they want. That means that the size of demonstrations for or against anything or anyone are an increasingly poor indicator of what the people want or do not want the state to do. Second, precisely because people are focusing on their private lives and taking responsibility for them, they are likely to become increasingly upset when the state attempts to intervene in their lives even for the most benign purposes, particularly if it does so in an ineffective manner. Such attitudes, widespread in many countries and important in limiting the power of state institutions, nonetheless pose a particular danger to countries making the transition from communism to democracy. While those views help promote the dismantling of the old state, they also virtually preclude the emergence of a new and efficient one. As a result, these countries are often likely to find themselves without the effective state institutions that modern societies and economies require if they are to be well regulated. And third, countries with depoliticized populations are especially at risk when they face a crisis. The governments cannot count on support because people no longer expect the governments to be able to deliver.

### State Good – Climate Change

#### State is the only actor that can solve the climate change

Yacobucci and Parker, Congressional Research Service, Resources, Science, and Industry Division, 8

(Brent D. and Larry, CRS Report for Congress, “Climate Change: Federal Laws and Policies

Related to Greenhouse Gas Reductions”, January 28, <http://www.nationalaglawcenter.org/assets/crs/RL31931.pdf>, accessed 7/11/12)

Climate change is generally viewed as a global issue, but proposed responses generally require action at the national level. In 1992, the United States ratified the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), which called on industrialized countries to take the lead in reducing greenhouse gases. Over the past 15 years, a variety of voluntary and regulatory actions have been proposed or undertaken in the United States, including monitoring of electric utility carbon dioxide emissions, improved appliance efficiency, and incentives for developing renewable energy sources. This report provides background on the evolution of U.S. climate change policy, from ratification of the UNFCCC to the George W. Bush Administration’s 2001 rejection of the Kyoto Protocol to the present. The report focuses on major regulatory programs that monitor or reduce greenhouse gas emissions, along with their estimated effect on emissions levels.

The George H. W. Bush, Clinton, and George W. Bush Administrations have largely relied on voluntary initiatives to reduce the growth of greenhouse gas emissions. This focus is particularly evident in the current Administration’s 2006 Climate Action Report (CAR), submitted under the provisions of the UNFCCC. Of roughly 50 programs summarized in the 2006 CAR, seven are described as “regulatory.” However, this small subset of the total U.S. effort accounts for a large share of greenhouse gas emission reductions achieved over the past decade. In general, these efforts were established and implemented in response to concerns other than climate change, such as energy efficiency and air quality. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-58) included provisions indirectly related to greenhouse gas emissions, such as energy efficiency and renewable energy. The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-140) addresses renewable energy and conservation, but also includes provisions specifically on climate change. These include a requirement for the use of renewable fuels with lower lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions than petroleum fuels, and the establishment of an Office of Climate Change and Environment in the Department of Transportation to implement research on mitigating the causes and addressing the affects of climate change on transportation.

### Climate Change – No Individual Obligation

Eighth, despite these costs, the major governments throughout the world still morally ought to take some of these steps. The clearest moral obligation falls on the United States. The United States caused and continues to cause more of the problem than any other country. The United States can spend more resources on a solution without sacrificing basic necessities. This country has the scientific expertise to solve technical problems. Other countries follow its lead (sometimes!). So the United States has a special moral obligation to help mitigate and adapt to global warming.8

Even assuming all of this, it is still not clear what I as an individual morally ought to do about global warming. That issue is not as simple as many people assume. I want to bring out some of its complications.

It should be clear from the start that "individual" moral obligations do not always follow directly from "collective" moral obligations. The fact that your government morally ought to do something does not prove that "you" ought to do it, even if your government fails. Suppose that a bridge is dangerous because so much traffic has gone over it and continues to go over it. The government has a moral obligation to make the bridge safe. If the government fails to do its duty, it does not follow that I personally have a moral obligation to fix the bridge. It does not even follow that I have a moral obligation to fill in one crack in the bridge, even if the bridge would be fixed if everyone filled in one crack, even if I drove over the bridge many times, and even if I still drive over it every day. Fixing the bridge is the government's job, not mine. While I ought to encourage the government to fulfill its obligations,9 I do not have to take on those obligations myself.

### Floating PIKs Bad

#### Plan focus good- Sets a stable focus of the entire debate, having a key point allows for the most in-depth discussion.

#### Fairness- It results in the entirety of the plan, hard to generate offense without turning ourselves

#### Kills topic specific education-We get a new resolution each year for a reason, plan focus is key to forcing discussion to be about the topic. Recycling the same arguments encourages stale debate and kills research incentive.

#### Moving target- Floating PIKs don’t get developed until later speeches where we can’t generate as much offense.

#### Not aff burden- We just have to prove that implementation of a topical plan Is good, not prove our justifications. Judge Discretion solves, they can choose whether to endorse the plan for any reason.

#### Voter for fairness and education. Reject the team not just the argument. Rejecting the team sets a bad model for debate and comes too late to be an effective remedy.

### Judge Choice

#### The judge can choose to endorse the plan for some but not all of the justifications we presented

#### 1. Justifications not mandatory for voting affirmative- we just have to prove the plan has beneficial outcomes 2. Not severance- the affirmative doesn’t mandate certain representations to be used3. More real world- people are able to pick their own justifications for why they support policies