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### Notes

#### A couple of strategy thoughts – in addition to the case frontline and the consumption focus K organized here, some additional neg ideas are:

#### \*Framework/T – since the aff is pretty obviously not topical

#### \*Low Oil Prices Bad/High Prices Good – the aff advocates a decrease in US consumption of oil so it probably decreases the global price of oil pretty considerably

#### \*Cap K – the aff at best focuses on one particular symptom of capitalism, and it doesn’t come close to advocating any kind of revolutionary action

#### \*Original Case Neg – the no behavioral shift cards in our policy gas tax neg file also apply to this file – I’ve included one of them in the solvency frontline already, but keep in mind that more of the original defense applies

### Consumption Focus K 1nc

#### Consumption focus individualizes responsibility, precluding institutional approaches to the environment – that turns the case, only institutional responses can create the social ethos necessary to solve environmental catastrophe

**Maniates 2**

(Michael Maniates, Professor of Political Science and Environmental Science at Allegheny College, 02, "Individualization: Plant a Tree, Buy a Bike, Save the World?" Confronting Consumption, p. 46-7)

The Lorax is not why the individualization of responsibility dominates the contours of contemporary American environmentalism. Several forces, described later in this chapter, 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 and adopted by these forces. Were he alive, Seuss would probably be surprised by the near deification 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.7 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." My claim in this chapter 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 becomes constricted. The individually responsible consumer is encouraged to purchase a vast array of "green" or "ecofriendly" products on the premise 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.9 Skeptics may reasonably question if the individualization of responsibility is so omnipresent as to warrant such concern. As the next section of this chapter shows, it is: the depoliticization of environmental degradation is in full swing across a variety of fronts and shows little sign of abating. The chapter continues with a review of the forces driving this individualization; in particular, it implicates the rise of global environmental problems and the construction of an individualized politics around them. How might these forces be countered? How can the politics of individualization be transcended? How might our environmental imagination be expanded? I wrestle with these questions in the final section of this chapter by focusing on the IPAT formula—a dominant conceptual lens within the held of environmental policy and politics, which argues that environmental impact = population x affluence x technology.

#### Individualization of economic responsibility causes genocide – consumer-focused analysis organizes environmental movements around individual self-preservation and choice, generating a violent tyranny of survival

Aasland ‘9,

(Dag, Prof. of Economics @ U of Agder, Norway, Ethics and Economy: After Levinas, pgs. 64-65)

“Each thing in so far as it is in itself endeavours to persist in its own being”. This is one of the basic propositions of Spinoza’s *Ethics* (1997: 98). It applies to all unliving, such as a stone, and it applies to all living, such as a human. It can be applied also to physical and biological systems. The human body is composed of cells possessing as their most important aspect a ‘drive’ to continue to exist; they have through evolution developed the ability to maintain both themselves and the part of their environment on which they depend to keep living, that is, other cells, and their ‘host’, the body. Thus, the body does what ‘it’ can to continue to be. Spinoza’s proposition may also be applied to the human as a mental being (neurophysiologists will certainly see a connection here): *I will continue to be me*. This will to preserve oneself Spinoza called (in Latin) *conatus essendi*. Violence and murder are to Levinas (1985: 86) extreme cases of the *conatus*. The need for economic freedom and the economic knowledge supporting this need is also an implication of the conatus. But Spinoza’s idea of a large ‘we’ as an all-encompassing, harmonious deity is not found in the works of Levinas, and this became even clearer to Levinas after the Holocaust. According to Zygmunt Bauman (1989) the Holocaust was a natural consequence of modernity. The time was mature when it became technologically and organizationally possible. Levinas went deeper: the Holocaust was an expression of the human *conatus*. In his struggle for freedom, autonomy and happiness, ~~man~~ has to – as I have described earlier in this book – *conceive* his surroundings, including his fellow ~~men~~. In my own ‘project of being’, consisting primarily in obtaining and exercising individual freedom and achieving a good life, I also involve others. This project is driven by a will to ‘totalise’ the world, within a conceivable knowledge. Economic freedom presumes a self-centred understanding of reality (Burggraeve, 2003: 57).

#### **Only global institutional focus can solve – everyday consumption analysis is too localized and ignores trans-border environmental issues – must take broad-scale action to solve**

Dauvergne 8

(Peter, Professor of Political Science, Canada Research Chair in Global Environmental Politics, and Director of the Liu Institute for Global Issues at the University of British Columbia, The Shadows of Consumption:

Consequences for the Global Environment, pgs. 16-17)

Of course, to some extent every consumer is responsible, although not all share equal responsibility. Those with power and wealth are consuming far more of the world’s ecological resources: a life of luxury in Philadelphia deflects more environmental damage farther than a life of poverty in Harare. Still, no single consumer, no matter how wasteful or profligate, can cause an ecological shadow to form or shift direction, although this does not absolve consumers who ignore the effects of their personal choices on the sustainability of life for others. Accepting that these effects are “real” is essential for sustaining the collective will for reforms. Yet far-reaching change will require far more than educating some consumers in some cultures to consume a few things more thoughtfully. As this chapter reveals, it will require tackling structural features of a world order that deflects environmental costs of consumption into spaces with relatively less power. In particular, governing mechanisms will need to guide globalization more effectively, strengthening environmentalism in ways that rein in the shadow effects of corporations, trade, financing, and local policies. Immediate action is imperative. As the global population races toward 9–11 billion, worldwide economic growth shows every sign of racing even faster, global consumerism every sign of consolidating further, and the next wave of globalization every sign of increasing both the scale and the speed of the ecological changes brought about by the shifting global patterns of consumption. In all likelihood, the globalization of environmentalism will continue both to improve the efficiency of producing, using, and recycling consumer goods and to promote further advances in global governance, from greener corporate codes of conduct, to stricter international environmental laws, to stronger cultural norms of “appropriate” consumption. But, as things now stand, and as chapter 23 will elaborate in the conclusion to this book, it will do so at a pace that is too slow and too incremental to prevent the intensity and spread of ecological shadows from escalating. The costs to the global environment and human health, as chapter 2 will make clear, are already too great not to take immediate action.

### 2nc Link Overview

#### The environmental imagination is a limited cognitive space that describes the terms of debates about the environment – the perm can’t solve – the choice to focus on consumption or production organizes this space, producing exclusive and distinct ethical bases for action towards the environment

#### The aff’s choice to focus on consumption treats the population as individual consumers first, and citizens second, transforming politics into the sphere that organizes consumption – this politics shifts responsibility for solving the environment onto individuals, and robs institutions of collective power to resolve ecological catastrophe

#### That turns the case – individualization of responsibility mediates human relations, creating a discourse of individual rights that substitutes the question “Why should I have to sacrifice? Other people aren’t!” for every stab at changes in collective behavior – that saps movements and ensures ecological catastrophe collapse

**Maniates 2**

(Michael Maniates, Professor of Political Science and Environmental Science at Allegheny College, 02, "Individualization: Plant a Tree, Buy a Bike, Save the World?" Confronting Consumption, p. 51-2)

In our struggle to bridge the gap between our morals and our practices, we stay busy—but busy doing what we are most familiar and comfortable with: consuming our way (we hope) to a better America and a better world. When confronted by environmental ills—ills many confess to caring deeply about—Americans seem capable of understanding themselves almost solely as consumers who must buy "environmentally sound" products (and then recycle them), rather than as citizens who might come together and develop political clout sufficient to alter institutional arrangements that drive a pervasive consumerism.15 The relentless ability of contemporary capitalism to commodity dissent and sell it back to dissenters is surely one explanation for the elevation of consumer over citizen."\* But another factor, no doubt, is the growing suspicion of and unfamiliarity with processes of citizen-based political action among masses of North Americans. The interplay of state and market after World War II has whittled the obligations of citizenship down to the singular and highly individualized act of voting in important elections. The increasing fragmentation and mobility of everyday life undermines our sense of neighborhood and community, separating us from the small arenas in which we might practice and refine our abilities as citizens. We build shopping malls but let community playgrounds deteriorate and migrate to sales but ignore school-board meetings. Modern-day advances in entertainment and communication increasingly find us sitting alone in front of a screen, making it all seem fine. We do our political bit in the election booth, then get back to "normal."1' Given our deepening alienation from traditional understandings of active citizenship, together with the growing allure of consumption-as-social-action, it is little wonder that at a time when our capacity to imagine an array of ways to build a just and ecologically resilient future must expand, it is in fact narrowingl. At a moment when we should be vigorously exploring multiple paths to sustainability, we are obsessing over the cobblestones of but one path. This collective obsessing over an array of "green consumption" choices and opportunities to recycle is noisy and vigorous, and thus comes to resemble the foundations of meaningful social action. But it is not, not in any real and lasting way that might alter institutional arrangements and make possible radically new ways of living that seem required.

### 2nc Alt Solvency

#### **Consumer approaches preclude effective action – only broad-based institutional action can overcome the collective action problem and produce incentives to act in a more environmentally conscious way**

Doremus 3

Holly Doremus, – Professor of Law @ UC-Davis Environs Environmental Law and Policy Journal, 2003, v27, pg. 239-240

I am not comparing most environmental violations to murder; obviously environmental transgressions are not subject to the same harsh and near-universal societal condemnation. I am simply suggesting that environmental protection, like other social goals, may require more than a societal consensus. Inevitably, some people will be "environmental deviants." They may disagree with a societal consensus in favor of environmental protection, they may have strong contrary motivations, or they may simply lack a strong self-sanctioning mechanism. At least some actions those "environmental deviants" would commit could cause grievous environmental harm, and therefore merit deterrence or punishment by legal sanctions. But in the environmental context there is a stronger and more generally applicable reason why law must persist even if we develop a very firm consensus on societal values. Environmental problems are typically collective action problems, requiring the concerted action of a large number of persons to solve. Individual action is futile; it costs the actor some effort or foregone opportunities without bringing the desired environmental gain. Under those circumstances, persons who hold environmentally protective values are likely not to act on those values without assurances that others will follow suit. 20 In theory, informal, nonlegal, social sanctions could ensure sufficient compliance to prevent futility. But in our increasingly anonymous world, social sanctions such as shame or ostracism may not operate very effectively.21 Legal mandates can provide confidence that environmentally protective action will not be futile, and that others will bear their fair share of the burden.

#### Institutional focus is key – consumption focus and individual responsibility evade the broad dimensions of environmental problems – only international accords can shape behavior

Nixon ‘11

(Rob, Rachel Carson Professor of English, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor, pgs. 38-39)

Among the decisive challenges such critical initiatives face is that of scale: how can we imaginatively and strategically render visible vast force fields of interconnectedness against the attenuating effects of temporal and geographical distance? This is a crucial challenge if we are to generate any sustained understanding of the transnational, intergenerational fallout from slow violence. The task of thinking on such a geographical scale-let alone a temporal one-can seem overwhelming. Indeed Wendell Barry has warned against the potentially debilitating effects of such large-scale approaches: “The adjective ‘planetary’ describes a problem in such a way that it cannot be solved ... The problems, if we describe them accurately, are all private and small.'?" I would argue, however, that although advocating personal environmental responsibility is essential, to shrink solutions to the level of the private and the small is evasive, even if it does constructively enhance one's sense of agency. Planetary problems-and transnational, national, and regional ones-cannot simply be resolved by the aggregated actions of responsible individuals. Institutional actions (and institutionalized inaction) have a profound impact on environmental outcomes, most blatantly in relation to climate change, which no collectivized ethical behavior can combat without backing from well-implemented transnational accords.

### 2nc Epistemology

#### **Environmental destruction and globalization are based on economic relationships not obvious or observable through everyday consumption – their method is flawed because it fails to take a global perspective that could apprehend these issues**

Dauvergne 10

(Peter, Professor of Political Science, Canada Research Chair in Global Environmental Politics, and Director of the Liu Institute for Global Issues at the University of British Columbia, “The Problem of Consumption”, *Global Environmental Politics*, May 2010, Vol. 10, No. 2, Pages 1-10)

Perhaps most worrying of all, over time the costs of consumption are drifting into the world’s most vulnerable ecosystems and poorest societies as powerful states and corporations externalize the environmental and social costs from the majority of consumers. This is adding to a growing crisis, for example, for the Inuit communities in the Arctic as industrial processes—from manufacturing in Europe to incinerating garbage in Asia—poison the land with persistent organic pollutants that travel up food chains and grasshopper across the globe through a process of repeated evaporation and redeposit until settling in cold climates.4 Such a process leaves consumers largely unaware—and corporations largely unaccountable for—the true costs of consumption. How many consumers in Tokyo, for example, would connect living in a concrete high-rise to deforestation in Papua New Guinea? Yet, over the last half-century, the most common use of the giant old-growth trees of Southeast Asia and Melanesia has been for plywood paneling to mold concrete in Japan. Called kon pane in Japanese, construction companies generally burned or left these panels to rot after only a few uses. Why such fantastic waste? The answer is simple: it was cheaper to buy new panels than clean the old ones.5 Consumers elsewhere are equally unaware of the externalities of con- sumption on the tropics. China’s decision in 1998 to ban natural forest logging at home caused timber imports to jump. Overall timber imports have quadru- pled over the last decade; and today half of all traded timber lands in China.6 Much of the timber entering China is illegal—as high as 80 percent from coun- tries like Indonesia, Cambodia, and Papua New Guinea—thus depriving governments and communities of revenue. Chinese consumers are not alone in purchasing and using these wood products. Chinese exports of wooden furniture to Europe and North America, for example, have been growing rapidly in recent years, with at least some of this furniture made from illegal logs from places like Southeast Asia and eastern Russia. Rising consumption of non-timber products is also driving tropical deforestation. On Indonesia’s outer islands, for example, plantation companies are burning down degraded forests to clear land for oil palm for the rising world- wide consumption of margarine and oil for deep-frying. Raging forest ares every year in Indonesia are now one of the world’s biggest sources of greenhouse gases. Another example is in the Amazon, where the primary cause of deforestation is land-clearing for cattle ranches as Brazil strives to hold onto its position as the world’s largest beef exporter by volume in a global marketplace where meat consumption is rising quickly. Clearing land for soybean plantations (for export markets from animal feed to processed foods) is another core cause of deforestation in the Amazon. Granted, this is all producing lots of cheap food—as well as lots of profits for multinational agricultural companies and the global fast-food industry.7 But the costs for the tropics far outweigh the benefits for increasingly obese consumers. And this is only one of many possible examples of how an unbalanced global economy is displacing much of the costs of consumption onto the world’s poorest peoples and most vulnerable ecosystems. Just look at the families in Manila now living inside smoking mountains of fast-food wrappers, car tires, and toxic waste drums. Or at the polar bears slipping into endangered status as their Arctic home melts away.

### AT Perm

#### **Focus on consumption gets co-opted – leads to green products that produce environmental collapse because increases in efficiency lead to net increases in consumption**

Speth 8

James, dean of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies at Yale University, and Professor in the Practice of Environmental Policy, The Bridge @ the Edge of the World, pg. 154

There are a number of basic limits on the greening of consumption. First, as stressed before in other contexts, the benefits of improved, greener consumption will tend to be overwhelmed by increased growth of consumption itself and even a strengthening of consumerism. John Lintort, in his article " Beyond the Economics of More," sees "establishment environmentalism" as a matter of making a profit from environmental problems through the introduction of new, cleaner products and the establishment of industries concerned with environmental cleanup. "Reducing consumption, much less the desire to consume, is emphatically not part of the programme," he notes, "The reason, or pretext, for this is the alleged reduction of welfare this would entail, and **hence its** political **infeasibility**. The result, although some specific improvements may occur, is overall a strengthening of the consumer society, and of the trend towards greater environmental damage." Green has become fashionable in some circles, but even greened products and services have **environmental costs** and require throughput.

### AT Solvency

#### **High prices only generate backlash – no change in consumer behavior**

Greenspan 7 – American economist, Former Chairman of the Federal Reserve of the United States

Alan Greenspan, The Age of Turbulence, London: Penguin 2007, pg 462

A gasoline tax would not impose a very large burden, especially if phased in over a number of years. U.S. household motor fuel outlays, at 3 percent of disposable income in early 2007, are where they were from 1953 to 1973 and far below the 4.5 percent experienced during the crisis of 1980. Even at heights of $3-plus per gallon in July 2006, motor fuel consumed only 3.8 percent of disposable personal income. Yet Americans are very sensitive to gasoline prices. We complain when they rise. Americans nonetheless continue to drive as much as before. In the face of gasoline price spikes, they reduce mileage driven only for a short while. The average number of miles driven per licensed driver has continued to drift upward: from 10,500 miles per driver in 1980 to 14,800 miles in 2006, an increase of 1.3 percent per year. With higher prices, since 2002 the increase has slowed to 0.2 percent per year. Drivers consume less gasoline only because they eventually buy more fuel-efficient cars.

#### Changes in consumption create greater environmental destruction – create guilt-free green consumption and cause third-world dumping and environmental destruction

Dauvergne 10

(Peter, Professor of Political Science, Canada Research Chair in Global Environmental Politics, and Director of the Liu Institute for Global Issues at the University of British Columbia, “The Problem of Consumption”, *Global Environmental Politics*, May 2010, Vol. 10, No. 2, Pages 1-10)

Influencing individual consumers to act more sustainably, then, is one of the most complex and difficult challenges for environmental governance. Influencing enough consumers to affect global change is an even greater challenge. And transforming major systemic drivers of consumption is still more difficult and complex. The overall system of global environmental governance is improving management on some measures, most notably by gradually expanding markets for more efacient products with less per unit environmental impacts. One ex- ample, among thousands, is the history of the increasing energy efficiency of new refrigerators since the global phase down of CFCs beginning in the early 1990s. But, because these advances tend to require or contribute to more con- sumption, and because they tend to do little to influence the drivers of con- sumption or mitigate the indirect costs of producing, transporting, and dispos- ing of consumer goods, much of the so-called “progress” is incremental, local, or temporary, unable on a global scale to produce enough change to mitigate the damaging environmental consequences of buying and using most consumer products. Sometimes this progress is even causing the costs of consumption to intensify further, with environmental conditions improving in developed countries and deteriorating in developing ones that produce and import more damaging products. This helps to explain why so many global environ- mental efforts are failing. It also helps to explain why so many involved in the global policy process are overly optimistic about the value of incremental environmentalism, as those with more power and wealth shift many of the costs of consumption to those with less. International environmental laws to control transboundary pollution are helping a little to mitigate the environmental damage of consumption (e.g., the 1989 Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Haz- ardous Wastes and their Disposal, and the 2001 Stockholm Convention on Per- sistent Organic Pollutants). So are consumer labels to certify that products are from sustainable sources (e.g., the Forest Stewardship Council and the Marine Stewardship Council). So are corporate policies to increase environmental and social accountability (e.g., Electrolux’s policy to audit suppliers in developing countries like China and Brazil to monitor compliance with its corporate code of conduct). And so are incentives for manufacturers to include disposal costs into the price of consumer goods (e.g., the European Commission’s End-of-Life Vehicles directive, which requires manufacturers to “de-pollute” and recycle used vehicles with their logo). Yet the big picture is clear. Even as global environmental governance con- tinues to strengthen incrementally, the “global environment” that is being “gov- erned” is continuing to slide into an ever-greater crisis, creating an ever-more difacult problem to “govern.” To be effective on a global scale, far more needs to be done, faster, to reimagine and reorganize an unbalanced global economy, and to shift more of the benefits to the world’s poorest people and less of the costs of producing, using, and disposing of consumer goods to the most vulner- able ecosystems. This will require international policy processes to tackle head on the systemic drivers of consumption.

#### Changing individual consumption patterns is insufficient – resources are globally fungible

Baker 4

Juliana, Discussions of Meat: Now, It's Not Personal!, World Watch 17 no5 6-7 S/O 2004

World Watch's July/August cover story ("Meat: Now, It's Not Personal!") prompted a flurry of e-mails and letters from the NGO community. In addition to some praiseful remarks from animal welfare organizations, we also received some surprisingly critical comments from groups working on agricultural issues. In general, they argued that Worldwatch missed the boat by not pointing out the role of small livestock farmers in sustainable agriculture (see the following letter from Mark Muller, one of the more thoughtful responses to the article, which makes a number of points we mostly agree with). The article's focus, which apparently we did not make explicit enough, was mainly the industrial system of meat production. A quick look at our publications list makes it clear that Worldwatch has been addressing the issue of sustainable agriculture in general, and sustainable meat production in particular, for a long time. In 1991, Worldwatch researchers Alan Durning and Holly Brough published Taking Stock: Animal Farming and the Environment. In addition to detailing the environmental effects of meat production--from the inefficient use of cropland to grow feed for animal to the destruction of tropical forests for grazing land--**Durning and Brough also examined the importance of livestock for sustaining livelihoods and food security**, particularly in developing countries. Since then Worldwatch has expanded the discussion about meat, explaining the complexities of the exploding human appetite for animal products. Our work has included articles in World Watch magazine about the effects of antibiotic misuse in industrial agriculture, and a cover story about the effects of rising meat consumption in the developing world ("Factory Farming in the Developing World," World Watch May/June 2003). We devoted an entire chapter in State of the World ("Watching What We Eat," State of the World 2004) to sustainable food choices, including how consumers can vote with their forks by supporting farmers who raise sustainable, humane animal products. Worldwatch has helped promote sustainable farming methods by telling the stories of farmers such as Bobby Inocencio, a Filipino who raises free range chickens and teaches other farmers his methods, and Iowa pig farmer Paul Willis, who distributes humanely raised pork products for Niman Ranch. These examples are proof that the meat we eat can be raised in ways that benefit the environment, farmers, and animals alike. Your July/August article on meat consumption ["Meat: Now, It's Not Personal!"] does an excellent job of identifying the environmental issues with the current industrial meat production and processing industry. Reducing our consumption of industrially produced meat will certainly improve health and the environment. However, because you paint all meat production in one broad stroke, your article does a disservice to the thousands of farmers using environmentally appropriate methods of livestock production in the United States, as well as the millions of people in less-developed countries who use livestock to improve the efficiency of food production. Most natural systems require continual interactions between plants and animals for nutrient cycling, seed distribution, and a host of other services each provides the other. Here in the Midwest, the prairie grasslands and the buffalo had this symbiotic relationship. Our current dominant agricultural system--which uses commercial fertilizer instead of manure, annuals like corn and soybeans rather than grass, and confined livestock rather than free-ranging animals--is a far cry from a natural system. Some innovative, sustainable farmers are mimicking nature's processes and planting a mix of grasses for cows, pigs, and even buffalo. These practices return nutrient flows and soil erosion back to the levels before tillage, providing tremendous benefits to soil and water quality. Your article states that "the easiest way to reduce the amount of excrement flowing down the Mississippi and killing the Gulf of Mexico is to eat less meat, thereby reducing the size of the herds upstream in Iowa or Missouri." I strongly disagree. First, the largest contributor of nitrogen to the Gulf dead zone is not animal manure (15 percent of total) but fertilizer (50 percent of total). Second, **the grain-oilseed-livestock complex has gone global and diversified. Not eating a hamburger may simply redirect Midwest corn from a feedlot to an ethanol plant, or** that **beef may instead be exported to one of the burgeoning Asian markets.**

#### Change in production and consumption patterns are key – consumption alone is not enough

Trainer 7 – Lecturer @ South Wales

Ted, Lecturer @ South Wales University in Australia, Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain A Consumer Society, SpringerLink

Clearly system change is needed. **The problems cannot be solved by** more **conservation** effort **on the part of individuals** and firms *within* consumer-capitalist society. They are being caused by an overshoot that is far too big for that, and they are being caused by some of the fundamental structures of this society. Consequently much of what is said under the heading of “sustainability” is nonsense and much of the effort being made to “save the planet” is a waste of time. Most irritating are the “What you can do in your own home” campaigners. “Buy biodegradable wash up liquid, use a low-flow shower head, recycle your bottles, buy a smaller car, etc.” Such **efforts can make no more than a negligible difference to household impact**, when we need something like a 90% reduction in *national* consumption. **Nothing remotely like this is possible within a** consumer-capitalist **society committed to affluent lifestyles** and limitless economic growth. **It is only possible through dramatically reducing the volume of** **production and consumption** and therefore by *changing from*such a society to one that is about frugal but adequate “living standards”, as little production and consumption as possible and a stable economy.

#### The alternative can’t overcome the public’s desire to consume

Douglas 10 – Peer-reviewed climate scholar

Richard Douglas, published essays on the philosophy and politics of climate change denial, Future Ethics, pg. 206

In the case of environmentalism the need for a readymade replacement paradigm to be available before the existing dominant paradigm is abandoned would seem to be especially important. This is because the core principle of environmentalism, that there are limits to growth, implies certain lessons, regarding the limitations of technological power and ultimately human mortality, such that it naturally provokes a strong response of denial and wishful thinking. **Without a**n adequate **replacement world-view which is able** to successfully address such concerns, **to make sense** of and offer consolation for them, **it is** simply **inconceivable that society** as a whole **will reject the paradigm of unending** economic **growth** which environmentalism attacks. So it is that, while in the last four decades **environmentalism** has won a significant popular acceptance for the idea that there are severe problems with this paradigm, it **has made relatively slow progress in transforming political and economic organization: the replacement ideas it offers are not adequate** for the job they have to do.