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# AFFIRMATIVE

## 1AC

### **CONTENTION ONE: Silence**

### **The fossil fuel industry has shut down debate over energy policy. The energy companies control the government line on energy. Alternative views and discourse have been marginalized and silenced.**

Scheer 06’ (Hermann Scheer, German member of parliament, Energy Autonomy : The Economic, Social and Technological Case for Renewable Energy. London, , GBR: Earthscan, 2006. p 133 http://site.ebrary.com/lib/northwestern/Doc?id=10167744&ppg=151)phol

The hegemonic position of the energy business has a suggestive power that even casts a spell over people who are aware that the conventional energy system has become prohibitive – a power that causes them to recoil from decisive change. Whenever the word ‘energy’ is uttered, it is always associated – like a Pavlovian reflex – with something that, on principle, is the ‘responsibility’ of the energy business. This association is equivalent to intellectually recognizing its exclusive mandate on all energy questions. When it comes to energy, the energy business – especially as represented on government commissions and in the business media – is also (as a rule) the first (and often the only) party whose opinion is sought and respected.

### Under the veil of economic rationality, the fossil fuel industry has systematically erased renewable energy from becoming a genuine alternative.

Scheer 06’ (Hermann Scheer, German member of parliament, Energy Autonomy : The Economic, Social and Technological Case for Renewable Energy. London, , GBR: Earthscan, 2006. p 141-142 http://site.ebrary.com/lib/northwestern/Doc?id=10167744&ppg=151)phol

In her book Power Play, the Australian social scientist Sharon Beder analysed the practical consequences of liberalization in different countries.’ 9 She comes to the conclusion that the brief history of liberalization is a story of broken promises. Prices for average households and small business have gone up almost everywhere. The reliability of service has suffered because investments in maintenance and training tasks have been neglected. Blackouts have increased. Environmental quality has, on the average, got worse; running times for old power plants with lower transformation efficiency have been artificially extended, investments in greater energy efficiency have mostly been cut – and each upshot of liberalization has contributed towards artificially propping up the price difference to electricity from combined heat and power facilities and renewable energy in favour of an environmentally harmful energy supply. In countries where there are no special laws to promote it, investments for renewable energy went down. At the same time, R&D efforts within corporations were reduced. The victors of this development have been big industrial consumers who are able to negotiate lower electricity prices on the basis of their purchasing power – and especially the electricity corporations, who have been elevated into transnational enterprises. Liberalization facilitated an unprecedented process of concentration on their behalf. This was even something the EU Commission explicitly wished. It expressly wanted larger electricity corporations; in the common European electricity market that was envisioned, smaller suppliers were not regarded as sufficiently functional. It was a curious and highly contradictory concept: ‘more market’ through consolidation in the field of electricity companies, because large enterprises were seen as more ‘marketable’. What is happening, therefore, is pseudo-liberalization as a vehicle for self-interest.

### Government policy on energy has been corrupted to its core. Alternative energy is impossible within the existing power structure.

Justmeans 10’ (Justmeans, green business news website, Solar Feeds, Hermann Scheer: A German Solar Hero, Saturday, 23 October, 2010, http://www.solarfeeds.com/justmeans/14821-hermann-scheer-a-german-solar-hero)phol

The government behaved like all the governments behave. They feel themselves and they act as partners and assistants of the conventional power structure. This has many reasons. Some believe—some politicians believe that there would be no alternative. They believe the arguments. Others are very closely linked, personally linked, with the power companies and in different ways of corruption. The most comfortable way to corrupt a politician is the method, illegal method, to pay them later, after office—after office, after leaving government, then hiring him for the board. And this is very popular here, a very usable way of, let's say, legalized corruption. And the thinking of all governments that they are dependent from the work of the energy supplier, because no economy can work without energy. And the monopoly of the conventional power, even in the thinking that there would be no alternative, this monopoly gave them so much influence, so much influence, that many governments are puppets, governors are puppets in the hand of these power companies.

### Appeals to a “gradual transition” play into the hands of the status quo energy system assuring that solar comes too late and fails to challenge existing structures of domination.

Cromwell 2k (David Cromwell is an oceanographer and writer, <http://www.ru.org/10-1cromwell.htm>, Local Energy, Local Democracy: Are economics and ecology on a collision course?, 2000, Renaissance Universal and Renaissance Magazine)phol

None of the above will happen if we simply leave it to the giant oil corporations to tinker with solar renewables—as Shell and BP Amoco are doing—while they bulldoze ahead with exploration and production of new oil and gas reservoirs. Citizen control over a decentralised solar economy is in direct competition with the profit imperative of such large companies. The present policy of governments and mainstream environmental organisations is to leave it up to fossil-fuel corporations and big utility companies to bring about a solar revolution. As Berman and O’Connor warn: this will “guarantee that the coming Solar Age will arrive a century behind its time, and that it will be every bit as autocratic as today’s fossil-fuel economy”. Decentralised renewable energy directed by local communities will only be won at the expense of the private energy monopolies who are currently engaged in cut-throat competition to protect and expand their share of the energy market. Warlike metaphors abound in company rhetoric. Earlier this year, Shell group chairman Mark Moody-Stuart glowingly described his company as “a great fleet of destroyers and torpedo boats”. It’s time to scuttle this fossil-fuel armada and launch a new fleet of solar-driven vessels fit for the twenty-first century.

### **This is more than a question of energy. The status quo concentration of power in the hands of energy companies and corrupt government makes authoritarianism inevitable.**

Scheer 06’(Hermann Scheer, Member of the German Bundestag for the SPD, President of EUROSOLAR, Energy Autonomy : The Economic, Social and Technological Case for Renewable Energy, London, GBR: Earthscan, 2006. p 283-234, http://site.ebrary.com/lib/northwestern/Doc?id=10167744&ppg=294)phol

The central political motive for a renewable energy strategy leading to energy autonomy is the possibility of guaranteeing or restoring the right of self-determination for states and civil societies and, within these political civil societies, maintaining democracy and general economic freedom. The development of the electricity industry into a transnational great power shows that this argument is not based on exaggerated fears. That industry’s next strategic move – massive entry into hydrogen production – would mean that the electric power business would also assume the role of fuel producer after it has already largely taken over gas supplies. That would either be tantamount to displacing the petroleum multinationals or to an international merger of the electricity with the petroleum cartel – and thereby equivalent to the establishment of an energy superpower whose political influence would overshadow all previous positions of power in the energy business. Energy scientist Cesare Marchetti, the most frequently cited promulgator of a super-centrally organized Hydrogen Age, is one of the few who has openly sketched out the consequences of this futuristic vision for politics (and therefore for civilization). He proceeds analytically in much the same way as this book has, only under the omen of hyper-centralized electricity and hydrogen production rather than under the more auspicious sign of widespread decentralized energy production. Marchetti adopts a techno-sociological perspective. He describes – with hymn-like praise – an energy supply system that he defines as ‘horizontal’. It is a system supported by transnational enterprises that arches over ‘vertically’ organized states. These enterprises would become ‘the strongest forces in the struggle with political power’. They would be the nucleus of a ‘world government’. This ‘grand design … is developing itself ’ as a direct consequence of ‘very large energy centers’ operating worldwide that Marchetti sees above all as a result of nuclear fusion technology. As an optimal site for these centres he discerns (simply because of the gigantic need for cooling water) islands (say, in the Pacific Ocean) from which hydrogen could be transported to every region of the globe.

### The ultimate conclusion of the fossil fuel dominated market state is the elimination of civic resistance and democratic institutions. Values become impossible to articulate in this world.

Scheer 06’(Hermann Scheer, Member of the German Bundestag for the SPD, President of EUROSOLAR, Energy Autonomy : The Economic, Social and Technological Case for Renewable Energy, London, GBR: Earthscan, 2006. P 285, http://site.ebrary.com/lib/northwestern/Doc?id=10167744&ppg=294)phol

Such a development, however, is most probably coterminous with decaying and therefore violence-filled societies in which, on the one hand, cultural monotony and social lethargy dominate while, on the other hand, social revolt, religious fundamentalism and new nationalistic excesses run riot against intolerable but seemingly inalterable conditions. It represents a departure from the values of security in life and the notion of ‘bonum commune’, the very opposite of all the values worth striving for in civilization. It is not a new historical stage, but rather a plunge into civilization’s dungeon. It means that transnational enterprises appear as the incarnation of a global interest, while states and civil societies embody ‘special interests’! The ‘market state’ degrades political institutions into territorial administrations serving global conglomerates. Although there is no reason at all to paint this trend in rosy colours, it is entirely conceivable. Unlike Bobbitt, Marchetti describes which power centre would inevitably be dominant under this scenario. Ultimately everything would be dependent on a centralized energy power. The ‘horizontal’ energy supply structures he describes in an act of deliberate rhetorical confusion would actually be the most vertical power conceivable, the ultimate in entire societies’ dependence on inter-state energy oligarchies, on a transnational ‘energy state’.

### The fossil fuel economy makes authoritarian violence inevitable

Shepard 09’ (John, Graduated from Azusa Pacific University, California (BA degree, major: Philosophy, minor: Psychology) and received his Masters of Divinity Degree from Gordon Conwell Theological Seminary, Boston, Massachusetts. “Oil Wars” http://www.northforest.org/SocialCulturalTopics/OilWars.html, December 2009 [TL])

Even if the nations of the world seem to be cooperating now in addressing global warming, once oil supplies begin to shrink this cooperation will certainly come to an abrupt end. Each nation will scramble to obtain access to the rapidly-diminishing supplies that remain. If history is a reliable guide, this will certainly lead to world war — likely a war of greater devastation than all wars combined. Perhaps this will be the great tribulation of the Bible. Unfortunately, the soldiers in war are usually young so that large casualty rates will result in a population composed of older people. I envision that democracy will one day be a thing of the past. I suspect that the brutality necessary in the oil wars could only be achieved under the leadership of unscrupulous tyrants (ala Machiavelli). Those nations that are timid in applying force will lose their share of the dwindling oil supplies and will perhaps be invaded by stronger neighbors. As a result, every nation will become ruthless, and democracy will be destroyed in the process.

This is more than a struggle for our civic voice. The fight for a solar transition is the fight for planetary survival.

Gould 02’ (Between Barbarism and a Solar Transition, Jay M. Gould, served on the Science Advisory Board of the Environmental Protection Agency during the Carter administration, Monthly review 2002, Volume 54, Issue 02 June, http://monthlyreview.org/2002/06/01/between-barbarism-and-a-solar-transition)phol

If 1 percent of the four trillion dollar investment in nuclear energy were invested in solar technologies today, it would be possible someday to cover every roof top in the world with photovoltaic shingles, paving the way for the eventual elimination of both pollution and poverty. While there would be plenty of profits accruing to the large companies from solarization, the great drawback for them is that ultimately solarization would provide electricity too cheap to meter. Sunlight, like the unpolluted air we would then breathe and the potable water we would then drink, would be far too abundant to be sold for a profit.

It may be, then, that socialism will come as a result of a fierce struggle by all who fear dying prematurely of hunger and environmental pollution, and who will fight for the coming solar transition, as the only possible alternative to barbarism and the extinction of homo sapiens as a species in a radioactive planet.

### THE PLAN

### Thus, we advocate: The United States federal government should substantially increase its development of space with space based solar power.

Contention Two: Speaking

Our current energy ideology kills critical thinking and relegates the mind to one-dimensional thought. Rethinking our stance on energy is key to dissolving these restrictions. We can’t talk about energy without confronting these issues.

Scheer 06’ (Hermann Scheer, German member of parliament, Energy Autonomy : The Economic, Social and Technological Case for Renewable Energy. London, , GBR: Earthscan, 2006. p 131-132 http://site.ebrary.com/lib/northwestern/Doc?id=10167744&ppg=151)phol

In the energy system, too, thinking has been reduced to the facts set up by the system itself. But this restriction contradicts the central role that physical energy plays in every vital question. The fact that this contradiction does not get recognized is a consequence of viewing any given problem in isolation and disregarding that problem’s contexts; this is a trend one may observe in every sector of society. It leads to fragmented perceptions and, accordingly, to perspectives that are more one-dimensional than those evoked by one-sided ideologies. The different areas of activity within society mutate into hermetically sealed subsystems that can barely get running feedback from constantly changing external factors. The energy system has a life of its own that is especially cut off from the outside, and its categories of action are especially autistic. But even other actors – including those championing a fundamental change in energy – are mostly integrated into their own subsystems where the approaches to thought and action are equally one-dimensional. They, too, are often standing in their own way. The obstacles to taking action on renewable energy may therefore be explained not only by the one-dimensional perspective of the energy business, but also by one-dimensional thinking in the fields of politics, economics, and environmental protection. Mentally dissolving this reductionist optic is the precondition for overcoming it in practice. The best recipe for dissolving it is to illuminate the reasons behind its formation and their specific consequences.

### In round discourse about energy is a prior question to their impacts because rethinking renewable energy would change everything about the way we think economically and politically about the world

Scheer 06’ (Hermann Scheer is a Member of the German Bundestag for the SPD, President of EUROSOLAR, The post-fossil future, Le Monde diplomatique, June 2006, http://www.hermannscheer.de/en/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=133&Itemid=11)phol

This opportunity for a post-fossil and post-nuclear future is not perceived as such, indeed the existence of this opportunity is still denied. This can be explained by a blinkered view of energy: isolated cost comparisons are carried out, instead of energy systems as a whole being compared. The outdated energy system, with its company structure, is seen as set in stone. And the assumption is made that it is technocratically neutral vis-à-vis other energy sources and ready and able to switch to a different source of energy at any point in time. Yet this is an unrealistic view, revealing a complete lack of basic knowledge of the technology concerned and the sociology of energy. For this type of objective neutrality is impossible in purely physical terms. Each energy system is bound to be geared to those particular sources of energy, which it uses. The choice of energy source determines the political, economic and technological effort required for extraction, processing, transport and distribution, including the transformation technology needed. This means that the switch to renewable energies and thus to wholly different energy flows would change everything. It would mean a switch from commercial to non-commercial primary energies, from a small number of large power stations and refineries to a large number of medium and small-scale power plants, from internationalised to regionalised infrastructure, from energies which produce emissions to emission-free energy. And, not least, from highly concentrated company and ownership structures to more diverse ones. The systemic shift in energy supply represents a paradigm shift in technological, economic and political terms. It is here that lies the political crux of the energy problem. Recognising this allows us to understand why certain groups are resisting renewable energies. And how this resistance can be overcome.

### A new approach to energy includes more than just switching technologies---policy changes that fail to include a holistic approach will only serve to entrench existing systems of domination.

**Bookchin** 93’ (Murray Bookchin , What is social ecology?. In: M.E. Zimmerman, J.B. Callicott, G. Sessions, K.J. Warren and J. Clark, Editors, Environmental Philosophy, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ (1993))

To prioritize any form of spirituality over the social factors that actually erode all forms of spirituality, raises serious questions about one's ability to come to grips with reality. At a time when a blind social mechanism, the market, is turning soil into sand, covering fertile land with concrete, poisoning air and water, and producing sweeping climatic and atmospheric changes, we cannot ignore the impact that a hierarchical and class society has on the natural world. We must earnestly deal with the fact that economic growth, gender oppressions, and ethnic domination-not to speak of corporate, state, and bureaucratic interests-are much more capable of shaping the future of the natural world than are privatistic forms of spiritual self-regeneration. These forms of domination must be confronted by collective action and major social movements that challenge the social sources of the ecological crisis, not simply by personalistic forms of consumption and investment that often go under the rubric of "green capitalism." We live in a highly cooptative society that is only too eager to find new areas of commercial aggrandizement and to add ecological verbiage to its advertising and customer relations

### Activists have an important role in the transition to a solar economy. The 1AC is a speech act that holds the government accountable.

Lewis 02’ (Sandra, Information and Action Addressing Public Policy for an Ecologically Sustainable WorldVolume 2, Number 2) “The Dark Side Of Our Dependence On Fossil Fuels: Time For Quakers To Take A Stand, March 2002, <http://www.quakerearthcare.org/Publications/QuakerEcoBulletin/QEBArchive/QEB-PDF/QEB2-2-energy.pdf>

Toward Sane Energy Policies Now is the time for quakers to speak out for energy policies that are environmentally sound, socially just, and economically feasible. Such policies would explicitly aim at eliminating our dependence on fossil fuels and would include strategies, timetables and investments required to achieve this goal. As a nation, we need to pursue this with the urgency and priority of other great national goals such as landing a man on the moon.

Clean, renewable technologies (such as wind and solar) are currently available and emerging technologies (such as hydrogen fuel cells) are on the verge of being ready for general use. Renewable sources of energy should be phased in through promotion and subsidy for clean power, increasing emissions restrictions, and decreasing support for dirty power. The policy must provide for a transition to these new technologies that would include retraining of work forces and education of the general public.

Sane policies must account for the environmental, social and moral consequences of the energy we use. It is up to us to hold our political leaders accountable for enacting such policies.

### Renewable energy is fundamental to the preservation of human values. Failure to speak out against the status quo makes you complicit in a system that is killing us all.

WREA 05’ (World Renewable Energy Assembly (WREA), November 26th to 30th, 2005, Bonn/Germany, 3rd World Renewable Energy Forum, The Human Right to Renewable Energy<http://www.hermannscheer.de/en/images/stories/pdf/WREA_2005_final_communique_en.pdf>, World Renewable Energy Assembly (WREA) 2005)phol

“All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.“ This first sentence of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights articulates a basic human commitment. Only by respecting this commitment, a humane life in peace can be assured durably. Energy is the fundamental prerequisite of every life. Availability of energy is a fundamental and indivisible human right. In the 20th century we have gained the experience that the established system of energy supply - mainly based on fossil energies, and partly nuclear energy - is not in a position to assure this human right for everybody. It is violated billion fold. Due to the imminent depletion of conventional energy sources and their dramatic impact on the environment and climate, this right can be assured even less for an ever-increasing number of people. The human right to energy can only be fulfilled by renewable energy. There is no more time to waste for the mobilisation of renewable energy. Until now, international efforts are clearly lagging behind the essential requirements and the opportunities given. The large number of UN conferences promises more than they can keep, because they are committed to consensual decision-making in every step. So far, UN organisations and multilateral development banks either have not been willing to clearly shift their priorities towards renewable energy, or have been prevented from doing so. The Kyoto Protocol is falling short of its requirements still. Its main problem lies in its focus on emissions trading and marketable rights, instead of emissions prevention by a paradigm shift towards renewables. The promotion of nuclear power is fixed in international law, while renewable energy is not. The fossil and nuclear energy system still receives around US$ 500 billion of subsidies annually, fifty times more than is spent on renewable energy. International government institutions reflect the renewable energy discrimination in their system. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) is promoting the proliferation of nuclear technology; the International Energy Agency (IEA) is operating as a satellite of the fossil energy industry. Both have misled the governments and the public for years, by playing down risks of nuclear and fossil energy, and by negating the potentials of renewable energy. These agencies are leading their governments to an energy policy that is blind to the future. We must not remain silent and ignore these facts any longer; the persons in charge have to be named. We are not only accountable for our actions, but also for our inaction.

## Inherency---No Transition

### Government is corrupted by fossil fuel companies in the squo.

Justmeans 10’ (Justmeans, green business news website, Solar Feeds, Hermann Scheer: A German Solar Hero, Saturday, 23 October, 2010, http://www.solarfeeds.com/justmeans/14821-hermann-scheer-a-german-solar-hero)phol

The government behaved like all the governments behave. They feel themselves and they act as partners and assistants of the conventional power structure. This has many reasons. Some believe—some politicians believe that there would be no alternative. They believe the arguments. Others are very closely linked, personally linked, with the power companies and in different ways of corruption. The most comfortable way to corrupt a politician is the method, illegal method, to pay them later, after office—after office, after leaving government, then hiring him for the board. And this is very popular here, a very usable way of, let's say, legalized corruption. And the thinking of all governments that they are dependent from the work of the energy supplier, because no economy can work without energy. And the monopoly of the conventional power, even in the thinking that there would be no alternative, this monopoly gave them so much influence, so much influence, that many governments are puppets, governors are puppets in the hand of these power companies.

### **Questions surrounding the energy system are controlled exclusively by energy companies.**

Scheer 06’ (Hermann Scheer, German member of parliament, Energy Autonomy : The Economic, Social and Technological Case for Renewable Energy. London, , GBR: Earthscan, 2006. p 133 http://site.ebrary.com/lib/northwestern/Doc?id=10167744&ppg=151)phol

The hegemonic position of the energy business has a suggestive power that even casts a spell over people who are aware that the conventional energy system has become prohibitive – a power that causes them to recoil from decisive change. Whenever the word ‘energy’ is uttered, it is always associated – like a Pavlovian reflex – with something that, on principle, is the ‘responsibility’ of the energy business. This association is equivalent to intellectually recognizing its exclusive mandate on all energy questions. When it comes to energy, the energy business – especially as represented on government commissions and in the business media – is also (as a rule) the first (and often the only) party whose opinion is sought and respected.

### Energy companies have used liberalization as an excuse to exclude renewable energy from the market.

Scheer 06’ (Hermann Scheer, German member of parliament, Energy Autonomy : The Economic, Social and Technological Case for Renewable Energy. London, , GBR: Earthscan, 2006. p 141-142 http://site.ebrary.com/lib/northwestern/Doc?id=10167744&ppg=151)phol

In her book Power Play, the Australian social scientist Sharon Beder analysed the practical consequences of liberalization in different countries.’ 9 She comes to the conclusion that the brief history of liberalization is a story of broken promises. Prices for average households and small business have gone up almost everywhere. The reliability of service has suffered because investments in maintenance and training tasks have been neglected. Blackouts have increased. Environmental quality has, on the average, got worse; running times for old power plants with lower transformation efficiency have been artificially extended, investments in greater energy efficiency have mostly been cut – and each upshot of liberalization has contributed towards artificially propping up the price difference to electricity from combined heat and power facilities and renewable energy in favour of an environmentally harmful energy supply. In countries where there are no special laws to promote it, investments for renewable energy went down. At the same time, R&D efforts within corporations were reduced. The victors of this development have been big industrial consumers who are able to negotiate lower electricity prices on the basis of their purchasing power – and especially the electricity corporations, who have been elevated into transnational enterprises. Liberalization facilitated an unprecedented process of concentration on their behalf. This was even something the EU Commission explicitly wished. It expressly wanted larger electricity corporations; in the common European electricity market that was envisioned, smaller suppliers were not regarded as sufficiently functional. It was a curious and highly contradictory concept: ‘more market’ through consolidation in the field of electricity companies, because large enterprises were seen as more ‘marketable’. What is happening, therefore, is pseudo-liberalization as a vehicle for self-interest.

## A2: Future Tech will solve

### **Waiting for new tech to solve warming is morally impermissible; the judge has an obligation to do the plan now.**

Abelsohn and O’Hara 11’ (Ethical Response to Climate Change, Dennis Patrick O’Hara, director of the Elliott Allen Institute for Theology and Ecology at St. Michael’s, Alan Abelsohn, assistant professor in the Department of Family and Community Medicine, and the Dalla Lana School of Public Health and lecturer in the Centre for Environment, at the University of Toronto,

Ethics and the Environment, Vol. 16, No. 1, Spring 2011, <http://www.jstor.org/pss/10.2979/ethicsenviro.16.1.25>)phol

The fourth popular disclaimer used by developed nations to justify a reticence to honor moral and legal requirements to reduce the adverse effects of climate change asserts that until more cost effective technolo- gies are available—and they are expected to be available in the near fu- ture—there is no current obligation to mitigate GHG emissions. However, since people and climate systems are presently being harmed, the most effective response currently available must be utilized. Even if more effec- tive technologies might become available in the future, there is a moral obligation to minimize all present harm, now, to the best of our abilities. Furthermore, since it is generally conceded that the polluter should pay for the harm caused and being caused, as well as all future harm, any delay in mitigating harmful activities only adds to the penalty that must be paid (Brown et al. 2006, 34–5).

# Advantage

## Fossil Fuel Dependence = Authoritarianism

### Oil companies cloud the light to solving Global Warming and persistently hijack American democracy – Healthcare debate and past government officials prove

Hari 2010 (Johann Hari, Journalist for the Independent, Huffington Post, The Guardian and New York Times, January 29, 2010, “Johann Hari: This corruption in Washington is smothering America's future, <http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/johann-hari/johann-hari-this-corruption-in-washington-is-smothering-americas-future-1882349.html>

For more than a century, the US has slowly put some limits – too few, too feeble – on how much corporations can bribe, bully or intimidate politicians. On Tuesday, they were burned away in one whoosh. The Supreme Court ruled that corporations can suddenly run political adverts during an election campaign – and there is absolutely no limit on how many, or how much they can spend. So if you anger the investment bankers by supporting legislation to break up the too-big-to-fail banks, you will smack into a wall of 24/7 ads exposing your every flaw**. If you displease oil companies by supporting legislation to deal with global warming, you will now be hit by a tsunami of advertising saying you are opposed to jobs and the American Way.** If you rile the defence contractors by opposing the gargantuan war budget, you will face a smear-campaign calling you Soft on Terror. Representative Alan Grayson says: "It basically institutionalises and legalises bribery on the largest scale imaginable. Corporations will now be able to reward the politicians that play ball with them – and beat to death the politicians that don't... You won't even hear any more about the Senator from Kansas. It'll be the Senator from General Electric or the Senator from Microsoft." To understand the impact this will have, you need to grasp how smaller sums of corporate money have already hijacked American democracy. Let's look at a case that is simple and immediate and every American can see in front of them: healthcare. The United States is the only major industrialised democracy that doesn't guarantee healthcare for all its citizens. The result is that, according to a detailed study by Harvard University, some 45,000 Americans die needlessly every year. That's equivalent to 15 9/11s every year, or two Haitian earthquakes every decade. This isn't because the American people like it this way. Gallup has found in polls for a decade now that two-thirds believe the government should guarantee care for every American: they are as good and decent and concerned for each other as any European. No: it is because private insurance companies make a fortune today out of a system that doesn't cover the profit-less poor, and can turn away the sickest people as "uninsurable". So they pay for politicians to keep the system broken. They fund the election campaigns of politicians on both sides of the aisle and employ an army of lobbyists, and for their part those politicians veto any system that doesn't serve their paymasters. Look for example at Joe Lieberman, the former Democratic candidate for Vice-President. He has taken $448,066 in campaign contributions from private healthcare companies while his wife raked in $2m as one of their chief lobbyists, and he has blocked any attempt in the Senate to break the stranglehold of the health insurance companies and broaden coverage. The US political system now operates within a corporate cage. If you want to run for office, you have to take corporate cash – and so you have to serve corporate interests. Corporations are often blatant in their corruption: it's not unusual for them to give to both competing candidates in a Senate race, to ensure all sides are indebted to them. It has reached the point that lobbyists now often write the country's laws. Not metaphorically; literally. The former Republican congressman Walter Jones spoke out in disgust in 2006 when he found that drug company lobbyists were actually authoring the words of the Medicare prescription bill, and puppet-politicians were simply nodding it through. But what happens if politicians are serving the short-term profit-hunger of corporations, and not the public interest? You only have to look at the shuttered shops outside your window for the answer. The banks were rapidly deregulated from the Eighties through the Noughties because their lobbyists paid politicians on all sides, and demanded their payback in rolled-back rules and tossed-away laws. As Senator Dick Durbin says simply: "The banks own the Senate," so they had to obey. It is this corruption that has prevented Barack Obama from achieving anything substantial in his first year in office. How do you re-regulate the banks, if the Senate is owned by Wall Street? How do you launch a rapid transition away from oil and coal to wind and solar, if the fossil fuel industry owns Congress? How do you break with a grab-the-oil foreign policy if Big Oil provides the invitation that gets you into the party of American politics? His attempt at healthcare reform is dying because he thought he could only get through the Senate a system that the giant healthcare corporations and drug companies pre-approved. So he promised to keep the ban on bringing cheap drugs down from Canada, he pledged not to bargain over prices, and he dumped the idea of having a public option that would make sure ordinary Americans could actually afford it. The result was a Quasimodo healthcare proposal so feeble and misshapen that even the people of Massachusetts turned away in disgust. Yet the corporations that caused this crisis are now being given yet more power. Bizarrely, the Supreme Court has decided that corporations are "persons", so they have the "right" to speak during elections. But corporations are not people. Should they have the right to bear arms, or to vote? It would make as much sense. They are a legal fiction, invented by the state – and they can be fairly regulated to stop them devouring their creator. This is the same Supreme Court that ruled that the detainees at Guantanomo Bay are not "persons" under the constitution deserving basic protections. A court that says a living breathing human is less of a "persons" than Lockheed Martin has gone badly awry. Obama now faces two paths – the Clinton road, or the FDR highway. After he lost his healthcare battle, Clinton decided to serve the corporate interests totally. He is the one who carried out the biggest roll-back of banking laws, and saw the largest explosion of inequality since the 1920s. Some of Obama's advisers are now nudging him down that path: the appalling anti-Keynesian pledge for a spending freeze on social programmes for the next three years to pay down the deficit is one of their triumphs. But there is another way. Franklin Roosevelt began his Presidency trying to appease corporate interests – but he faced huge uproar and disgust at home when it became clear this left ordinary Americans stranded. He switched course. He turned his anger on "the malefactors of great wealth" and bragged: "I welcome the hatred... of the economic royalists." He put in place tough regulations that prevented economic disaster and spiralling inequality for three generations. There were rare flashes of what Franklin Delano Obama would look like in his reaction to the Supreme Court decision. He said: "It is a major victory for big oil, Wall Street banks, health insurance companies, and other powerful interests that marshal their power every day in Washington to drown out the voices of everyday Americas." But he has spent far more time coddling those interests than taking them on. The great pressure of strikes and protests put on FDR hasn't yet arisen from a public dissipated into hopelessness by an appalling media that convinces them they are powerless and should wait passively for a Messiah. Very little positive change can happen in the US until they clear out the temple of American democracy. In the State of the Union, Obama spent one minute on this problem, and proposed restrictions on lobbyists – but that's only the tiniest of baby steps. He evaded the bigger issue. If Americans want a democratic system, they have to pay for it – and that means fair state funding for political candidates. Candidates are essential for the system to work: you may as well begrudge paying for the polling booths, or the lever you pull. At the same time, the Supreme Court needs to be confronted: when the court tried to stymie the new deal, FDR tried to pack it with justices on the side of the people. Obama needs to be pressured by Americans to be as radical in democratising the Land of the Fee (CRCT). None of the crises facing us all – from the global banking system to global warming – can be dealt with if a tiny number of super-rich corporations have a veto over every inch of progress. If Obama funks this challenge, he may as well put the US government on e-Bay – and sell it to the highest bidder. How would we spot the difference?

### Oil rich states use their mineral wealth the inhibit democracy through military spending

Ross 01’ (<http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/exed/sites/ldf/Academic/Ross%20-%20Does%20Oil%20Hinder%20Democracy.pdf>, DOES OIL HINDER DEMOCRACY?, MICHAEL L. ROSS, Professor of political science at UCLA, World Politics 53 (April 2001), 325- --6))phol

Citizens in resource-rich states may want democracy as much as citizens elsewhere, but resource wealth may allow their gov- ernments to spend more on internal security and so block the popula- tion’s democratic aspirations. Skocpol notes that much of Iran’s pre-1979 oil wealth was spent on the military, producing what she calls a “rentier absolutist state.”34 Clark, in his study of the 1990s oil boom in the Republic of Congo, finds that the surge in revenues allowed the government to build up the armed forces and train a special presidential guard to help maintain order.35 And Gause argues that Middle East de- mocratization has been inhibited in part by the prevalence of the mukhabarat (national security) state.36 There are at least two reasons why resource wealth might lead to larger military forces. One may be pure self-interest: given the oppor- tunity to better arm itself against popular pressures, an authoritarian government will readily do so. A second reason may be that resource wealth causes ethnic or regional conflict; a larger military might reflect the government’s response. Mineral wealth is often geographically con centrated. If it happens to be concentrated in a region populated by an ethnic or religious minority, resource extraction may promote or exac- erbate ethnic tensions, as federal, regional, and local actors compete for mineral rights. These disputes may lead to larger military forces and less democracy in resource-rich, ethnically fractured states such as An- gola, Burma, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Indonesia, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Sierra Leone, and South Africa. This mechanism would be consistent with the research of Collier and Hoeffler and de Soysa, who find that natural resource wealth tends to make civil war more likely.

### Oil dependence prevents democratization Luft 08 (Gal, executive director of the Institute for the Analysis of Global Security (IAGS), “Dependence on Middle East Energy and its Impact on Global Security”, 6-2-08, http://www.thecuttingedgenews.com/index.php?article=537) OP (thank you)

Studies show that countries rich in easily extracted and highly lucrative natural resources that do not have well-developed democratic traditions, do not sufficiently invest in education, productivity, or economic diversification. In addition, such resource-rich governments do not feel obligated to be accountable or transparent to their people and they deny them representation. They also have no imperative to educate women and grant them equal rights. While their oil wealth allows them to be the strategic pivot of world politics and economy, the record of these “trust fund states” on human rights, political stability, and compliance with international law, is abysmal. Some Persian Gulf countries have made an effort not to repeat the reckless spending policies that accompanied previous spikes in oil prices by diversifying their investment portfolios and strengthening their non-oil sector. But they still continue to use oil revenues as a means to maintain their power. Thus freedom and democracy advance at an extremely slow pace, if at all. In some places the petrodollars influx only causes a reversal in the progress toward freedom. As New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman noted in what he calls “the first law of petropolitics,” the price of oil and the pace of freedom always move in opposite directions in authoritarian countries highly dependent on oil and gas for their GDP. If democratization makes any significant progress in the Middle East it only happens in countries that do not rely on energy exports like Jordan, Bahrain, or Morocco.

### Oil based economies prevent cultural development which stifles the growth of democracy.

Ross 01’ (<http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/exed/sites/ldf/Academic/Ross%20-%20Does%20Oil%20Hinder%20Democracy.pdf>, DOES OIL HINDER DEMOCRACY?, MICHAEL L. ROSS, Professor of political science at UCLA, World Politics 53 (April 2001), 325- --6))phol

Finally, a third explanation can be derived from modernization theory, which holds that democracy is caused by a collection of social and cul- tural changes—including occupational specialization, urbanization, and higher levels of education—that in turn are caused by economic devel- opment.38 Different scholars emphasize different clusters of social and cultural changes. Perhaps the most carefully shaped position comes from Inglehart, who argues that two types of social change have a direct impact on the likelihood that a state will become democratic:

1. Rising education levels, which produce a more articulate public that is bet- ter equipped to organize and communicate, and

2. Rising occupational specialization, which first shifts the workforce into the secondary sector and then into the tertiary sector. These changes produce a more autonomous workforce, accustomed to thinking for themselves on the job and having specialized skills that enhance their bargaining power against elites.39

Although modernization theory does not address the question of re- source wealth per se, an implicit corollary is that if economic develop- ment does not produce these cultural and social changes, it will not result in democratization. As Inglehart notes: “Is the linkage between development and democracy due to wealth per se? Apparently not: if democracy automatically resulted from simply becoming wealthy, then Kuwait and Libya would be model democracies.”40 In other words, if resource-led growth does not lead to higher education levels and greater occupational specialization, it should also fail to bring about de- mocracy. Unlike the rentier and repression effects, the modernization effect does not work through the state: it is a social mechanism, not a political one.

The rentier, repression, and modernization effects are largely com- plementary. The rentier effect focuses on the government’s use of fiscal measures to keep the public politically demobilized; the repression ef- fect stresses the government’s use of force to keep the public demobi- lized; and the modernization effect looks at social forces that may keep the public demobilized. All three explanations, or any combination of them, may be simultaneously

### Oil is critical to the functioning of biopolitical order- surveillance and record keeping depend on petroleum.

McWhorter 2k7 (Ladelle, Professor of Environmental studies, Philosophy Department, James Thomas Professor in Philosophy, <http://rauli.cbs.dk/index.php/foucault-studies/article/viewFile/875/893>, 2007)

We should not forget that biopower in all its glory emerged at just about the same time as the oil industry emerged in the US (at the end of the 1860s) and made enormous, leaping gains in momentum as the nation‐states of the industrialized world converted to a petroleum economy based on ubiquitous petroleum‐derived and dependent technologies. Basic techniques of normalization—for example, extensive record‐keeping and surveillance—were possible without petroleum and natural gas (as Bentham’s plan for the Panopticon demonstrates), but they were not possible on anything like the massive scale that they are with the inventive development and extensive use o petroleum products over the last one hundred and forty years. On first glance one might think that much of modern technology—such as surveillance cameras or computers—are not petroleum products and do not use oil in their operation. We tend to think of electricity, largely generated world‐wide by hydro‐electric and coal power, as independent of the oil industry, but the fact is that it is not; most of the machinery in power plants that produce electricity from moving water and fuels other than petroleum and natural ga are built and transported, as well as maintained, with the aid of oil. Without oil, none of those technologies would be viable. And without plastics made from petroleum, we would have no cell phones, no laptops, no light‐weight cameras, recording devices, or vehicles. Virtually all of the surveillance and record‐keeping technology currently in use depends on the availability of oil. To realize the almost incredible degree to which our biopolitical world is dependent on petroleum, one only has to look around the room in which one is sitting at any given moment and ask what would not be there if there were no petroleum‐derived synthetic materials, no gasoline or diesel or jet fuel, and no petroleum‐based lubricants or coolants. And what would happen if the oil from which those things and their replacements are made or transported were to stop flowing? What exercises of power would no longer be possible? My suspicion is that without oil, biopower as a vast network of interlocking and overlapping practices would soon break down.

### US imperialism and governmental policy is driven by it’s addiction to fossil fuels

Wilkerson 06’ (Joseph, Energy and Psyche: Resource Addiction in the Technological Age, <http://www.ecopsychology.org/journal/ezine/archive3/addiction.pdf>, April 2006[TL])

The pathological need to control is another key facet of addiction. “Addicts need to control their world to maintain access to the source of their obsession,” Glendenning emphasizes (Roszak ed. 48). Like denial, the need to control can be observed in more than just consumer behavior. This commanding attitude helps to explain both individual energy use and corporate and governmental policy. Energy use (and technology, by extension) is, at base, a tool of control. A thermostat allows consumers to control the temperature of their living and working spaces. A light fixture allows us to control lumination. A car allows us to live and work where we choose and still attend to our needs and wants. Energy allows us to produce goods which make our lives easier, which improve our health, which make us feel good. But, asks theologian Thomas Berry, “what benefit is worth giving up the purity of the air we breathe, the water we drink, the life- giving soil in which our food is grown” (51)? Not all technology is bad, certainly. But the consumer’s desire to control with it has become pathological, and it will take more than technical efficiency or conservation to address this. A reevaluation of our energy “needs” will reveal that a disturbing number reflect our need to control natural cycles of heat and cold, day and night, and natural features like topography and climate. Such a fundamental divorce from natural cycles certainly must impact our psyches. Energy and technology *producers*, too, must exercise control if they are to maintain our addiction--the source of their livelihood. Durning calls such upkeep the “cultivation of needs:” advertising which perpetuates or augments our desires for anything from alcohol or sugar to fame, security or wealth. (“Entire industries,” he notes, “have manufactured a need for themselves” (Durning 119).) Since energy is the fuel which makes other technology possible, the electricity industry, for example, is not alone in its battle to “cultivate needs.” Arguably, any industry that relies on energy colludes in perpetuating our addiction to it day by day; the automotive, agribusiness and appliance industries are a few obvious examples.

## Fossil Fuel dependence = War

### Fossil fuels are the leading cause of war. We need to use solar power, and citizen action to turn away from non-renewable resources

Beyond fossil fuel 08’ (“Resource Wars” http://www.beyondfossilfuel.com/resources/resource\_wars\_012308.html1-23-08 [TL])

In the U.S., we have it easy. Power, food and shelter are in abundance all around us. As Americans we take for granted how truly blessed we are. Electricity is just a light switch away, groceries are in abundance just a few miles away, and gasoline although high, is cheaper than bottled water. Can you imagine trying to survive having to fight for your resources everyday? What if we had to grow our on food, kill our own meat and find enough wood to heat our home at night? It was not too many years ago, many people in the U.S. were doing just that! This resource war has already begun. The first thing you think of is oil, but what about water, natural gas, wheat, corn and almost all commodities including lead are being gobbled up around the world, while stocks of these resources are dwindling away. As the population of the world surges past six billion the demand for resources are exceeding supply. We already see big players like China buying energy companies in Canada. China sees this resource war coming and they are planning ahead to secure their energy future as much as possible. Look at our leaders in the U.S. are they securing our energy future. The president is calling for the mass production of ethanol and bio-diesel. Will this help our energy problems? Not really, ethanol is just a band-aid controlled by Big Oil. The president’s new energy bill goes backward by removing solar and wind tax breaks. Will this massive increase in food being used for fuel cause our food to go up? Learn more about Peak Food Much more needs to be done and right now before these resource wars become ugly. China is buying resources all over the world from timber to scrap metal. Scrap metal is in such great demand that cargo ships full of the stuff are being shipped from the U.S. to China everyday. If you pay attention you can see how this is turning not only into a world wide problem but into a domestic problem. Corn is even being stolen from grain elevators. A truck load of corn once worth $15,000 is now worth $50,000. Atlanta is having a water crisis, it is fighting with other states in court over the precious resource called water. As resources become scarcer the survival of the fittest will come into play. The strong will take from the weak without asking first. Even though Sadam was a very bad guy some believe part of the reason the U.S. entered Iraq was to secure oil for the U.S. This is just the first war of possibly many to come over resources like oil. Cheney is quoted as saying this war will not end in our lifetime. Which is it his lifetime or our children’s lifetime? Our leaders know more than they are telling the people. Maybe they know our resources like oil is being used up faster then the supply and they are not telling us. President Bush’s Crawford Winter White House is an environmentalist dream. It has 25,000 gallons of rainwater storage, gray water collection from sinks and showers for irrigation, passive solar, geothermal heating and cooling. It seems he knows something about the future we don’t. The control of natural resources like oil, timber and other raw materials have been a factor in civil wars in Sierra Leone, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ivory Coast, and Angola. Who will win this game of "Survivor"? Maybe it will be the countries with the most resources and the armies to protect them. Russia will be one of these countries. The resource rich countries without a strong army that could be targeted may include Africa or Canada. I hope it will not come to world wars and global theft of resources. Maybe we are just in a Commodity Super Cycle as Jim Rogers believes and will end around 2015. In the mean time we can adapt and use less of these limited resources. Find more alternatives to hydrocarbons by using renewable sources like wind, solar, and geothermal. The problem is we are running out of time. The U.S. government needs to start a “REAL” energy program equitant to the efforts in putting a man on the moon. They said putting a man on the moon could not be done, but we did it! If enough time and effort is put in any project it can be done., but we cannot wait till the resource crisis is in our lap. The U.S. leaders need to give us the Good, Bad and the Ugly no matter how much it hurts. The U.S. people are the most resourceful and innovative folks in the world. They just need direction and a goal. We can move forward with great tenacity, working day and night till we achieve our ENERGY INDEPENDENCE.

### Government Corruption is a Direct Result of our Dependency on Foreign Oil – Such dependency clouds government judgment and ensures endless wars

Lewis 02’ ((Sandra, Information and Action Addressing Public Policy for an Ecologically Sustainable WorldVolume 2, Number 2) “The Dark Side Of Our Dependence On Fossil Fuels: Time For Quakers To Take A Stand, March 2002 <http://www.quakerearthcare.org/Publications/QuakerEcoBulletin/QEBArchive/QEB-PDF/QEB2-2-energy.pdf>)

Most of us have reaped the benefits of an economy powered by fossil fuel. There is no need to list the wonders, comforts, conveniences, and prosperity wrought by this century-long dependence. But we can no longer ignore the extreme costs. We are on a collision course with ecological reality. It’s time to recognize how our dependence puts us in direct conflict with core values embodied in the Quaker Testimonies of Integrity, Peace, Simplicity, Equality and Community. Events of recent months shed glaring light on the dark side of our nation’s dependence on fossil fuel. The World Trade Towers’ destruction is, perhaps, its most dramatic expression to date. U.S. foreign policy is now driven largely by our dependence on oil. We maintain a global military presence to ensure the flow. We make deals that support oppressive governments and overlook gross violations of human rights to feed our habit — slave labor to build a UNOCAL pipeline in Burma, for example. To ensure our access to oil, we train and arm factions like the Taliban, and then look the other way when these weapons are used to enforce despotic rule. Gross inequalities of wealth and power among nations fueled by huge disparities in the use of fossil fuels sow the seeds of war. Our Peace Testimony calls on us to work t o take away the occasion of war. Ending our dependence on fossil fuel has become an essential expression of this Testimony.

### Only ‘horizontal’ power, or renewable energy, can prevent civilization from plunging back into the dungeons of history.

Scheer 06’(Hermann Scheer, Member of the German Bundestag for the SPD, President of EUROSOLAR, Energy Autonomy : The Economic, Social and Technological Case for Renewable Energy, London, GBR: Earthscan, 2006. P 285, http://site.ebrary.com/lib/northwestern/Doc?id=10167744&ppg=294)phol

Such a development, however, is most probably coterminous with decaying and therefore violence-filled societies in which, on the one hand, cultural monotony and social lethargy dominate while, on the other hand, social revolt, religious fundamentalism and new nationalistic excesses run riot against intolerable but seemingly inalterable conditions. It represents a departure from the values of security in life and the notion of ‘bonum commune’, the very opposite of all the values worth striving for in civilization. It is not a new historical stage, but rather a plunge into civilization’s dungeon. It means that transnational enterprises appear as the incarnation of a global interest, while states and civil societies embody ‘special interests’! The ‘market state’ degrades political institutions into territorial administrations serving global conglomerates. Although there is no reason at all to paint this trend in rosy colours, it is entirely conceivable. Unlike Bobbitt, Marchetti describes which power centre would inevitably be dominant under this scenario. Ultimately everything would be dependent on a centralized energy power. The ‘horizontal’ energy supply structures he describes in an act of deliberate rhetorical confusion would actually be the most vertical power conceivable, the ultimate in entire societies’ dependence on inter-state energy oligarchies, on a transnational ‘energy state’.

## Fossil Fuel dependence = extinction

### Transition to ecological society that includes renewable shift is key to survival

Biehl 97’ (Janet Biehl, editor of bookchin reader considered best intro to social ecology by bookchin, THE MURRAY BOOKCHIN READER, 1997, <http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/bookchin/reader/intro.html>)phol

Social ecology, drawing on multiple domains of knowledge, traces the roots of the ecological crisis to dislocations in society. As Bookchin put it in "Ecology and Revolutionary Thought": "The imbalances man has produced in the natural world are caused by the imbalances he has produced in the social world."(9) This inextricable relation between society and ecology remains a pillar of social ecology. But social ecology has not only a critical dimension but a reconstructive one as well. Since the causes of the ecological crisis are social in nature, we can avert the present danger of ecological disaster only by fundamentally transforming the present society into a rational and ecological one. In this same 1964 article, in "Toward a Liberatory Technology" (written the following year), and in many subsequent works, Bookchin described his version of the truly libertarian socialist society. It would be a decentralized and mutualistic one, free of hierarchy and domination. Town and country would no longer be opposed to each other but would instead be integrated. Social life would be scaled to human dimensions. Politics would be directly democratic at the community level, so that citizens can manage their own social and political affairs on a face-to-face basis, forming confederations to address larger-scale problems. Economic life would be cooperative and communal, and technology would eliminate onerous and tedious labor. Bookchin would elaborate and refine many aspects of this society-- and the means to achieve it--over subsequent decades. But its earliest outlines were sketched as early as 1962 and developed in 1964 and 1965. Here Bookchin also proposed that an ecological society could make use of solar and wind power as sources of energy, replacing fossil fuels. At that time renewable energy sources--solar and wind power--were subjects of some research and experimentation, but they had essentially been abandoned as practical alternatives to fossil and nuclear fuels; nor did the existing environmental literature pay much attention to them. Not only did Bookchin show their relevance to the solution of ecological problems, he stood alone in demonstrating their integral importance to the creation of an ecological society.

## Democracy Good---War

### **Democratization prevents war**

Ward and Gleditsch 98 (Michael D., Professor of Political Science, University of Washington, and Kristian S,graduate research trainee in the Globalization and Democratization Program, at University of Colorado, Boulder, March 1998, The American Political Science Review, lexis)phol

democratization-whether in mild or strong degrees-is accompanied by reduction, not increase, in the risk of war. Though we do not present graphs of the converse, changes toward autocracy and reversals of democratization are accompanied by increased risks of war involvement. These risks are proportionally greater than the decline or benefits of further democratization. Thus, there is strong evidence that democratization has a monadic effect: It reduces the probability that a country will be involved in a war. Although the probability of war involvement does not decrease linearly, it does decrease monotonically, so that over the entire range of democracy minus autocracy values, there is a reduction of about 50%. During the democratic transition, at every point along the way as well as at the end points, there is an attendant reduction in the probability of a polity being at war. We also find that reversals toward greater levels of autocracy (not shown) not only increase the probability of war involvement. Apparently, it is more dangerous to be at a given level of democracy if that represents an increase in the level of authoritarianism than it is to be at the same level of democracy if that represents a decrease in the authoritarian character of the regime. Stated differently, reversals are riskier than progress. It has been argued that institutional constraints are theoretically important in translating the effect of democracy into foreign policy (Bueno de Mesquita, Siverson, and Woller 1992; Siverson 1995). If the idea of democracy is separated into its major components, then the degree of executive constraints empirically dominates the democracy and autocracy scales(Gleditsch and Ward 1997).

## Democracy Good-Economy

### **Democracy increases economic and educational capabilities, solves all their offense.**

Davis and Trebilcock 8 (Fall, The American Journal of Comparative Law , 56 Am. J.Comp. L. 895, Lexis)phol

The effects of improved governance on income in the long run are found to be very large, with an estimated 400 percent improvement in per capita income associated with an improvement in governance by one standard deviation, and similar improvements in reducing child mortality and illiteracy. To illustrate, an improvement in the rule of law by one standard deviation from the current levels in Ukraine to those "middling levels prevailing in South Africa would lead to a fourfold increase in per capita income in the long run. A larger increase in the quality of the rule of law (by two standard deviations) in Ukraine (or in other countries in the former Soviet Union), to the much higher level in Slovenia or Spain, would further multiply this income per capita increase. Similar results emerge from other governance dimensions: a mere one standard deviation improvement in voice and accountability from the low level of Venezuela to that of South Korea, or in control of corruption from the low level of Indonesia to the middling level of Mexico, or from the level of Mexico to that of Costa Rica, would also be associated with an estimated four fold increase in per capita incomes, as well as similar improvements in reducing child mortality by 75 percent and major gains in literacy.

## Democracy Good---Environment

### Decentralized democracy is key to an ecological society and survival

Forman 91’ (Dave Foreman, cofounder of earth first!, Murray Bookchin founder of social ecology movement and social ecology institute, 1991, Defending the Earth: A Debate, Anarchist Library, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/HTML/Murray_Bookchin_and_Dave_Foreman__Defending_the_Earth__A_Debate.html>)phol

At first glance, at least, the garden scenario described by Nash bears more than a passing resemblance to the Utopian vision of social ecology. Murray Bookchin, after all, described microbiologist René Dubos in 1974 as an important early social ecology thinker. [16] While Bookchin's and Dubos' views were far from identical even then, their visions for the humanly inhabited portions of the Earth did overlap significantly. Bookchin, however, expressed himself in much more radical terms. Following Peter Kropotkin, the visionary nineteenth-century anarchist geographer, Bookchin has argued that we need to transform our oppressive industrial capitalist society into “an ecological society based on non-hierarchical relationships, decentralized democratic communities, and eco-technologies like solar power, organic agriculture, and humanly scaled industries.” [17]According to Bookchin, decentralized forms of production and food cultivation tailored to the carrying capacities of particular bioregions are not only more efficient and ecologically sustainable, they also restore humanity's intimate contact with soil, plant and animal life, sun, and wind. This, he believes, is the only way to fully anchor and sustain a widespread ecological sensibility within our culture. Furthermore, he maintains that only by challenging the profitseeking, “grow or die” dynamic of the corporate capitalist economy and creating an alternative economy oriented to ecologically sustainable production to meet vital human needs can we genuinely protect the planet from the ravages of acid rain, global warming, and ozone destruction. Bookchin, of course, is not the only modern radical ecological thinker to draw on Kropotkin. Several writers, including some deep ecologists, have echoed Kropotkin's eco-anarchist ideas of communitarian democracy, deurbanization, industrial decentralization, alternative technology, organic agriculture, limits to growth, and a renewed naturalist sensibility. Social ecology, however, is the body of ideas that has most self-consciously built on this eco-anarchist foundation and further developed and elaborated a workable vision of “an ecological society.” In doing so, social ecology makes an enormous contribution to the radical ecology movement, one which is neglected at our peril. Earth First! activist Judi Bari is sadly ill-informed when she maintains that the contours of an ecological society are “not spoken to in any leftist theory.

## Democracy Good---Values

### Democracy provides essential freedoms and rights to people---It makes all values possible.

Dahl, 2000 (Robert, Sterling Professor Emeritus of Political Science and Sr. Research Scientist Sociology, member of the National Academy of Sciences, the American Philosophical Society and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences past President of the American Political Science Association.“OnDemocracy”http://books.google.com/books?id=jCJ\_kUOcCpIC&printsec=frontcover&dq=democracy&hl=en&ei=apwgTuSbJMGpsALYtt2YAw&sa=X&oi=book\_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CC0Q6AEwAA#v=onepage&q&f=false 2000[TL])

In addition to all the rights, freedoms, and opportunities that are strictly necessary in order for a government to be democratic citizens in a democracy are certain to enjoy an even more extensive array of freedoms. A belief in the desirability of democracy does not

exist in isolation from other beliefs. For most people it is a part of a cluster of beliefs. Included in this cluster is the belief that freedom of expression, for example, is desirable in itself. In the universe of values or goods, democracy has a crucial place. But it is not the only good. Like the other rights essential to a democratic process, free expression has its own value because it is instrumental to moral autonomy, moral judgment, and a good life.

# Solvency

## Solar Transition key to Democracy

### Full Democracy cannot be realized while big energy companies are leading the energy economy. Only renewable energy and local democracy can solve.

Cromwell 2k (David Cromwell is an oceanographer and writer, <http://www.ru.org/10-1cromwell.htm>, Local Energy, Local Democracy Are economics and ecology on a collision course?, 2000, Renaissance Universal and Renaissance Magazine)phol

In their 1996 book Who Owns the Sun?, solar energy campaigners Daniel Berman and John O’Connor rightly declared that “democracy is a false promise if it does not include the power to steer the energy economy”. It’s a crucial point that not even Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth appear to have grasped; should we really be leaving it to the oil companies to create the solar revolution? Climate change is arguably the greatest threat facing humanity. Society’s addiction to fossil fuels—hard-wired by corporate greed and government handouts to the fossil fuel industry in the form of tax benefits and subsidies—is driving us down a highway of self-destruction. Diverting from such a suicidal course will require a twin revolution: switching to renewable energy generation while also boosting the power of local democracy. This may seem an odd combination at first sight, but the reasoning behind it shows why opposing economic globalisation and replacing it with an ecological alternative is so important for the well-being of people and the planet. Here in the UK, the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution has told the government that carbon dioxide emissions must fall by 60% in the next 50 years if there is to be any realistic possibility of even “a tolerable effect on the climate”. But how likely are such “huge cuts” while transnational corporations dictate how society produces and consumes energy? According to the San Francisco-based Transnational Resource and Action Center (TRAC), “Big Oil’s long-term strategy is still dictated by the urge to explore”. New exploration and pipelines threaten the survival of peoples in the Amazon basin, Southeast Asia and North America. BP Amoco, the world’s largest solar company, is committed to spending $5 billion in the next 5 years on oil exploration and production in the sensitive environment of Alaska alone. This dwarfs the trifling sum of $45 million recently spent on its solar business division. Meanwhile, Shell proudly proclaims that it is “focusing [its] energies on developing [renewable energy] solutions” even as its annual reports project fossil fuel growth. Shell’s investment in renewables is only 10% of their spending on hydrocarbon exploration ($1 billion annually), 0.8% of its global investment ($12 billion) and only 0.06% of its global sales ($171 billion): a drop in the barrel, in other words. In the global economy, the unsustainable expansion of corporate activities into ever-larger markets means that there is an almost irresistible force driving the formation of mega-companies of all types. Growth demands further growth, and if companies do not expand in today’s “internationally competitive” markets they stagnate and die. Smaller enterprises are swallowed up whole or trampled underfoot in the stampede to maintain or increase returns on short-term investment, or even simply to repay loan capital. The business of generating energy is no different in this respect to other industrial operations; there is an inherent trend away from small-scale, community-based enterprises towards large-scale, centralised operations. It should therefore come as no surprise that oil companies are engaged in a frenzy of mergers similar to news corporations, investment firms and biotech industries. Describing the ongoing BP Amoco merger, The Independent newspaper in London coolly reported that “the existing cost reduction plan involves 10,000 redundancies, of which 6,000 have already been achieved”. At Exxon and Mobil, job losses will exceed 9,000

### Fossil fuel production supports autocratic regimes, while solar power decreases the government role and gives people more freedom

Global Issues 11’(“Energy Security: reliance on foreign sources of energy and geopolitics” <http://financialflattery.com/?tag=authoritarian-regimes> May 15 2011 [TL])

It is well established now that large scale fossil fuel production comes at a high geopolitical cost as well as an environmental one. That is, those dependent on such fuels resort to violence or support authoritarian regimes to ensure they retain their positions of power and influence. This is why we see so many autocratic regimes in the Middle East and why they have been supported for decades by the West. And yet while alternatives to fossil fuels also include large scale government or big industry backed ideas, there is also the potential threat of locally produced energy sources, such as solar power. That is, it takes away the role of governments and large industries in these areas, potentially giving people truer freedom while bringing development.

### **An oligarchical authoritarian society lead by energy companies is inevitable in the squo unless we begin using ‘horizontal’ renewable energy.**

Scheer 06’(Hermann Scheer, Member of the German Bundestag for the SPD, President of EUROSOLAR, Energy Autonomy : The Economic, Social and Technological Case for Renewable Energy, London, GBR: Earthscan, 2006. p 283-234, http://site.ebrary.com/lib/northwestern/Doc?id=10167744&ppg=294)phol

The central political motive for a renewable energy strategy leading to energy autonomy is the possibility of guaranteeing or restoring the right of self-determination for states and civil societies and, within these political civil societies, maintaining democracy and general economic freedom. The development of the electricity industry into a transnational great power shows that this argument is not based on exaggerated fears. That industry’s next strategic move – massive entry into hydrogen production – would mean that the electric power business would also assume the role of fuel producer after it has already largely taken over gas supplies. That would either be tantamount to displacing the petroleum multinationals or to an international merger of the electricity with the petroleum cartel – and thereby equivalent to the establishment of an energy superpower whose political influence would overshadow all previous positions of power in the energy business. Energy scientist Cesare Marchetti, the most frequently cited promulgator of a super-centrally organized Hydrogen Age, is one of the few who has openly sketched out the consequences of this futuristic vision for politics (and therefore for civilization). He proceeds analytically in much the same way as this book has, only under the omen of hyper-centralized electricity and hydrogen production rather than under the more auspicious sign of widespread decentralized energy production. Marchetti adopts a techno-sociological perspective. He describes – with hymn-like praise – an energy supply system that he defines as ‘horizontal’. It is a system supported by transnational enterprises that arches over ‘vertically’ organized states. These enterprises would become ‘the strongest forces in the struggle with political power’. They would be the nucleus of a ‘world government’. This ‘grand design … is developing itself ’ as a direct consequence of ‘very large energy centers’ operating worldwide that Marchetti sees above all as a result of nuclear fusion technology. As an optimal site for these centres he discerns (simply because of the gigantic need for cooling water) islands (say, in the Pacific Ocean) from which hydrogen could be transported to every region of the globe.

### Decentralized solar economies go hand in hand with local democracy.

Cromwell 2k (David Cromwell is an oceanographer and writer, <http://www.ru.org/10-1cromwell.htm>, Local Energy, Local Democracy

Are economics and ecology on a collision course?, 2000, Renaissance Universal and Renaissance Magazine)phol

Rather than pursuing such a destructive energy policy—in which corporations continue to overload the atmosphere with global-warming gases, destroy jobs and damage sensitive ecosystems—society could be using local renewable energy sources. These come in many forms: wind, wave, solar, geothermal, small-scale hydro, biomass fuels. Some are available at every location around the globe. Consequently, small-scale decentralised economies would be able to make use of a range of local energy sources for local needs. On the other hand, large industrialised economies are locked into centralised power sources that convert fossil fuel or nuclear power into electricity, which is then transmitted over hundreds or even thousands of miles. This is extremely wasteful: two-thirds of the energy in fossil fuels is lost in the production and transmission process. Electricity is an indefensible luxury for 90% of our energy uses. Lighting and heating homes, for example, can be made much more energy-efficient by adopting “passive” solar building designs, low-energy lights and tight insulation. Energy efficiency is vastly under-exploited. US journalist Ross Gelbspan points out that “as a bridge to a new energy era”, the economics panel of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has identified a number of “no regrets” steps. At virtually no cost, these could reduce greenhouse gas emissions by around 20%. They include such simple steps as implementing known efficiency and conservation techniques, planting more trees (to absorb carbon dioxide), and instituting international standards for energy-efficient appliances. Such measures should be encouraged at the same time as a switch to green energy. Removing fossil fuel and nuclear tax credits and subsidies which currently promote the destruction of the global environment and diverting them to windmill farms, home-based fuel cells, photovoltaic panels and hydrogen fuel plants would provide the necessary boost to propel renewable energy into the big league of global industry. Renewable energy analyst Scott Sklar estimates that for every million dollars spent on oil and gas exploration, only 1.5 jobs are created; for every million on coal mining, 4.4 jobs. But for every million spent on making solar water heaters, 14 jobs are created. For manufacturing solar electricity panels, 17 jobs. For electricity from biomass and waste, 23 jobs. In modern “civilisation”, the population tends to cluster in large cities in which a high-consumption lifestyle is encouraged. Profligate energy use, international trade and the concentration of millions of people in urban centres are thus intimately linked. This is why a decentralised, solar-based economy must go hand in hand with a revitalised locally-based democracy; one cannot succeed without the other. What would such a society look like? Based on suggestions presented by Berman and O’Connor in Who Owns the Sun?, a blueprint for a solar society would incorporate:  Public ownership of energy—just as is the case with water or schools in some countries and American states.  Massive investment in renewable energy technologies and building design, by diverting tax breaks and subsidies from fossil fuel and nuclear energy.  Access to loans, tax credits and rebates for photovoltaics, solar water heating, wind and small-scale hydro generators, and other forms of renewable energy technologies.  Net metering (i.e. monitoring electricity flows) and rate-based incentives, so independent home- and business-based electricity producers are paid the same price for electricity they supply to the grid as they would be required to pay for the grid power if they used it.  Partnerships between industry, government and local communities to oversee the new green industries, in order to ensure that the public knows what is being produced in a factory, by what means, and how wastes and by-products will be managed.  New government legislation to ensure that all this is carried out.

## Individual Action/Activism Key

### Citizen’s engagement in political life is directly linked to government accountability

Voltmer 08’ (Katrin, Senior Lecturer of Political Communication and Director of Research at the Institute of Communications Studies, University of Leeds, UK. “The media, Government accountability, and citizen engagement” [http://www.ansa-eap.net/about-us/v-o-i-c-e-s/the-media-government/[TL](http://www.ansa-eap.net/about-us/v-o-i-c-e-s/the-media-government/%5BTL)])

Voltmer's argument is premised on the claim that democratic accountability encompasses not only political power holders but also the citizens and the media that link governments and citizens. She observes that the ability and willingness of the citizens to engage in political life, in addition to the quality of public communication, play an important part in strengthening the link between those in power and the citizenry. Voltmer suggests that collective accountability means civic engagement that goes far beyond voting: "if citizens are ignorant about political issues, do not make an effort to have a say, despise their representatives, and do not believe in democratic values, then the viability of that democracy might be seriously at risk - even if the institutions are perfectly designed."

### **Local action and ethics are key to realizing the severity of the warming crisis and eventually guiding our response.**

Abelsohn and O’Hara 11’ (Ethical Response to Climate Change, Dennis Patrick O’Hara, director of the Elliott Allen Institute for Theology and Ecology at St. Michael’s, Alan Abelsohn, assistant professor in the Department of Family and Community Medicine, and the Dalla Lana School of Public Health and lecturer in the Centre for Environment, at the University of Toronto,

Ethics and the Environment, Vol. 16, No. 1, Spring 2011, <http://www.jstor.org/pss/10.2979/ethicsenviro.16.1.25>)phol

Yet, while this new awareness heralds an understanding of human cul- ture that can purportedly be less anthropocentric and more Earth friendly, the vestiges of the same thinking that created the crisis of climate change still continue to guide most of our responses to this global problem. Even today, we continue to reject actions that favor the health of the planet if these entail a cost to our own national economies as if we and our econo- mies could survive on a devastated planet. Since we need to understand and correct the global impact of our local actions, we cannot rely on the attitudes and ethics that allowed for the creation of the problem. Since we need to address a planetary problem, we need ethical principles that guide not only our local but also our global responses to climate change. Furthermore, we need a better understanding of the magnitude and di- mensions of the problem. Accordingly, this paper will consider the ethical principles that might guide an effective response to climate change as well as certain responses that are either misguided or inadequate. It will con- sider the impact of climate change on human health so that we can better understand the scope and severity of the crisis.

### The role of the individual is to unmask political violence and break down class power through individual action.

Foucault 71’ (Michel Foucault, you’re an idiot if you don’t know off the top of your head, The Foucault Chomsky Debate, http://www.chomsky.info/debates/1971xxxx.htm, 1971)phol

It seems to me that the real political task in a society such as ours is to criticise the workings of institutions, which appear to be both neutral and independent; to criticise and attack them in such a manner that the political violence which has always exercised itself obscurely through them will be unmasked, so that one can fight against them. This critique and this fight seem essential to me for different reasons: firstly, because political power goes much deeper than one suspects; there are centres and invisible, little-known points of support; its true resistance, its true solidity is perhaps where one doesn't expect it. Probably it's insufficient to say that behind the governments, behind the apparatus of the State, there is the dominant class; one must locate the point of activity, the places and forms in which its domination is exercised. And because this domination is not simply the expression in political terms of economic exploitation, it is its instrument and, to a large extent, the condition which makes it possible; the suppression of the one is achieved through the exhaustive discernment of the other. Well, if one fails to recognise these points of support of class power, one risks allowing them to continue to exist; and to see this class power reconstitute itself even after an apparent revolutionary process.

# Answers to

## A2: Framework

### The only way to break the single dimensional thinking the energy system has created is to illuminate the reason for its formation---the affirmative is a prerequisite to effective education and policymaking

Scheer 06’ (Hermann Scheer, German member of parliament, Energy Autonomy : The Economic, Social and Technological Case for Renewable Energy. London, , GBR: Earthscan, 2006. p 131-132 http://site.ebrary.com/lib/northwestern/Doc?id=10167744&ppg=151)phol

In the energy system, too, thinking has been reduced to the facts set up by the system itself. But this restriction contradicts the central role that physical energy plays in every vital question. The fact that this contradiction does not get recognized is a consequence of viewing any given problem in isolation and disregarding that problem’s contexts; this is a trend one may observe in every sector of society. It leads to fragmented perceptions and, accordingly, to perspectives that are more one-dimensional than those evoked by one-sided ideologies. The different areas of activity within society mutate into hermetically sealed subsystems that can barely get running feedback from constantly changing external factors. The energy system has a life of its own that is especially cut off from the outside, and its categories of action are especially autistic. But even other actors – including those championing a fundamental change in energy – are mostly integrated into their own subsystems where the approaches to thought and action are equally one-dimensional. They, too, are often standing in their own way. The obstacles to taking action on renewable energy may therefore be explained not only by the one-dimensional perspective of the energy business, but also by one-dimensional thinking in the fields of politics, economics, and environmental protection. Mentally dissolving this reductionist optic is the precondition for overcoming it in practice. The best recipe for dissolving it is to illuminate the reasons behind its formation and their specific consequences.

### Fossil Fuel dependence controls the way we think---challenging its stranglehold on our minds is a prerequisite to any other discussion.

Wilkerson, ’06 (Joseph, Energy and Psyche: Resource Addiction in the Technological Age, <http://www.ecopsychology.org/journal/ezine/archive3/addiction.pdf>, April 2006[TL])

Our industrial-capitalist economy has created, in both individuals and society, an addiction to the consumption of energy which threatens not only the survival of the natural environment, but also the landscape of our human psyche. And if the industrial relationship to petroleum and other energy sources is indeed an addiction, then it will take more than “technology...reliable alternative energy sources and ...clean-energy research” (United) to facilitate our recovery. Before a diagnosis intended for individuals can be useful in explaining a collective psychological procss, however, we must understand addiction on a personal level. Merriam-Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary broadly defines addiction as “persistent compulsive use of a substance known by the user to be harmful” (13). Ecopsychologist Ralph Metzner, a pioneer in the application of “diagnostic analogy” (80) to psyche-nature interaction, 1 expands the definition: “behavior that continues in spite of the fact that the individual knows that it is destructive to family, work, and social relationships” (89). If we can put aside the intangibility of energy and the inaccuracy of labeling it as a “substance,” per se, then a “diagnostic analogy” may indeed elucidate the striking parallels between commercial energy consumption and clinical substance abuse. And if we accept the preponderance of evidence both that “addictive behavior is one of the most pervasive and intransigent mental health problems facing our society today” (Carson 295) and that humanity’s present resource consumption is ecologically unsustainable, then the possibility of a significant causal link will not surprise us.

### Impossible to separate the question of technology from its social and political context---Our interpretation impact turns their policymaking and education claims.

**Bookchin** 93’ (Murray Bookchin , What is social ecology?. In: M.E. Zimmerman, J.B. Callicott, G. Sessions, K.J. Warren and J. Clark, Editors, Environmental Philosophy, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ (1993))

To prioritize any form of spirituality over the social factors that actually erode all forms of spirituality, raises serious questions about one's ability to come to grips with reality. At a time when a blind social mechanism, the market, is turning soil into sand, covering fertile land with concrete, poisoning air and water, and producing sweeping climatic and atmospheric changes, we cannot ignore the impact that a hierarchical and class society has on the natural world. We must earnestly deal with the fact that economic growth, gender oppressions, and ethnic domination-not to speak of corporate, state, and bureaucratic interests-are much more capable of shaping the future of the natural world than are privatistic forms of spiritual self-regeneration. These forms of domination must be confronted by collective action and major social movements that challenge the social sources of the ecological crisis, not simply by personalistic forms of consumption and investment that often go under the rubric of "green capitalism." We live in a highly cooptative society that is only too eager to find new areas of commercial aggrandizement and to add ecological verbiage to its advertising and customer relations

Narrative Practice used to discuss critical aspects of our view of energy are just as important as the substance itself – Only through a combination of both can we achieve a true understanding of the underlying reasons as to why the “structures” we use are failing

Buell 05 (Lawrence Buell, Powell M. Cabot Professor of American literature at Harvard, A.B. at Princeton, Ph.D. from Cornell, 2005 The Future of Environmental Criticism “The Emergence of Environmental Criticism” p. 9-10)

On the contrary, literature-and-environment studies have striven almost from the start to define their position on the critical map analytically as well as through narrative practice. One strategy has been to build selectively on poststructuralist theory while resisting the totalizing implications of its linguistic turn and its aftermaths, such that the word-world gets decoupled from the material world to the point of making it impossible to conceive of literary dis­course as other than tropology or linguistic play or ideological for­mation. **From this standpoint, "theory and ecology" might be seen as a fruitful, energizing collaboration to the end of calling into "question the concepts on which the old hierarchies are built"** (meaning for this writer androcentrism specifically and arithro-pocentrism more generally), even as one resists an exclusive focus on "textuality, as networks of signifying systems of all kinds" that would privilege "networks of language and culture" to the eclipse of culture's imbrication in "the networks of the land" (Campbell 1989: 128, 133, 136). In a similar spirit, Verena Conley plumbs the archive of Trench critical theory over the past half-century, hoping to confirm the hypothesis "that the driving force of poststructural thought is indissolubly linked to ecology" (Conley 1997: 7), and succeeding in a number of instances (most notably Felix Guattari, Michel Serres, and Luce Irigiray), though she admits to not being able to do much with Derrida or Baudrillard. British ecocritic Dominic Head suggests a ground for dialogue between "the broader Green movement" and postmodern theory with respect to a com­parable "deprivileging of the human subject" (Head 1998a: 28). Dana Phillips commends anthropologist of science Bruno Latour's canny reflections on the inextricable hybridization of nature and culture as a corrective against ccocriticism's incautious attempts to distinguish cleanly between the two (Phillips 2003: esp. 30-4).

## A2: Kritiks---Permutation

### The affirmative is a key starting point---Rethinking renewable energy would change everything about the way we think economically and politically about the world.

Scheer 06’ (Hermann Scheer is a Member of the German Bundestag for the SPD, President of EUROSOLAR, The post-fossil future, Le Monde diplomatique, June 2006, http://www.hermannscheer.de/en/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=133&Itemid=11)phol

This opportunity for a post-fossil and post-nuclear future is not perceived as such, indeed the existence of this opportunity is still denied. This can be explained by a blinkered view of energy: isolated cost comparisons are carried out, instead of energy systems as a whole being compared. The outdated energy system, with its company structure, is seen as set in stone. And the assumption is made that it is technocratically neutral vis-à-vis other energy sources and ready and able to switch to a different source of energy at any point in time. Yet this is an unrealistic view, revealing a complete lack of basic knowledge of the technology concerned and the sociology of energy. For this type of objective neutrality is impossible in purely physical terms. Each energy system is bound to be geared to those particular sources of energy, which it uses. The choice of energy source determines the political, economic and technological effort required for extraction, processing, transport and distribution, including the transformation technology needed. This means that the switch to renewable energies and thus to wholly different energy flows would change everything. It would mean a switch from commercial to non-commercial primary energies, from a small number of large power stations and refineries to a large number of medium and small-scale power plants, from internationalised to regionalised infrastructure, from energies which produce emissions to emission-free energy. And, not least, from highly concentrated company and ownership structures to more diverse ones. The systemic shift in energy supply represents a paradigm shift in technological, economic and political terms. It is here that lies the political crux of the energy problem. Recognising this allows us to understand why certain groups are resisting renewable energies. And how this resistance can be overcome.

## A2: Post Modernism/Kritiks

### **The judge should reject Postmodernism, it is responsible for prevention of the transition from fossil fuel to a solar economy.**

Yanity 04’ (Brian Yanity, a student at Columbia University, 6/18/04

<http://upsidedownworld.org/energyquestionthree.htm>, Socialism and the Energy Question, [Upside Down World](http://upsidedownworld.org/))phol

It is the task of the modern, environmentally conscious age to force this transition to a solar global economy, thereby overcoming the doomed fossil industrial age that has not only closed its eyes to the life-and-death choices that confront it, but utterly denies that such choices exist. The US philosopher Arran Gare writes in his book Postmodernism and the Environmental Crisis that disorientation ‘has been made a virtue, and the absence of fixed reference points is celebrated.’ He portrays a generation mistrustful of the wider picture and of large-scale solutions. Such crises of identity and the loss of confidence in the future of society have always made an appearance when the existing social model has lost its credibility. But that is no excuse to all abandon all convincing models. Thanks to postmodernism, primary school teachers, and thus children, are trained to ignore a scientific understanding of the world. Most of the graduate students in departments of physical science and engineering throughout the industrialized countries are from Asia, where postmodern ideas about primary and secondary education have less influence.

## A2: Deep Ecology

### **Liberation through eco technology is possible.**

Bookchin et al 91’ (Dave Foreman, cofounder of earth first!, Murray Bookchin founder of social ecology movement and social ecology institute, 1991, Defending the Earth: A Debate, Anarchist Library, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/HTML/Murray_Bookchin_and_Dave_Foreman__Defending_the_Earth__A_Debate.html>)phol

Another way is possible, of course. Eco-technologies can and should be developed. There has been some interesting work in this area during the last twenty-five years. I have personally experimented with various eco-technologies since 1974 at the Institute for Social Ecology. There we put up solar collectors, windmills, ecologically designed buildings; we worked with aquaculture and organic agriculture assisted by a variety of tools and techniques. Other groups such as the New Alchemy Institute have been working on these things even more intensely than we have. I am convinced a liberatory eco-technology is possible. Hopefully, we can all agree on that.

## A2: Disads

### Fossil Fuel Dependence is the root cause of their impacts---Its try or die for the affirmative

Lewis 02’ ((Sandra, Information and Action Addressing Public Policy for an Ecologically Sustainable WorldVolume 2, Number 2) “The Dark Side Of Our Dependence On Fossil Fuels: Time For Quakers To Take A Stand, March 2002 <http://www.quakerearthcare.org/Publications/QuakerEcoBulletin/QEBArchive/QEB-PDF/QEB2-2-energy.pdf>)

Seeds of Corruption Nothing illustrates better the link between dependence on fossil fuel and corruption in American institutions than the rise and fall of Enron. Enron flourished in Texas and then nationally under government policies and subsidies bought and paid for by the fossil fuel industrial complex. While the Bush administration and other politicians try to disassociate themselves from the debacle, the fingerprints of Enron and other corporate interests are evident throughout the administration’s energy proposals. These proposals are now embodied in legislation passed by the U.S. House of Representatives. The Enron story exposes a stunning lack of integrity — blatant and insidious — among leaders in government, industry, financial institutions and the media. **It challenges us to confront deep threats to democracy itself that arise from our dependence on fossil fuel**. Our Quaker Testimony on Integrity calls us to act against these threats. Seeds of Ecological and Social Disintegration Our use of fossil fuels is devastating the earth, destroying cultures, and endangering human health. To discover and recover oil, roads are slashed through rainforests, drilling sites contaminate fresh water and soil, leaky pipelines spill millions of gallons of crude oil on wildlife and pristine tundra, and indigenous people are pushed to the brink of extinction. The temporary influx of cash upsets economies, corrupts governments, and concentrates wealth among a few. Oil refineries pollute the air, soil, and water of the impoverished communities that surround them. The extraction of coal devastates entire communities as it removes mountaintops, destroys watersheds, and leaves behind hundred-million-gallon toxic slurry ponds. The combustion of coal and oil are responsible for soot, ground level ozone, acid rain, and an increase in climate-changing atmospheric carbon dioxide. The air pollution exacerbates respiratory illness especially for asthmatic children and the elderly, is responsible for the decline of our eastern hardwood forests, and has poisoned most of the lakes in the northeast U.S. With less than 5% of the world’s population, the U.S. contributes 25% of the climate-changing gases, and yet the U.S. government has withdrawn from international negotiations to address world-wide human-induced climate change. The true costs of fossil fuels are staggering and cannot be measured in dollars. The administration’s proposals to expand fossil fuel production and increase our dependence on them are politically corrupt, ecologically and economically dangerous, and morally bankrupt.

## A2: Elections

### Elections will always present an excuse to hold back true change for issues like the environment- it is time to focus on long term goals instead of politicians short term interests

### **Suzuki 11** (David Suzuki, [science](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Science) [broadcaster](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Presenter) and [environmental](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Environmentalism) activist. [Ph.D](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Doctor_of_Philosophy) in [zoology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zoology), April 29, 2011 “One year after the BP disaster, why are governments still putting the oil industry before the environment?” <http://www.themarknews.com/articles/4923-the-politics-of-fossil-fuel>)

Our insatiable appetite for fossil fuels has also led to concerns over [hydraulic fracturing](http://www.grist.org/list/2011-04-11-natural-gas-from-fracking-is-worse-for-climate-than-coal-says-ne%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank), or “fracking,” whereby great amounts of water, sand, and chemicals are blasted into wells to fracture the underground shale and release natural gas. Leaks, blowouts, water contamination, increased ozone in the atmosphere, and emissions of methane, a powerful greenhouse gas, are just some of the possible consequences of this procedure. What this tells us, along with facts about pollution and climate change, is that we need to take a hard look at our energy use and sources. We can’t expect to get reliable information from the industry; after all, its priority is to promote its own interests. And, it appears, **we can’t expect much better from governments, which are often led by people who are more interested in their own short-term interests, based on election cycles, than in the longer-term interests of the people who elect them.**

### Our electoral system is failing us - Both Republicans and Democrats are subject to the corruption of the oil companies their ideology has no preference

Estrada 07 (Michael Estrada, Texas State University-San Marcos, Dept. of Political Science, Public Administration, 5/1/2007, The Oil Industry's Ability to Affect American Elections “The United State’s Dependence on Oil” <http://ecommons.txstate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1210&context=arp&sei-redir=1#search=%22elections%20oil%20companies%22>) CC

Oil companies have made it extremely difficult for the United States government to enact an energy policy that would be in the best national interest if the policy is also detrimental to the oil industry. Stability provides favorable views from the public of the overall political landscape at the time of the stability. **Attempts to change the energy policy could lead to an effort by oil companies to destabilize things, thus weakening the political institution and encouraging change for the political landscape**. The solid entanglements of the political institution have created a lack of political motivation to change. This lack of motivation to change is no more evident than in the United States’ energy policy. Energy is central to the development of each nation, and, therefore, each nation has a duty to recognize the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of an energy policy. This recognition includes the limits on resources, desired economic development and type of growth that an energy policy will pursue, along with national security threats. The costs of developing and implementing an energy policy are great. Due to these great costs, investments for research and development for energy sources eventually force a nation to choose one source of energy as a priority (Masserson 1990). The costs of changing a nation’s choice for their source of energy furthers the lack of will for change, as do the procedural aspects of change. In the United States, change of this sort must go through several jurisdictions before accepted. Oil companies need only gain support from some of these jurisdictions to prevent an undesirable change. While the executive branch of the U.S. government yields the political, military and economic elements necessary for the oil industry to succeed, the oil industry has the money to back opponents of the executive, thus weakening the executive branches’ power because the money gives strength to the opponents of the executive. Possibly even by having other branches of the government gain control by the opposition party, the oil industry can create a breadth of opposing ideas, something amenable to a lack of change (Goel 2004). While oil companies tend to exert their political power in favor of Republicans, Goel points out that It is crucial to appreciate that the extension of this support transcends political party, ideology or foreign policy agenda. This may seem surprising since the industry has a strong preference for the Republican administrations: George W. Bush received US $1.9 million from the industry, thirteen times more than Al Gore in the 2000 campaign. However, while differing administrations may focus on a given geographical region or even favour certain companies, the overall thrust remains unaltered. For example, it is highly likely that the Clinton administration’s support of the Majors’ mergers was due to a realization that bigger size was essential to gaining negotiating leverage and managing the risk associated with operating in Russia, the Caspian and West Africa (Goel 2004, 483). Goel illustrates that while the oil industry seems to prefer the Republican Party, in actuality they prefer those who will vote in favor of them and that just happens to be the Republican Party more often than not. **The oil industry’s support across political parties also illustrates the far reaching power the oil industry yields and has used in the past to support candidates one way or the other. Robert Engler (1961) paints a clearer picture that it is not a Political Party the oil industry favors, but rather the ideology of conservatism over liberalism.** The oil industry reaches out overtly in many ways, but no more so than through the extensive channels of contact provided by their lobby and campaign contributions. Oil companies accept politics as a part of good management to sustain their successes. It is hard to lay blame on an industry which follows a system that is necessary for prolonged success. **It is not the business practices that fail the interests of a nation but rather the electoral system**. Contributions of the oil industry are so important because of the enormous amount of money it takes to be successful in a campaign. Long striving cycles are hard to break, especially in this case, as political decisions create wealth for the oil industry and that wealth re-circulates to allow for those political decisions.

## A2: Politics

### Oil companies buy off members in congress – We have to break away from their corrupt ideals by definitively moving away from our dependence on foreign oil

Kurtzleben 10 (Danielle Kurtzleben, data reporter at US News and World Report. “[Oil and Gas Industry Gives Big to Members of Congress](http://www.ihavenet.com/politics/2010-Elections-Oil-and-Gas-Industry-Gives-Big-to-Members-of-Congress-DK.html)” June 18 2010 <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2010/06/18/oil-and-gas-industry-gives-big-to-members-of-congress-lincoln-and-vitter-are-among-the-10-lawmakers-who-get-the-most-from-the-industry>) CC

The oil and gas industry has contributed more than $7.5 million to members of the 111th Congress thus far in the 2010 election cycle. That makes the industry the 15th most generous out of 80 tracked by the Center for Responsive Politics, a nonpartisan research group which compiles campaign finance data. The confluence of the impending November elections and the oil spill crisis in the Gulf of Mexico have brought the influence of oil and gas campaign contributions into the spotlight. The industry's $7,504,019 in contributions to members of the 111th Congress puts it behind such big industries as lawyers and law firms (No. 1), securities and investment (No. 4), and pharmaceuticals and health products(No. 9). (Corporations and labor unions are legally barred from contributing to federal candidates, so these figures reflect contributions from industry employees, their families, and political action committees.) Arkansas Democratic Sen. Blanche Lincoln tops the list of recipients of oil money for this election cycle with $286,400, followed by Louisiana Republican Sen. David Vitter , with $242,600. Oklahoma Democrat Dan Boren leads House members, with $139,700 in contributions from the oil and gas industry. Here are the top 10 recipients of oil money:

Many factors can influence why a politician receives money from an industry, says Center spokesman Dave Levinthal. Seniority, committee memberships, and the oil and gas industry's economic prominence in a particular state can all play major roles in drawing campaign funds from the industry. "Many of the people on this list have a confluence of two or three of those factors going in their favor, which means that they have a pretty good chance of raising six-figure sums from the oil and gas industry," says Levinthal. . For example, Alaska Sen. Lisa Murkowski is the ranking Republican on the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to which Lincoln and Republican Sen. Robert Bennett also belong. Likewise, Roy Blunt is on the House Energy and Commerce Committee , and Boren is a member of the House Committee on Natural Resources. Vitter and Pennsylvania Democratic Sen. Arlen Specter both serve on the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works. Also, not surprisingly, eight of these top 10 recipients also come from states closely connected with the oil and gas industry. Texas, Alaska, Louisiana, and Utah are significant crude oil producers. Pennsylvania is the top petroleum-refining state in the Northeast. Oklahoma is a major natural gas producer, the fifth most prolific state in terms of crude oil production, and home to the city of Cushing, a major domestic crude oil trading hub. Though Exxon Mobil, Chevron, and BP didn't donate to a member directly, contributions from people associated with the companies make them the top-contributing oil companies. Lincoln, the biggest recipient of oil and gas dollars, received $17,500 from people associated with those three oil contributors this election cycle, including $4,000 from BP. This makes her the second-leading congressional recipient of money from contributors affiliated with BP. Sen. Lisa Murkowski , the recipient of $37,500 from people associated with the top three oil companies, is also the top congressional recipient of money from contributors associated with BP, with $7,000. On the whole, contributors from the oil and gas industry have given 62 percent of their dollars this election cycle to Republicans. Those associated with Exxon Mobil have given 85 percent of their $515,264 in contributions to Republicans. Chevron is the next most generous, with 81 percent of its $440,879 in political contributions to members of the GOP. Those affiliated with BP have also given a majority of their contributions to Republicans, but the breakdown is not so extreme, and the total is far smaller: only 56 percent of BP's $112,591 have gone to Republicans. Overall, the spread of oil and gas contributions in politics is broad yet uneven. The industry has contributed to 424 of the 535 current members of Congress, but the amount of contributions varies greatly. While the average oil and gas contribution to members of Congress is over $17,800, the median contribution is only $6,375. This indicates that, while many members receive only small amounts, a small number receive much larger sums.

### Oil Companies are the reason a policy that reduces US dependence on foreign oil does not already exist- despite rising environment and security issues

Estrada 07 (Michael Estrada, Texas State University-San Marcos, Dept. of Political Science, Public Administration, 5/1/2007, The Oil Industry's Ability to Affect American Elections “The United State’s Dependence on Oil” <http://ecommons.txstate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1210&context=arp&sei-redir=1#search=%22elections%20oil%20companies%22>) CC

A major reason gasoline consumption is such a politically important topic is due to strong dependence on foreign oil to produce gasoline and a lack of policy to curtail this demand. Goel describes the nineteen nineties as non-advancing in terms of a domestic petroleum policy. He writes about our current state as having “no coherent policy response to the escalating security and environmental costs of America’s petroleum use” (Goel 2004, 471). According to a paper in 2004 by Goel, “at the end of 2003, the Middle East held 63 percent of the world reserves, North America held 5.5 percent, and Europe, Latin America and Africa held about 9 percent each” (Goel 2004, 468). He also writes that “Americans consume far more energy, about 70 percent more on a relative basis, than their counterparts in the developed world” (Goel 2004, 469**). Our dependence on foreign oil and the problems this dependence presents is widely known and accepted** 9 (Goel 2004, GAO 1993, GAO 2005). Goel wonders why “the United States failed to enact a comprehensive policy aimed at curbing domestic petroleum consumption in the face of immense environmental and security costs” (Goel 2004, 467**). This failure to enact such a policy has emitted a debate as to why an effective policy has not been enacted. This debate includes a strong argument that oil companies have prevented such a policy by political means.** It is unbelievable to many that the United States has no policy intact that can move the U.S. away from a dependence on oil. The cornerstone of a policy to break the dependence on oil would be the introduction of substitutes for oil products which, if used, would provide benefits to consumers that outweigh the benefits of primarily using oil. The lack of such a policy provides credence to the idea that oil companies, who would be hurt by such a policy, are partly to blame for this.

### We have become more passive than ever- we are accepting the injustices of the oil companies as they corrupt our democratic system

Estrada 07 (Michael Estrada, Texas State University-San Marcos, Dept. of Political Science, Public Administration, 5/1/2007, The Oil Industry's Ability to Affect American Elections “The United State’s Dependence on Oil” <http://ecommons.txstate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1210&context=arp&sei-redir=1#search=%22elections%20oil%20companies%22>) CC

There are many factors contributing to the price consumers pay at the pump for gasoline. The consumer is, however, accepting whatever price is given to them. Because of the lack of substitutes and the demand structure for gasoline in the U.S., the consumer is a “price-taker.” Chouinard and Perloff write that “the effect of a shift in the demand curve on prices depends on costs and market structure. However, if wholesalers and retailers are price setters, an outward shift of the demand curve may, but not necessarily lead to higher prices” (2002, 4). The lack of price variability due to a shift in demand also provides the opportunity for price discrimination by firms which hold a large amount of market power. Since demand in this country is so high and inelastic, the opportunity exists that prices at the pump are not greatly influenced by an even further increase in demand. Considering prices are possibly not affected by either an increase or decrease in demand, it is highly possible that prices are not set at true supply/demand equilibrium. Instead, there may be a factor vendors must consider when setting gas prices that is not measurable by economic numbers**. This factor can be envisioned as a “glass ceiling” imposed by the will of the people. The price of gasoline must not exceed this “glass ceiling” in order to avoid responsive action that may reduce the value of oil. Robert Engler describes this process in the following way: The scale of decision making involved in the corporation’s internal and external affairs has a wider consequence for the whole economy. Choices made out of the judgment of corporate needs evoke response and cause social dislocations among communities and nations. It thus becomes more difficult to separate private from the public aspects of its behavior. Once this is recognized, the major oil companies increasingly include in their calculations the factor of public opinion. Their concern is the continued acceptance of their roles and the maintenance of a social structure that will further this pattern of control** (1961, 34). **The judgment required to maintain a desired social structure is not usually used as justification for price change, but visible factors in determining gas prices can be used to justify any changes if the end result is under this invisible line**. These visible factors are grouped by Chouinard and Perloff into the following seven categories: “Demand, cost, seasonality (which affects both demand and cost), market power, taxes, pollution laws and vertical relations (which affect market power and cost)” (2002, 3). Wachs writes that “The pump price of gasoline and other motor fuels depends on changes in response to many factors in addition to tax rates: changes in crude oil prices, seasonality in the relationship between supply and demand, unusual geopolitical events” (Wachs 2003, 2- 3). Borenstein and Shepard contend that “today’s price change is a function of past price changes” (1993, 18-19). Glasner’s (1985) arguments tend to focus more on the idea that 11 price is determined by the market, with little consequence as to production cost. What everyone seems to agree with, however, is that the main consequence for the price of gasoline is the price of oil and the actions of the oil industry.

## A2: Economy DA

### **Saving the earth comes before saving the economy. Multiple reasons, putting the economy before the earth kills value to life, outweighs their impacts, also warming turns the economy, without a healthy earth the economy will collapse.**

Abelsohn and O’Hara 11’ (Ethical Response to Climate Change, Dennis Patrick O’Hara, director of the Elliott Allen Institute for Theology and Ecology at St. Michael’s, Alan Abelsohn, assistant professor in the Department of Family and Community Medicine, and the Dalla Lana School of Public Health and lecturer in the Centre for Environment, at the University of Toronto,

Ethics and the Environment, Vol. 16, No. 1, Spring 2011, <http://www.jstor.org/pss/10.2979/ethicsenviro.16.1.25>)phol

Firstly, during this stage of inaction or delayed action, basic human rights to life, health and security are being significantly compromised. As has been noted by the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, nations do not have an option to protect these rights, but are compelled to act to protect them (United Nations Office of the High Com- missioner for Human Rights 2008). Inaction or inertia is unacceptable, especially since the effects of climate change is “estimated to have caused 150,000 deaths and 5.5 million DALYs [disability adjusted life years],” annually, since 2000 (World Health Organization 2003).Secondly, the cost to polluters should not determine if or to what extend polluters must take remedial action. That is, the requirement to act is not dependent on the ability or desire of polluters to bear the economic costs associated with their harmful acts, but is determined by victims’ rights to life, health and security (United Nations 1948, Article 3). Using “willingness-to-pay” as a criteria or determinant for action devalues the lives, health and security of those who have unwillingly been placed at risk by climate change. Admittedly, economic cost can be utilized to deter- mine the most cost effective response but it cannot be used to determine if one is obligated to respond at all (Brown et al. 2006, 31). Thirdly, the argument that one should delay responding to climate change until such time as it will not harm a nation’s economy reverses two concepts. A society constructs economic structures to promote the flourishing of humans. That is, economics is a means while human flour- ishing is an end. The “economic harm” argument for delaying responses to climate change reverses this order since tolerance for continued human suffering becomes the means to achieve the goal of economic prosperity. But no country or company has the right to use other nations or people as a means for achieving economic goals, nor may they endanger the life of others for that same end (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Com- mission 2008, 14). Furthermore, prioritizing economic prosperity over human flourishing also favors the human economy over Earth’s economy. But since humans are derivative for Earth’s evolutionary processes and remain inextricably dependent on them, and since human economic ac- tivity is derivative from and dependent upon Earth’s economy, it is not possible to have a flourishing human economy on a devastated planet any more than it is possible to have healthy people on a sick planet. Earth’s economy is primary while humanity’s economy is derivative, not the re- verse (Berry 2009). Fourthly, as the Stern Report has noted, “the evidence shows that ig- noring climate change will eventually damage economic growth....Tack- ling climate change is the pro-growth strategy for the longer term, and it can be done in a way that does not cap the aspirations for growth of rich or poor countries. The earlier effective action is taken, the less costly it will be” (Stern 2006, ii). Delaying action to reduce GHG emissions will actually be more costly to economies in developed countries both in the near and long term. The “economic harm” argument is a misguided and ill-informed prioritization of current investors’ interests at the expense of the welfare of future generations. Ironically, when President H.W. Bush addressed the Rio Earth Summit on June 15, 1992, he noted that, “It’s been said that we don’t inherit the earth from our ancestors, we borrow it from our children” (Bush 1992). Regrettably, this insight did not inform his response to climate change.

### Renewable Energy stimulates the Economy – Job Creation

Lewis 02’ ((Sandra, Information and Action Addressing Public Policy for an Ecologically Sustainable WorldVolume 2, Number 2) “The Dark Side Of Our Dependence On Fossil Fuels: Time For Quakers To Take A Stand, March 2002 <http://www.quakerearthcare.org/Publications/QuakerEcoBulletin/QEBArchive/QEB-PDF/QEB2-2-energy.pdf>)

Renewable energy can stimulate the economy A number of studies have shown that energy conservation and the use of renewable sources of energy would in fact stimulate the economy: A World Wildlife Fund study indicates that energy efficiency policies and development of renewable energy resources could result in 750,000 new jobs nationwide over the next nine years and 1.3 million new jobs by 2020. See this study at <[http://www.worldwildlifefund.org/climate](http://www.worldwildlifefund.org/climate%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)>. A report from the Environmental and Energy Study Institute (EESI) entitled “The 2002 Farm Bill: Revitalizing the Farm Economy Through Renewable Energy Development.” shows that developing our nation’s on-farm renewable energy resources (bioenergy, wind, solar, and geothermal) has the potential to boost farmer income, create jobs in rural communities, diversify our nation’s energy market, and protect our environment. A Department of Energy study reports that a government-led program to encourage energy efficiency could reduce growth in electricity demand by 20 to 47 percent in the U.S—a savings equivalent of 265 to 610 300-megawatt power plants. In fact, if our country does not invest in the new technologies, we are likely to be left in the technological development dust as other countries cash in on the boom.

## A2: Climate DA

### **Current tactics for solving warming only serve to perpetuate current political power structures.**

Abelsohn and O’Hara 11’ (Ethical Response to Climate Change, Dennis Patrick O’Hara, director of the Elliott Allen Institute for Theology and Ecology at St. Michael’s, Alan Abelsohn, assistant professor in the Department of Family and Community Medicine, and the Dalla Lana School of Public Health and lecturer in the Centre for Environment, at the University of Toronto,

Ethics and the Environment, Vol. 16, No. 1, Spring 2011, <http://www.jstor.org/pss/10.2979/ethicsenviro.16.1.25>)phol

The leaders of some countries—for example, Canada and the USA— have maintained that until all governments agree to reductions of GHG emissions, including in particular the developing countries of China and India, no country is obliged to reduce their GHG emissions. This argu- ment is indefensible for several reasons. Firstly, it ignores the historical pattern of GHG emissions in the developed countries that have permitted them to grow wealthy economies while harming the planet, and would deny that same route to prosperity to developing countries while not resolving the fiscal inequity. Their current approach of maintaining the status quo perpetuates existing inequities and ignores the harm that the more vulnerable countries endure due to the adverse effects of climate change. Secondly, since the developed countries have benefited from their over-utilization of the atmospheric commons, and since they are better able to adapt to climate change and undertake mitigation efforts, the UN- FCCC noted that the signatories to that convention “should protect the climate system for the benefit of present and future generations of hu- mankind, on the basis of equity and in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities. Accordingly, the developed country Parties should take the lead in combating climate change and the adverse effects thereof” (United Nations 1992b, Article 3(1)). The developed countries should not wait until the developing coun- tries can match their response to climate change, nor should they support a status quo that maintains inequitable burdens on the more vulnerable nations (Ikeme 2003, 200). They are in a better position to act since they have greater wealth and technology, the acquisition of which has hastened climate change. Countries like Canada and the USA must defend their failure to honor the conventions which they have signed, and explain why they maintain practices that harm other countries. The aggrieved are not likely to find comfort in the argument that nations need not cease prac- tices that are harmful to the victims as long as other nations continue to cause similar harm. Nations are accountable for their own actions and may not deflect that accountability with the claim that others are also culpable, as if to say that if many are culpable then none are culpable. Another’s immoral activity does not sanction one to engage in the same immoral activity any more than a murderer’s crime gives permission or impunity for one to murder.

## A2: Objectivism

### **Oil is a tool of coercion, by reducing our dependence we solve all their impacts. -----A2: Objectivism**

Kelanic 08’ (Black Gold and Blackmail: The International Politics of Oil Coercion, Rosemary A. Kelanic, Department of Political Science University of Chicago, <http://research.chicagobooth.edu/energy/docs/Kelanic-website.pdf>, 2008)phol

Energy security experts have warned of thepotential of oil being used as a political weapon against the United States; despite  the existence of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, many believe America has  meaningful exposure to a severe disruption.   Similar fears surround Russia’s apparent willingness to use its oil and natural gas resources to wrest political concessions from European countries, as it has done with mixed results since the dissolution of the USSR.These concerns raise a number of questions. Chief among them is whether  the “oil weapon” confers political leverage to those who wield it.  Can nations  actually blackmail adversaries by threatening their access to oil?  If so, when is “oilcoercion” most likely to be effective and why?  For these purposes, oil coercion isdefined as a situation in which one state threatens or takes actions to deprive the  target of its oil supply until it acquiesces to the coercer’s political demands.

## A2: Cap k

### Oil is the root cause of Capitalism- We exploit it for profit and have become addicted

Wilkerson 06’ (Joseph, Professor of Environmental Science, Energy and Psyche: Resource Addiction in the Technological Age, <http://www.ecopsychology.org/journal/ezine/archive3/addiction.pdf>, April 2006[TL])

 “The development of capitalism,” writes deep ecologist and wilderness educator Dolores LaChapelle, “consists in making a group of people addicted to some ‘substance’ and selling it to them” (48). She cites as evidence the age of exploration roughly beginning with Columbus and describes the development of addictions to gold, silver, sugar, tobacco and opium, among others (40). This “substance approach to reality” (49) made modern capitalism possible. By compartmentalizing the natural, material world, Europeans turned the earth into a pile of “natural resources,” commodities which existed for human exploitation, consumption, and now, addiction. One of LaChapelle’s historical observations still can be observed today: Europeans turned the Indian’s sacred tobacco into just another substance--unrelated to anything else. And then produced it on plantations and sold it to a world, gradually growing more addicted to it--until now it’s one of the leading causes of death. Formerly tobacco was life-enhancing, because smoking the ceremonial pipe strengthened the relationships among 10all the humans present as well as put humans into relationship with “powers” of the sky and of the earth (49). A disturbingly similar phenomenon has occurred with modern energy use. In many long- lived hunter-gatherer cultures, communal fires are the source of energy: they were used to prepare food and warm and protect families or entire tribes. Moreover, they were objects of veneration and centers of ritual (Fiero 3); the energy of the fire was one expression of the energy of the universe. Thomas Berry observes that “awareness of an all-pervading mysterious energy articulated in the infinite variety of natural phenomenon seems to be the primordial experience of human consciousness, awakening to an awesome universe filled with mysterious power” (24). But capitalism commodified that energy, bundled it and sold it by the gallon and the kilowatt-hour, and thus denied energy its “life-enhancing” powers. In a supreme irony, capitalists stripped energy of its most vital value when they placed a price on it. Most of us could hardly say we utilize an “all-prevading mysterious energy” when we switch on the blender or “[awaken] to an awesome universe filled with mysterious power” when we make our morning commute. There can exist no “all-pervading” commodity, no strictly utilitarian essence. When we view the energy that we purchase at the gas station or through our electric bill as a *substance*--a tool of technological utility--not an essence, as Berry describes, we become addicted.

### Renewable energy is key to any sort of anti-capitalist project.

Harriss-white and Harriss 08’ (Barbara Harriss-White, Elinor Harriss, Professor of Development Studies at oxford, Unsustainable Capitalism: The Politics of Renewable Energy in the UK, Socialist Register, Vol 43, <http://socialistregister.com/index.php/srv/article/view/5859>)phol

In the final chapter of his influential book, The Future of the Market, Elmar Altvater seeks the genesis of a new kind of socialist project in a 're-moralization of resource allocation' which he thinks neither markets, nor the 'thin' democracy permitted by markets, allow. He concludes: '(t)oday the further evolution of society is possible only if the economic rationality of market procedures is firmly embedded in a complex system of social, non-market regulation of money and nature'. Energy must be central to such a project, but the systems properties of its fixed physical infrastructure exemplify the formidable obstacles it faces. For many good reasons nuclear energy is an unacceptable option; and if energyconservation (or so-called 'energy efficiency') is recognized as insufficient, we are left with renewableenergy generation. It is from renewable energy that Altvater's alternative of a low impact, 'entropy-minimizing', democratically-regulated social infrastructure might be developed. Any alternative must start from where we are now. This essay describes how the market-driven politics of energy in the UK (whose economy is now powered by coal, oil, gas and nuclear energy) are blocking the development ofrenewable energy, which has physical and technological properties consistent with new, lower-waste forms of capitalism and also with a sustainable socialist economy.

### Replacing nuclear plants with SBSP is key to breaking down capitalism.

SLPA no date (<http://slp.org/res_state_htm/nuc_catas79.html>, The Socialist Alternative to Nuclear Catastrophe, Socialist Labor Party of America, statement, no date)phol

Moreover, putting the nation on a socialist foundation based on production for use would free the economy of the capitalist economic imperatives that have fueled the drive toward nuclear energy. A socialist economy would be characterized by the planning and rational allocation of resources that are rendered impossible by the profit motive. A socialist society would reduce the need for all sources of energy by eliminating the enormous waste that takes place today under capitalism. Planned obsolescence, shoddy products and other manifestations of the waste that permeate capitalist production would be eliminated. Mass transit systems would be developed. And a socialist society would accelerate the development of safe, nonpolluting, renewable sources of energy. These efforts—coupled with the dismantling of U.S. imperialism’s massive nuclear arsenal—would rapidly eliminate the social peril nuclear energy now poses. Workers today continue to live under the shadow of nuclear disaster, but in a socialist society workers could enjoy a material abundance without in any way compromising their health and safety. Outrages like the one that occurred near Harrisburg continue to expose the antisocial nature of the capitalist system for all workers to see. And as the manifold social problems of capitalism increasingly threaten the lives and well-being of workers, it becomes more and more imperative that they recognize the need to organize politically and economically to take control of the economy, abolish class-divided capitalism and administer production through their own democratic bodies.

### Oil is responsible for the perpetuation of the capitalist system.

Yanity 04’ (Brian Yanity, a student at Columbia University, 6/18/04

<http://upsidedownworld.org/energyquestionthree.htm>, Socialism and the Energy Question, [Upside Down World](http://upsidedownworld.org/))phol

The goal of universal provision is the social and democratic ideal of the modern age, an ideal which originated with the industrial revolution. But the industrial revolution’s excesses, which have led us to put ourselves above nature, make it impossible to realize this ideal for all people in the long term. To achieve universal provision, it is not necessary to give nature priority over the needs of humans. What is essential… is the primacy of physical laws over the laws of the market. In practical economic terms, this means above all that locally or regionally produced solar energy, foodstuffs and solar resources should be consumed and marketed in preference to otherwise equivalent products. A society which, with the aid of its political institutions, is unable to reverse the primacy of the market over nature is destined to die. The choice is not between public and private enterprise, between the free market and the planned economy. It is a question of the physical laws that govern private and public enterprise, market and planned economy alike. [ Emphasis original ] This is the essence of a truly materialist analysis of the energy question. Although Scheer makes the mistake of claiming that “the old dispute of capitalism versus socialism pales into insignificance before the life-or-death choice of renewable versus non-renewable energy resources”, and makes the common mistake of saying Marxism ignores the environment, he still finds it necessary to quote the Communist Manifesto at great length: The speed and scope of globalization had already been documented in Karl Marx and Fredrich Engels’s Communist Manifesto of 1848. The relevant passage is now more topical than ever. You have only to replace the ‘bourgeoisie’ with the modern term ‘big business’ – albeit they have slightly different characteristics- to arrive at an impressively apt description of the present situation, even down to the one-sided and arrogant conception of economic development: The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form, was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes. Constant revolutionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real condition of life and his relations with his kind.The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the entire surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere. The bourgeoisie has, through its exploitation of the world market, given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of reactionists, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries, whose introduction becomes a life and death question for all civilized nations, by industries that no longer work up indigenous raw material, but raw material drawn from the remotest zones; industries whose products are consumed, not only at home, but in every quarter of the globe. In place of the old wants, satisfied by the production of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter-dependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures, there arises a world literature. The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilization. The cheap prices of commodities are the heavy artillery with which it batters down all Chinese walls, with which it forces the barbarians' intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners to capitulate. It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilization into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image. The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a considerable part of the population from the idiocy of rural life. Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilized ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West. The bourgeoisie keeps more and more doing away with the scattered state of the population, of the means of production, and of property. It has agglomerated population, centralized the means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands. The necessary consequence of this was political centralization. Independent, or but loosely connected provinces, with separate interests, laws, governments, and systems of taxation, became lumped together into one nation, with one government, one code of laws, one national class interest, one frontier, and one customs tariff. [English edition of 1888] Renewable Energy is the Material Basis for Socialism. Everybody’s gotta little light under the sun.

### Alternatives to capitalism are impossible without renewable energy.

Yanity 04’ (Brian Yanity, a student at Columbia University, 6/18/04

<http://upsidedownworld.org/energyquestionthree.htm>, Socialism and the Energy Question, [Upside Down World](http://upsidedownworld.org/))phol

When decisions about energy production and consumption are decided democratically by the majority of people, renewable energy will naturally become the main energy source. When such decisions are by a few looking out only for their own profits, even if the vast majority of people do support clean sources of energy, renewables will not become implemented in a democratic manner. As socialists, we know that we should not be shy about making public demands which capital says is unrealistic. These will only strengthen are argument that the system as a whole is not reformable. As Paul McGarr said in a 2000 International Socialism Journal article: The same picture emerges from other collapsed civilisations, where there is little evidence of the ruling class being willing to carry through the fundamental changes needed to avoid disaster. This is what Marx and Engels meant when they talked of crisis having two possible resolutions, either 'a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large or in the common ruin of the contending classes'. Marx pointed to the way this process of crisis could unfold in relation to the environment. He argued that any society depends 'on the climate, the physical properties of the soil, the physically conditioned mode of its utilisation' and how if that society 'is to continue in the old way, the reproduction of its members under the objective conditions already assumed as given is necessary'. But such reproduction of society in its existing form, with its existing class relations and way of organising production, has the seeds of disaster built into it: 'Production itself in time necessarily eliminates these conditions, destroying instead of reproducing them, etc, and as this occurs the community decays and dies, together with the property relations on which it was based'. The grip of the old ruling class leads to an increasing inability to sustain the needs of society on the basis of the old way of organising production. Persistence in a particular way of organising society and the production it is based on produces social crisis and environmental crisis, the two go hand in hand. Renewable energy should not be called “alternative” energy, though that is true in the present energy situation. If human civilization is to survive, there is ultimately no alternative to renewable energy. And as stated by Scheer: The Earth is rich, and it owes its wealth to the sun. That this wealth is today more often burnt than used and preserved for the future is the greatest economic nonsense imaginable. And then to call this destruction of resources ‘economic growth’ makes a mockery of the phrase. This is not economic growth, but economic destruction, and it leads not to Adam Smith’s ‘wealth of nations’, but rather to Elmar Altvater’s ‘poverty of nations’. Socialism depends upon abundance, and the only resources which are truly abundant are renewable resources. True abundance, and therefore socialism, on a global scale is impossible without widespread use of renewable energy. The future socialist society will no doubt be powered by renewable energy, while coal, gas, oil, and nuclear will be phased out entirely. Instead of something which should be deferred until after capitalism, this is a problem which we should work on right now. The potential and knowledge are out there, and practical solutions are popping up all over the place. A big part of the job of socialists is preparing the future, and the future will be powered by renewable energy.

### **Solar power is the only way to prevent barbarism and extinction through the collapse of capitalist energy companies.**

Gould 02’ (Between Barbarism and a Solar Transition, Jay M. Gould, served on the Science Advisory Board of the Environmental Protection Agency during the Carter administration, Monthly review 2002, Volume 54, Issue 02 June, http://monthlyreview.org/2002/06/01/between-barbarism-and-a-solar-transition)phol

If 1 percent of the four trillion dollar investment in nuclear energy were invested in solar technologies today, it would be possible someday to cover every roof top in the world with photovoltaic shingles, paving the way for the eventual elimination of both pollution and poverty. While there would be plenty of profits accruing to the large companies from solarization, the great drawback for them is that ultimately solarization would provide electricity too cheap to meter. Sunlight, like the unpolluted air we would then breathe and the potable water we would then drink, would be far too abundant to be sold for a profit.

It may be, then, that socialism will come as a result of a fierce struggle by all who fear dying prematurely of hunger and environmental pollution, and who will fight for the coming solar transition, as the only possible alternative to barbarism and the extinction of homo sapiens as a species in a radioactive planet.

## A2: Nuclear Power---Democracy

### Nuclear power depends on a centralized government

Barker 2011 (Rocky, author of Scorched Earth: How the Fires of Yellowstone Changed America. ,Saving All the Parts, Reconciling Economics and the Endangered Species Act, environmental reporter for the Idaho Statesman, “States right vs nuclear power in Idaho” http://voices.idahostatesman.com/2011/01/19/rockybarker/states\_rights\_versus\_nuclear\_power\_idaho 1-19-2011[TL])

Nuclear power is a technology that depends on a strong central government to thrive. It needs the federal government to pick up some of the risks in the form of insurance and loan guarantees. The huge infrastructure needed to manage waste products with thousands of years of half life doesn’t fit with the relatively short time line of private businesses or individuals.

### **Solar power solves for freedom better then other energy sources**

Laird 03’(Constructing the Future: Advocating Energy Technologies in the Cold War, Laird, Frank N., Ph.D., Political Science @ MIT, Technology and Culture, Volume 44, Number 1, January 2003, pp. 27-49, <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/technology_and_culture/summary/v044/44.1laird.html>)phol

Interestingly, many mainstream energy analysts who were emphatically not solar advocates, ecological or otherwise, accepted the idea that a solar society would be decentralized, more rural, simpler.59 Often they took this as reason for hostility toward solar technology, at least in certain forms. A reporter from Chemical and Engineering News interviewed Denis Hayes shortly after he had become the director of the federally funded Solar Ener- gy Research Institute in Golden, Colorado, the largest solar energy research laboratory in the country. Hayes, one of the best-known environmental and solar advocates in the country, had organized the first Earth Day in 1970 and the first Sun Day in 1978, and in many publications had criticized both mainstream energy policy and conventional solar advocates. The sec- ond question in the interview was: “It’s also been said that many solar advo- cates—the ‘small is beautiful’ crowd, if you will—are trying to force a tran- sition to solar energy as a way of imposing their own social vision on society at large. Can you comment on that?” Hayes denied the implication, arguing that a nuclear society would restrict people’s freedom but that a solar society could be free and pluralistic or not, depending more on tradi- tional politics than technology.

## A2: Nuclear Power---General Impact Turns

### Drawbacks of Nuclear power outweigh the benefits

Time For Change 2007 (“Time for change: Pros and cons of nuclear power and sustainability”http://timeforchange.org/pros-and-cons-of-nuclear-power-and-sustainability, January 11, 2007[TL])

The problem of radioactive waste is still an unsolved one. The waste from nuclear energy is extremely dangerous and it has to be carefully looked after for several thousand years (10'000 years according to United States Environmental Protection Agency standards). High risks: Despite a generally high security standard, accidents can still happen. It is technically impossible to build a plant with 100% security. A small probability of failure will always last. The consequences of an accident would be absolutely devastating both for human being as for the nature. The more nuclear power plants (and nuclear waste storage shelters) are built, the higher is the probability of a disastrous failure somewhere in the world. Nuclear power plants as well as nuclear waste could be preferred targets for terrorist attacks. No atomic energy plant in the world could withstand an attack similar to 9/11 in New York. Such a terrorist act would have catastrophic effects for the whole world. During the operation of nuclear power plants, radioactive waste is produced, which in turn can be used for the production of nuclear weapons. In addition, the same know-how used to design nuclear power plants can to a certain extent be used to build nuclear weapons (nuclear proliferation). The energy source for nuclear energy is Uranium. Uranium is a scarce resource, its supply is estimated to last only for the next 30 to 60 years depending on the actual demand. The time frame needed for formalities, planning and building of a new nuclear power generation plant is in the range of 20 to 30 years in the western democracies. In other words: It is an illusion to build new nuclear power plants in a short time

### Radiation from nuclear plants lasts for thousands of years and is extremely dangerous

Dodd 2010 (Michael, postgraduate student studying Environmental Technology, specialising in energy policy undergraduate degree in Physics. “How to power the world: disadvantages of nuclear power” http://www.howtopowertheworld.com/disadvantages-of-nuclear-power.shtml, 2010 [TL])

High level radioactive waste is very dangerous. It lasts for tens of thousands of years before decaying to safe levels. It is highly radioactive and is probably the biggest hurdle we face if nuclear power is going to be taken seriously. If there is to be a "nuclear renaissance", a sophisticated method of dealing with this waste must be refined. This point itself has sparked a surprising number of debates. For example, how do you write "danger" on a concrete box, when in 5,000 years the word "danger" may no longer exist? What symbols could we use to let people know to leave it well alone? As you can see from the graph below, the radioactivity of nuclear waste takes about 10 000 years to return to that of the original ore.

## A2: Nuclear Power-Warming

### Nuclear power increases global warming and Co2 by 65%

Nuclear Energy Information Services 04’ (“Some Important facts about nuclear power” http://www.neis.org/literature/Brochures/npfacts.htm August 31, 2004 [TL])

Our planet seems to be warming up as a result of gases in our atmosphere which trap heat. This "Greenhouse Effect" may come from humankind's increased burning of fossil fuels (coal, oil, gas, wood), which release a gas called carbon dioxide (CO2), and from other industrial sources which produce other "greenhouse" gases. C02 represents half of the amount of gases that produce the Greenhouse Effect. Global warming could have devastating effects: changes in climate and growing seasons; shifts in growing regions; spread of deserts; raising of ocean levels. These effects are the environmental equivalent of nuclear world war! Unlike coal and oil plants, nuclear power plants do not produce CO2. However, nuclear power plants cannot appreciably help in the fight against Global Warming for a number of reasons: Prohibitive Cost: Each nuclear power plant costs between $3 to $5 billion just to construct! The U.S. would need over 400 additional nuclear reactors to replace its coal plants. This construction alone would cost roughly $1.2 to $2.0 trillion dollars! Worldwide, 8,000 nuclear plants would be needed to replace coal plants to meet energy needs for the next 30 years (there are only 430+ plants in operation worldwide now). These plants would cost the world approximately $24 trillion just to construct! However, one would have to add the following costs to these calculations to get a truer picture of the situation: increased costs for nuclear waste disposal and plant decommissioning; increased costs for scarcer nuclear fuels; increased costs to safeguard nuclear facilities and materials from sabotage, terrorism, and diversion; increased likelihood of major, multi-billion dollar accidents and their disrupting economic effects. Too Slow to Make an Effect: Most experts agree that major action must take place in the next 5 - 10 years to be able to lessen the predicted Global Warming effects. Yet, to build this many plants -- even if we had the resources -- would take decades. Calculations have shown that even if the world built the 8,000 plants mentioned above, world CO2 levels would still increase 65% over the next 30 years. Coal Energy Only One Contributor: Only 7% of world C02 comes from U.S. coal, oil, and gas plants; and worldwide, CO2 represents only half of the problem. Nuclear power plants, therefore do little to reduce world C02 levels, and only at a tremendous cost; nuclear power does nothing to reduce the other greenhouse gases such as methane, chlorofluorocarbons, halons, etc. Nuclear power only serves to drain needed money and resources away from the solutions for the other, non-CO2 half of the problem. Better, Quicker Means Exist: Compared to nuclear power, for every dollar spent on conservation and efficiency techniques, seven times the amount of CO2 is removed from the atmosphere. These techniques are more quickly implemented, and at lower costs (see above). Other important steps that must be taken include building far more fuel efficient cars; greater use of public transportation and bicycles; decreased energy consumption; planting of trees; halting rainforest destruction and ocean pollution (both of which help absorb CO2); halting the spread of deserts through land reform and management in the Third World; and population control.

### Nuclear reactors produce Co2 and are worse than other energy sources.

Caldicott 07’ (Helen, written books (Nuclear Madness.- What You Can Do and Missile Envy), developed dozens of video tapes and films, written scores of articles which have appeared in nearly every major newspaper and magazine; spoken at major universities throughout the world and has met with heads of state everywhere. Activist for anti-nuclear and peace. Received peace medal.“Nuclear power is not the answer” Introduction. Google Books,2007 [TL])

Nuclear power is not "clean and green," as the industry claims, because large amounts of traditional fossil fuels are required to mine and refine the uranium needed to run nuclear power reactors, to construct the massive concrete reactor buildings, and to transport and store the toxic radioactive waste created by the nuclear process. Burning of this fossil fuel emits significant quantities of carbon dioxide (COJ—the primary "greenhouse gas"—into the atmosphere. In addition, large amounts of the now-banned chlorofluoro-carbon gas (CFC) are emitted during the enrichment of uranium. CFC gas is not only 10,000 to 20,000 times more efficient as an atmospheric heat trapper ("greenhouse gas") than CO,, but it is a classic "pollutant" and a potent destroyer of the ozone layer. While currently the creation of nuclear electricity produces Only one-third the amount of CO, emitted from a similar-sized, conventional gas generator, tins is .1 transitory statistic. (>ver several decades, as the concentration of available uranium ore declines, more fossil fuels will be required to extract the ore from less-concentrated ore veins. Within ten to twenty years, nuclear reactors will produce no net energy because of the massive amounts of fossil fuel that will be necessary to mine and to enrich the remaining poor grades of uranium. (The nuclear power industry contends that large quantities of uranium can be obtained by reprocessing radioactive spent fuel. However, this process is extremely expensive, medically dangerous for nuclear workers, and releases large amounts of radioactive material into the air and water; it is therefore not a pragmatic consideration.) 13y extension, the operation of nuclear power plants will then produce exactly the same amounts of greenhouse gases and air pollution as standard power plants.

## A2: Land Based CP

### SBSP can power remote locations, that includes people in poverty who might not have previously been able to connect to the grid.

Xin et al, 2009’ (Sun Xin, Masters degree in aerospace management, Evelyn Panier, Cornelius Zünd, and Raul Gutiérrez Gómez, Toulouse Business School, May 2009 <http://www.nss.org/settlement/ssp/library/2009-FinancialAndOrganizationalAnalysisForSSP.pdf>)phol

Remote Premium: Some people are willing (and often have no choice) to pay more for energy in remote places, since generation in place is either difficult or expensive and given population density and distance to the power grid setting up the infrastructure to get interconnected results in prohibitive costs. Therefore, the idea is offering SSPS in-situ power generation at comparatively lower costs because of the logistics implied (no required fossil fuel transportation and storing or wired power transmission infrastructure), as well as environmentally friendly (no fossil fuel burning, water dams flooding terrain, or highly spaced wind turbines affecting landscape and wild life, among others). Some examples of regions where the stated conditions exist and such a concept would work well are isolated towns or villages in Siberia, Africa, Alaska, China, India, the Amazon region, Antarctica and medium size islands and archipelagos. The concept of this premium is associated with small stationary applications which are explained in their corresponding section. According to the “space solar power program, final report” paper of the International Space University of Kitakyushu, Japan, written in 1992, a reasonable price per kW/h at remote locations can be set up between US$ 0.22 and US$ 0.55, depending upon factors such as transportation costs for fuel and power output of the generator. At this time Antarctica is the place with the highest price per kW/h. Such values are derived from direct operation costs; environmental costs due to the impact of burning fossil fuels (Diesel as the main one) haven’t been accounted for. Therefore any power provider that intends to be competitive in such market type must offer costs within this range. Green Premium: For research purposes two sets of surveys were developed, details and results are explained in the Market Research section of this report as well as in Appendix E. One of the surveys was designed for common consumers and among other results it was found that people are willing to pay a surcharge of 1-5% of their regular electricity bill for the option of buying pollution free energy, such as SSPS. A 2.5% addition to the total electricity bill of potentially hundreds of thousands of households would provide an important economic incentive to develop green energy sources. A portion of this can be devoted to payback the investments made to develop a commercially viable SSPS. This finding, along with the fact that “only about 12% of the daily energy production on earth comes from renewable sourcesshow that there is a huge potential for a successful business model based on the SSPS concept”.

### SBSP is key to affecting the largest number of people by connecting people in remote areas and those in poverty. The plan will raise awareness in these groups.

Space Energy 10’ (SBSP: Filling a critical gap in global needs, <http://spaceenergy.com/About/WhySpaceEnergy.htm> copyright 2010, Space Energy, SBSP contractor.)phol

Safe, reliable, renewable, base-load power that is affordable and widely available has long been the ‘holy grail’ of researchers and scientists in the energy industry. Aside from averting conflict associated with resource wars, abundant clean energy has the potential to truly improve life around the world in many ways. Rural electrification can offer one of the fastest ways out of poverty for developing areas. It can ensure that food and medicines are preserved and made available where they are needed the most. It can provide power for water purification and desalination and light so that children can study and develop their potential. This is why Space Energy is committed to harnessing existing and new methods for clean energy generation and transmission, such as from ground-based solar power and space-based solar power.

### The poor are key to any activism because they are affected most by the oil companies.

Yanity 04’ (Brian Yanity, a student at Columbia University, 6/18/04

<http://upsidedownworld.org/energyquestionthree.htm>, Socialism and the Energy Question, [Upside Down World](http://upsidedownworld.org/))phol

 We have to go to the grassroots and struggle from below. Poor people and workers spend a much greater part of their incomes on energy consumption than do rich people, so are disproportionately affected by the negative aspects of the fossil energy industry. What kind of grassroots renewable energy development is possible in an industry dominated by a few large corporations? The good news is that this is already going on. Home-sized renewable power systems are becoming increasingly more popular. The movements for municipally-owned and cooperative utilities offer more democratic control for consumers, and though a far cry from any kind of meaningful worker’s democracy, they are still important and should be supported against the likes of Enron. Opinion polls have consistently shown in the last three decades that most of the U.S. public wants greater investment in renewables and energy efficiency. Among the short-term reforms that people should demand include generous subsidies for installing renewable energy systems in homes, and a “green-sin tax” on large energy corporations, from which money could go to renewable energy programs.

## A2: Agent CP

### Co-operation on SBSP is key – ensures long terms political and technological interest- justifies perm

Garretson 2010 (Peter A. Garretson, chief, future science and technology exploration, for the U.S. Air Force. August 2010 SKY’S NO LIMIT: SPACE-BASED SOLAR POWER,THE NEXT MAJOR STEP IN THE INDO-US STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP? *Introduction* p. 9, <http://spacejournal.ohio.edu/issue16/papers/OP_SkysNoLimit.pdf>)

While space-based solar power (SBSP) is a civil and renewable energy concept, it is also a legitimate topic of security discourse. There are several reasons for this. **First, neither the citizens of a country nor its government are secure if they do not have access to a constant supply of energy. Without a constant, predictable supply of energy, higher levels of complexity are not sustainable – industry cannot take place, economies wither, cities die, scarcity drives conflict and instability, and populations dwindle. More importantly, a nation may not be able to defend its borders and its interests.** Those charged with guarding society are keenly aware of this relationship between energy and security. This explains the second reason, which is that part of the recent expression of interest of both countries has come from within their respective defence establishments. Then one must be mindful that most space technology, particularly enabling launch technology, 2 is dual use and has defence and proliferation implications. Partnership on dual use technologies has its own security logic, as one must consider who might feel threatened or excluded. Finally, a transition to a regime of renewable energy based upon space solar power will have very significant long-term implications for the international security environment, including vastly improved access to space, the need for space traffic control, space debris remediation, new regulatory institutions, vastly improved capabilities in space, as well as new equities and vital interests.

# NEGATIVE

# Solvency

## Solvency Turns---Decentralization bad

### Decentralization undermines political cooperation and transfers governmental responsibilities to locals without the resources to be successful.

 Litvack 2007 (Jennie, lead economist for human development, Latin America and the Caribbean Region, World lead country economist for Morocco and was based in Rabat country economist for Vietnam and coordinator of the Decentralization Thematic Group holds a PhD from the Fletcher School at Tufts University, Medford, MA. May 24, 2007Bank.http://www.ciesin.org/decentralization/English/General/Different\_forms.html[TL])

But decentralization is not a panacea, and it does have potential disadvantages. Decentralization may not always be efficient, especially for standardized, routine, network-based services. It can result in the loss of economies of scale and control over scarce financial resources by the central government. Weak administrative or technical capacity at local levels may result in services being delivered less efficiently and effectively in some areas of the country. Administrative responsibilities may be transferred to local levels without adequate financial resources and make equitable distribution or provision of services more difficult. Decentralization can sometimes make coordination of national policies more complex and may allow functions to be captured by local elites. Also, distrust between public and private sectors may undermine cooperation at the local level.

## Land Based CP---Solvency

### Ground based systems are cheaper and easier to make then space based.

Dige 10’ (<http://www.brighthub.com/science/space/articles/95286.aspx#ixzz1SabMbjWV>, Dige, Ph.D. in Microelectronics Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, About Solar Power Satellites (SPS), Nov 13, 2010, Brighthub)

placing solar panels on the ground is much easier and less expensive than using satellite systems. A huge investment is needed to get a satellite into orbit. Besides, other problems could appear in the space environment, such as higher radiation damage. The SPS technology is still immature, which keeps it from being a cost-competitive power in the present.

### SBSP launches actually cause warming; the emissions from construction would be massive. Also, SBSP costs billions of dollars while comparable land based solar power is far cheaper,

Ilnyckyj 09’ (Milan Ilnyckyj, is a graduate of the University of British Columbia (B.A. International Relations and Political Science) and the University of Oxford (M.Phil International RelationsSpace-based solar power, APRIL 17, 2009http://www.sindark.com/2009/04/17/space-based-solar-power/)

The Pacific Gas and Electric Company is seeking regulatory approval for aspace based solar power system. The plan is for a 200 megawatt (MW) facility that will generate electricity from sunlight in orbit and beam it to a ground receiving station using radio waves. Older gamers may recall this technology as the basis of the ‘microwave’ power plants in SimCity 2000. Unfortunately, while the SimCity plants cost just $30,000 and produced 14,000 MW of energy, the 200 MW PG&E facility is expected to cost several billion dollars – far more than ground-based facilities with comparable output. The one real perk of space-based systems in geosynchronous orbits is that they will be exposed to the sun at all times, eliminating the need for storage or load balancing. Some have even speculated that the technology might eventually be able to direct beams of energy directly to facilities (perhaps even vehicles) that require it, reducing the need for transmission and energy storage infrastructure. I am not sure how to feel about such initiatives. On the one hand, it is possible that space-based solar power will eventually be a commercially and ecologically viable source of energy. On the other, it may be a distraction from the urgent changes that need to occur in the near-term. There are also issues with the emissions associated with space launches, as well as the limited number of slots for satellites in geosynchronous orbit and ‘optical aperture’ issues. For now, it really doesn’t seem like a viable technology. That being said, if a private group can convince regulators that it is safe and environmentally effective, and investors that it is viable, I don’t see any reason to interfere with the attempt

## Land Based CP---Turns Case

### The aff effectively nationalizes energy by making the government the main source of electricity---turns centralization

Thoma 06’(<http://economistsview.typepad.com/economistsview/2006/05/the_nationaliza.html>, Tuesday, May 09, 2006, The Nationalization of Energy Resources and Investment Incentives, Economist's View, Mark Thoma, economist)

As the price of oil and other energy inputs has risen, countries have attempted to capture a larger share of the profits, often through nationalization of energy resources. However, this undermines the incentive for foreign countries to invest and has led to large losses in production over time since many countries are not capable of duplicating the investment efforts of foreign companies. These countries could, perhaps, do much better at capturing a share of the profits of oil companies without substantially reducing their incentives to invest by using lessons from incentive compatible utility regulation. A good resource on these issues is "Designing Incentive Regulation for the Telecommunications Industry," by Sappington and Weisman. This regulation is designed to replace older markup over cost regulation that left firms with no incentive to control costs or to increase productivity through new investment and has considerable advantages in that regard. Here's the article on nationalization and falling investment: Nationalist politics muscle back into world energy, by Carola Hoyos, Financial Times: More than a decade after founding the Organisation of the Petroleum Exporting Countries, Juan Pablo Perez Alfonzo fell out of love with oil. Deeply disappointed by the destructive impact high oil prices had had on petroleum-producing nations such as his native Venezuela, in 1976 he branded it the “devil’s excrement”. Thirty years on, the price of oil is soaring again and oil-rich countries are following the same route of aggressive nationalism... In the latest manifestation, Bolivia last Sunday nationalised its energy industry, sending in the army to seize gas fields and threatening to expel international oil companies in 180 days if they did not agree to new – and far less favourable – contracts... As energy-rich countries have become wealthier and less dependent on foreign investors, they have also grown increasingly assertive. Russia has threatened to cut off supplies to its biggest customers unless they agree to higher prices while others, such as Venezuela, have jeopardised investment by imposing onerous new contracts on international companies...When national governments strengthen their grip, the outcome is more often than not a deterioration in the country’s industry and a drop in output... William Ramsay, deputy director of the International Energy Agency... is in no doubt that the surge in nationalism in Latin America and elsewhere is self-defeating. ... “Look at the production capacity of Venezuela – it has fallen dramatically. ... If you don’t get the balance right between the companies’ interest and the country’s interest, the country ultimately will lose.”... Julian Lee, of the Centre for Global Energy Studies in London, estimates that factors involving geopolitical crisis and nationalism in Iran, Iraq, Nigeria, Russia, Kuwait and Venezuela have reduced oil supply since 2000 by as much as 7.8m barrels a day – equivalent to the combined consumption of Germany, France, Italy and Spain. Frederic Lasserre, chief energy analyst at Société Générale in Paris, adds: “Latin America is the perfect region to witness the impact of nationalism on production. Mexico and Venezuela have stated for the last 10 years that they should be able to increase their oil production. In both cases, the production has not really increased and is even showing some signs of decline.”... Even where governments remain friendly to international investors, the demands on oil companies sometimes come from rebel groups. In Nigeria, for example, militants have sought direct payments for local communities from oil giants such as Shell. In Venezuela, the consultancy Wood Mackenzie calculates, the state has seized back $5.4bn from international oil companies by changing contract terms. ... Now the oil ministry is going after contracts in the expensive, heavy oilfield of the Orinoco belt, prompting some foreign executives to assume the worst – the full nationalisation of Latin America’s second biggest oil industry. Why would that be such bad news for production levels? International energy executives argue that when a national oil company takes over, it does not have access to the technology needed to maximise oil recovery. Meanwhile, other potential fields – such as heavy oilsands – or transport routes, like a project to send Bolivian gas to the US, may not see the light of day because investors are unwilling to commit the amounts needed while the threat of nationalisation hangs over them.... As the oil price rises, and countries become even warier of taking on foreign partners, the balance of power is shifting between international oil companies and the countries in which they are based.

## SSP Bad---Collisions etc

### **SBSP is bad, multiple reasons—It’s extremely expensive, Space overcrowding causes collisions, Microwave beams are potentially harmful and could cause cancer and radioactivity.**

Bansal 11’ (<http://www.ecofriend.com/entry/the-good-the-bad-and-the-ugly-space-based-solar-energy/>, The Good, the bad and the ugly: Space based solar energy, Gaurav Bansal, Ecofriend staff writer, May 23 2011, Ecofriend)

1.High costs and long gestation period: Development cost for solar panels of that magnitude would be very large and will also take long time to manufacture as even the first space-based solar project passed California State also has gestation period of 7 long years. Similarly, costs to operationalize even a single large panel is very high, which makes it even more difficult for poor nations to do so. such pilot project byJapan also even runs into more than 20 billions of dollars even before operationalization. 2. Satellite traffic will increase: A large number of such projects can lead to overcrowding of space in the geosynchronous orbit. This may lead to a mishap like the one collision that happened between the Iridium Satellite LLC-operated satellite and the Russian Cosmos-2251 military satellite occurred at about 485 miles above the Russian Arctic on Feb, 2009.

The Ugly 1.Potential damage to Atmosphere: Till now microwave and other transmission methods that are adopted for all over the world are for communication and broadcast purposes only. However, for energy transmission, the wavelength has to very high which can be potentially dangerous to our atmosphere and will increase the risk of leukemia and cancer among humans. Suggested concentration and intensity of such microwaves at their center would be of 23 mW/cm2 and at periphery would be 1 mW/cm2 , which compares to the current United States Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) workplace exposure limits for microwaves. Similarly very high frequency used for such long distance propagation can be very dangerous and may lead to increase in radioactivity in earth’s environment. 2.Laser beam penetration: Transmission of energy through atmosphere has not yet been done at a large scale and its successful commercial utilization is still under question. The ionosphere, the electrically charged portion of the atmosphere, will be a significant barrier to transmission.

## SSP Bad---Space Weaponization

### SBSP is a violation of the UN Outer Space Treaty’s ban on space weaponization.

Fan et al 10’ (William Fan, Harold Martin, James Wo, Brian Mak, “Industry and Technology Assesment”, Space Based Solar Power, June 2, 2011, <http://www.pickar.caltech.edu/e103/Final%20Exams/Space%20Based%20Solar%20Power.pdf>)

Due to the high energy transmitter that it will utilize, space based solar power could potentially be in violation of international space treaties. In 1967, the Outer Space Treaty was signed by the United States and other world powers. One of the key issues addressed by this treaty is space based weapons. The Outer Space Treaty bans the placement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in space or on any celestial body. This could become a serious issue for space based solar power because of the potential for the transmitter to become a dual use weapon. Additionally, the newly proposed Space Preservation Treaty could severely hinder the implementation of space based solar power, as it would ban the any kind of weapon from being placed in space. In addition to political issues, there may be social disapproval of having a potential weapons system in space.

## Environment DA

### **SBSP would fundamentally alter and destroy desert ecosystems.**

Advantages About Solar Energy, no date (<http://advantagesaboutsolarenergy.info/space-based-solar-power-101-energy/#more-429>, Space Based Solar Power 101 | Energy, Advantages about solar energy, no date)

The size of a single solar-power satellite, the one that orbits the Earth collecting solar power, would be 15 times the size of the current international space station. What about the size of the collecting station and where would it be housed? The NSSO suggests the collecting station on Earth would be in a desert. The result of the beam on this eco-system is that it would turn into a lush landscape. This sounds great, don’t we want more lush rain forrest like areas in the world? But changing one eco-system changes them all, especially one as large as Sahara. We are all connected and we really cannot predict the ramifications of such a drastic change. We then need to factor in the production of these big satellites and receiving stations. Are they made out of recycled materials? How many times do we need to send crews up into space to maintain these solar collectors, what debris do we leave in space to do this?

### Destroying ecosystems leads to loss of bio-d

Strieker 02’ (Scientists agree world faces mass extinction, August 23, 2002 Posted: 11:43 AM EDT (1543 GMT), Gary Strieker, CNN's global environmental correspondent, <http://archives.cnn.com/2002/TECH/science/08/23/green.century.mass.extinction/index.html>)

The complex web of life on Earth, what scientists call "biodiversity," is in serious trouble. "Biodiversity includes all living things that we depend on for our economies and our lives," explained Brooks Yeager, vice president of global programs at the World Wildlife Fund in Washington, D.C. "It's the forests, the oceans, the coral reefs, the marine fish, the algae, the insects that make up the living world around us and which we couldn't do without," he said. Nearly 2 million species of plants and animals are known to science and experts say 50 times as many may not yet be discovered. Yet most scientists agree that human activity is causing rapid deterioration in biodiversity. Expanding human settlements, logging, mining, agriculture and pollution are destroying ecosystems, upsetting nature's balance and driving many species to extinction. There is virtual unanimity among scientists that we have entered a period of mass extinction not seen since the age of the dinosaurs, an emerging global crisis that could have disastrous effects on our future food supplies, our search for new medicines, and on the water we drink and the air we breathe. Estimates vary, but extinction is figured by experts to be taking place between 100 to 1,000 times higher than natural "background" extinction.

### **Loss of bio-d causes extinction.**

Schroder 10’ (Will biodiversity loss spell human extinction?, Friday, May 21st, 2010, Ingrid Schroder, writer for Cohabitaire, <http://www.cohabitaire.com/2010/05/will-biodiversity-loss-spell-human-extinction/>, Cohabitaire)

In short, yes, we are potentially doomed. The severity of this threat however, really depends on whether we halt destruction of biological diversity and how long it takes us to do so. For those without a dictionary: “Biodiversity is the variety of all living things; the different plants, animals and micro organisms, the genetic information they contain and the ecosystems they form. Biodiversity is usually explored at three levels – genetic diversity, species diversity and ecosystem diversity. These three levels work together to create the complexity of life on Earth.” – The Australian Museum The UN has declared the 22nd of May International Day of Biological Diversity and 2010 the International year of biodiversity to highlight the crucial tipping point we face. Climate change is but one piece of the puzzle that needs to be addressed along with pollution, introduced species and habitat loss. There has been plenty of press over the [rss-cut]recent launch of the UN’s Global Biodiversity Outlook report which notes that the linked challenges of biodiversity loss and climate change must be addressed by policymakers with equal priority and in close co-ordination, if the most severe impacts of each are to be avoided. UNEP executive director, Achim Steiner points out “Many economies remain blind to the huge value of the diversity of animals, plants and other life forms and their role in healthy and functioning ecosystems, from forests and freshwater to soils, oceans and even the atmosphere.” “Humanity has fabricated the illusion that somehow we can get by without biodiversity or that it is somehow peripheral to our contemporary world,” he said. “The truth is we need it more than ever on a planet of 6.8 billion people heading to 9 billion people in 2050.” Dr Aaron Bernstein, author of Sustaining Life: How Human Health Depends on Biodiversity, describes the situation as “the greatest delusion of our times”. Speaking at Sydney’s Lowy Institute last month, Bernstein presented a comprehensive—and sobering—view of how human medicines, biomedical research, the emergence and spread of infectious diseases, and the production of food, both on land and in the oceans, depend on biodiversity. He stressed that “our health relies on the health of the natural world” with over 67% of US pharmaceuticals derived from nature, while treatments for diseases such as cancer are only possible using complex molecules found in nature. Dr Bernstein went on to outline the destruction of symbiotic systems, sometimes irreversibly, as a result of human activity such as overfishing, deforestation, and agricultural run off resulting in oxygen-less ‘dead-zones’ – which will ultimately effect food supplies. New infectious diseases are also emerging as we destroy habitats – forcing species together that would not have been in contact naturally, and also through factory farming where large numbers of animals such as chickens, cows and pigs exist in such close proximity seeing infections mutate and spread more rapidly, eventually to humans. So what is being done about it? In 2002, targets were made at the Convention on Biological Diversity, compiling over 30 indicators, measuring different aspects of biodiversity, including changes in species’ populations and risk of extinction, habitat extent and community composition. Studies since have found no evidence for a significant reduction in the rate of decline of biodiversity, and that the pressures facing biodiversity continue to increase. “Our analysis shows that governments have failed to deliver on the commitments they made in 2002: biodiversity is still being lost as fast as ever, and we have made little headway in reducing the pressures on species, habitats and ecosystems”, says Dr Stuart Butchart, of the United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre and BirdLife International. Will mother nature have the last laugh? It’s quite probable. If food runs low, epidemic diseases rise and oxygen becomes limited – it doesn’t take a genius to work out that we won’t last long. And while it might not happen in our lifetime, do you really want to play a role in the extinction of the human race?