Hello, and welcome to the print edition of the 2012-2013 Duke Environmental Law Symposium, “Conservative Visions of Our Environmental Future.” The live symposium, sponsored by Duke Environmental Law and Policy Forum, the Duke Federalist Society, Duke College Republicans, and the Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions, was held on September 24, 2012 at Duke University’s Reynolds Industries Theater. With slightly over a month to go before the Presidential election, we convened a provocative set of speakers to present a different take on timely and important issues.

Our names are David and Sara, and we are liberals. That confessional does not sound exactly right in this context because, when it comes to environmental issues, liberal views are anything but anonymous. Liberal environmentalism is vocal and loud, making up for the surprising silence of our Prius engines with the slogans screaming from the bumper stickers: “Save the Whales!” “No Fracking Way!”

Of course, there are bumper stickers in response. They are often on the back of a pick-up truck that could fit a Prius or two in the truck bed, flanked by a McCain/Palin sticker. “Reduce Carbon Emissions:
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Shoot an Environmentalist!” “Green is the New Red!” In that last one, the “G” in Green is made with a hammer and sickle.

And that is what the environmental debate is too often reduced to—bumper stickers.

In both the live event and print edition of the Symposium, we aim to get past the screaming stereotypes. By presenting one general side of the environmental debate, we hope to facilitate more national discussion that begins with reasoned analysis and fully articulated positions rather than moral diatribes and talking points. This reasoning applies to both sides. The liberal enviro-hippies (the two of us include ourselves in that group) need to confront cost-benefit analysis and the free market. Conservative economists need to consider both externalities and environmental ethics. By presenting speeches and articles from thought leaders including Bob Inglis, Jonathan Adler, Nick Loris, Eli Lehrer, Shi-Ling Hsu, and Reed Watson, we hope to change the basis of the discussion.

The event on September 24, 2012 was held in front of 300 students and community members from the North Carolina area. The first panel entitled “Climate, Energy, and a Path Forward” featured Jeff Holmstead, former EPA Assistant Administrator for Air, and Nick Loris, an environmental economist at the Heritage Foundation. Next, the second panel, “Cutting the Budget: Greening the Planet,” focused on budgetary issues and featured Eli Lehrer, President and Founder of the R-Street Institute, and Jeremy Carl, a senior fellow at Stanford’s Hoover Institution. After an inspiring keynote address from former Congressman Bob Inglis, the third panel, entitled “North Carolina’s Energy Future,” focused on North Carolina-specific issues and featured John Hood, President of the North Carolina-based John Locke Foundation, North Carolina State Representative Chuck McGrady, and Christopher Ayers, who serves on the North Carolina Environmental Management Commission. Finally, the fourth panel featured Jonathan Adler, a Professor at Case-Western and a top figure in environmental law, and Reed Watson, the Director of Applied Programs at the Property and Environment Research Center, discussing “Free-Market Environmentalism.”

Key themes included the importance of innovation, the need to remove market-distorting subsidies, and the necessity of relying on market principles to solve environmental problems. However, throughout the speeches and discussions, there was disagreement. How should we respond to the climate crisis? When is regulation necessary? Those questions cannot be answered on bumper stickers,
and the speakers did an amazing job articulating realistic—and optimistic—paths forward.

So where do we go from here? The Symposium points toward a simple and hopeful solution—we keep the discussion going. Good people come to different conclusions on how to solve environmental problems. We might never start from the same ideological place, but if the debate stays in bumper-sticker land, we will always be screaming past each other. However, if we can combine liberal and conservative ideas, we may end with a sustainable, positive vision of our environmental future. Because that is what is at stake in this discussion—the future. By speaking rather than screaming, we can positively change that future, and in the process, we can change the world.