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#### The rapacious drive to secure energy is a symptom of “challenging-forth,” a mindset that renders everything as disposable. Only through rejecting challenging forth and embracing bringing forth can we avoid this hollowing out of Being

Waddington 5 A Field Guide to Heidegger: Understanding 'The Question concerning Technology' more by David Waddington Educational Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 37, No. 4, 2005 http://concordia.academia.edu/DavidWaddington/Papers/538046/A\_Field\_Guide\_to\_Heidegger\_Understanding\_The\_Question\_concerning\_Technology

Most essays on technology focus primarily on practical issues surrounding the use of particular technologies . Heidegger’s essay, however, does not—instead, it focuses on the ways of thinking that lie behind technology. Heidegger (1977, p. 3) thinks that by coming to understand these ways of thinking, humans can enter into a ‘free relationship’ with technology. After dismissing the conventional account of technology, which supposedly states that technology is simply a means to an end, Heidegger commences a discussion on ancient craftsmanship. He suggests that the ancient craftsmanship involves the four Aristotelian causes: material, formal, ﬁnal, and efﬁcient. Intuitively, one might think that the efﬁcient cause of a given craft-item (the craftsman) was the most signiﬁcant of the four. However, although the craftsman has an important role in that she unites the four causes by considering each of them carefully, each of the four causes is equally co-responsible for the particular craft-item that is produced. Heidegger comments, ‘The four ways of being responsible bring something into appearance. They let it come forth into presencing’ (1977, p. 9). Appropriately enough, Heidegger names this process bringing-forth . Notably, bringing-forth is not merely a descriptive genus under which the four causes are subsumed—rather, it is a uniﬁed process, ‘a single leading-forth to which [each of the causes] is indebted’ (Lovitt, 1972, p. 46).Heidegger writes that bringing-forth ‘comes to pass only insofar as something concealed comes into unconcealment’ (1977, p. 11). Thus, instead of the craft-item being created by the craftsman, as one would think, it was revealed or unconcealed .In ‘The Thing’, Heidegger comments on the making of a jug, The jug is not a vessel because it was made; rather, the jug had to be made because it is this holding vessel. The making … lets the jug come into its own. But that which in the jug’s nature is its own is never brought about by its making. (1971, p. 168)Clearly, revealing/unconcealing in the mode of bringing-forth contains strong hints of Platonism. Bringing-forth is the mode of revealing that corresponds to ancient craft. Modern technology, however, has its own particular mode of revealing, which Heidegger calls challenging-forth . Thinking in the mode of challenging-forth is very different from thinking in the mode of bringing-forth: when challenging-forth, one sets upon the elements of a situation both in the sense of ordering (i.e. setting a system upon) and in a more rapacious sense (i.e. the wolves set upon the traveler and devoured him). In bringing-forth, human beings were one important element among others in the productive process; in challenging-forth, humans control the productive process. Efﬁciency is an additional important element of thinking in the mode of challeng-ing forth; the earth, for example, is set upon to yield the maximum amount of ore with the minimum amount of effort. Essentially, challenging-forth changes the way we see the world—as Michael Zimmerman pointedly remarks, ‘To be capable of transforming a forest into packaging for cheeseburgers, man must see the forest not as a display of the miracle of life, but as raw material, pure and simple’ (1977, p. 79).Production in the mode of challenging-forth reveals objects that have the status of standing-reserve . Objects that have been made standing-reserve have been reduced to disposability in two different senses of the word: (1) They are disposable in the technical sense; they are easily ordered and arranged. Trees that once stood chaotically in the forest are now logs that can be easily counted, weighed, piled, and shipped. (2) They are also disposable in the conventional sense; like diapers and cheap razors, they are endlessly replaceable/interchangeable and have little value. For the most part, challenging things forth into standing-reserve is not a laudable activity, and thus it makes sense to wonder what drives human beings to think in this way. Heidegger’s answer to this motivational question is unconventional— instead of suggesting that the origins of this motivation are indigenous to human beings, he postulates the existence of a phenomenon that ‘sets upon man to order the real as standing-reserve’ (1977, p. 19). Heidegger calls this mysterious phenomenon enframing ( Ge-stell in German). The word ‘Ge-stell’ gathers together several meanings of the -stellen family of German verbs: in Ge-stell, humans are ordered ( bestellen ), commanded ( bestellen ), and entrapped ( nachstellen ) (Harries 1994,p. 229). Heidegger thinks that our default state is that of being trapped by Ge-stell; this is what he means when he writes, ‘As the one who is challenged forth in this way, man stands within the essential realm of [Ge-stell]. He can never take up a relationship to it only subsequently’ (1977, p. 24; Sallis, 1971, p. 162). According to Heidegger (1977, p. 25), there are different ‘ordainings of destining’ for human beings. Although the default destining is that of Ge-stell, it is possible to choose an alternate road. Heidegger thinks that human beings have been granted the special role of ‘Shepherds of Being’—we have been granted the power to reveal the world in certain ways (Ballard, 1971, p. 60). Trapped in Ge-stell, we tend to reveal things in the mode of challenging-forth, but we can also choose to reveal things in the mode of bringing-forth. Heidegger comments, ‘Placed between these possibilities, man is endangered from out of destining’ (1977, p. 26). However, by carefully considering the ways of thinking that lie behind technology, we can grasp the ‘saving power’. We can realize that we, the Shepherds of Being, have a choice : we can bring-forth rather than challenge-forth. Thus, once we understand the thinking behind technology, we become free to choose our fate—‘… we are already sojourning in the open space of destining’ (Heidegger, 1977, p. 26).

### Off

#### 1. Romney wins now – national polls and independents.

Geraghty, Contributor, 10-25

[Jim, “Obama ‘Wins’ Debate, But Somehow Romney Wins the Undecideds”, The National Review, 10-25-12, <http://www.nationalreview.com/campaign-spot/331597/obama-wins-debate-somehow-romney-wins-undecideds>, RSR]

President Obama scored a modest win in the third presidential debate, according to the latest Washington Post-ABC News tracking poll, but it’s Republican Mitt Romney who moved the needle among likely voters — including independents — with his debate performances. Overall, the contest remains unchanged from Tuesday, with 49 percent of likely voters nationally backing Romney, and 48 percent supporting Obama. But as was the case after the first and second debates, more voters say they have better, not worse, opinions of the former Massachusetts governor when assessing the three debates. Most say the president’s debate performances did not change their views of him, a continuing challenge for an incumbent stuck with an approval rating in dangerous territory: 50 percent of likely voters approve of how he’s handling the job, 49 percent disapprove. Looking at handling the economy as a broad issue, Romney’s lead among independents has swelled to 56 to 39 percent in the new poll, an advantage that helps him to a sizable, 12-point lead over Obama when it comes to their voting preferences. Obama won independent and other voters by eight percentage points in 2008.

#### 2. PTC extension means Obama wins – swing states

Danko 12 (Peter, freelance writer, his work has appeared in Wired, The New York Times, San Francisco Chronicle , “Romney’s Anti-Wind Stance: A Swing State Problem?” <http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/Romneys-Anti-Wind-Stance-A-Swing-State-Problem/>, Acc: 8/1/12, og)

The PTC might seem an unlikely player in a national election focused on the state of the economy, but in what could be harrowingly tight states, even shifting a very small percentage of votes could make a real difference. That’s because in some states — in Iowa, for instance — wind is seen as a jobs issue, and it’s very popular: Public Opinion Strategies, which polls for Republican candidates, reported recently [PDF] that in the Hawkeye State, “More than half of voters (57 percent), including 41 percent of Republicans and 59 percent of Independents, would be less likely to vote for a candidate for President if that candidate did not support expanding American wind power generation.”¶ Colorado is another swing state where a strong anti-wind stand like Romney’s could be a factor. There, the Denver Post noted Monday that Vestas has said it would likely be forced to lay off most of its Colorado workers – 1,700 people at facilities in Brighton, Windsor and Pueblo – if the tax credit isn’t extended. In Colorado, like Iowa, support for wind is bipartisan; Republican Reps. Cory Gardner and Scott Tipton have both come out in favor of the PTC.

#### 3. Obama will cut the nuclear stockpile and funding for missile defense if re-elected

Diehl 12 (Jackson, Deputy Editorial Page Editor of The Washington Post, “Sharp foreign-policy differences between candidates”, http://www.startribune.com/opinion/commentaries/ 168689676.html?refer=y)

You wouldn't know any of that from listening to the conventions, of course. Mitt Romney and Barack Obama appear determined to avoid serious debate.¶ That doesn't mean, as some in the foreign policy world like to argue, that this presidential election won't change much, even if Romney wins. It's true that U.S. interests and the pursuit of them tend to remain broadly consistent across presidencies. Obama has fought Al-Qaida just as ruthlessly as George W. Bush did; if Romney is elected, he will surely drop his threats to start a trade war with China, just as Bush and Bill Clinton did.¶ There nevertheless are some big and bright differences in this election on foreign policy. More even than those on the economy, they are likely to have practical consequences within months of the election -- since, for the most part, action by Congress won't be necessary. Though the candidates don't talk about them, they are easy enough to find in their position papers, or in Obama's case, his first-term record.¶ Start with Russia. Never mind Romney's much-reported claim that Russia is "our No. 1 geopolitical foe," or Obama's oversold "reset" with Moscow. The significant difference is that if Obama is reelected, he will seek to strike a new deal with Vladimir Putin to significantly cut the U.S. and Russian nuclear stockpiles. To do that, he acknowledged last March, he will have to compromise with Putin on U.S. and NATO plans for missile defense; in what he thought was a private aside, he told then-President Dmitry Medvedev that "after my election, I have more flexibility" on that.¶ Romney's policy would be close to the opposite. In 2010, he strongly opposed Obama's New Start treaty with Russia, which made a modest trim in nuclear warheads. Romney meanwhile has promised to boost spending on missile defense, which has been a pet GOP cause for three decades. So there's one clear choice: less nukes, or more missile defense.

#### 4. This reduction causes prolif and weakened US deterrent

Kimbell 12 (Bryan, Heritage Foundation, April 5th, “Senator Kyl Speaks Out on Missile Defense”, http://blog.heritage.org/2012/04/05/senator-kyl-speaks-out-on-missile-defense/)

Senator Kyl begins by revisiting the President’s unguarded comments to Russian President Dmitry Medvedev in Seoul, South Korea. To elucidate these whispers to Medvedev, Senator Kyl points to President Obama’s larger aspiration of a “world without nuclear weapons.” This is cause for concern. Obama’s apparent readiness to compromise U.S. missile defense capabilities for Russian cooperation in the realm of nuclear-arms reductions is a flawed approach to increasing global security.¶ For starters, all Russian demands regarding missile defense have a common denominator: They seek to limit the U.S. capability to defend from ballistic missile attack. For example, on numerous occasions, the Russians have insisted on the U.S. sharing the range and speed of missile defense interceptors, particularly the SM-3 block IIB. This interceptor would be capable of intercepting Russian inter-continental ballistic missiles and is, therefore, essential for protecting the American homeland.¶ While President Obama is pursuing nuclear arms reduction, the Russians are modernizing two of the three legs of their nuclear triad, increasing dependence on nuclear weapons and maintaining a robust nuclear warhead production capability. These actions demonstrate that the Russians have no intention of shrinking their nuclear warhead arsenal. President Obama’s inclination to compromise only increases America’s vulnerability to ballistic missile attack.¶ The President’s plans of lowering the number of deployed nuclear weapons could actually stimulate instability. Kyl points out that lower numbers of U.S. nuclear weapons could “encourage China and other nations to seek equivalence” and cause our allies to be “less certain about American nuclear guarantees” and, thus, develop their own nuclear capabilities. This is in alignment with The Heritage Foundation’s series of nuclear gaming exercises in late 2009, which concluded that “pursuing a policy of nuclear disarmament in a proliferated setting actually leads to instability. When confronted with a crisis, countries relied on nuclear weapons more, not less.”¶ The flawed approach of pursuing a “nuclear zero” policy in today’s proliferated environment is dangerous and puts the American people and its allies at grave risk. As Senator Kyl states, “Supporting a robust nuclear deterrent and an effective missile defense is a moral obligation for all those who are entrusted with ensuring our nation’s security.”

#### 5. Unchecked nuclear spread will cause global nuclear war – shorter flight times and lack of second strike capacity

Cimbala 8 (Stephen, Political Science Professor at the University of Pennsylvania, March, “Anticipatory Attacks: Nuclear Crisis Stability in Future Asia” Comparative Strategy, Vol 27 No 2, p 113-132, InformaWorld)

The spread of nuclear weapons in Asia presents a complicated mosaic of possibilities in this regard. States with nuclear forces of variable force structure, operational experience, and command-control systems will be thrown into a matrix of complex political, social, and cultural crosscurrents contributory to the possibility of war. In addition to the existing nuclear powers in Asia, others may seek nuclear weapons if they feel threatened by regional rivals or hostile alliances. Containment of nuclear proliferation in Asia is a desirable political objective for all of the obvious reasons. Nevertheless, the present century is unlikely to see the nuclear hesitancy or risk aversion that marked the Cold War, in part, because the military and political discipline imposed by the Cold War superpowers no longer exists, but also because states in Asia have new aspirations for regional or global respect.12 The spread of ballistic missiles and other nuclear-capable delivery systems in Asia , or in the Middle East with reach into Asia, is especially dangerous because plausible adversaries live close together and are already engaged in ongoing disputes about territory or other issues.13 The Cold War Americans and Soviets required missiles and airborne delivery systems of intercontinental range to strike at one another's vitals. But short-range ballistic missiles or fighter-bombers suffice for India and Pakistan to launch attacks at one another with potentially “strategic” effects. China shares borders with Russia, North Korea, India, and Pakistan; Russia, with China and North Korea; India, with Pakistan and China; Pakistan, with India and China; and so on. The short flight times of ballistic missiles between the cities or military forces of contiguous states means that very little time will be available for warning and attack assessment by the defender. Conventionally armed missiles could easily be mistaken for a tactical nuclear first use. Fighter-bombers appearing over the horizon could just as easily be carrying nuclear weapons as conventional ordnance. In addition to the challenges posed by shorter flight times and uncertain weapons loads, potential victims of nuclear attack in Asia may also have first strike-vulnerable forces and command-control systems that increase decision pressures for rapid, and possibly mistaken, retaliation. This potpourri of possibilities challenges conventional wisdom about nuclear deterrence and proliferation on the part of policymakers and academic theorists. For policymakers in the United States and NATO, spreading nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction in Asia could profoundly shift the geopolitics of mass destruction from a European center of gravity (in the twentieth century) to an Asian and/or Middle Eastern center of gravity (in the present century).14 This would profoundly shake up prognostications to the effect that wars of mass destruction are now passe, on account of the emergence of the “Revolution in Military Affairs” and its encouragement of information-based warfare.15 Together with this, there has emerged the argument that large-scale wars between states or coalitions of states, as opposed to varieties of unconventional warfare and failed states, are exceptional and potentially obsolete.16 The spread of WMD and ballistic missiles in Asia could overturn these expectations for the obsolescence or marginalization of major interstate warfare. For theorists, the argument that the spread of nuclear weapons might be fully compatible with international stability, and perhaps even supportive of international security, may be less sustainable than hitherto.17 Theorists optimistic about the ability of the international order to accommodate the proliferation of nuclear weapons and delivery systems in the present century have made several plausible arguments based on international systems and deterrence theory. First, nuclear weapons may make states more risk averse as opposed to risk acceptant, with regard to brandishing military power in support of foreign policy objectives. Second, if states' nuclear forces are second-strike survivable, they contribute to reduced fears of surprise attack. Third, the motives of states with respect to the existing international order are crucial. Revisionists will seek to use nuclear weapons to overturn the existing balance of power; status quo-oriented states will use nuclear forces to support the existing distribution of power, and therefore, slow and peaceful change, as opposed to sudden and radical power transitions. These arguments, for a less alarmist view of nuclear proliferation, take comfort from the history of nuclear policy in the “first nuclear age,” roughly corresponding to the Cold War.18 Pessimists who predicted that some thirty or more states might have nuclear weapons by the end of the century were proved wrong. However, the Cold War is a dubious precedent for the control of nuclear weapons spread outside of Europe. The military and security agenda of the Cold War was dominated by the United States and the Soviet Union, especially with regard to nuclear weapons. Ideas about mutual deterrence based on second-strike capability and the deterrence “rationality” according to American or allied Western concepts might be inaccurate guides to the avoidance of war outside of Europe.19

### Off

#### The United States federal government should implement a cap and trade system.

#### Cap and trade solves warming - comparatively more effective at reducing emissions than incentives for wind

Frondel et al 9 (Dr. Manuel Frondel, Ph.D. in economics, professor for Energy Economics and Applied Econometrics at Ruhr-Universität Bochum, chief of the Environment and Resources Research Division at Rhine-Westphalia Institute for Economic Research; Nolan Ritter, Economics PhD candidate and researcher with Rhine-Westphalia Institute for Economic Research; Prof. Colin Vance, Ph.D in Economics, Adjunct Professor of Quantitative Methods with Jacobs University Bremen; “Economic impacts from the promotion of renewable energies: The German experience”, Final report – October 2009, www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/germany/Germany\_Study\_-\_FINAL.pdf)

Consumers ultimately bear the cost of renewable energy promotion. In 2008, the price mark-up due to the subsidization of green electricity was about 1.5 Cent per kWh (2.2 Cents US $), meaning the subsidy accounts for about 7.5% of average household electricity prices.¶ Given the net cost of 41.82 Cents/kWh for PV modules installed in 2008, and assuming that PV displaces conventional electricity generated from a mixture of gas and hard coal, abatement costs are as high as 716 € (US $1,050) per tonne.¶ Using the same assumptions and a net cost for wind of 3.10 Cents/kWh, the abatement cost is approximately 54 € (US $80). While cheaper than PV, this cost is still nearly double the ceiling of the cost of a per-ton permit under Europe’s cap-and- trade scheme. Renewable energies are thus among the most expensive GHG reduction measures.¶ There are much cheaper ways to reduce carbon dioxide emissions than subsidiz ing renewable energies. CO2 abatement costs of PV are estimated to be as high as 716 € (US $1,050) per tonne, while those of wind power are estimated at 54 € (US $80) per tonne. By contrast, the current price of emissions certificates on the European emissions trading scheme is only 13.4 Euro per tonne. Hence, the cost from emission reductions as determined by the market is about 53 times cheaper than employing PV and 4 times cheaper than using wind power.¶ Moreover, the prevailing coexistence of the EEG and emissions trading under the European Trading Scheme (ETS) means that the increased use of renewable energy technologies generally attains no additional emission reductions beyond those achieved by ETS alone. In fact, since the establishment of the ETS in 2005, the EEG’s net climate effect has been equal to zero.¶

#### Cap and trade solves their econ advantage – creates jobs

Lyon and Madrid 11 (Susan Lyon is Special Assistant for Energy Policy and Jorge Madrid is a Research Associate at American Progress, September, “The Price is Right”, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2011/09/15/10386/the-price-is-right/)

Setting a price on carbon would accelerate America’s economic recovery while also creating clean energy jobs, spurring technological innovation, and fighting climate change. It is one key step to reach the broader goal of catalyzing the transformation to an efficient and sustainable low-carbon economy.¶ In reducing the deficit, we need to think about the health of our entire economic system. With staggering unemployment, the focus of any deal needs to be on job growth and the future of the American middle class.¶ A price on carbon would spur job creation in emerging sectors and industries from clean-tech manufacturing to R&D centers around the country. A Berkeley-Yale analysis of the Senate’s American Clean Energy and Security Act (Waxman-Markey), a comprehensive clean energy and climate bill with a cap-and-trade pricing system, estimated net job creation from a price on carbon included in the bill at 918,000 to 1.1 million jobs. CAP and the Political Economy Research Institute found job creation potential of 1.7 million jobs from the Waxman-Markey bill, which also contained a carbon pricing system.¶ Further, the clean energy jobs resulting from the innovation and investment that are spurred by a price on carbon are good, well-paying jobs. A recent Brookings analysis found that median wages in the jobs sectors defined as part of the “clean economy” are currently 13 percent higher than median U.S. wages.

### Solvency

#### Wind industry is better off without PTC – eliminates uncertainty and inefficient players

Anderson 12 (Jared, Editor, AOL Energy, former Senior Analyst at Energy Intelligence Group, “Wind Sector Considers Life Without the PTC”, <http://energy.aol.com/2012/06/25/wind-sector-considers-life-without-the-ptc/>, Acc: 8/1/12, og)

Wind power's competiveness with conventional fossil fuels erodes considerably without the PTC, going from about $.06/kWh to $.08/kWh, said Frantzis.¶ There is much "consternation" among frustrated developers that has paralyzed the sector, said Kevin Walsh, Managing Director, Power & Renewable Energy at GE Energy Financial Services. Given this situation domestically, GE EFS is investing outside the US in places with greater regulatory certainty like Canada, Australia and Europe, Walsh told AOL Energy on the sidelines of the conference.¶ But it's not all doom and gloom. The winners in a post PTC world will be "developers with portfolios of higher wind resource sites with access to transmission in liquid markets," said Tim Rosenzweig, CEO of Goldwind USA, a major turbine original equipment manufacturer (OEM) based in China.¶ Manufacturers able to most effectively solve the cost/performance equation could be among the post PTC winners, Rosenzweig said.¶ The operational advantages lost without the government incentive will need to be made up in other areas such as project capital expenditure, project operating expenditure and wind resource and turbine performance said Rosenzweig's slide presentation.¶ The US will still be an attractive business environment without the PTC because it will remain an available, sophisticated market that could interest foreign players. "It will be a proving ground," said Rosenzweig. Additionally, post consolidation, remaining players will be ready to enjoy a larger share of a "normal" market.¶ Read more about PTC expiration in the AOL Energy white paper "Wind Rush," here.¶ Some other positive outcomes of a declining PTC include greater regulatory certainty, increased ability to plan long term, the elimination of federal politics, a differentiation of the wind industry and the establishment of a year-to-year incentive, said Paul Gaynor, CEO of First Wind.¶ "Like Heroine"¶ The economics will be more difficult, said Gaynor, and turbine prices will need to come down, materials will need to improve and turbine lifetimes will need to lengthen to help balance the lost operational benefits afforded by the PTC.¶ And while developers "love their tax equity investors, they are expensive," said Gaynor. Tax equity investment is a financing mechanism that takes advantage of the PTC.¶ One reason it is difficult for the industry to get away from the incentive is that wind power was essentially a "garage band technology in 1992" and investment tax credits originated from that nascent business climate, it's hard to rip that system up and start from scratch now, Gaynor said.¶ Although he is confident that companies will be able to "make it work" without the tax credit, it won't be easy -"it's like heroine, hard to get off," said Gaynor.

#### Picking winners bad - plans undermines innovation which turns case

Loris 11 Nicolas Loris is an analyst in the Heritage Foundation’s Roe Institute of Economic Policy Studies. "Power Down the Subsidies to Energy Producers" Aug 3 www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2011/08/power-down-the-subsidies-to-energy-producers

But the damage subsidies inflict on our economy extends well beyond direct costs. A special endorsement from the government artificially props up that technology. This reduces the incentive for the producer to become cost-competitive, stifles innovation and encourages government dependence.¶ The federal government has no business picking commercial winners and losers. That’s the job of the marketplace. Indeed, it’s doubly damaging when government decides to manipulate the market through subsidies, because government - almost invariably - picks losers. That’s not surprising, because companies that seek handouts most strenuously are those that cannot compete without them.

#### Wind power fails – unreliable in providing electricity to the grid in peak hours, which means coal, natural gas and nuclear plants can’t be replaced

Institute for Energy Research 12 (August 13th, a not-for-profit organization that conducts intensive research and analysis on the functions, operations, and government regulation of global energy markets, California’s Flex Alert: A Case Study in Intermittent Energy, http://www.canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/48788)

California has long been a leader in promoting wind and other renewables to power the electricity grid. Recently, California has gone even further and in 2011, Gov. Jerry Brown signed a law to force an increase in the amount of renewables utilities must use to 33 percent of the state’s electricity by 2020.¶ Currently, the state is experiencing a stressed electricity grid because of high demand and because some nuclear and natural gas plants are offline. Mandated renewable energy is proving itself incapable of filling the void. This situation show how little actual value wind, solar and other politically correct renewables have in the real world work of supplying people with electricity when they need and want it.¶ California is currently experiencing a “flex alert” which strongly urges Californians to use less electricity. According to the California ISO, the operator of the region’s power grid, it is “critical” to conserve electricity today to make sure there aren’t blackouts. Here’s the graphic representing the alert:¶ Because California is rushing headlong toward more and more renewables in the electricity grid it is important to look at how renewables are contributing to keeping the electricity grid stable. For example, California has 4.297 gigawatts of installed wind capacity which could really help California balance the grid if the wind blew at the right times (spoiler alert—the wind doesn’t blow at the right times).¶ The first chart below shows the supply and demand for August 9, 2012 in the California ISO electrical grid. The actual demand is in blue and the available generation is in orange. The second chart shows the renewable generation in California at that time.¶ There are some very important things to note with respect to the renewable generation. Wind’s production peaked just before 1 am, when electricity demand was dropping as people went to bed and nighttime temperatures reduced the need for air conditioning. At the time, wind was producing 6 percent of California’s electricity, but after 1 am, wind began to falter and wind production fell by 90 percent by 11 am. At that time, wind was producing less than 100 megawatts of electricity—a mere 0.2 percent of the electricity in California.¶ This shows how wind fails to produce electricity when needed most. At 11 am, as electricity demand was rapidly increasing and electricity producing was needed most, wind was at a low ebb. Fortuitously, wind production increased in the afternoon, but by 5:30 pm, wind was only producing a little more than 1 percent of California’s total electricity.¶ Solar helped meet demand more than wind, because solar has the advantage of producing electricity when the sun is shining and households are using more power. But even solar failed to produce much electricity during the period of highest demand, producing just 2 percent of the state’s electricity at its peak. Solar production peaked at nearly 1 gigawatt at 11 am and continued to produce about 1 gigawatt until 3 pm. The problem is that the state’s highest period of demand occurred at about 5 pm, when solar’s production had fallen by over 50 percent from its peak.¶ This data shows how little value wind and solar have in producing electricity when people really need it, and should be a wake-up call to California—one of the many states with mandates—as well as the Obama administration and other promoters of wind and solar. Even though wind and solar production might be growing in California, it isn’t helping to balance the grid and keep the lights on. Electricity production has to balance electricity demand and wind and solar aren’t doing a good job contributing. Moreover, it does not matter how many wind and solar installations are built because natural gas and other reliable power plants will be required to be built to meet peak electricity demand.

#### Turbine parts backlog means plan won’t even begin implementation for years

Richard 8 (Michael, Science & Technology, 4/7, http://www.treehugger.com/files/2008/04/wind-power-turbine-shortage-supple-problems.php)

We recently wrote about the massive **growth in the wind power industry** and how **forecasts estimate a 155% growth between now and 2012** (bringing total installed capacity to 240 gigawatts). Well, **there's a dark cloud on the horizon. The problem is not with demand, but with supply.**¶ **If you want wind turbines to build a wind farm, take a number and grab a magazine, because the wait could be long. If you order now, you might not get the turbines before late 2009 or later, depending on your connections with suppliers.** This is similar to what solar panel makers have been going through with the silicon shortage for the past few years.

#### Wind fails – electrical grid infrastructure can’t support it

Morriss et al 9 (ANDREW P. MORRISS, H. Ross and Helen Workman Professor of Law & Professor of Business, University of Illinois; WILLIAM T. BOGART, Dean of Academic Affairs and Professor of Economics, York College of Pennsylvania; ANDREW DORCHAK, Head of Reference and Foreign/International Law Specialist, Case Western Reserve University School of Law; ROGER E. MEINERS, John and Judy Goolsby Distinguished Professor of Economics and Law, University of Texas-Arlington; UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LAW AND ECONOMICS RESEARCH PAPER SERIES NO. LE09-001, “GREEN JOBS MYTHS”, March 12th, www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/morriss-green-jobs-myths.pdf)

Yet another problem associated with wind energy is that the most favorable locations for wind power are often not accessible by the existing electrical grid,468 a problem recognized by President Obama:¶ One of, I think, the most important infrastructure projects that we need is a whole new electricity grid. Because if we're going to be serious about renewable energy, I want to be able to get wind power from North Dakota to population centers, like Chicago. And we're going to have to have a smart grid if we want to use plug-in hybrids then we want to be able to have ordinary consumers sell back the electricity that's generated from those car batteries, back into the grid. That can create 5 million new jobs, just in new energy.469¶ Additional electrical transmission lines are also key to entrepreneur T. Boone Pickens’ dream of turning Texas into “the Saudi Arabia of wind.”470 According to the Department of Energy, it would require an additional 12,000 miles of high-voltage transmission lines costing $60 billion (undiscounted) to increase the contribution of wind to national electricity production to 20 percent by 2030.471¶ Wind power thus faces two key problems in increasing its share of electricity generation. First, it is unavailable at some times of peak power demand and so requires costly backup capacity. Second, current infrastructure is inadequate to support a rapid expansion of wind energy generation. Further, as we noted earlier, existing efforts to increase wind generation capacity have run into major hurdles with regulatory laws and NIMBY efforts.472 Despite these widely known problems, which are never discussed in depth in the green jobs literature, green jobs policy proposals propose enormous increases in wind capacity without detailing a strategy for how these problems will be solved.473 Green jobs proponents thus exhibit extensive technological optimism with respect to wind’s prospects.

### Econ

#### Growth high now—housing, energy, banking, industrial base, and deficit reduction by the end of the year—history proves

Altman 9/3, former US deputy Treasury secretary

(9/3/12, Roger Altman is founder and chairman of Evercore Partners and a former US deputy Treasury secretary, “The US economy may surprise us all”, <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/f7ec3e66-f5ac-11e1-bf76-00144feabdc0.html#axzz25j9wVhop>)

But when they do, it is possible that the US economy will surprise on the upside. A housing revival, the revolution occurring in energy, a rejuvenated banking system and a leaner industrial base could lead to US growth beyond the 2.5 per cent rate that is widely seen as its long-term potential. In other words, the famine could be followed by a feast. There are precedents for such a growth spurt. We saw it in the recovery from the deep 1981-82 recession and over the latter half of the 1990s. True, those periods were not preceded by a financial collapse. But they did not involve a monetary response as powerful as that unleashed by the US Federal Reserve in 2008 and 2009. There are now serious forecasts, for example from the International Monetary Fund and The Conference Board, which suggest the annual growth rate may reach 3-4 per cent within five years. There are five factors that suggest there could be a surge in US growth. First, the housing sector is improving. Between 1980 and 2005 it accounted for an average 4.5 per cent of gross domestic product and before the crash it employed more than 3m Americans. But in 2012 it represents only 2.4 per cent of GDP and 2m jobs. Almost 1.5m mortgages are still in foreclosure. But the first signs of renewal have appeared: prices are rising in almost half of the country’s major housing markets. Pent-up demand is huge. Goldman Sachs expects housing starts to hit 1.4m annually by 2015, up from 700,000 this year. After 2015, the total will rise further and boost GDP, as household formation rates and the starts-to-population ratio revert to historical norms. The second cause for optimism is the breathtaking increase in oil and gas production. Data from the US Energy Information Administration support this. Natural gas output reached an all-time high this year, with shale gas accounting for half of it. On the oil side, US production fell 48 per cent from its 1970 high to only 5m barrels a day in 2008. Driven by shale, it is up almost 20 per cent from 2008 to 2012. IHS Cera, a research group, projects that oil production will rise another 3m b/d and reach a new high by 2020. Within five years, the oil gains alone could add more than 1 percentage point to annual GDP growth and up to 3m jobs. The fall in natural gas prices will reduce the average utility bill by almost $1,000 a year. It will also reinvigorate the US petrochemical industry and some manufacturing sectors. Third, amid the political controversy and negative publicity, the US banking system has recovered faster than anyone could have imagined. Capital and liquidity have been rebuilt to levels unseen in decades. Legacy mortgage problems are fading. Profits are very strong. Lending is growing quickly: total bank credit outstanding now stands at $9.8tn, according to Fed data, a record high. The proportion of bank lending going to business will next year probably reach a record level. Fourth, the US has made a huge leap in industrial competitiveness. Unit production costs are down 11 per cent over the past 10 years, while costs have risen in almost every other advanced nation. The differences in labour costs compared with China are narrowing. Consider the automotive sector. In 2005, Detroit’s hourly labour costs were 40 per cent higher than at US plants owned by foreign carmakers, according to research by Evercore Partners. Today these costs are virtually identical and the big three carmakers have regained market share. Furthermore, personal savings rates are up to 4 per cent – from near zero before the crisis – and are expected to stabilise. This will spur higher levels of private investment and even further productivity gains. Finally (and more speculatively), the US may surprise itself and the world by rectifying its deficit and debt problems. If Barack Obama is re-elected, he may allow the George W. Bush tax cuts to expire at the end of 2012. That step could force Congress to the negotiating table and produce a large, balanced deficit-reduction programme that would boost confidence, the stock market and private investment

#### Government spending on incentives for renewables destroys jobs

Alvarez et al 9 (Gabriel Calzada Álvarez PhD, Associate Professor of Applied Economics at Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, in Madrid; Raquel Merino Jara, Associate Professor of Economics at Universidad Rey Juan Carlos; Juan Ramón Rallo Julián, Professor of Economics at Universidad Rey Juan Carlos; José Ignacio García Bielsa, Mining Engineer, former Director of RWE Trading/Solutions, responsible for the development of their energy business in Spain and Portugal; “Study of the effects on employment of public aid to renewable energy sources,” March 2009, www.juandemariana.org/pdf/090327-employment-public-aid-renewable.pdf)

Finally, it is worth considering the distribution of the destroyed jobs across the economy. Obviously, the specific productive sectors affected will depend on how the government finances the subsidies to renewable energy. We can basically separate the approaches intro three groups: increases in energy rates, increase in taxes or an increase in public debt.¶ The first method aims to correct the rate deficit, which in part is caused by the subsidies to the renewables, evidenced by a higher future electric cost. According to the National Energy Commission, the price of a comprehensive energy rate (paid by the end consumer) in Spain would have to be increased 31% to begin to repay the historic debt generated by this deficit.58¶ It is obvious that, if the rates were to increase by 31% — or by a lower percentage which, while it would not eliminate the deficit, it would reduce it—the energy intensive companies would suffer a very pronounced decline in their profitability and would have to reduce or eliminate operations in Spain. In our country, the sectors that consume the most energy are metallurgy, non-metallic mining and food processing, beverage and tobacco.From the groups above, it is worth highlighting that some of the most affected industries59 would be producers of basic iron and steel products (in Spain, it consumed €470.77 million), basic chemical products (€382.13 million), plastics (€297.18 million), manufacture and first transformation of precious metals (€280.58 million) as well as producers of cement, lime and plaster (€202.22 million).¶ Unsurprisingly, the steel mills, the most electricity-intensive sector, have already been hurt by the high prices of electricity in Spain, exactly as the Acerinox example discussed below.¶ It is possible, of course, as it is indeed the case today in Spain, that the administration may try to prevent the most energy-intensive companies from leaving by bestowing upon them the privilege of paying a lower rate than the rest of the consumers pay. In Spain, it happens with the G4 rate, which is being taken advantage of by companies such as Arcelor Mittal, Asturiana de Zinc and Alcoa. But, as we have said, this privilege exacerbates the rate deficit, which, ultimately, must be financed through higher prices for the rest of non-privileged consumers or for the taxpayer.¶ And this leads us to the second possibility that we will mention to finance the rate deficit: an increase in taxation.¶ This method reduces the amount of income that consumers or businesses have available, reducing consumption and/or investment. For example, the average annuity payable to renewables is equivalent to 4.35% of all VAT collected, 3.45% of the household income tax, or 5.6% of the corporate income tax for 2007.60 Regardless of whether the increase impacts consumption or investment more, the most affected sectors of the economy will be those with a greater pro-cyclical productions (such as automotive).¶ Finally, the subsidy to pay for “green jobs” or renewables could be financed by issuing public debt. This strategy poses a similar effect to the previous method but spread out over time (since it implies higher future taxes). However, debt has an additional effect: a restriction of present available credit that a business could use to refinance its debt or undertake new investments. Thus, employees of the most leveraged businesses or of investment projects that would need cheaper credit to be undertaken will suffer the costs of the renewables.¶ It is not possible to directly translate Spain’s experience with similar exactitude or confidence, and claim that the U.S. should expect a loss of from 6.6 million to eleven million jobs as a direct consequence were the promise to create 3 to 5 million “green jobs” met (in addition to the jobs lost due to the opportunity cost of private capital employed in renewable energy), although the study clearly reveals that if President Obama would dedicate the massive resources needed to create those 3 to 5 million jobs, the U.S. should certainly expect its results to follow such a tendency.

#### Wind plants produce only a few temporary jobs

Boone 5 (Jon, PhD, Environmentalist, and Formal Intervenor in Wind Installation Hearings, “DIRECT TESTIMONY OF JON BOONE BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND”, http://www.windaction.org/?module=uploads&func=download&fileId=162, Acc: 8/2/12, og)

Very few permanent jobs will likely be created— perhaps a couple of low wage¶ maintenance employees. According to a report by the National Renewable Energy Lab on¶ windplant jobs, the national average is one maintenance employee for every 12-15¶ turbines. A 20 turbine windplant in Meyersdale, Pennsylvania now employs only two¶ maintenance employees. The claim here that four permanent jobs will be created appears¶ generous. But even if it were true, this is a very small return relative to a $40 -50 million¶ capital project.¶ 13¶ During construction, a few local security guards and some local earth moving crews may¶ be hired for a few months, while the bulk of construction will probably be completed by¶ non-local labor, since many huge turbines are actually manufactured in Europe(often as¶ subcontracts to US firms like GE) with warranties likely serviced by the manufacturer¶ and its employees. A recent study by the Iowa Department of Natural Resources on the¶ "Top of Iowa" windplant showed that, of the 200 total construction jobs, only 20 were¶ local—and all disappeared within six months.

#### Matthews talks about an extension, not permanent extension being key to industry. No reason why SQUO doesn’t solve for this.

#### Wind turbines devastate the housing and property market

Kielisch 9 (Kurt, President, Appraisal Group One, company specializing in forensic appraisal, eminent domain, stigmatized properties and valuation research, “WIND TURBINE IMPACT STUDY”, <http://docs.wind-watch.org/AGO-WIND-TURBINE-IMPACT-STUDY.pdf>, Acc: 7/31/12, og)

The impact of a wind turbine close to a property “takes a property of substantial value ¶ and takes away all of the characteristics that are the strengths of that property,” Bounds said. ¶ “The visual impact takes away value. The noise takes away value. The property owners ¶ complain that the wind turbines take away value and there is no way for them to escape.”¶ 124¶ In Maryland, a wind farm developer demonstrated the diminution of value when it ¶ bought two abutting properties to their wind farm and were unable to sell them for close to ¶ their purchase price. They bought one property for $104,447.50 and sold it for $65,000. They ¶ bought another property for $101,049.00 and shortly thereafter sold it for only $20,000.¶ 125¶ Studies have shown that fear of wind farms can negatively affect purchase prices. In his ¶ February 2009 study, “Impact of Wind Turbines on Market Value of Texas Rural Land,” ¶ Appraiser Derry Gardner studied 350 acres of premium ranch land that were put on the market ¶ for $2.1 million. A prospective buyer agreed to the sale price but backed out when the seller ¶ disclosed a 27-turbine wind farm within a 1½ mile radius from the property. The seller ¶ discounted the land by 25%, but the buyer still declined to purchase. As of the study’s ¶ publication, after two years on the market there has been little interest in the property despite ¶ its other positive characteristics.¶ 126¶ Independent studies have shown an average diminution of value up to -37% when the ¶ turbine is on the property; up to -26% average diminution for properties within 1,056 – 2,112 ¶ feet of a turbine; and up to -25% average diminution for properties within 1.8 miles of turbines. ¶ Properties can also suffer an additional 15-25% diminution in value due to infrastructure ¶ construction (clearing, blasting, digging, etc.), high voltage transmission power lines (HVTL) to ¶ transport generated electricity, substations, additional traffic for servicing turbines and HVTLs, ¶ and additional roads.¶ 127¶ ¶ Wind farms have the potential to impact local property values.¶ 128¶ As the number of ¶ houses near to, or with a view of the installation increases, the likelihood of aesthetic or ¶ economic objections seems to increase.¶ 129

#### Housing key to the economy

Reuters 10 (“What's left to fix housing market?”, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/03/21/businesspro-us-economy-weekahead-outlook-idUSTRE62K1G420100321>, Acc: 8/3/12, og)

Housing was at the heart of the global recession, and plays a crucial role in the U.S. economy. During the boom years, rising home values left Americans feeling flush, and they were able to tap home equity to boost spending. The bust has taken a $10 trillion bite out of household wealth, and spending has suffered.¶ As poorly as the housing market has performed so far this year, some economists think it may soon get worse. The tax credit, which was expanded and extended late last year, expires in April, the Fed is wrapping up its mortgage asset purchases by the end of this month, and millions of homeowners are behind on payments, leaving them vulnerable to foreclosure, which tends to drive down prices of neighboring homes.¶ Sal Guatieri, an economist with BMO Capital Markets in Toronto, said the economic recovery was grinding along instead of gaining momentum, and a "precarious" housing market was a big reason why.¶ "Witness February's 6 percent pullback in (housing) starts and a surprising setback in homebuilder confidence in March," he said. "This wasn't supposed to happen until after the homebuyer tax credit expired in April."¶ WHAT MORE?¶ The tax credit has been a pit of a puzzle. It spurred huge demand late last year, when buyers rushed to close deals before the originally scheduled expiration. Congress then extended and expanded the credit, but the second installment has not generated the same demand.¶ As for the Fed's efforts, between cutting interest rates to near zero and buying up mortgage-related assets, the central bank has successfully pushed mortgage rates down. The average rate on a 30-year mortgage has hovered near 5 percent in recent weeks, but that has not been enough to spark much activity.¶ What happens to rates when the Fed wraps up its asset-buying program at the end of this month is a big question mark. Fed officials expect minimal market reaction, but the central bank has never embarked on such an ambitious buying spree and cannot be certain what will happen when it ends.¶ Some economists think this uncertainty may be one reason why the Fed signaled last week that it would keep its benchmark interest rate near zero for the foreseeable future. Perhaps officials want to see how the housing market behaves before dropping a hint that borrowing costs may soon rise.¶ Economists at IHS Global Insight offered other reasons for concern about the housing market's path.¶ "Economic conditions remain dire, with unemployment likely to remain stubbornly near 10 percent for some time," the firm wrote in a quarterly housing market report on Friday. "In addition, the federal tax credit for first-time buyers played a significant and temporary role in bolstering the market."¶ The report found that the national housing market was 8.9 percent undervalued at the end of 2009, and not a single metropolitan area was considered "extremely overvalued." Contrast that with 2005, the height of the housing bubble, when 52 metro areas were judged to be extremely overvalued.¶ Since that peak, 10 metro areas have seen home prices fall by more than half, and 31 have recorded drops of more than 40 percent. That is a big reason why household wealth has dropped by $10 trillion since 2007.¶

#### Renewable subsidies hurt the economy – they crowd out jobs and capital investment in other industries and lower overall economic potential.

Frondel et al 9 (Dr. Manuel Frondel, Ph.D. in economics, professor for Energy Economics and Applied Econometrics at Ruhr-Universität Bochum, chief of the Environment and Resources Research Division at Rhine-Westphalia Institute for Economic Research; Nolan Ritter, Economics PhD candidate and researcher with Rhine-Westphalia Institute for Economic Research; Prof. Colin Vance, Ph.D in Economics, Adjunct Professor of Quantitative Methods with Jacobs University Bremen; “Economic impacts from the promotion of renewable energies: The German experience”, Final report – October 2009, www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/germany/Germany\_Study\_-\_FINAL.pdf)

While employment projections in the renewable sector convey seemingly impres- sive prospects for gross job growth, they typically obscure the broader implications for economic welfare by omitting any accounting of off-setting impacts. These impacts include, but are not limited to, job losses from crowding out of cheaper forms of conventional energy generation, indirect impacts on upstream industries, additional job losses from the drain on economic activity precipitated by higher electricity prices, private consumers’ overall loss of purchasing power due to higher electricity prices, and diverting funds from other, possibly more beneficial investment.¶ Proponents of renewable energies often regard the requirement for more workers to produce a given amount of energy as a benefit, failing to recognize that this ¶ lowers the output potential of the economy and is hence counterproductive to net job creation. Significant research shows that initial employment benefits from re- newable policies soon turn negative as additional costs are incurred. Trade- and other assumptions in those studies claiming positive employment turn out to be unsupportable.¶ In the end, Germany’s PV promotion has become a subsidization regime that, on a per-worker basis, has reached a level that far exceeds average wages, with per- worker subsidies as high as 175,000 € (US $ 240,000).¶ It is most likely that whatever jobs are created by renewable energy promotion would vanish as soon as government support is terminated, leaving only Germany’s export sector to benefit from the possible continuation of renewables support in other countries such as the US.¶

#### Plan hurts the economy – increased electricity costs cause massive unemployment

Zycher 12 (Benjamin, Pacific Research Institute Senior Fellow, Martin V. Smith School of Business and Economics adjunct professor, associate in the Intelligence Community Associates Program of the Office of Economic Analysis, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, U.S. Department of State, former senior staff economist for the President's Council of Economic Advisers, March 27, “Renewable Energy Subsidies Should Be Abandoned,” <http://www.finance.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Zycher%20Senate%20Finance%20renewables%20incentives%20testimony%203-27-12.pdf>, d/a 8-1-12, ads)

Because renewable electricity generation is more costly than conventional¶ generation, policies driving a shift toward heavier reliance upon the former would¶ increase aggregate electricity costs, and thus reduce electricity use below levels that¶ would prevail otherwise. The 2007 EIA projection of total U.S. electricity consumption¶ in 2030 was about 5.17 million gWh.29 The latest EIA projection for 2030 is about 4.31¶ million gWh, a decline of about 16.6 percent.30 The change presumably reflects some¶ combination of assumptions about structural economic shifts, increased conservation, substitution of renewables for some conventional generation, and a price increase from¶ about 8.8 cents per kilowatt-hour to 9.0 cents (in 2009 dollars).¶ It would be surprising if that reduction in total U.S. electricity consumption failed¶ to have some employment effect. Figure 1 displays data on percent changes in real GDP,¶ electricity consumption, and employment for the period 1970 through 2009.31 It is obvious from the aggregate trends that electricity use and labor employment¶ are complements rather than substitutes; the simple correlation between the percent¶ changes for the two is 0.61, meaning, crudely, that a percent change in one tends to be¶ observed with a 0.61 percent change in the other, in the same direction. The simple¶ GDP/electricity and GDP/employment correlations are 0.67 and 0.85, respectively.

#### No reason they solve for the entirety of manufacturing. Only create 37,000 jobs.

#### Manufacturing decline inevitable and it’s not key to the economy

MGI 12, Mckinsey Global Institute – research branch of the Mckinsey management consulting company, “Trading myths: Addressing misconceptions about trade, jobs, and competitiveness”, May, http://www.mckinsey.com/insights/mgi/research/productivity\_competitiveness\_and\_growth/six\_myths\_about\_trade

Myth: Mature economies are losing out to emerging markets in trade and thus face increasing trade deficits. Reality: The trade balance of mature economies has remained largely stable in the aggregate and even begun to improve. There are wide variations between individual countries, but no evidence supports claims of a wholesale deterioration of the trade balance between the mature and emerging economies over the past decade. Myth: Manufactured goods drive deteriorating trade deficits. Reality: Imports of primary resources, whose prices have been rising sharply, are the largest negative contributor to the trade balance of mature economies. In 2008, mature economies ran a 3.3 percent of GDP trade deficit in primary resources but a 0.5 percent of GDP surplus in manufactured goods and specifically a 1.6 percent surplus in knowledge-intensive manufacturing. Some individual mature countries run trade deficits in knowledge-intensive manufacturing. Myth: Trade is at the heart of the loss of manufacturing jobs. Reality: Changes in the composition of demand and ongoing productivity increases are the main reasons for the decline in the number of such jobs in mature economies. The share of manufacturing in these countries’ total employment is bound to decline further, from 12 percent today to less than 10 percent in 2030, according to our analysis. MGI finds that trade or offshoring are responsible for the loss of around 20 percent of the 5.8 million US manufacturing jobs eliminated between 2000 and 2010.

### Energy Leadership

#### Non-unique - American leadership now – reducing emissions

Roberts 12 (David Roberts is a staff writer for Grist, writing about Energy, politics, and more, July 17th, U.S. leads the world in cutting CO2 emissions — so why aren’t we talking about it?, http://grist.org/climate-policy/u-s-leads-the-world-in-cutting-co2-emissions-so-why-arent-we-talking-about-it/)

Contrary to popular belief, the U.S. is making progress on climate change.¶ We have cut our carbon emissions more than any other country in the world in recent years — 7.7 percent since 2006. U.S. emissions fell 1.9 percent last year and are projected to fall 1.9 percent again this year, which will put us back at 1996 levels. It will not be easy to achieve the reductions Obama promised in Copenhagen — 17 percent (from 2005 levels) by 2020 — but that goal no longer looks out of reach, even in the absence of comprehensive legislation.

#### No reason why the international signal sent by the plan is enough to overcome self-motivated interests of other countries.

#### Can’t solve environmental leadership – international skepticism

Victor 8 (David G., law professor at Stanford's Program on Energy and Sustainable Development and adjunct senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations."The next U.S. President won't be green", 5-1-08 <http://www.newsweek.com/id/135073/>)

The U.S. record on international environmental issues is highly uneven for reasons that have little to do with George W. Bush's leadership. His administration has been tarred across the planet for reckless leadership on international environmental issues. (Its actual record, while dreadful, is not a uniform failure. It has done useful things in a few areas, such as a thoughtful initiative to help conserve forests in the Congo Basin.) But the signature of Bush's reckless foreign policy in this area, his decision to withdraw from the Kyoto treaty barely three months after taking office, actually has its roots in the Clinton administration. Clinton was highly committed to environmental issues and his vice president, Al Gore, was an even more passionate leader. Their zealous diplomats negotiated a treaty that was larded with commitments that the United States never could have honored. The promise to cut U.S. emissions 7 percent below 1990 levels is a good example. Because actual emissions were rising steadily, it would have been impractical to turn them around in time to meet the 2012 Kyoto deadline. The U.S. Congress never could have passed the requisite legislation, and no leader in the White House could have changed that voting arithmetic. The U.S. withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol was inevitable. ¶ What does this mean for America's credibility in the world? When the American president promises, should anyone listen?¶ Increasingly, other countries are learning that the answer is no—because American leaders have a habit of promising a lot more than they can deliver. Environmental issues are particularly prone to overpromising, and not just by the United States. Europe, too, is fresh with unrealistic claims by political leaders. The European Union, for example, has launched negotiations for the post-Kyoto agreement by claiming that Europeans will cut greenhouse-gas emissions 20 percent to 30 percent by 2020—an outrageous goal considering that most of Europe (with the exception mainly of Britain and Germany) will fail to meet their existing targets, and emissions are actually rising. Europe as a whole would blow through its Kyoto targets if not for its generous use of a scheme that lets them take credit for overseas investment in low-carbon technologies—despite mounting evidence that many of those overseas credits don't actually deliver real reductions in emissions. Smart politicians know that the benefits lie mainly in the promising today and not in the delivery long in the future. ¶ Ironically, the more enthusiastic the leader, the less credibility he or she has. While the Clinton administration was busy negotiating the Kyoto treaty, the U.S. Senate was passing a resolution, 95 to 0, to signal that it would reject any treaty that didn't contain specific commitments by developing countries to control their effluent of greenhouse gases. Since the developing countries had already rejected that outcome the Clinton administration had little room to maneuver. The great reversal in U.S. "leadership" on global warming over the last year—signaled by President Bush's speech three weeks ago embracing the need for limits on greenhouse gases—came from the people rather than top leaders. Public concern about global warming is rising (though it will be checked by the even more acute worries on the economy and war). The Bush speech was more a recognition that serious efforts to develop climate legislation are already well underway without his stamp. Many states are already planning to regulate greenhouse gases. The Senate has a serious bill on this subject scheduled for floor debate starting June 2. Its sponsors are Joe Lieberman (the former running mate of Al Gore but now alienated from the Democratic Party for his overly independent views) and John Warner (a Republican who has no former track record on global warming). These are ideal leaders for this issue because often it takes the fresh faces focused on building bipartisan majorities to get things done in America.¶ Perhaps the most interesting signal that American presidents are losing the ability to lead is an effort to rewrite the rules that would govern environmental treaties under American law. Committed environmentalists have rightly noted that America's Constitution requires a two-thirds vote for treaties in the Senate. That standard is nearly impossible to meet because one third of the Senate is usually opposed to anything interesting. Serious efforts are now underway to reinterpret environmental "treaties" as agreements between Congress and the president, which would require only a majority vote. Most trade agreements, for example, travel under this more lax standard and also have special voting rules that require Congress to approve the agreement as a whole package rather than pick it apart piece by piece. Rebranding and changing voting rules makes it easier to approve agreements, boosting the credibility of the president to negotiate agreements that serve the country's interest.

#### India won’t stop polluting

McCarthy 11 (Michael, India emerges as chief opponent of a new global-warming treaty, December 5th, the Independent's Environment Editor, is one of Britain's leading writers on the environment and the natural world, http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/india-emerges-as-chief-opponent-of-a-new-globalwarming-treaty-6272332.html)

India is now the leading opponent of a new comprehensive global-warming treaty, it became clear at the weekend after the first week of negotiations at the UN Climate Conference in Durban, South Africa.¶ The world's second most populous country has resolutely set its face against a fresh climate deal that at some stage would involve every country in the world cutting its carbon emissions in an effort to bring climate change under control.¶ The Indians are refusing to approve anything that might put a brake on their economy, now expanding with growth in 2010 estimated at 10.4 per cent. Its carbon emissions are growing at more than 9 per cent a year, the fastest of any major nation, and the country has shot up to become the world's third biggest carbon emitter, after China and the US.¶ But the Indians are relying on this growth to take hundreds of millions of their nearly 1.2 billion people out of poverty and they want nothing to do with curbing these emissions.

#### They US and China won’t come to a climate agreement - negotiators don’t want it and no way the plan changes the minds of the delegation members

Bello and Solon 12 (Walden, Foreign Policy In Focus columnist Walden Bello is a member of the House of Representatives of the Philippines and a senior analyst at the Bangkok-based think tank Focus on the Global South; Pablo Solon, former Bolivian Ambassador to the UN, “Breaking the Climate Stalemate”, 9/12, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/walden-bello/breaking-the-climate-stal\_b\_1873867.html)

In reality, both the United States and China want a weaker climate agreement. In the United States, influential politicians and corporations are not committed to deep real cuts. And China's leaders realize that the longer they can put off a legally binding agreement, the better, since China will be far ahead in GHG emissions in a few years and a weak agreement will be in its interest.¶ The climate talks stalemate is not therefore the result of a disagreement between the two biggest powers, but rather of a common desire not to be obliged to change their policies of consumption, production, and gaining control of natural resources around the world.¶ The position of the U.S. and Chinese delegations, as well as those from many other countries, reflects more the concerns of their elites than of their people. In China, there are massive protests against environmentally destructive development projects. In the United States and Canada, the movement against the exploitation of tar sands is the expression of a civil society that wants to stop polluting our planet.¶ The elites of emerging economies are using the just demand of "historical responsibility" or "common but differentiated responsibility" in order to steal time and secure a weak binding agreement. The deliberate prolonging of the stalemate means allowing business as usual. Given that this strategy has led to a dead end, it is imperative that civil society regain its independent voice and articulate a position distinct from that of the Group of 77 and China.

#### Warming doesn’t cause extinction – newest climate simulations

Stampf 8 (Olaf, Staff Writer for Spiegel Online, “Not the End of the World as We Know It,” May 5th,[http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,481684,00.html](http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0%2C1518%2C481684%2C00.html))\

But even this moderate warming would likely have far fewer apocalyptic consequences than many a prophet of doom would have us believe. For one thing, the more paleontologists and geologists study the history of the earth's climate, the more clearly do they recognize just how much temperatures have fluctuated in both directions in the past. Even major fluctuations appear to be completely natural phenomena. Additionally, some environmentalists doubt that the large-scale extinction of animals and plants some have predicted will in fact come about. "A warmer climate helps promote species diversity," says Munich zoologist Josef Reichholf. Also, more detailed simulations have allowed climate researchers to paint a considerably less dire picture than in the past -- gone is the talk of giant storms, the melting of the Antarctic ice shield and flooding of major cities. Improved regionalized models also show that climate change can bring not only drawbacks, but also significant benefits, especially in northern regions of the world where it has been too cold and uncomfortable for human activity to flourish in the past. However it is still a taboo to express this idea in public. For example, countries like Canada and Russia can look forward to better harvests and a blossoming tourism industry, and the only distress the Scandinavians will face is the guilty conscience that could come with benefiting from global warming.

#### Their wind power solves warming evidence is from Greenpeace. Not qualified to make a scientific claim.

#### Can’t solve warming – its too late

Hamilton 10 – Professor of Public Ethics @ ANU

Clive Hamilton, Professor of Public Ethics in Australia, 2010, “Requiem for a Species: Why We Resist the Truth About Climate Change,” pg 27-28

The conclusion that, even if we act promptly and resolutely, the world is on a path to reach 650 ppm is almost too frightening to accept. That level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere will be associated with warming of about 4°C by the end of the century, well above the temperature associated with tipping points that would trigger further warming.58 So it seems that even with the most optimistic set of assumptions—the ending of deforestation, a halving of emissions associated with food production, global emissions peaking in 2020 and then falling by 3 per cent a year for a few decades—we have no chance of preventing emissions rising well above a number of critical tipping points that will spark uncontrollable climate change. The Earth's climate would enter a chaotic era lasting thousands of years before natural processes eventually establish some sort of equilibrium. Whether human beings would still be a force on the planet, or even survive, is a moot point. One thing seems certain: there will be far fewer of us. These conclusions arc alarming, co say the least, but they are not alarmist. Rather than choosing or interpreting numbers to make the situation appear worse than it could be, following Kevin Anderson and Alice Bows I have chosen numbers that err on the conservative side, which is to say numbers that reflect a more buoyant assessment of the possibilities. A more neutral assessment of how the global community is likely to respond would give an even bleaker assessment of our future. For example, the analysis excludes non-CO2, emissions from aviation and shipping. Including them makes the task significantly harder, particularly as aviation emissions have been growing rapidly and are expected to continue to do so as there is no foreseeable alternative to severely restricting the number of flights.v' And any realistic assessment of the prospects for international agreement would have global emissions peaking closer to 2030 rather than 2020. The last chance to reverse the trajectory of global emissions by 2020 was forfeited at the Copenhagen climate conference in December 2009. As a consequence, a global response proportionate to the problem was deferred for several years.

#### Single issues don’t spillover on China cooperation

Clarke 11 [Visiting Research Fellow at the East Asian Institute (EAI), National University of Singapore, 11, Ryan, “Maintaining Baseline Stability in China-U.S. Relations: Alliance Structures, Rethinking Flashpoints, and Identifying New Shared Interests,” EAI Working Paper No. 158, 9-16, <http://www.eai.nus.edu.sg/EWP158.pdf>, RSR]

In recent years we have witnessed an explosion of analysis on both the future trajectories of China as well as the United States and the nature of the interactions between them with prognoses varying wildly. Some boldly predict a myopic, conflict free future in China-U.S. relations where America recognizes the inevitability of a rising China and adjusts its grand strategy, military deployments, and trade policy in order to clear the way for this predetermined geopolitical shift. For China, it obligingly adjusts its key institutions, market regulations, and foreign policy practices to be in line with the established norms of the heretofore largely undefined yet often cited “international community.” Others openly voice fears of a repeat of the events that rocked human civilization in the 19th and 20th centuries with terms such as security dilemma, security spiral, hard balancing, nationalism, and others returning into the everyday vernacular. Those who subscribe to the latter paradigm over-extrapolate from seemingly individual issues, such as Taiwan (which is actually an artifact of history), to make broad assessments of the overall direction of the China-U.S. relationship. “Test case”, “precedent”, and the like are now applied to what have previously been regarded as rather unitary issues. If defense-centric analysis becomes the dominant mode, then we had better prepare ourselves to see a constant stream of security dilemmas and escalations with no exit. No one actually desires such an outcome. This study seeks to make a humble contribution by providing a balanced, realistic, and policy-oriented analysis of the most pressing contemporary issues in the relationship between Washington and Beijing. Through this work, this study aims to highlight that while many ingrained, structural issues (Taiwan, Korean Peninsula, American alliance structures, etc…) continue to pose challenges to the relationship, there are still frontier areas in which shared interests can rationally be identified and expanded upon. There are indeed many challenges that China and America face in the future management of their relationship and there is ample space for miscalculation and escalation with unpredictable results. However, this study seeks to break out of the “wait-and-see” approaches which characterize so much analyses in Asia as well as the West.

#### Relations solve nothing – China doesn’t work with the US.

Blumenthal, Resident Fellow at AEI, ‘11

[Dan, Current commissioner and former vice chairman of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, where he directs efforts to monitor, investigate, and provide recommendations on the national security implications of the economic relationship between the two countries. Previously, he was senior director for China, Taiwan, and Mongolia in the Secretary of Defense's Office of International Security Affairs and practiced law in New York prior to his government service. At AEI, in addition to his work on the national security implications of U.S.-Sino relations, he coordinates the Tocqueville on China project, which examines the underlying civic culture of post-Mao China. Mr. Blumenthal also contributes to AEI's Asian Outlook series and is a research associate with the National Asia Research Program, 10-31-11, The top ten unicorns of China policy”, AEI

http://www.aei.org/article/foreign-and-defense-policy/regional/asia/the-top-ten-unicorns-of-china-policy/]

9) We need China's help to solve global problems. This is further down on my list because it is not really a fantastical unicorn. It is true. What is a fantasy is that China will be helpful. We do need China to disarm North Korea. They do not want to, and North Korea is now a nuclear power. The same may soon be true with Iran. The best we can get in our diplomacy with China is to stop Beijing from being less helpful. It is a fact that the global problems would be easier to manage with Chinese help. However, China actually contributing to global order is a unicorn.

#### Can’t solve warming - deforestation

Howden 7(Daniel Howden, The Independent “Deforestation: The Hidden Cause of Global Warming” 14 May 2007. DOA August 15, 12 sphinx.tsf.hu/new/iny/files/1645.doc)

**Most people think of forests** only in terms of the CO2 they absorb. The rainforests of the Amazon, the Congo basin and Indonesia are thought of **as the lungs of the planet.** But **the destruction of those forests will in the next four years** alone, in the words of Sir Nicholas Stern, **pump more CO2 into the atmosphere than every flight in the history of aviation to at least 2025.¶** Indonesia became the third-largest emitter of greenhouse gases in the world last week. Following close behind is Brazil. Neither nation has heavy industry on a comparable scale with the EU, India or Russia and yet they comfortably outstrip all other countries, except the United States and China.¶ What both countries do have in common is tropical forest that is being cut and burned with staggering swiftness. Smoke stacks visible from space climb into the sky above both countries, while satellite images capture similar destruction from the Congo basin, across the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Central African Republic and the Republic of Congo.¶ According to the latest audited figures from 2003, **two billion tons of CO2 enters the atmosphere** every year **from deforestation.** That destruction amounts to 50 million acres - or an area the size of England, Wales and Scotland felled **annually.¶** The remaining standing forest is calculated to contain 1,000 billion tons of carbon, or double what is already in the atmosphere.¶ As the GCP's report concludes: **"If we lose forests, we lose the fight against climate change."**

#### UN Climate negotiations fail – no one cares about global climate treaties

Cohen 11 (Steven Cohen¶ Executive Director, Columbia University’s Earth, Understanding the Failure of the UN's Climate Talks¶ Posted: 12/12/11 09:12 AM ET Institutehttp://www.huffingtonpost.com/steven-cohen/understanding-the-failure\_b\_1142999.html)

It is getting to be a pretty familiar routine by now. Thousands of people from around the world gather to negotiate and influence global climate policy. Rhetoric flies for a week or two, negotiators bargain long into the night, and a modest, unenforceable agreement is finally brought up for a vote. At this point, it is pretty obvious that the United Nations climate negotiation process may serve as a useful agenda-setting mechanism, but it is no way to make global public policy. For all but a small number of trade, environmental and security issues, it is impossible to formulate meaningful global public policy.¶ Unfortunately, climate change is not one of the issues amenable to global agreement.¶ To understand why these talks are not succeeding, it is useful to think about the evolution of environmental policy and its gradual movement from the fringe of the policy agenda to its center. When the environmental movement begins in the early 20th century it was characterized by a concern for wilderness preservation and identified with naturalists like Teddy Roosevelt and John Muir. The environment was a spiritual quest associated with nostalgia for a pre-industrial America. Protecting the environment was a nice, but not particularly essential task for the political and economic elites running America. This culminates in the 1960's and 1970's with enactment of laws regulating air, water and waste. At this point the environmental policy issue might be thought of something akin to keeping your house neat and presentable for visitors. It was embarrassing when Cleveland's Cuyahoga River caught fire. When Apollo 8 showed us those incredible pictures of the entire fragile blue planet from outer space, it all became codified: Nice people took care of their home planet.¶ In the late 1970's, the Love Canal toxic waste dump crisis taught America about the issue of hazardous waste. We learned about the connection of air pollution to cancer and other illnesses. In the 1980's the environment evolved into an issue of public health. It wasn't just that nice people tried to make sure they kept the planet looking pretty, but environmental pollution was poison that could make you sick or even kill you. With the emergence of this health dimension in the last two decades of the 20th century, the environmental issue moved a little off the fringes of the policy agenda, a little bit closer to the place where important public policy is made.¶ If we fast forward to today, in the second decade of the 21st century, the environmental issue has morphed into the issue of economic and environmental sustainability. The environment has assumed a new place at the center of community, corporate, and national policymaking. It is no longer a second-tier issue relegated to those "environmental types," but a key issue affecting profits, economic growth and political power. The U.N. climate policy process was designed when the environment was not yet a central issue to the power elite. The very fact that the U.N. was able to take the lead on this process is an indication that it was not considered a central issue by the world's political and economic powers. As the implications of global climate policy for nations and industry became clearer, the U.N. decision making venue became increasingly irrelevant. Unfortunately, no other venue has been developed to replace it.

#### Defense blocks cooperation on climate change

Sacramento Bee 7 [U.S. rift with Europe: G-8 should stay focused on climate change, lexis]

Global climate change should top the agenda of this week's G-8 summit of leaders from the United States, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia and Great Britain -- plus Brazil, Mexico, China, India and South Africa. ¶ But U.S. proposals for placing missile defense systems in Poland and the Czech Republic (dubbed "son of Star Wars") has dominated discussions leading up to the talks -- and, unfortunately, have the potential to derail the push to fight global warming. The United States will have to take the lead to elevate the one issue and defuse the other.¶ The need for action is urgent. The Earth is rapidly reaching tipping points that will make it more difficult to head off dramatic changes in global warming in the future. And the Kyoto Protocol, where nations committed to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, expires in 2012. The United States did not sign that agreement.¶ As German Chancellor Angela Merkel, chair of the G-8 and host of the summit, has said on climate change, "If the United States doesn't move, then others will also wait and see." Merkel wants the G-8 summit to agree to set long-term goals to cut greenhouse gas emissions to 50 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2050 -- and for this framework to be a new basis for an international agreement replacing the Kyoto Protocol. It would be nice to see such a landmark deal come out of the summit.

#### Economic factors block cooperation on climate change

Christian Science Monitor 7 [Warming's bad guys made good, lexis]

Leaders of the world's two largest emitters of greenhouse gases, the United States and China, laid out plans in the past week to reduce their impact on the planet. But these two giants on the global scene also suggested two won'ts: They won't be bound to action by other nations and they won't hurt their own economies. ¶ Even with those caveats, the fact that the Bush administration and China's top governing body, the State Council, acted just before the G-8 summit of industrial leaders this week is a healthy sign.¶ They now recognize their interests, and perhaps the welfare of all nations - especially poor ones - are at stake. They should be welcomed for joining the effort to save the global "commons" that is the atmosphere and oceans.

## 2NC

## CP

### A2: Perm

#### 1. Perm still links to the net benefits – elections, the picking winners turn, and the subsidies kill the economy turns - they still require the government to provide incentives for energy production.

#### 2. Permutation is worse - causes crowd-out—decreases domestic investments and innovations

De Rugy 12 (Veronique, Senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center, "Assessing the Department of Energy Loan Guarantee Program", 6/19 mercatus.org/publication/assessing-department-energy-loan-guarantee-program)

4. Crowding Out To some (for example, those lucky enough to receive the loan guarantee), government money may seem to be free. But it isn’t, of course. The government has to borrow the money on the open market too. This additional borrowing comes from Americans’ savings, as does the money that Americans invest in the private sector’s growth. There comes a point when there just aren’t enough savings to satisfy both masters. In other words, when government runs a deficit to finance its preferred projects, it can affect private sector access to capital, and lead to a reduction in domestic investment. Economists use the term “crowding out” to describe the contraction in economic activity associated with deficit- financed spending.[30] In addition, the competition between public and private borrowing raises interest rates for all borrowers, including the government, making it more expensive for domestic investors to start or complete projects. Over time, this could mean that American companies will build fewer factories, cut back on research and development, and generate fewer innovations. As a result, our nation’s future earning prospects will dim, and our future living standards could suffer.

#### 3. Permutation is net worse – we’ve proven reasons why market subsidies are bad – why would you choose market subsidies and cap and trade when just cap and trade is better.

### A2: Links to Elections – Obama Bad

#### Cap and trade not percieved

Financial Times 9 (http://blogs.ft.com/energy-source/2009/12/03/cap-and-trade-perennially-unpopular/#ixzz29imRe8OT)

Yet while the majority in most countries supports action on climate change, surveys suggest that attitudes to cap-and-trade are more ambivalent. Yet an HSBC survey last year showed that carbon trading simply doesn’t rate highly on people’s radars, when thinking about government action on climate change:

#### Cap and trade unpopular

Mark 10 (David, a senior editor at POLITICO, which he joined October 2006, Cap-and-trade political kryptonite for Democrats?, http://www.politico.com/arena/energy/)

POLITICO reports that over two dozen lawmakers who voted for the 2009 cap and trade bill lost on Nov. 2, ushering in a new class of Republicans who doubt global warming science and want to upend President Barack Obama's environmental and energy policies.¶ Longtime Rep. Rick Boucher, representing the Southwest Virginia coal region, lost his seat. "I don't think there's any question about it, cap and trade was the issue in the campaign," Andy Wright, a former Boucher chief of staff, told POLITICO. "If Rick had voted no, he wouldn't have had a serious contest."

#### Voters oppose cap and trade

National Federation of Independent Business 10 (NFIB is the nation's leading small business association, with offices in Washington, D.C. and all 50 state capitals. Founded in 1943 as a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization, NFIB gives small and independent business owners a voice in shaping the public policy issues that affect their business, http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/state-polls-show-voters-opposed-to-federal-cap-and-trade-system-82261182.html)

WASHINGTON, Jan. 21 /PRNewswire-USNewswire/ -- On the heels of two national surveys showing small business owner and voter opposition to a cap-and-trade program, the National Federation of Independent Business today released 16 state-based surveys further highlighting the political unpopularity and economic uncertainty behind the proposed program. The research was designed to question state and national participants regarding economic, employment and other political concerns pertaining to Congressional action on energy and environmental policies.¶ "Voters have spoken across the country and their concerns are clearly based on the burdensome economic problems that hit them at home—high unemployment, slow economic growth, and rising energy prices," said Dan Danner, NFIB's president and CEO. "The time is not right—either politically or economically—for a federal cap-and-trade program that will cause more harm than good to the voters who need the most help, and are the most impacted."

### Solves leadership

#### We solve their China advantage – cooperation is contingent on the success of the Durban platform as per their Dirigner evidence. If we prove we can get enviornmental issues done and get a UN climate agreement done, then we access their cooperation scenario.

#### Cap and trade solves environmental leadership

Greenstone 10 (Michael Greenstone¶ Director, The Hamilton Project and Senior Fellow¶ The Hamilton Project¶ Michael Greenstone is the 3M Professor of Environmental Economics in the Department of Economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology., “The Benefits of Cap-and-Trade Would Have Exceeded Its Costs” http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/up-front/posts/2010/07/30-climate-change-greenstone)

Of course, it is natural to ask why Americans should pay for benefits in other countries. Climate change is a global problem and, as such, some of the benefits from U.S. action will spill over to other countries. In the same vein, we will also reap the benefits from carbon reduction programs abroad. What we have learned through past negotiations in the international arena is that if the United States takes a clear leadership position, it will greatly increase the chances of a global agreement to reduce emissions.¶ The passage of an economy wide cap-and-trade system would exert just such leadership. Indeed, the real payoff from a domestic cap-and-trade system is that it could pave the way for global action toward emission reductions along the lines that were discussed at the Copenhagen climate change summit in December. If there are global emissions reductions like those spelled out in the Copenhagen Accord, then the domestic benefits would easily exceed the domestic costs.

#### Cap and trade is key to unified diplomatic pressure on China to reduce emissions

Morgan 11 (Dan Morgan, fellow at the German Marshall Fund of the United States, U.S. Shelves "Cap and Trade" -- Policy Shift (And Congressional Opposition) Sink EU-Style Climate Exchange-Market In U.S. By Dan Morgan, http://www.europeaninstitute.org/EA-February-2011/us-shelves-qcap-and-tradeq-policy-shift-and-congressional-opposition-sink-eu-style-climate-exchange-market-in-us.html)

No accident, the omission merely confirmed a development that has become obvious: the big idea of a U.S. “cap and trade system” to limit greenhouse-gas emissions is dead for this administration and even more clearly, anathema to the new Republican-leaning Congress. For the remaining two years of the President’s mandate, the Obama administration has clearly concluded that the pursuit of a national carbon ceiling – in effect, a price tag on pollution – has to be abandoned as a policy approach that is currently unworkable. In the U.S, the opposing view is too strong: that pollution limits will constrain economic growth. The Result? Without any prospect of a government-mandated “cap,” there can be no U.S. national system of emissions-trading as a way to ratchet down carbon-caused greenhouse gases.¶ Its demise does not bury hopes that the U.S. will still work for “clean energy” to curb carbon pollution, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and combat climate change. But, it does deliver a severe blow to longstanding hopes for transatlantic convergence on “cap-and-trade” as a potentially global model for “decarbonizing” economies.¶ For a decade, this approach has been a point of common transatlantic purpose among U.S. and European climate-change negotiators, who saw it as the most flexible and pragmatic approach to global cooperation in curbing greenhouse gases. The EU has pioneered this approach: its Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) started in 2005 and is the world’s largest market of this kind. Even though the ETS has suffered severe teething problems, its operations have been steadily improving, making it a paradigm for other nations to join.¶ Now the concept has been orphaned. While the EU will continue operating the ETS, there is no realistic prospect of seeing the U.S. join this initiative, certainly not before new elections in 2012, and perhaps never. As the EU persists alone, European industrialists can be expected to complain that the system makes them less competitive internationally. And, of course, the absence of a common transatlantic stance will ease diplomatic pressure on China and other nations that are growing global sources of carbon pollution. In practice, the impact of the EU’s ETS as a world exemplar always depended on being joined by a similar U.S. system with real teeth. The ETS excludes agriculture and many other non-industrial sources of carbon pollution, many of which would have been captured by the proposed U.S. system. A big exception would still have been American agriculture, whose emissions were ignored in the U.S. draft bill. Even so, the U.S. version of the cap-and-trade bill was still strongly opposed by the American farm lobby: this block of largely Democratic legislators worked tirelessly in the Democratic-conrolled Senate to keep the bill from coming up. Indeed, the measure died there. The U.S. farm sector lobbied so strongly because the sector is highly sensitive to any rise in electricity and gas prices and feared that cabon caps, especially on refineries in the Middle West, would drive up these costs. In contrast, EU farm groups had little to fear, at least at this stage, from the weaker ETS system when it was adopted.

### investors

#### Cap and trade will lead to private investment in renewable energy, solving the aff

Podesta et al 9 (John D. Podesta, Chair and Counselor of the Center for American Progress, Kate Gordon, Senior Fellow at American Progress, Bracken Hendricks, Senior Fellow at American Progress and Benjamin Goldstein, Energy Policy Analyst for Center for American Progress, September 2009, The Clean-Energy Investment Agenda: A Comprehensive Approach to Building the Low-Carbon Economy)

A host of market failures and distortions have conspired to inhibit the deployment of clean, renewable energy. First, a century of subsidies and infrastructure investments to support the provision of carbon-based energy has severely tilted the playing field. Second, the hidden costs associated with greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants have been typically treated as negative externalities and never factored in to the market price that¶ we pay for traditional energy. These costs affect our public health, national security, and our environment—indeed, the unchecked release of global warming pollution into the atmosphere has been called the greatest market failure of all time. And third, clean-energy solutions face major market barriers specific to their sector—the fact that landlords often do not pay their own utility bills hinders energy efficiency investments in buildings; the lack of distribution infrastructure inhibits the availability of ethanol and other alterna- tive fuels; and our outdated transmission grid poses major obstacles to deploying greater quantities of utility-scale renewable energy. A comprehensive policy approach will help us to overcome these numerous market failures and increase demand for clean energy.¶ Establishing a cap and a price on global warming pollution¶ Putting a cap and price on pollution is a critical first step and a major component in the mix of policies that will help build a prosperous low-carbon future. A price on pollution turns the negative environmental effects of carbon emissions into a real business cost for emitters, thus correcting a major market failure. A cap on emissions sets a clear goal and establishes a long-term signal in the market, encouraging innovation and allowing busi- nesses to plan their investment strategies.¶ The American Clean Energy and Security Act proposes a cap-and-trade system as the mechanism to establish a cap and a price on greenhouse gas pollution. This system has the additional benefit of allowing companies to trade emissions permits, which results in the highest-emitting firms and industries buying permits from—and therefore investing in— the lowest-emitting, most efficient firms and technologies.¶ ￼￼￼¶ ￼5

### CP doesn’t link to picking winners

#### Tax credits link to picking winners

Loris 11 Nicolas Loris is an analyst in the Heritage Foundation’s Roe Institute of Economic Policy Studies. "Power Down the Subsidies to Energy Producers" Aug 3 www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2011/08/power-down-the-subsidies-to-energy-producers

America has an energy addiction - and it’s not an addiction to oil, as many politicians would have you think. It’s an addiction to government subsidies. The addicts, you see, are energy producers, not the consumers.

Their growing dependence on federal handouts is the real cause of America’s energy crisis. Energy subsidies have needlessly wasted taxpayer dollars, retarded commercialization of new technologies and failed to reduce our reliance on foreign energy sources. Washington would do well to end all energy subsidies.¶ Energy subsidies come in numerous forms ranging from direct expenditures to targeted tax breaks, from production mandates to loan guarantees. Basically, any public policy that favorsthe production or consumption of one type of energy over another can be considered a subsidy.¶

#### Cap and trade doesn’t pick winners and solves global warming more efficiently

Gillespie 8 (Robert Gillespie, director of Gillespie Economics, Ph.D. in Economics from MIT, “ECONOMIICS OF GLOBAL WARMING”, Paper presented at the 52nd Agricultural and Applied Economics Conference, Canberra, Australia, February 2008, http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/handle/6006)

However, it is likely to be highly economically inefficient for the government to use GHG levels to vet development proposals, “pick winners” for government funding and support or impose or shame people into some subjective idealised behaviour on the basis of carbon counting.¶ For any policy to be effective in slowing global warming it must raise the market price of carbon, which will raise the price of fossil fuels and the products of fossil fuels. Prices can be raised by limiting the number of permits that are available (cap and trade) or by levying a tax on carbon emissions (Nordhaus 2007b). This will achieve a number of outcomes:¶ • it will provide signals to consumers about what goods and services are high-carbon ones and should be used more sparingly – allowing their choices to have regard to all the attributes of the goods and services.¶ • it provides signals to producers about which inputs use more carbon (such as coal and oil) and which use less or none (such as natural gas or nuclear power), thereby inducing firms to substitute to low-carbon processes.¶ • it gives market incentives for inventors and innovators to develop and introduce low-carbon products and processes that can replace the current generation of technologies.¶ • It will economise on the information that is required to do all these three tasks. Through the market mechanism, a high carbon price will raise the price of products according to their carbon content. Ethical consumers today, hoping to minimize their “carbon footprint,” have little chance of making an accurate calculation of the relative carbon use in, say, driving 250 miles as compared to flying 250 miles. With a carbon price, the total embodied carbon would be priced, and the cost of all activities would rise by the tax times the embodied carbon. Consumers will still not know how much of the price is carbon, but they can make their decisions confident that they are paying for the social cost of their carbon footprint (Nordhaus 2007b).¶ 7¶ As identified by Norhaus (2007b p 29) “raising the price of carbon is a necessary and sufficient step for tackling global warming. The rest is largely fluff”. That is, “picking winners” is not required.

## Solvency

### Picking winnners

#### Innovation solves great power war

Baru 9 Sanjaya is a Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School in Singapore Geopolitical Implications of the Current Global Financial Crisis, Strategic Analysis, Volume 33, Issue 2 March 2009 , pages 163 – 168

Hence, economic policies and performance do have strategic consequences.2 In the modern era, the idea that strong economic performance is the foundation of power was argued most persuasively by historian Paul Kennedy. 'Victory (in war)', Kennedy claimed, 'has repeatedly gone to the side with more flourishing productive base'.3 Drawing attention to the interrelationships between economic wealth, technological innovation, and the ability of states to efficiently mobilize economic and technological resources for power projection and national defence, Kennedy argued that nations that were able to better combine military and economic strength scored over others. 'The fact remains', Kennedy argued, 'that all of the major shifts in the world's military-power balance have followed alterations in the productive balances; and further, that the rising and falling of the various empires and states in the international system has been confirmed by the outcomes of the major Great Power wars, where victory has always gone to the side with the greatest material resources'.4 In Kennedy's view, the geopolitical consequences of an economic crisis, or even decline, would be transmitted through a nation's inability to find adequate financial resources to simultaneously sustain economic growth and military power.

#### Innovation in the energy sector is vital to overall U.S. competitiveness and leadership – means they can’t solve their economy advantage or their environmental leadership advantage

Deutsch 8 [John, Former undersecretary of DOE and Institute Professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Issues in Science and Technology, "Ending the Inertia on Energy Policy," Winter 08, RSR]

There is only one solution to the challenge: The United States must begin the long process of transforming its economy from one that is dependent on petroleum and high-emission coal-fired electricity to one that uses energy much more efficiently, develops alternative fuels, and switches to electricity generation that is low-carbon or carbon-free. The benefits of such a transformation are indisputable: It would avoid unnecessary cost and disruption to the U.S. economy, protect the environment, and enhance national security. The United States has sought to adopt an effective and coherent energy policy since the first oil crisis of 1973, but it has failed to do so. The challenge for U.S. political leaders is to craft, fund, and diligently sustain a range of policy measures that will make this critical transition as certain, rapid, and cost-effective as possible. In order to meet this challenge, the United States must undergo an innovation revolution. The rate at which the United States is able to develop and deploy new energy technologies will, to a great extent, determine the ultimate speed and cost of the economic transformation. Large-scale carbon capture and sequestration, advanced batteries, plug-in hybrid vehicle technologies, next-generation biofuels for the transportation sector, and a number of other innovations will be vital to achieving a low-carbon economy, and the United States must not only develop but deploy these technologies. The benefits of such innovation will accrue to other countries as well, for U.S. technical assistance programs and trade will carry these advances abroad.

#### Government subsidies creates risky market structures – this turns case as pricing bubbles collapse

Gerdin 11 (Erik Gerding, Associate Professor at University of Colorado Law School. His research interests include securities, banking law, financial regulation generally, and corporate governance, “The Inherent, Ineluctable Instability of Financial Institution Regulation”, <http://www.theconglomerate.org/2011/09/the-inherent-ineluctable-instability-of-financial-institution-regulation.html>, September 12, 2011)

Here is my second contribution to the Faculty Lounge Online Forum on the legislative and regulatory process of financial reform. Check out the posts by the other contributors including, Kim Krawiec (Duke), Christie Ford (Univ. British Columbia), Brett McDonnell (Minnesota), Saule Omarova (North Carolina), and Dan Schwarz (Minnesota). In my last post, I concluded that the presence of government subsidies – particularly guarantees explicit (deposit insurance) and implicit (Too-Big-To-Fail) – makes the political economy of financial institution regulation different from other areas of the regulatory state. In this post, I argue that these government subsidies and moreover, the underlying reason for government subsidies, contributes to the inherent instability of financial institution regulation. The presence of government guarantees – explicit or implicit – creates strong incentives for financial firms to externalize the cost of their risk taking onto taxpayers. But there is more to government guarantees than moral hazard. Consider the following: Market distortion: When the government subsidizes some financial firms but not others, it distorts the market. A lower cost of capital allows the subsidized firms to undercut their competition. This can drive competitors either out of business or, if risk is being mispriced because of an asset boom, into riskier market segments (a phenomena I explored in a symposium piece). Cheaper debt and leverage: Government guarantees also. make debt cheaper than equity This supercharges the incentives of financial firms to increase leverage. Higher leverage of financial institutions, in turn, works to increase the effective supply of money. More money can fuel asset price bubbles and mask the mispricing of risk (phenomena explored by Margaret Blair in this paper, as well as by me in a forthcoming symposium piece in the Berkeley Business Law Journal.) Cheaper debt and regulatory capital arbitrage: Cheaper debt also supercharges financial firm incentives to game regulatory capital requirements (something I am writing about in the context of the shadow banking system. See also Jones; Acharya & Schnabl; Acharya & Richardson. Bailouts and correlated risk: Governments face pressure to bail out firms when their risk taking is highly correlated (because multiple firms will fail at the same time). On the flip side, this creates a strong incentive for financial firms to take on correlated risk. (See, e.g., Acharya et al.). Correlated risk taking reinforces the kind of herding that behavioral finance scholars have analyzed in the context of asset price bubbles. So feedback loops abound. What to do, then, about government subsidies? “Stop us before we bail out again” One approach is to erect barriers to the government providing subsidies and bailouts. Dodd-Frank is chock full o’ provisions that aim to do just this. But legal scholars need to give policymakers a dose of reality about the ability of law to hardwire “no bailouts, no subsidies.” I just came back from a conference last week in which a number of economists kept saying that this hardwiring was exactly what law needed to contribute to financial reform. Here is how some of the law professors in the room (including your friend and mine Anna Gelpern) responded: 1. Legal rules are by nature incomplete and, under pressure, firms and regulators will seek ways around rules. 2. It ain’t so easy for a sovereign to bind itself. In the end, what is the remedy and who will enforce it? 3. There is nothing to stop Congress from amending the law. Legislatures can’t entrench laws against amendments by future legislatures (although the government must honor contractual obligations – for a discussion of these issues, see U.S. v. Winstar) True, Dodd-Frank’s prohibitions on bailouts and governments are not just pieces of paper. Law does constrain government behavior to a degree and can promote political accountability. However, we should not expect “law” to work like a wind-up toy that is self-executing without worrying about issues of interpretation, compliance, incentives, and the norms of government actors. I restrained myself at the conference from delivering a little legal koan: “the law will bind government officials, if they believe it binds them.” As an aside: it strikes me that the legal academy has to do a much better job of educating economists, policy makers and the public about what is “law” and how it operates. We have to do this in an accessible manner and without undermining important norms of legal compliance. Financial reform proposals are replete with calls for more “automatic regulations” – whether to counter capture or political pressure to spike the economic punch when the party gets startin’. (For example, economists have proposed the very sensible policy of counter-cyclical capital buffers) But fetishizing automatic regulations can pervert financial regulation. Over-reliance on automatic regulation: Ignores the fact that regulators and lawmakers must interpret laws; and Discounts the likelihood or regulatory arbitrage or regulatory evasion. In short, we need to have a much richer discussion of what the “law in action” means. Letting it Burn: Confusing Bailouts with Other Externalities of Financial Institution Risk-Taking What if restrictions on bailouts and government guarantees work too well? There is a rationale for government interventions like deposit insurance, lender-of-last resort, and bailouts. They are not just about “capture.” Financial institution failure can impose significant negative externalities (which is a fairly antiseptic description of the social costs of financial crises). Counterparty and market discipline don’t force firms to internalize all of these externalities. I respect the intellectual consistency and fervor of those who believe that bailouts and government interventions are the root of all financial regulatory problems. But I wouldn’t trust them in any position of responsibility. Deposit insurance and bailouts aren’t the only ways governments distort markets when they act to avoid crises. Lender-of-last resort actions and even interest rates changes can create a type of moral hazard (see “Put, Greenspan”). It is a lot harder for central banks to calibrate liquidity responses to market seizures than armchair critics think. Countering Subsidies So if some government subsidization of the financial firms is inevitable, it is critical that the government counter these subsidies -- whether by limiting firm risk-taking or charging firms for the subsidy. Absent attempts to counter subsidies, we are right back where this post started – moral hazard, distortion, cheap debt --> leverage and capital arbitrage.

## Econ

### 2NC/1NR Top Level Incentives Bad

#### Incentives for renewables will kill 11 million jobs

Alvarez et al 9 (Gabriel Calzada Álvarez PhD, Associate Professor of Applied Economics at Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, in Madrid; Raquel Merino Jara, Associate Professor of Economics at Universidad Rey Juan Carlos; Juan Ramón Rallo Julián, Professor of Economics at Universidad Rey Juan Carlos; José Ignacio García Bielsa, Mining Engineer, former Director of RWE Trading/Solutions, responsible for the development of their energy business in Spain and Portugal; “Study of the effects on employment of public aid to renewable energy sources,” March 2009, www.juandemariana.org/pdf/090327-employment-public-aid-renewable.pdf)

Europe’s current policy and strategy for supporting the so-called “green jobs” or renewable energy dates back to 1997, and has become one of the principal justifications for U. S. “green jobs” proposals. Yet an examination of Europe’ s experience reveals these policies to be terribly economically counterproductive.¶ This study is important for several reasons. First is that the Spanish experience is considered a leading example to be followed by many policy advocates and politicians. This study marks the very first time a critical analysis of the actual performance and impact has been made. Most important, it demonstrates that the Spanish/EU-style “green jobs” agenda now being promoted in the U.S. in fact destroys jobs, detailing this in terms of jobs destroyed per job created and the net destruction per installed MW.¶ The study’s results demonstrate how such “green jobs” policy clearly hinders Spain’s way out of the current economic crisis, even while U.S. politicians insist that rushing into such a scheme will ease their own emergence from the turmoil.¶ The following are key points from the study:¶ 1. As President Obama correctly remarked, Spain provides a reference for the establishment of government aid to renewable energy. No other country has given such broad support to the construction and production of electricity through renewable sources. The arguments for Spain’s and Europe’s “green jobs” schemes are the same arguments now made in the U.S., principally that massive public support would produce large numbers of green jobs. The question that this paper answers is “at what price?”¶ 2. Optimistically treating European Commission partially funded data, we find that for every renewable energy job that the State manages to finance, Spain’s experience cited by President Obama as a model reveals with high confidence, by two different methods, that the U.S. should expect a loss of at least 2.2 jobs on average, or about 9 jobs lost for every 4 created, to which we have to add those jobs that non-subsidized investments with the same resources would have created.¶ 3. Therefore, while it is not possible to directly translate Spain’s experience with exactitude to claim that the U.S. would lose at least 6.6 million to 11 million jobs, as a direct consequence were it to actually create 3 to 5 million “green jobs” as promised (in addition to the jobs lost due to the opportunity cost of private capital employed in renewable energy), the study clearly reveals the tendency that the U.S. should expect such an outcome.¶ 4. At minimum, therefore, the study’s evaluation of the Spanish model cited as one for the U.S. to replicate in quick pursuit of “green jobs” serves a note of caution, that the reality is far from what has typically been presented, and that such schemes also offer considerable employment consequences and implications for emerging from the economic crisis.¶ 5. Despite its hyper-aggressive (expensive and extensive) “green jobs” policies it appears that Spain likely has created a surprisingly low number of jobs, two- thirds of which came in construction, fabrication and installation, one quarter in administrative positions, marketing and projects engineering, and just one out of ten jobs has been created at the more permanent level of actual operation and maintenance of the renewable sources of electricity.¶ 6. This came at great financial cost as well as cost in terms of jobs destroyed elsewhere in the economy.¶ 7. The study calculates that since 2000 Spain spent €571,138 to create each “green job”, including subsidies of more than €1 million per wind industry job.¶ 8. The study calculates that the programs creating those jobs also resulted in the destruction of nearly 110,500 jobs elsewhere in the economy, or 2.2 jobs destroyed for every “green job” created.¶ 9. Principally, the high cost of electricity affects costs of production and employment levels in metallurgy, non-metallic mining and food processing, beverage and tobacco industries.¶ 10. Each “green” megawatt installed destroys 5.28 jobs on average elsewhere in the economy: 8.99 by photovoltaics, 4.27 by wind energy, 5.05 by mini-hydro.¶ 11. These costs do not appear to be unique to Spain’s approach but instead are largely inherent in schemes to promote renewable energy sources.¶ 12. The total over-cost – the amount paid over the cost that would result from buying the electricity generated by the renewable power plants at the market price - that has been incurred from 2000 to 2008 (adjusting by 4% and calculating its net present value [NPV] in 2008), amounts to 7,918.54 million Euros (appx. $10 billion USD)¶ 13. The total subsidy spent and committed (NPV adjusted by 4%) to these three renewable sources amounts to 28,671 million euros ($36 billion USD).¶ ￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼14. The price of a comprehensive electricity rate (paid by the end consumer) in Spain would have to be increased 31% to being able to repay the historic debt generated by this rate deficit mainly produced by the subsidies to renewables, according to Spain’s energy regulator.¶ 15. Spanish citizens must therefore cope with either an increase of electricity rates or increased taxes (and public deficit), as will the U.S. if it follows Spain’s model.¶ 16. The high cost of electricity due to the green job policy tends to drive the relatively most electricity-intensive companies and industries away, seeking areas where costs are lower. The example of Acerinox is just such a case.¶ 17. The study offers a caution against a certain form of green energy mandate. Minimum guaranteed prices generate surpluses that are difficult to manage. In Spain’s case, the minimum electricity prices for renewable-generated electricity, far above market prices, wasted a vast amount of capital that could have been otherwise economically allocated in other sectors. Arbitrary, state-established price systems inherent in “green energy” schemes leave the subsidized renewable industry hanging by a very weak thread and, it appears, doomed to dramatic adjustments that will include massive unemployment, loss of capital, dismantlement of productive facilities and perpetuation of inefficient ones.¶ 18. These schemes create serious “bubble” potential, as Spain is now discovering. The most paradigmatic bubble case can be found in the photovoltaic industry. Even with subsidy schemes leaving the mean sale price of electricity generated from solar photovoltaic power 7 times higher than the mean price of the pool, solar failed even to reach 1% of Spain’s total electricity production in 2008.¶ 19. The energy future has been jeopardized by the current state of wind or photovoltaic technology (more expensive and less efficient than conventional energy sources). These policies will leave Spain saddled with and further artificially perpetuating obsolete fixed assets, far less productive than cutting- edge technologies, the soaring rates for which soon-to-be obsolete assets the government has committed to maintain at high levels during their lifetime.¶ 20. The regulator should consider whether citizens and companies need expensive and inefficient energy – a factor of production usable in virtually every human project- or affordable energy to help overcome the economic crisis instead.¶ 21. The Spanish system also jeopardizes conventional electricity facilities, which are the first to deal with the electricity tariff deficit that the State owes them.¶ 22. Renewable technologies remained the beneficiaries of new credit while others began to struggle, though this was solely due to subsidies, mandates and related programs. As soon as subsequent programmatic changes take effect which became necessary due to “unsustainable” solar growth its credit will also cease.¶ 23. This proves that the only way for the “renewables” sector - which was never feasible by itself on the basis of consumer demand - to be “countercyclical” in crisis periods is also via government subsidies. These schemes create a bubble,¶ which is boosted as soon as investors find in “renewables” one of the few profitable sectors while when fleeing other investments. Yet it is axiomatic, as we are seeing now, that when crisis arises, the Government cannot afford this growing subsidy cost either, and finally must penalize the artificial renewable industries which then face collapse.¶ 24. Renewables consume enormous taxpayer resources. In Spain, the average annuity payable to renewables is equivalent to 4.35% of all VAT collected, 3.45% of the household income tax, or 5.6% of the corporate income tax for 2007.

### Uq

#### Manufacturing and jobs up now – futures.

Bloomberg, 10-25

[Bloomberg News, “US futures up on of jobs, manufacturing numbers”, 10-25-12,

<http://www.businessweek.com/ap/2012-10-25/us-futures-up-ahead-of-jobs-manufacturing-numbers>, RSR]

NEW YORK (AP) — Stock futures edged higher Thursday with some positive numbers coming out of the manufacturing sector and potentially more evidence of an improving jobs picture. Dow Jones industrial futures rose 61 points to 13,082. The broader S&P futures tacked on 7.3 points to 1,412.60. Nasdaq futures gained 16.75 points to 2,667.25. The report from the Commerce Department on orders for long-lasting U.S. manufactured goods shows a surge in September, the largest in nearly three years. Orders for durable goods leapt 9.9 a percent after a 13.1 percent decline in the previous month. However, orders for core capital goods, considered a good proxy for business investment, were unchanged. Also on Thursday, the Labor Department reported that weekly applications for U.S. unemployment aid fell last week to a seasonally adjusted 369,000, which would signal modest hiring. Anything below 375,000 can lower the unemployment rate. In September, unemployment dipped to 7.8 percent. That is the lowest level since January 2009.

#### Unemployment down now – more people are being hired.

Censky, 10-16

[Annalyn, “White House defends the drop in unemployment”, CNN Money, 10-16-12,

<http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2012/10/16/white-house-defends-the-drop-in-unemployment/comment-page-1/>, RSR]

Sperling, who heads the White House's National Economic Council, pointed to data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which shows the unemployment rate fell to 7.8% last month, down from 9.0% a year earlier. Most of that decline is due to workers getting jobs - not people dropping out of the labor force, Sperling said at the National Association for Business Economics Annual Meeting in New York Tuesday

### Hurt employment

#### Wind subsidies hurt employment – lowered Danish GDP by 270 million

Sharman and Meyer 9 (Hugh Sharman, degreee in civil engineering, founder and principal of Incoteco, an energy consulting firm based in Hals, Denmark, and Henrik Meyer, Master of Economics, Deputy Director at Copenhagen Consensus Center, WIND ENERGY THE CASE OF DENMARK, September 2009, www.cepos.dk/fileadmin/user\_upload/Arkiv/PDF/Wind\_energy\_-\_the\_case\_of\_Denmark.pdf)

Denmark has been a first-mover in the wind power industry for over ten years, and its leading wind turbine manufacturers have been able to maintain a very strong global position. This has been a consequence of a concerted policy to increase the share of wind power in Danish electricity generation. The policy has only been made possible through substantial subsidies supporting the wind turbine owners. This indirect subsidy has in turn generated the demand for wind turbines from the manufactures. Exactly how the subsidies have been shared between land, wind turbine owners, labor, capital and shareholders is opaque, but it is fair to assess that no Danish wind industry to speak of would exist if it had to compete on market terms.¶ This paper documents the experiences gained in Denmark with regard to the employment effect of subsidizing the wind industry.¶ Substantial subsidies have been directed to the Danish wind mill industry over years. From 2001-2005 the yearly subsidy has been 1.7-2.6 billion DKK. The Danish Wind industry counts 28,400 employees. This does not, however, constitute the net employment effect of the wind mill subsidy. In the long run, creating additional employment in one sector through subsidies will detract labor from other sectors, resulting in no increase in net employment but only in a shift from the non-subsidized sectors to the subsidized sector. Allowing for the theoretical possibility of wind employment alleviating possible regional pockets of high unemployment, a very optimistic ballpark estimate of net real job creation is 10% of total employment in the sector. In this case the subsidy per job created is 600,000- 900,000 DKK per year ($90,000-140,000). This subsidy constitutes around 175-250% of the average pay per worker in the Danish manufacturing industry.¶ In terms of value added per employee, the energy technology sector over the period 1999-2006 underperformed by as much as 13% compared with the industrial average.¶ This implies that the effect of the government subsidy has been to shift employment from more productive employment in other sectors to less productive employment in the wind industry.¶ As a consequence, Danish GDP is approximately 1.8 billion DKK ($270 million) lower than it would have been if the wind sector work force was employed elsewhere.

### Electricity

#### Energy efficiency hurts GDP

Zycher 12 (Benjamin, Pacific Research Institute Senior Fellow, Martin V. Smith School of Business and Economics adjunct professor, associate in the Intelligence Community Associates Program of the Office of Economic Analysis, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, U.S. Department of State, former senior staff economist for the President's Council of Economic Advisers, March 27, “Renewable Energy Subsidies Should Be Abandoned,” <http://www.finance.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Zycher%20Senate%20Finance%20renewables%20incentives%20testimony%203-27-12.pdf>, d/a 8-1-12, ads)

But there exists no evidence with which to predict that a reduction in electricity¶ consumption would yield an increase in employment. Like all geographic entities, the¶ U.S. has certain long-term characteristics---climate, available resources, geographic¶ location, trading partners, ad infinitum---that determine in substantial part the long-run¶ comparative advantages of the economy in terms of economic activities and¶ specialization. Figure 2 presents the historical paths of the electricity intensity of U.S.¶ GDP (kilowatt-hour per dollar of output) and of the labor intensity of U.S. electricity¶ consumption (employment per kilowatt-hour).33 During 1970-2009, the electricity intensity of GDP has increased and declined¶ over various years, but for the whole period has declined slightly at a compound annual¶ rate of about 0.3 percent. The labor intensity of U.S. electricity consumption---in a sense,¶ the employment “supported” by each increment of electricity consumption---has declined more-or-less monotonically over the entire period, at an annual compound rate of about¶ 1.05 percent.34 This may be the result largely of changes in the composition of GDP¶ (toward services), and perhaps the substantial increase in U.S. labor productivity in¶ manufacturing. But these data do not suggest that a reduction in electricity consumption¶ would yield an increase in aggregate employment; instead, they suggest the reverse. In¶ short, while the employment/electricity relationship may have declined over time, there is¶ no evidence that it is unimportant in an absolute sense, and it is far from inverse.

### No manufacturing

#### The components would be produced abroad – Denmark proves

Schwartz 5 (L.M. Schwartz is the Chairman of the Virginia Land Rights Coalition. “Wind Power Dollars and Sense” http://www.vlrc.org/articles/3.html)

Ironically, Denmark benefited more than anyone else from California’s renewable energy program. In 1985, 67 percent of the wind turbines installed in California were manufactured in the US. By 1999, 65 percent of the wind turbines operating in California were manufactured overseas. Today, 90 percent of the world’s wind turbine manufacturers are based in Europe, with Denmark remaining the world’s dominant supplier of wind turbines. GE Wind, formerly Enron Wind Corp., is the only major US wind turbine manufacturer to survive the 1990s. And its new turbines are largely based on designs of the German firm Tacke, bought by Enron in 1999.

#### Manufacturing decline inevitable and it’s not key to the economy

MGI 12, Mckinsey Global Institute – research branch of the Mckinsey management consulting company, “Trading myths: Addressing misconceptions about trade, jobs, and competitiveness”, May, http://www.mckinsey.com/insights/mgi/research/productivity\_competitiveness\_and\_growth/six\_myths\_about\_trade

Myth: Mature economies are losing out to emerging markets in trade and thus face increasing trade deficits. Reality: The trade balance of mature economies has remained largely stable in the aggregate and even begun to improve. There are wide variations between individual countries, but no evidence supports claims of a wholesale deterioration of the trade balance between the mature and emerging economies over the past decade. Myth: Manufactured goods drive deteriorating trade deficits. Reality: Imports of primary resources, whose prices have been rising sharply, are the largest negative contributor to the trade balance of mature economies. In 2008, mature economies ran a 3.3 percent of GDP trade deficit in primary resources but a 0.5 percent of GDP surplus in manufactured goods and specifically a 1.6 percent surplus in knowledge-intensive manufacturing. Some individual mature countries run trade deficits in knowledge-intensive manufacturing. Myth: Trade is at the heart of the loss of manufacturing jobs. Reality: Changes in the composition of demand and ongoing productivity increases are the main reasons for the decline in the number of such jobs in mature economies. The share of manufacturing in these countries’ total employment is bound to decline further, from 12 percent today to less than 10 percent in 2030, according to our analysis. MGI finds that trade or offshoring are responsible for the loss of around 20 percent of the 5.8 million US manufacturing jobs eliminated between 2000 and 2010.

### Property value k2 econ

#### Wind farms decrease property values – prefer our study – uses hedonic analysis that controls for omitted variables and other biases

Heintzelman and Tuttle 11 (Martin D., Assistant Professor, Clarkson University School of Business, and Carrie M., Ph.D. Candidate in Environmental Science and Engineering at Clarkson University, and Director of Engineering, Development Authority of the North Country, “Values in the Wind”, <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1803601>, Acc: 7/31/12, og)

This paper improves upon this literature using data on 11,331 arms-length residential and agricultural property transactions between 2000 and 2009 in Clinton, Franklin, and Lewis Counties in Northern New York to explore the effects of relatively new wind facilities. We use fixed effects analysis to control for the omitted variables and endogeneity biases common in hedonic analyses, including the previous literature on the impacts of wind turbines. We find that nearby wind facilities significantly reduce property values in two of the three counties we study. We find evidence of endogeneity bias in the use of fixed effects models with relatively large geographic-groupings (census block-groups or census blocks) that appears to be controlled for in a repeat sales approach.

#### Their studies are flawed – only surveys properties miles away

Boone 5 (Jon, PhD, Environmentalist, and Formal Intervenor in Wind Installation Hearings, “DIRECT TESTIMONY OF JON BOONE BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND”, http://www.windaction.org/?module=uploads&func=download&fileId=162, Acc: 8/2/12, og)

One of the most validated real estate precepts is the idea that significant natural views¶ have premium value, and intrusions which restrict that view erode value. Realtors doing¶ business near windplants in the western United States and in Europe understand that¶ property will sell for between ten and thirty percent less than previous market value,¶ depending upon how close it is to the windplant. The few "studies” which appear to¶ support the claim that windplants don't devalue property are extremely flawed in fact and¶ methodology, often surveying people and evaluating property miles away from a wind¶ site, then “averaging” these results with properties adjacent to windplants.

## Warming

#### UN agreements are useless – countries will just ignore them

Walsh 11 (Bryan, senior writer for TIME magazine, covering energy and the environment, Another Year, Another U.N. Climate-Change Summit: Expect Big Talk in Durban, and Few Results, http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,2100430,00.html#ixzz26tOFSen1)

Though Bush's eight-year mockery of a climate policy drew attention away from this original Kyoto dilemma, the

problem preceded him. As Michael Liebreich of Bloomberg New Energy Finance pointed out in a research note this week, it took five years to negotiate the Kyoto Protocol and eight years for it to come into force, and since its base year of 1990, energy-related emissions have risen 45%. "If this is not failure, what on earth does failure look like?" Liebreich wrote. (Read about climate-change denial.)¶ The environmentalists at Durban this week and next week would call foul on that sentiment, arguing that Kyoto would have been much more effective with U.S. participation. That's likely true — but that ignores a central delusion. We've spent 17 years at U.N. climate summits working to craft a global climate deal with the idea that international agreements can force national behavior. With climate change, however, that simply hasn't been true. European nations — Western European nations, at least — have embraced more-aggressive action on carbon emissions because there has long been more popular and elite support for taking action. But Canada, which ratified the Kyoto Protocol, later decided essentially to ignore it, and has already made clear that it will not take on further carbon-cut commitments without changes to the framework. Japan and Russia — which also ratified the Kyoto Protocol — have echoed that position.¶ Top-down international policymaking has its appeal, in part because it allows us to believe that the world can come together and solve a threat as complex and frightening as climate change with a single treaty. It makes for great slogans — remember the call to "Seal the Deal" at Copenhagen two years ago — and even better magazine covers. But top down is not the way things actually work, and after stalling and kicking the real debate down the road for the past 17 years, we've run out of time. The Kyoto Protocol expires next year, and right now there is virtually nothing set to replace it.

#### The plan can’t solve leadership – not taken seriously

The Business Times Singapore 7 [Can Bush follow through on his green policy?, lexis]

¶ WHO looks to President George Bush for leadership on global warming? When he announced his intention last week to set the United States on to the path of reducing greenhouse gases, the world reacted with scepticism.The sceptics see it as presidential grandstanding which in effect is intended to stall the Group of Eight nations' talks in Germany this week. That conclave aims to adopt a unified stand on the post-Kyoto round discussions ahead of a global in Bali later this year.¶ Similar scepticism was heard about the president's announcement last month about setting up an interdepartmental study on vehicle emissions in the US. Indeed, the Bush administration had to be hauled to the US Supreme Court and its federal Environmental Protection Agency had to be directed to use its power to rein in emissions. ¶ So, President Bush finds himself in a situation of being damned if you do and damned if you don't. After having spurned the Kyoto Protocol, the main global treaty for cutting emissions, and questioning the very science involved in global warming, Mr Bush has a hard time convincing the world that he is for real changes on emissions.¶ Earlier, there were sound bites like 'America is addicted to oil' and there was a tantalising proposal for cellulosic ethanol for the future and with funding increased for research to support technology-backed solutions to greenhouse gas emissions. But at the same time, immediate action to require more miles from vehicles was shunned. Nor has he abandoned his opposition to the cap and trade system to control emissions, a central plank of the Kyoto Protocol.

#### Can’t solve warming:

#### A. Too late

Hamilton 10 – Professor of Public Ethics @ ANU

Clive Hamilton, Professor of Public Ethics in Australia, 2010, “Requiem for a Species: Why We Resist the Truth About Climate Change,” pg 27-28

The conclusion that, even if we act promptly and resolutely, the world is on a path to reach 650 ppm is almost too frightening to accept. That level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere will be associated with warming of about 4°C by the end of the century, well above the temperature associated with tipping points that would trigger further warming.58 So it seems that even with the most optimistic set of assumptions—the ending of deforestation, a halving of emissions associated with food production, global emissions peaking in 2020 and then falling by 3 per cent a year for a few decades—we have no chance of preventing emissions rising well above a number of critical tipping points that will spark uncontrollable climate change. The Earth's climate would enter a chaotic era lasting thousands of years before natural processes eventually establish some sort of equilibrium. Whether human beings would still be a force on the planet, or even survive, is a moot point. One thing seems certain: there will be far fewer of us. These conclusions arc alarming, co say the least, but they are not alarmist. Rather than choosing or interpreting numbers to make the situation appear worse than it could be, following Kevin Anderson and Alice Bows I have chosen numbers that err on the conservative side, which is to say numbers that reflect a more buoyant assessment of the possibilities. A more neutral assessment of how the global community is likely to respond would give an even bleaker assessment of our future. For example, the analysis excludes non-CO2, emissions from aviation and shipping. Including them makes the task significantly harder, particularly as aviation emissions have been growing rapidly and are expected to continue to do so as there is no foreseeable alternative to severely restricting the number of flights.v' And any realistic assessment of the prospects for international agreement would have global emissions peaking closer to 2030 rather than 2020. The last chance to reverse the trajectory of global emissions by 2020 was forfeited at the Copenhagen climate conference in December 2009. As a consequence, a global response proportionate to the problem was deferred for several years.

## 1NR

## Elections

### OV

#### DA outweighs and turn case –

#### Timeframe - Obama reelection means immediate cooperation with Russia on an arms reduction treaty. That’s 1NC Diehl. This increases the incentive for other states to proliferate as it signals a weakened US nuclear umbrella. The treaty cuts out important parts of our arsenal. That’s 1NC Kimball. This increases the risk of immediate miscalc as new proliferators lack second strike capability and have shorter flight times. That’s 1NC Cimballa.

#### Probability - Prolif makes preemption likely – state uncertainty.

Knopf, Professor in the Department of National Security Affairs at the Naval Postgraduate School, ‘2

[Jeffrey, “Recasting the proliferation optimism-pessimism debate,” Security Studies, Vol. 12, No. 1, p. 60-61, October]

The second implication of pressures to seek damage limitation is therefore that optimists are too quick to dismiss the possibility of preemption. Optimists argue that states will never attempt a first strike because they can never be certain of achieving 100 percent success, and the possibility of retaliation with even a few nuclear weapons makes preemption too great a risk.54 As long as state leaders value the survival of their society,55 this is certainly true for any premeditated “bolt from the blue.” If one believes, however, that an attack by the other side is about to take place, then one might not require a guarantee of a perfect first strike, but merely a reasonable chance that one can destroy enough of the other side’s forces to make a meaningful difference in the damage one suffers. Waltz simply does not get this point. In the revised version of the debate book, he writes: “The initial advantage [of striking first] is insignificant if the cost of gaining it is half a dozen cities.”56 If leaders believe, however, that the choice has boiled down to losing six cities or losing twelve, they may see a first strike as a way to save six cities. If prospect theory—which suggests that people are especially willing to gamble to try to reduce what appear to be certain losses—is correct, the chances of such a choice are even greater than RDT would anticipate.57 This reveals the problem with phrasing the second requirement for deterrence stability as the existence of second-strike capabilities. Secure secondstrike forces add greatly to crisis stability, but they are not sufficient to ensure that there are no deliberate decisions to launch first. In circumstances where there are growing doubts about whether nuclear deterrence will continue to hold, damage-limitation pressures could potentially lead to an intentional decision to preempt even with an expectation that the opponent will have some forces that could survive and strike second.

#### Turns warming – Even a small-scale nuclear war would wreck the climate

Hindustan Times 06 (December 12, “Even small regional nuclear war can have disastrous global affects, say nuclear scientists”)

Washington, Dec 12 --A team of scientists from UCLA, the University of Colorado at Boulder and Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, have said that even a regional nuclear war could devastate large cities and disrupt the global climate. According to them, even a small-scale, regional nuclear war could produce "as many direct fatalities as occurred during all of World War II", and disrupt the global climate for a decade or more, impacting nearly everyone on Earth. The scientists reviewed the current status of nuclear weapons development, analysed data on modern mega-cities and applied a state-of-the-science climate model. They calculated the local effects of individual "small", Hiroshima-size (15-kiloton) nuclear detonations in urban centers, including potential casualties from the blast and radioactive fallout, said Richard Turco, professor in the UCLA Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences and a member and founding director of UCLA's Institute of the Environment. In two research articles posted online in the journal Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions, Turco and Toon, a co-author on the current research, said that even a small-scale, regional nuclear war could produce as many direct fatalities as occurred during all of World War II and disrupt the global climate for a decade or more. The new results represent the first comprehensive quantitative assessment of the consequences of a nuclear conflict between small or emerging nuclear states, said Richard Turco, professor in the UCLA Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences and a member and founding director of UCLA's Institute of the Environment. They concluded: "Even the smallest nuclear powers today and in the near future may have as many as 50 or more Hiroshima-size weapons in their arsenals, according to the scientists. Moreover, about 40 countries possess enough plutonium and uranium to construct substantial nuclear arsenals." "Considering the relatively small number and sizes of the weapons - perhaps less than one megaton in total yield - the potential devastation would be catastrophic and long-term," Toon said and added: "a single low-yield nuclear detonation in an urban center could lead to more fatalities, in some cases by orders of magnitude, than occurred in major historical wars." Megacities attacked with nuclear devices, through war or terrorism, would likely be abandoned indefinitely, inducing mass migration and long-term economic decline, said Turco. The scientists estimated the quantities of soot - the highly absorbing component of smoke - that would be generated in urban firestorms ignited by nuclear detonations. This effort was led by Toon, professor and chair of the department of atmospheric and oceanic sciences at the University of Colorado at Boulder, together with Turco and University of Colorado student Charles Bardeen. At Rutgers, Alan Robock, professor of environmental sciences and associate director of the Center for Environmental Prediction at Rutgers' Cook College, professor Georgiy Stenchikov and postdoctoral associate Luke Oman (now at Johns Hopkins University) employed a coupled atmosphere-ocean climate model to simulate the effects of the putative smoke emissions in perturbing the global climate system and causing regional climatic anomalies. The amount of soot emitted by firestorms was found to exceed 5 million metric tons in many cases. Because so many people live in megacities, the quantity of black smoke generated per kiloton of explosive yield could be more than 100 times larger than previously estimated for a full-scale superpower nuclear exchange involving thousands of megatons, according to one of the journal papers. While a regional nuclear confrontation among emerging nuclear powers might be geographically constrained, the environmental impacts could spread worldwide, Robock and his colleagues conclude. "We examined the climatic effects of the smoke produced in a regional conflict in the subtropics between two opposing nations, each using 50 Hiroshima-size nuclear weapons to attack the other's most populated urban areas," Robock said. The post-war climate simulations used soot emissions provided by Toon, Turco and Bardeen.

#### Turns economy – nuclear wars around the globe would wreck a country’s economy as it would destroy important infrastructure and shift spending entirely to the military sector.

### A2: NUQ

#### Our link is specifically about wind being key to the election. No reason why oil matters. Energy issues in SQUO is not enough.

### A2: Wind PTC Pushed In SQUO

#### They say Obama pushing PTC in the SQUO –

#### Obama collapsing renewable in the US right now – incentives are being rolled back. Bigger perception link because of funding.

Jacobs 12 (Justin, Petroluem Economist, 5/25 ; Is the boom-time over for US renewables, Lexis)

Justin Jacobs, LONDON: The clean energy sector has been a rare bright spot for the ailing US economy since the financial crisis took hold. Strong political support from the Obama administration and generous stimulus spending has fuelled a golden age for wind and solar technologies and led to a resurgence in the moribund nuclear industry. Non-hydro renewable electricity generation in the US, including nuclear power, doubled from 2006 to 2011, even if it still accounts for less than a tenth of electricity produced. But the good times could soon come to an end, though, as stimulus funds run dry and a host of subsidy programmes expire over coming years, potentially creating a ruinous "funding cliff", a report from three think tanks has warned. The report, Beyond Boom and Bust: Putting Clean Tech on a Path to Subsidy Independence, was written by authors from the Breakthrough Institute, the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program and the World Resources Institute. It points to 2012 as a make-or-break year for the sector. Federal funding for clean energy - wind, solar and nuclear primarily - is expected to fall by nearly half this year, from $30.7 billion in 2011 to around $16 billion. That is down from a peak of $44.3 billion dollars in 2009. And spending is projected to continue its precipitous decline. By 2014 federal spending on clean energy technologies is projected to fall to $11 billion, a decline of 75% from 2009, the report's author's claim. Last year, for example, a crucial grant programme known as Section 1603, which BP took advantage of to approve an $800 million wind farm in Kansas, was allowed to expire. That led to an increase of some 50%-130% in the cost of financing new wind projects, according to the report. Dozens of similar subsidy programmes, representing 70% of all clean energy support measures, are scheduled to expire by 2014. "In the first quarter of 2012, global clean energy investment dropped to its lowest level since 2008. Good news stories are being replaced with headlines about closing factories, bankruptcies, and cancelled projects. Clean tech appears to be at a crucial inflection point," says Letha Tawney, a co-author of the report and senior associate at the World Resources Institute.

#### Nothing before September matters –

Voters just started paying attention and media spotlight is intensified

Garofoli 9/8 (Joe, Political Reporter @ San Fransisco Chronicle, http://www.sfgate.com/politics/joegarofoli/article/Critical-time-in-presidential-campaign-3850847.php)

Americans will choose their next president in less than two months and the race is a statistical dead heat as it enters the season that matters most: The one where Americans who are not political geeks start paying attention.¶ The race will turn on how voters feel about the economy. Should President Obama be re-elected because it is headed in the right direction - 30 consecutive months of private sector job growth after precipitous losses during the George W. Bush presidency - or should GOP nominee Mitt Romney take the wheel because unemployment has been above 8 percent for more than three years, the longest stretch since the Great Depression?¶ RealClearPolitics.com's average of major polls shows 62 percent of Americans feel the country is headed in the wrong direction.¶ Coming out of a fortnight of back-to-back political party conventions that ended last week, each side has little room for error as the spotlight intensifies - and September is traditionally the cruelest months for gaffes. It was in September 2008 when GOP vice presidential nominee Sarah Palin became a running joke on "Saturday Night Live" after positing that being the governor of Alaska enhanced her foreign policy credentials because her state was so close to Russia.

#### Specifically, events right before the election matter most.

Silver, political statistician, 10-20 (Nate, Oct. 20: Calm Day in Forecast, but Volatility Ahead, New York Times, Five Thirty Eight Blog, http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/20/oct-20-calm-day-in-forecast-but-volatility-ahead/?gwh=4BBCD1B81042084889017C63987CCFBB#more-36417, da 10-21-12)

But if the score is tied, or if it’s a one-run game, a run scored in the eighth will make a huge difference.¶ That’s where we find ourselves right now in the presidential race. This election is close and is likely to end up that way. There’s about a 50-50 chance that the election will end up within 2.5 percentage points, according to the forecast, against only a 15 percent chance that either candidate will win by five points or more.¶ For this reason, the percentage estimates in the forecast are likely to be volatile from here on out.¶ Early in the year, we’d treat as a pretty big deal if a candidate’s Electoral College win probability increased by a percentage point or more (for instance, to 63 percent from 62 percent). Now, changes like that are going to be fairly common, and there will often be larger shifts. Thursday, for example, was a good but hardly spectacular day for Mr. Obama in the polls, and that was enough to produce about a 5 percent swing toward him. Friday, however, brought a 2 percent shift back toward Mr. Romney, despite polling that seemed fairly mixed on the surface.

### Uniqueness

#### Extend 1NC – Geraghty evidence. Independents, the biggest swing vote, in the election, are going Romney’s way right now due to economic reasons. Already affecting national polls.

#### Framing issue – warrant coming out of CX of the Silver evidence is because Obama is winning Ohio right now.

#### **Romney will win Ohio—independents, voter turnout, GOP trends, and renewed enthusiasm**

Jordan 10/25 (Josh, small-business market-research consultant, “

Why Romney Doesn’t Need a Poll Lead in Ohio,” [http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/331593/why-romney-doesnt-need-poll-lead-ohio-josh-jordan#](http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/331593/why-romney-doesnt-need-poll-lead-ohio-josh-jordan), NP)

But even with Obama currently enjoying a 2.1 point lead, Romney is still in great shape to win Ohio on Election Day. Here are some of the reasons for the optimism coming from Boston these days:¶ Romney’s strength with independents keeps growing: Last week when Obama led the Real Clear Politics average by 2.5 points, Romney led among independents by an average of 8.7 points. Romney has since increased that lead with independents to 12.3 points, which is why he’s been able to cut Obama’s overall lead even as the polls have leaned more Democratic. In 2008 Obama beat McCain with independents by eight points. It would be almost impossible for Obama to win Ohio while suffering a 20-point swing among independents.¶ The polls give Democrats a better turnout advantage than they had in 2008: As I explained in my last Ohio post, in 2008 Democrats beat Republicans in turnout by five points. The current polls show an average of D+6.6. A D+5 turnout in 2008 gave Obama a 4.5-point victory, while he is currently leading by only 2.1 points on an even greater D+6.6 turnout. Again, we know it should be very difficult for Democrats to match their 2008 turnout, let alone increase it.¶ History suggests late deciders will break against the incumbent: This is a rule that always receives some skepticism, but it’s very likely to benefit Romney at least some on Election Day. In 2004, late deciders broke against George W. Bush heavily, even though he was a wartime president. John Kerry beat Bush by 25 points among voters who decided in the last month, 28 points among voters that decided in the three days prior to Election Day, and 22 points among day-of deciders. Those voters were 20 percent of the Ohio electorate; while this year there are expected to be fewer late deciders, Obama cannot afford to lose among by those margins and still win.¶ In Ohio, Republicans tend to outperform their share of the national vote: In the last nine elections, the GOP has outperformed in Ohio. With Romney currently running just ahead of Obama nationally, it seems much more likely that Obama’s lead in Ohio has more to do with the higher party-ID advantage than a dramatic shift in Ohio from the past nine elections.¶ Strength with crossover voters in Ohio: In addition to Romney’s strength with independents, in the past two elections the GOP candidate has won over more Democrat votes than he’s lost Republican ones. Obama’s Ohio win in 2008 was based entirely on his strength with independents and the wave turnout, both of which are highly unlikely to be repeated in 2012. If Romney wins with independents by anywhere near the current average he has and takes more crossover voters than Obama does, Obama would need to exceed 2008 turnout greatly to win.¶ So, with less than two weeks until Election Day we will all know the results soon enough, but as more Ohio polls come in, it is important to remember that the picture for Romney in Ohio is better than many pundits would have us believe. It only takes a quick look at Romney’s rallies to remind us it’s not 2008 anymore, as Republicans have reclaimed the enthusiasm advantage that led to such sweeping 2008 victories for Democrats. That GOP enthusiasm has become contagious since the debates, and it is exactly what has Team Obama so afraid these days. All they have left to hang their hopes on is a slim lead in the polls, and even that might not be enough on Election Day.

#### Romney wins now – best polls and swing states.

Chambers 10-24 (Dean, Arlington Conservative, “Mitt Romney 54 percent 359 electoral votes projected at UnSkewed Polls site”, http://www.examiner.com/article/mitt-romney-54-percent-359-electoral-votes-projected-at-unskewed-polls-site)

While the Gallup tracking poll released today shows Romney leading the race 50 percent to 46 percent, other major polls and projections are also suggesting Mitt Romney will be the next president of the United States. Calling it the “Unskewed Projection” of the 2012 presidential race, QStarNews has released today via UnSkewedPolls.com a detail prediction of the race by popular vote in all states and nationally as well as a projection by electoral votes. The report projects Mitt Romney will defeat President Obama by a 54 percent to 46 percent by national popular vote and 359 electoral votes for Romney to 179 electoral votes for Obama. The projection includes a chart predicting the popular vote and vote percentages for all the states as well as vote data from all states from the last four presidential elections. The QStarNews/UnSkewedPolls.com projection of the race is based on analyzing and predicting the popular vote in each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia by assessing the votes in the last four elections, the political profile, demographic changes, current and recent polls including the QStarNews polls as well information regarding the targeting of those states by the Obama and Romney campaigns this year. The QStarNews/UnSkewedPolls.com predicts that overall turnout nationally will be about 105 percent of what it was in 2008 and the electorate will be made up of 34.8 percent Republicans, 35.2 percent Democrats and 30.0 percent independents. The reports projects that a total of 130,955,000 voters will vote in the election this year. Romney is shown winning all 11 of the key swing states, as also projected in the latest QStarNews poll of swing states, in the QStarNews/UnSkewedPolls.com projection. Those states include Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin. Most observers of this election and their projections consider Michigan and Pennsylvania to be more likely to be won in November by President Obama. The map above shows the electoral college projection from this QStarNews/UnSkewedPolls.com report. Mitt Romney is projected to win 359 electoral votes while President Obama is expected to win the remaining 179 electoral votes. While many will be surprised to see Romney winning Oregon, Minnesota, Michigan and Pennsylvania, the other surprises are how close states like Connecticut, New Jersey and Maine end up in popular since those states have been fairly safely in the Obama column in most projections and polls up to now. QStarNews reports this “definitive projection” will be highly accurate because of the methodology used to produce the numbers on which it is based. QStarNews was quite accurate in projecting the 2010 elections for Congress, senators and governors.

#### Prefer our polls – they provide a more accurate representation of likely voters.

Geraghty, Contributor, 10-25

[Jim, “Obama ‘Wins’ Debate, But Somehow Romney Wins the Undecideds”, The National Review, 10-25-12,

<http://www.nationalreview.com/campaign-spot/331597/obama-wins-debate-somehow-romney-wins-undecideds>, RSR]

Meanwhile, Bob Krumm looks at the national polls and concludes that most pollsters have wildly high estimations of how many respondents are “likely voters” – from about 70 percent for Rasmussen, to about 80 percent for the NBC/Wall Street Journal poll, to about 85 percent for the ABC News/Washington Post poll and Gallup, to an unfathomable 93 percent of the IBD/TIPP poll. Historically, the percentage of registered voters who actually cast ballots is in the high 60s, low 70s; the percentage of the voting age population who casts ballots is usually in the 50s. It hit 62 percent in 2008.

#### Don’t let them say their evidence is more recent. Statewide and national polls are all conducted at the beginning of the week, meaning we use just as recent polls. Also, no reason why ONE to TWO days matters more.

### Link

#### Extend 1NC – Danko. Plan specifically popular in states like Iowa and Colorado where it can swing the election. The race is especially tight in these locations.

#### Iowa is key to the election – Axelrod

King 12 (John, CNN Chief National Correspondent, “Battlegrounds: Iowa's six electoral votes could be decisive”, August 16th, http://www.cnn.com/2012/08/16/politics/king-battleground-iowa/index.html)

"It's going to be close," Branstad says of the state, making note of the heavy commitment of candidate time, staff and spending both campaigns are making to Iowa.¶ That includes busy booths just a few steps away from each other at the fair, where both campaigns are helping to register voters and recruit volunteers.¶ Branstad, whose involvement in presidential politics goes back more than a quarter-century, smiles at all the activity -- and attention.¶ "It's fun," the governor says, "to be a battleground state."¶ Axelrod, who also traveled with Vice President Joe Biden the last time he came to Iowa, says the state and its six electoral votes could prove decisive.¶ "John, my philosophy is always to plan for the worst and hope for the best," Axelrod says. "And so we're planning for 270 electoral votes (the minimum for victory). In that scenario, even a smaller state like Iowa can be a pivotal state. And that's why we're spending three days here. We're not leaving anything to chance. We're fighting for every vote and every electoral vote. And these electoral votes matter."

#### Colorado is the key swing state – money, candidate visits and lots of unaffiliated voters

Levin 12 (Sam writer for the Denver alternative weekly Westword, August 30th, “Red or blue, all eyes are on Colorado this election”, http://www.westword.com/2012-08-30/news/colorado-swing-state/)

Ryan was repeating a refrain that has become common at local rallies for both President Barack Obama and Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney. With Election Day just over two months away, the evidence of Colorado's importance in the national race is everywhere, from the millions of dollars both campaigns and supporting super-PACs are pouring into television advertisements across the state to the weekly traffic jams and road closures caused by the candidates' increasingly frequent visits. Colorado — alongside Ohio, Virginia, Florida (site of the Republican National Convention) and several other toss-ups — continues to make national news as one of the key battleground states.¶ And as the fight for Colorado's voters — and nine electoral votes — wages on, polls, political pundits and local party leaders seem to agree on just one thing: Whether this state's purple mountain majesties turn red or blue in November could determine the next president of the United States.¶ \*\*\*¶ The reason for Colorado's importance as a swing state is quite simple: The largest group of voters isn't tied to either of the two major parties. This state is more purple than it is red or blue. More voters in Colorado are registered as unaffiliated than as Democrats or Republicans, and these are exactly the voters that both campaigns are vigorously targeting. Based on the most recent data from the Colorado Secretary of State's office, as of July there were 3,456,191 registered voters in the state, of which 1,206,035 were unaffiliated, 1,093,025 were Democrats and 1,124,158 were Republicans.

#### Their evidence is just in the context of renewable subsidies, not the wind PTC. Prefer the specificity of our evidence.

#### Also, plan specifically kills base turn out for Obama. 1NC Danko says that groups like environmentalists will not vote for a candidate unless they support the PTC adamantly.

#### Base turnout key

Cillizza 12 (Chris, American political reporter for the Washington Post. He writes The Fix, a daily political weblog for the Post website. He is a regular contributor to the Post on political issues, “Is the 2012 election more about base than undecideds?”, http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2012-election-more-about-base-than-undecideds/2012/08/19/2cd2f98c-ea02-11e1-9ddc-340d5efb1e9c\_story.html)

Conventional wisdom dictates that President Obama and former Massachusetts governor Mitt Romney will spend the next 78 days assiduously courting the sliver of voters — somewhere between 5 percent and 10 percent of the electorate — who call themselves political independents and insist they remain genuinely undecided about which candidate to support.¶ Elections are, after all, decided by the ideological middle; the two parties’ bases are already aligned behind their candidates, and the trick is to persuade enough of those centrist independents to side with your, well, side, to win. Except, of course, when it’s not.¶ “The only thing undecided in this election are the TV anchors’ ties on election night,” said Dan Hazelwood, a Republican direct-mail consultant. “Both sides believe there is little chance for a dramatic shift in opinion, so that leaves trench political warfare as the default strategy. That means identifying and turning out your own supporters.”¶ Heaps of national polling would seem to affirm Hazelwood’s contention. Political polarization is at an all-time high, with even soft partisans already aligned behind either Obama or Romney. That has shrunk the middle of the electorate to single digits nationally. Simply put: There just aren’t that many people left for the campaigns to convince — no matter how much money (and it will be lots of money) the two sides spend between now and Nov. 6.¶ Given that political reality, there is a strong case to be made that the two campaigns should spend most of their time/energy/¶ money not trying to find and persuade independents and undecideds but rather trying to identify and rally their (already united) bases.

#### Support for wind is bipartisan – conservatives back home district jobs and liberals like clean energy

Shahan 12 (Zach, editor of Cleantechnica.com, former Executive Director of a non-profit organization promoting sustainable development and clean transportation in Charlottesville, VA, former city planner, July 4th, http://cleantechnica.com/2012/07/04/16-house-republicans-push-house-leadership-to-pass-ptc-extension-for-wind-power/?utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+IM-cleantechnica+%28CleanTechnica%29)

Last week, “16 Republican House freshmen and two of their Democratic colleagues sent a letter to House leadership requesting immediate extension of the Production Tax Credit (PTC) for American wind energy,” the American Wind Energy Association (AWEA) noted. “I want to thank Rep. Kristi Noem and her 17 colleagues in the House freshman class for fighting for USA wind jobs. They understand that affordable, homegrown wind power is creating one of our best new sources of clean American electricity and tens of thousands of American manufacturing jobs in the process,” AWEA CEO Denise Bode stated. “The PTC is an example of effective, job-creating tax policy, but with expiration looming at the end of the year, 37,000 good American jobs are in peril. That is why Congress must act now to save USA wind jobs and keep this success story moving forward.” Along with this statement, AWEA included mention of the following salient facts: Bipartisan support –Supporters in both parties have been raising this issue since late last year as an urgent action item for Congress, including more than 100 cosponsors of HR 3307 (almost a quarter of them Republicans) and S 2201. –The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, American Farm Bureau, and Edison Electric Institute are among over 400 organizations and companies endorsing the PTC extension. –A bipartisan coalition of 23 governors led by Gov. Terry Branstad (R-Iowa) supports extending the PTC. Gov. Branstad recently wrote The Wall Street Journal on its economic benefits. –Republican, Democratic and Independent voters broadly support wind power and its expansion. –Highlighting the bipartisan nature of wind power was a recent dialogue between Karl Rove, former senior advisor to President George W. Bush, and Robert Gibbs, former Press Secretary and advisor to President Obama at WINDPOWER 2012 in Atlanta, Ga. As Rove stated, “You don’t need moderates to get this done. You need conservative Republicans who say this means jobs to my district and a resource we’ve got plenty of. And you need Democrats to say this is a way to expand the range of options that we have as a country for energy.”

#### Ohio residents support alternative energy development

Funk 12 (John, buisness reporter for The Plain Dealer, Ohioans agree: Advanced energy technology crucial to economic survival, June 27th, http://www.cleveland.com/business/index.ssf/2012/06/ohioans\_agree\_advanced\_energy.html)

CLEVELAND, Ohio -- Eight out of 10 Ohio residents think that the development of advanced energy technologies -- everything from hybrid cars to smart buildings to wind, solar and nuclear energy -- are important to the state's economic future, a new poll has found. And a majority of the state's residents think that Ohio's political leaders ought to further their development, according to the random survey of 705 adults conducted last week by pollster John Zogby's JZ Analytics and has a margin of error of 3.8 percent.

### Impact

#### Prolif increases tension that results in escalation – changed perceptions of motivation and posturing

Knopf, Professor in the Department of National Security Affairs at the Naval Postgraduate School, ‘2

[Jeffrey, “Recasting the proliferation optimism-pessimism debate,” Security Studies, Vol. 12, No. 1, p. 57-58, October]

Nuclear weapons can exacerbate tensions in two ways: by creating an increased perception of threat and by prompting efforts to limit damage in the event of nuclear war. On the first point, proliferation optimists write as if potential adversaries exist at a given, fixed level of hostility. This is unlikely to be the case. Rather, a state that acquires nuclear weapons is likely to be perceived as more threatening than it was before. This will be partly because of the new, more destructive capabilities at its disposal. In some cases, however, a state’s pursuit of nuclear weapons may also change how other states view its intentions. This is especially likely because new and aspiring nuclear states are not always circumspect in their pronouncements. In March 1994, in the midst of a crisis over North Korea’s suspected nuclear weapons program, the North’s chief negotiator threatened his South Korean counterpart that a war could break out in which the South would be turned into “a sea of fire.”47 After the May 1998 nuclear tests in India, Prime Minister Vajpayee wrote President Clinton and explicitly cited a threat from China as a motivation for the tests. Statements by Defense Minister Fernandes shortly before and again shortly after the tests also described China as “potential threat number one” to India.48 Other Indian officials publicly warned Pakistan to end its support for separatist insurgents in Kashmir. Home Minister Advani called on Islamabad to “realize the change in the geostrategic situation” and said that in the new circumstances even the option of “hot pursuit” would not be ruled out.49 Such statements are bound to be provocative to the states against which they are directed. States on the receiving end of new, public nuclear threats will likely feel a need to display their toughness as a way to show they will not be intimidated. While nuclear weapons do encourage caution, they can also create pressures to demonstrate resolve, and any such demonstration carries with it some risk of escalation.

#### Prolif cascades cause militarization of disputes—escalates to great power war.

Kroenig, assistant professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, ‘9

[Matt, November 2009, “Beyond Optimism and Pessimism: The Differential Effects of Nuclear Proliferation”, http://belfercenter.hks.harvard.edu/publication/19671/beyond\_optimism\_and\_pessimism.html]

Nuclear proliferation can embolden new nuclear states, triggering regional instability that could potentially threaten the interests of power-projecting states and even entrap them in regional disputes. New nuclear weapon states may be more aggressive and this newfound assertiveness can result in regional instability. I define regional instability as a heightened frequency (but not necessarily the intensity) of militarized interstate disputes among states in a given geographical region. The threat that regional instability poses to power-projecting states is different from the concern about international instability expressed by the proliferation pessimists. Pessimists assume that international instability is bad in and of itself – and they may be right. But, power-projecting states have a different concern. They worry that nuclear proliferation will set off regional instability and that, because they have the ability to project power over the new nuclear weapon state, they will be compelled to intervene in a costly conflict. Power-projecting states could feel the need to act as a mediator between nuclear-armed disputants, provide conventional military assistance to one of the parties in the dispute, or because they have the ability to put boots on the ground in the new nuclear state, potentially be drawn into the fighting themselves. There is direct evidence that nuclear weapons can contribute to regional instability. Robert Rauchhaus has demonstrated that nuclear weapon states are more likely to engage in conflict than nonnuclear weapon states. 46 Michael Horowitz extends this analysis to show that aggressiveness is most pronounced in new nuclear states that have less experience with nuclear diplomacy.47 These related findings are not due to the fact that dispute-prone states are more likely to acquire nuclear weapons; the scholars carefully control for a state’s selection into nuclear status. Rather, the findings demonstrate that nuclear weapons increase the frequency with which their possessors participate in militarized disputes. Qualitative studies have also provided supporting evidence of nuclear weapons’ potentially destabilizing effects. Research on internal decision-making in Pakistan reveals that Pakistani foreign policymakers may have been emboldened by the acquisition of nuclear weapons, encouraging them to initiate militarized disputes against India.48 Proliferation optimists counter that nuclear proliferation should increase regional stability, but the most recent empirical investigations undermine the stronger versions of the optimism argument.49 While nuclear-armed states may be less likely to experience full-scale war providing some support for the optimist position, the preponderance of evidence suggests that nuclear-armed states are more likely to engage in other types of militarized disputes.50 This is true whether only one state or all of the contentious actors in a region possess nuclear weapons.51 Furthermore, for the sake of argument, even if nuclear proliferation does have stabilizing effects as optimists argue, as long as regional conflict among nuclear-armed states is possible, the basic argument presented here still holds. This is because power-projecting states may still feel compelled to intervene in the conflicts that do occur. These are conflicts that they perhaps could have avoided had nuclear weapons been absent. There is direct evidence that regional conflicts involving nuclear powers can encourage power-projecting states to become involved in nuclear disputes. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger was reluctant to aid Israel in the 1973 Yom Kippur War until Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir threatened that, without U.S. assistance, she might be forced to use nuclear weapons against the Arab armies.52 In response, Kissinger reversed his decision and provided emergency aid to the Israeli DefenseForces.53 The Soviet Union also considered a military intervention to help its Arab proxies in the Yom Kippur War, causing the United States to go on nuclear alert, and leading leaders in both Moscow and Washington to consider the very real possibility that a conflict involving a regional nuclear power could spiral into a superpower war.54 Similarly, in 1999 and 2002, the United States became caught in diplomatic initiatives to prevent nuclear war in crises between the nuclear- armed countries of India and Pakistan.55 Indeed, the expectation that powerful states will intervene in conflicts involving a nuclear-armed state is so firmly ingrained in the strategic thinking of national leaders that small nuclear powers actually incorporate it into their strategic doctrines. South Africa’s nuclear doctrine envisioned, in the event of an imminent security threat, the detonation of a nuclear weapon, not against the threatening party, but over the Atlantic Ocean in an attempt to jolt the United States into intervening on South Africa’s behalf.56 Israel’s nuclear doctrine was also constructed along similar lines. While the Israelis are notoriously silent about the existence and purpose of their nuclear arsenal, Francis Perrin, a French official who assisted in the development of Israel’s nuclear program in the 1950s and 1960s, explained that Israel’s arsenal was originally aimed “against the Americans, not to launch against America, but to say ‘If you don’t want to help us in a critical situation, we will require you to help us. Otherwise, we will use our nuclear bombs.’”57 Similarly, Pakistan’s surprise raid on Indian-controlled Kargil in 1999 was motivated partly by the expectation that Pakistan would be able to retain any territory it was able to seize quickly, because Pakistani officials calculated that the United States would never allow an extended conflict in nuclear South Asia.58 For these reasons, power-projecting states worry about the effect of nuclear proliferation on regional stability. U.S. officials feared that nuclear proliferation in Israel could embolden Israel against its Arab enemies, or entice Arab states to launch a preventive military strike on Israel’s nuclear arsenal. In a 1963 NIE on Israel’s nascent nuclear program, the consensus view of the U.S. intelligence community was that if Israel acquired nuclear weapons, “Israel’s policy toward its neighbors would become more rather than less tough...it would seek to exploit the psychological advantage of its nuclear capability to intimidate the Arabs.”59 President Kennedy concurred. In a letter to Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, Kennedy wrote that Israel should abandon its nuclear program because Israel’s “development of such (nuclear) weapons would dangerously threaten the stability of thearea.”60 Similarly, in the case of China’s nuclear program, U.S. officials believed that a nuclear-armed China would “be more willing to take risks in military probing operations because of an overoptimistic assessment of its psychological advantage.”61 More recently, U.S. officials have continued to fear the effect of nuclear proliferation on regional stability. In a 1986 Top Secret CIA Assessment, U.S. intelligence analysts predicted that a nuclear North Korea would have “a free hand to conduct paramilitary operations without provoking a response.”62 Similarly, a U.S. expert testified before Congress in 2006 that “A nuclear arsenal in the hands of Iran’s current theocratic regime will be a source of both regional and global instability.”63 U.S. officials assessed that regional instability set off by nuclear proliferation could compel them to intervene directly in regional conflicts. In the early 1960s, U.S. officials speculated that Israel could potentially leverage its nuclear arsenal to compel the United States to intervene on its behalf in Middle Eastern crises.64 Similarly, in 1965, Henry Rowen, an official in the Department of Defense, assessed that if India acquired nuclear weapons, it could lead to a conflict in South Asia “with a fair chance of spreading and involving the UnitedStates.”65 At the time of writing, U.S. defense strategists are planning for the possibility that the United States may be compelled to intervene in regional conflicts involving a nuclear-armed Iran or North Korea and their neighbors.66 Leaders in power-projecting states also fear that regional instability set off by nuclear proliferation could entrap power-projecting states in a great power war. Other power- projecting states, facing a mirror-image situation, may feel compelled to intervene in a crisis to secure their own interests, entangling multiple great powers in a regional conflict. In a 1963 NIE, U.S. intelligence analysts assessed that “the impact of (nuclear proliferation in the Middle East) will be the possibility that hostilities arising out of existing or future controversies could escalate into a confrontation involving the major powers.”67 President Johnson believed that a nuclear Israel meant increased Soviet involvement in the Middle East and perhaps superpower war.68 If historical experience provides a guide, U.S. strategists at the time of writing are undoubtedly concerned by the possibility that China may feel compelled to intervene in any conflict involving a nuclear-armed North Korea, making the Korean Peninsula another dangerous flash-point in the uncertain Sino-American strategic relationship.

#### Prolif optimists rely on theorizing over data – models are insufficient for policymaking.

Busch, Professor of Government at Christopher Newport University, ‘4

[Nathan, “No End in Sight: The Continuing Menace of Nuclear Proliferation” p 281-314]

Until now, the proliferation debate has largely taken place on an abstract, theoretical level. No doubt this orientation partly reflects perfectly legitimate scholarly concerns: in order to improve our understanding of international affairs, we of course need to establish theories to explain and predict state action. Participants in the proliferation debate have gone astray, however, in placing theorizing at the beginning, rather than at the end of their thinking. Instead of building theories on solid evidence gathered from rigorous empirical studies, they have too often predicted future state actions only on the basis of preexisting theories. From a scholarly point of view, one of the most important lessons from the present study is that we cannot afford anything other than a relentlessly empirical foundation for—and testing of— social science theory. While abstract theorizing can be found on both sides of the debate, it is especially common among the optimists. Rather than asking how NWSs actually do act, optimists have begun with theories of how states should act—that is, in accordance with supposedly "realist" rational-actor models—and predicted the actions of states on that basis. One need only recall Waltz's confident statement, "We do not have to wonder whether they [NWSs] will take good care of their weapons. They have every incentive to do so.""" On the contrary, the proper approach to theory would begin with wonder about whether states do, in fact, always act with such rational incentives in mind. As the present study has demonstrated, there is little empirical support for such an optimistic position where nuclear proliferation is concerned. While realist theories may be useful for explaining certain types of state actions, they are inappropriate models for predicting specific policies and actions that NWSs will take. Having oversimplified the causes and motivations of state action, the optimists make highly inappropriate policy recommendations regarding nuclear proliferation. Indeed, those recommendations go beyond what the optimists' own theories could possibly support. In a context other than the proliferation debate, Waltz argues that his theories cannot predict specific policies or particular actions by individual states; instead, he maintains, they can predict only general trends.1" But, as Jeffrey Knopf has pointed out, when one is advocating a further proliferation of nuclear weapons, predicting general trends is not enough: one must be certain that one's theories are correct all of the time. It is likely that a certain awareness of the special dangers attending nuclear weapons policy leads Waltz to misapply his own realist theory and predict that NWSs will act rationally without exception. But that awareness must be replaced by fully conscious practical reasoning. Empirically grounded theories, combined with the prudence of the policymaker, would lead to policy recommendations that are more sound. Absent a nuclear exchange, or a series of nuclear exchanges, we will lack conclusive proof that a further spread of nuclear weapons will lead to nuclear catastrophes. May such a proof never be forthcoming. In the meantime, however, I hope this study will contribute to more nuanced and accurate theorizing about state action—theories acknowledging that while states sometimes act rationally, they often fail to do so when constrained by certain political, bureaucratic, economic, and other factors. I also hope this study will contribute to better-informed policymaking on nuclear issues. Although continued study of the historical record and future developments will surely provide additional relevant information, it is already fairly clear that U.S. and global interests lie in preventing a further spread of nuclear weapons and reducing nuclear dangers among current NWSs as much as possible. If the United States takes the lead in these areas, we will make progress toward making the world a safer place.

### A2: China Can Solve

#### China can’t solve for countries under US nuclear umbrella.