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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 remove all subsidies and tax credits for energy production and institute a carbon tax per ton of emissions. The tax should be revenue neutral and the revenue should be used for offsetting reductions in income and payroll taxes and increases in the earned income tax credit.

#### A carbon tax solves better for warming and avoids picking winners

Griffin 9 (James, Professor at the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University; Director of the Robert A. Mosbacher Institute for Trade, Economics and Public Policy; he holds the Bob Bullock Chair in Public Policy and Finance and is a director in the Berkeley Research Group, a boutique economic consulting house; Ph.D. in economics from the University of Pennsylvania; he is a Humboldt Fellow and serves on the editorial board of three economics journals; his research has resulted in six books and over 50 refereed journal articles; he has maintained a long-standing interest in energy policy, having co-authored the leading textbook in the field; “A smart energy policy: an economist's Rx for balancing cheap, clean, and secure energy” p.4-5

In this book I argue that the best energy policy for balancing the often-compet-¶ ing goals of cheap, clean, and secure energy would use the price system to fundamentally alter consumer behavior, business behavior, and the incentives to develop alternative-energy technologies. Currently, the price system fails to incorporate the true social cost of fossil fuels—the costs associated with climate¶ diange and oil security. Because these fossil fuels are artiﬁcially cheap, alternative clean and secure energy technologies are forced to compete on a very un-even playing ﬁeld. By taxing fossil fuels to reﬂect their true environmental and security costs, we can level the playing ﬁeld for these new technologies. Given a level playing ﬁeld, new technologies will ﬂourish, and energy conservation will regin in the overall growth of energy consumption. There will be no need for special subsidies, tax credits, and so forth for alternative technologies deemed winners of the congressional beauty pageant for alternative fuels. Instead, the marketplace will identify the winners and winnow out failed technologies.¶ There is currently no way for policymakers to identify the ultimate winners and¶ losers. We have no idea what technologies will dominate in thirty or ﬁfty years.¶ Instead of policymakers attempting to socially engineer the outcome, as in the¶ case ofcom-based ethanol, it is far better to create the market conditions under¶ which unknown and unknowable technologies will ﬂourish. Using the price system to modify human behavior is not a novel idea. “Sin¶ taxes” on alcohol and cigarettes, for example, have be shown to substantially¶ reduce consumption of both. in the Scandinavian counuies, high¶ taxes on alcohol have proved to be an eﬁecﬁve means of curtailing consurnp-¶ tion, after experimts with a variety of command-and-conu'ol policies, such as¶ prohibidon, generated much public discontent. But in the case of fossil fuels,¶ taxes would not only discourage the consumpﬁon of fossil fuels, but they¶ would also provide a level playing ﬁeld on which new energy technologies¶ could compete and ﬂourish. Speciﬁcally,¶ Congress should enact security a security tax per barrel of oil and a carbon tax per ton of carbon, thus raising the of all carbon-mntainingﬁnlr to ngﬂect tbeir true social cost.¶ Such a strategy has several advantages over the policy of awarding subsidies¶ and protective tariﬁ to industries represented by strong, entrenched lobbies¶ such as the Renewable Fuels Association (com-based ethanol producers) and¶ subjecting consumers to various command-and-conuols:¶ ° All new technologies would enjoy a more level playing ﬁeld.¶ ° The market, not the government, would determine which of the new tech-¶ nologies are the winners.¶ ° This approach is more uansparent. It is exuernely diﬂicult to assess the costs¶ (in terms of lost tax revenues) and the eﬁectiveness of the current patchwork¶ of subsidies and tax credits. In contrast, imposing carbon and security taxes would force us to ask how much we are willing to pay for clearner air and added oil security.¶ ° A focus on the prices right for fossil fuels would limit the opportunity¶ for Congress to pass legislation designed to enrich pardcular private-interest¶ groups.

### Off

#### The United States federal government should engage in bilateral military cooperation with China.

#### Bilateral military cooperation is key to the US China relationship and promoting cooperation on other issues

Xinhua 12 (China, U.S. enhance military relations, 9/18, http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/china/2012-09/18/c\_131857212.htm)

Senior military leaders on Tuesday called for more efforts to promote military ties between China and the United States.¶ "The two sides should, within the framework of building a China-U.S. cooperative partnership, promote a new type of military relations featuring equality, reciprocity and win-win cooperation in an active and pragmatic way," Defense Minister Liang Guanglie said.¶ Liang made the remarks during a joint press conference held with visiting U.S. Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta after their talks on bilateral military ties.¶ China and the U.S. should explore a path of coexistence and establish a new type of relations that corresponds to their influence, Liang said.¶ He called on both sides to increase mutual trust, enhance their understanding of their respective defense policies and strategic trends and increase dialogue and communication.¶ The two militaries need to abandon zero-sum thinking and strengthen mutually beneficial cooperation, Liang said.¶ Both sides also need to properly solve disputes and differences and respect each other's core interests and concerns, he added. ' Liang encouraged the two militaries to deepen substantial cooperation in areas of non-traditional security, such as humanitarian rescues, anti-piracy efforts and medical assistance.¶ Panetta said a stable and constructive U.S.-China relationship is absolutely a vital component of U.S. strategy.¶ "We won't achieve security and prosperity in the 21st century without a constructive U.S.-China relationship. including a stronger military-to-military relationship," said Panetta.¶ Panetta said the U.S. and China have begun a process of positive exchanges. "The point of this is to send a very positive signal to all the nations of this region and the world that we intend to establish a relationship that is healthy, stable, reliable, and continuous."¶ Liang and Panetta exchanged views on U.S. weapon sales to Taiwan, the Diaoyu Islands, the rebalancing of U.S. policy, the South China Sea, cyberspace and outer space security.¶ Xu Caihou, vice chairman of the Central Military Commission, also met with Panetta on Tuesday, expressing China's will to develop a new type of military ties.¶ Enhancing strategic mutual trust is the basis of the stable development of bilateral military ties, said Xu, adding that China hopes to engage in benign and cooperative interaction with the U.S.¶ Stressing that the United States and China enjoy extensive common interests, Panetta said it is conducive for both countries, the Asia-Pacific region and the entire world to maintain the healthy development of bilateral military ties.

### 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.

### Leadership

#### 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

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

#### 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.

#### Competitiveness doesn’t matter - the theory is totally inaccurate

Krugman 94 Krugman, Paul prof of econ at Princeton “Competitiveness: A Dangerous Obsession”, Foreign Affairs, 00157120, Mar/Apr94, Vol. 73, Issue 2

It was a disappointing evasion, but not a surprising one. After all, the rhetoric of competitiveness--the view that, in the words of President Clinton, each nation is "like a big corporation competing in the global marketplace"--has become pervasive among opinion leaders throughout the world. People who believe themselves to be sophisticated about the subject take it for granted that the economic problem facing any modern nation is essentially one of competing on world markets--that the United States and Japan are competitors in the same sense that Coca-Cola competes with Pepsi--and are unaware that anyone might seriously question that proposition. Every few months a new best-sell-er warns the American public of the dire consequences of losing the "race" for the 21st century.[1] A whole industry of councils on competitiveness, "geo-economists" and managed trade theorists has sprung up in Washington. Many of these people, having diagnosed America's economic problems in much the same terms as Delors did Europe's, are now in the highest reaches of the Clinton administration formulating economic and trade policy for the United States. So Delors was using a language that was not only convenient but comfortable for him and a wide audience on both sides of the Atlantic.¶ Unfortunately, his diagnosis was deeply misleading as a guide to what ails Europe, and similar diagnoses in the United States are equally misleading. The idea that a country's economic fortunes are largely determined by its success on world markets is a hypothesis, not a necessary truth; and as a practical, empirical matter, that hypothesis is flatly wrong. That is, it is simply not the case that the world's leading nations are to any important degree in economic competition with each other, or that any of their major economic problems can be attributed to failures to compete on world markets. The growing obsession in most advanced nations with international competitiveness should be seen, not as a well-founded concern, but as a view held in the face of overwhelming contrary evidence. And yet it is clearly a view that people very much want to hold--a desire to believe that is reflected in a remarkable tendency of those who preach the doctrine of competitiveness to support their case with careless, flawed arithmetic.

#### They don’t solve manufacturing - components would be produced abroad – California 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.

#### 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.

#### Economic collapse causes global nuclear war.

Friedberg and Schoenfeld, ‘8 (Aaron [Prof. Politics. And IR @ Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School and Visiting Scholar @ Witherspoon Institute], and Gabriel, [Senior Editor of Commentary and Wall Street Journal], “The Dangers of a Diminished America”,

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html)

Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability. The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity. None of this is good news if the authoritarian leaders of these countries seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures.

#### Data disproves hegemony impacts

Fettweis, 11

Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO

It is perhaps worth noting that there is no evidence to support a direct relationship between the relative level of U.S. activism and international stability. In fact, the limited data we do have suggest the opposite may be true. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defense in real terms than it had in 1990.51 To internationalists, defense hawks and believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities,” argued Kristol and Kagan, “doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace.”52 On the other hand, if the pacific trends were not based upon U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate war, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence. The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable United States military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums, no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races, and no regional balancing occurred once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities. Most of all, the United States and its allies were no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and kept declining as the Bush Administration ramped the spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be necessary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated. Military spending figures by themselves are insufficient to disprove a connection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. Once again, one could presumably argue that spending is not the only or even the best indication of hegemony, and that it is instead U.S. foreign political and security commitments that maintain stability. Since neither was significantly altered during this period, instability should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of hegemonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is decisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. However, even if it is true that either U.S. commitments or relative spending account for global pacific trends, then at the very least stability can evidently be maintained at drastically lower levels of both. In other words, even if one can be allowed to argue in the alternative for a moment and suppose that there is in fact a level of engagement below which the United States cannot drop without increasing international disorder, a rational grand strategist would still recommend cutting back on engagement and spending until that level is determined. Grand strategic decisions are never final; continual adjustments can and must be made as time goes on. Basic logic suggests that the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment. And if the current era of stability is as stable as many believe it to be, no increase in conflict would ever occur irrespective of U.S. spending, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation. It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expectations had been fulfilled. If increases in conflict would have been interpreted as proof of the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, the only evidence we have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that the current peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S. military spending. Evidently the rest of the world can operate quite effectively without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone.

#### Petropolitics good - oil dependence is key to heg- reserve currency and engagement

Drezner 8 (Daniel W. Drezner is a professor of international politics at the Fletcher School at Tufts University and a senior editor at The National Interest “Oil Dependence as Virtue” National Interest Nov/Dec 2008, Issue 98 Ebsco)

But would this really be the case? It may be that the assumptions we hold are grounded in a misunderstanding of the global order. Perhaps instead, without oil dominating their economies, the Middle East oil states would be far less dependent on the United States for trade, for security and for dollars. Perhaps the dollar would no longer be the world's reserve currency, which would severely hinder America's ability to fund its current-account deficit--and its military superiority. And then, perhaps, the security guarantee the United States provides to the Middle East--and by extension the entire oil-dependent world--would be null and void. In short, a world that doesn't need oil may also be a world that doesn't need the United States. But when prices of oil are skyrocketing, people aren't thinking about the possible long-term implications of energy independence, only the short-term gains.

#### Numerous alt causes that are more relevant to US power projection capabilities.

Cohen, Fellow at the Century Foundation, ‘12

[Michael, “Rotting from the Inside Out”, 2-21-12, Foreign Policy,

<http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/02/21/rotting_from_the_inside_out>, RSR]

There is, however, one serious problem with this analysis. Any discussion of American national security that focuses solely on the issue of U.S. power vis-à-vis other countries -and ignores domestic inputs -is decidedly incomplete. In Kagan's New Republic article, for example, he has little to say about the country's domestic challenges except to obliquely argue that to focus on "nation-building" at home while ignoring the importance of maintaining U.S. power abroad would be a mistake. In fact, in a recent FP debate with the Financial Times' Gideon Rachman on the issue of American decline, Kagan diagnoses what he, and many other political analysts, appear to believe is the country's most serious problem: "enormous fiscal deficits driven by entitlements." Why is this bad? It makes it harder, says Kagan, for the United States to "continue playing its vital role in the world" and will lead to significant cutbacks in defense spending. However, a focus on U.S. global dominance or suasion that doesn't factor in those elements that constitute American power at home ignores substantial and worsening signs of decline. Indeed, by virtually any measure, a closer look at the state of the United States today tells a sobering tale of rapid and unchecked decay and deterioration in a host of areas. While not all of them are generally considered elements of national security, perhaps they should be. Let's start with education, which almost any observer would agree is a key factor in national competitiveness. The data is not good. According to the most recent OECD report on global education standards, the United States is an average country in how it educates its children -12th in reading skills, 17th in science, and 26th in math. The World Economic Forum ranks the United States 48th in the quality of its mathematics and science education, even though we spend more money per student than almost any country in the world. America's high school graduation rate is lower today that it was in the late 1960s and "kids are now less likely to graduate from high school than their parents," according to an analysis released last year by the Editorial Projects in Education Research Center. In fact, not only is the graduation rate worse than many Western countries, the United States is now the only developed country where a higher percentage of 55 to 64-year-olds have a high school diploma than 25 to 34-year-olds. While the United States still maintains the world's finest university system, college graduation rates are slipping. Among 25 to 34-year-olds, America trails Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Ireland, Israel, Japan, South Korea, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom in its percentage of college graduates. This speaks, in some measure, to the disparities that are endemic in the U.S. education system. If you are poor in America, chances are you attend a school that underperforms, are taught by teachers that are not as effective, and have test scores that lag far behind your more affluent counterparts (the same is true if you are black or Hispanic -you lag behind your white counterparts). Can a country be a great global power if its education system is fundamentally unequal and is getting steadily worse? What about national infrastructure -another key element of national economic power and global competitiveness? First, the nation's broadband penetration rates remain in the middle of the global pack and there is growing divide in the United States between digital haves and have nots. Overall, its transportation networks are mediocre compared to similarly wealthy countries and according to the World Economic Forum, the United States ranks 23rd in the OECD for infrastructure quality -a ranking that has steadily declined over the past decade. American commuters spend more time in traffic than Western Europeans, the country's train system and high-speed rail lines in general pale next to that of other developed nations, and even the number of people killed on American highways is 60 percent higher than the OECD average. Part of the problem is that the amount of money the U.S. government spends on infrastructure has steadily declined for decades and now trails far behind other Western nations. In time, such infrastructure disadvantages have the potential to undermine the U.S. economy, hamstring productivity and competitiveness, and put the lives of more Americans at risk -and this appears to be happening already. Finally, a closer look at the U.S. health care system is enough to make one ill. Even after the passage of Obama's 2010 health care reform bill (which every Republican presidential candidate wants to repeal) the United States is far from having a health care system that meets the needs of its citizens. According to a July 2011 report by the Commonwealth Fund, "the U.S. has fewer hospital beds and physicians, and sees fewer hospital and physician visits, than in most other countries" even though it spends far more on health care per capita than any other country in the world. In addition, "prescription drug utilization, prices, and spending all appear to be highest in the U.S., as does the supply, utilization, and price of diagnostic imaging." Long story short, the United States spends more for less on health care than pretty much any other developed nation in the world. That might also explain why life expectancy in America trails far behind most OECD countries. The United States also has the unique distinction of having one of the highest rates of income inequality in the world, on par with such global powerhouses as Cameroon, Madagascar, Rwanda, Uganda, and Ecuador. It has the fourth worst child poverty rate and trails only Mexico and Turkey in overall poverty rate among OECD countries. And when it comes to infant mortality, the U.S. rate is one of the worst in the developing world. But not to fear, the United States still maintains some advantages. For example, it is one of the fattest countries in the world, with approximately one-third of the country considered obese (including one out of every six children). In addition, the United States has, by far, the largest prison population -more than China, Iran, and Cuba -one of the highest homicide rates in the world, and one of the highest rates of death from child abuse and neglect. This steady stream of woe is certainly dispiriting, but the more optimistic might be inclined to respond that America had has problems before and has always found a way to right the ship. Certainly, this is a legitimate counter-point. The problem is that anyone looking to Washington today would have a hard time imagining that Congress and the White House will lock arms anytime soon and fix these various national crises. And this political gridlock is the biggest reason to be concerned about decline. Perhaps at no point in recent American history has the country's politics been less capable of dealing with serious challenges. Certainly, when one party basically rejects any role for the federal government in providing health care, improving educational opportunity, or strengthening the social safety net, the chances for compromise appear even slimmer. As Harold Pollack, a professor at the University of Chicago, said to me, "What future president, witnessing Barack Obama's difficulties over health reform, will make an equivalent political investment regarding climate change or another great national concern? I fear that we are headed for a kind of legislative Vietnam syndrome in which our leaders will shy away from the large things that must be done." Obama argued in his recent State of the Union speech that "innovation is what America has always been about." Indeed, the recent report of the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation found that the United States is currently sixth in global innovation and competitiveness. Good news, right? Not so fast. The report also found that the country is dead last in "improvement in international competitiveness and innovation capacity over the last decade." Bottom line: dysfunction reaps an ill reward. Kagan's retort to this argument is that "on many big issues throughout their history, Americans have found a way of achieving and implementing a national consensus." True, but the philosophical divide between the two parties over the role of government offers little reason for optimism that such a new national consensus is in the offing. The fact is, discussions of U.S. power that only take into account America's global standing in relation to other countries are not only misleading -they're largely irrelevant. Sure, America has a bigger and better military than practically every other nation combined. Sure, it has a better global image than Russia or China or any other potential global rival. Sure, America's economy is bigger than any other nation's (though this is a debatable point). But if its students aren't being well educated, if huge disparities exist in technological adoption, if social mobility remains stagnant if the country's health care system is poorly functioning, and if its government is hopelessly gridlocked, what good is all the global power that transfixes Kagan and others? The even more urgent question is how the United States can hope to maintain that power if it's built on a shaky foundation at home. Rather than talking about how great America is on the campaign trail -which surely both candidates will do throughout the 2012 election -the country would likely be better off having an honest discussion on the immense challenges that it faces at home. Even more helpful would be a recognition that education, health care, infrastructure, and overall national economic competitiveness is as essential to U.S. national security as, for example, the number of ships in the U.S. Navy. All this talk about the myth of American decline might make Americans feel better about themselves for a while, but it is a distraction from the real and declining elements of U.S. power.

### Warming

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

#### The 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### Can’t solve - 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.

#### No reason why wind PTC is able to overcome the entirety of other alt causes to the relations that “function outside of the negotiations”.

#### 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.

#### Can’t solve environmental leadership – 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.

#### 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."**

#### 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

### Solvency

#### Back up plants are worse – wind investment trades off with building cleaner fossil fuel plants

Page 8 (Lewis, National Wind Watch, July 3, http://www.wind-watch.org/news/2008/07/03/research-wind-power-pricier-emits-more-co2-than-thought/)

Oswald is an expert on gas turbines, having worked for many years at Rolls Royce\*. He says that most people, in allowing for gas backup to wind farms, assume that the current situation of gas-turbine usage applies. Not so, he says. Gas turbines used to compensate for wind will need to be cheap (as they won’t be on and earning money as often as today’s) and resilient (to cope with being throttled up and down so much). Even though the hardware will be cheap and tough, it will break often under such treatment; meaning increased maintenance costs and a need for even more backup plants to cover busted backup plants. Thus, the scheme overall will be more expensive than the current gas sector. And since people won’t want to thrash expensive, efficient combined-cycle kit like this, less fuel-efficient gear will be used — emitting more carbon than people now assume. High-efficiency base load plant is not designed or developed for load cycling … Load cycling CCGT plant will induce thermal stress cracking in hot components … The other impact on the individual plant is a reduction in the plant’s utilisation. This has an economic consequence, which will encourage operators of generation plants to buy cheaper, lower-efficiency and therefore higher carbon emission plants … Reduced reliability will require more thermal plant to be installed … And it gets worse. All this will hammer the gas grid’s pipeline networks and storage hardware too, costing the end consumer even more money — again, something that isn’t currently accounted for in wind power schemes. Power swings from wind will need to be compensated for by power swings from gas-powered plants, which in turn will induce comparable power swings on the gas network as plant ramps up and down. This will have a cost implication for the gas network, an implication that does not seem to have been included in cost of wind calculations …In essence, wind plans aren’t actually wind plans, according to Oswald. They’re gas plans with windfarms used to reduce the amount of gas actually burned in the plants. But he thinks the assumptions now made on costs and emissions reductions to be anticipated are unduly optimistic. From one perspective, one might argue that this is the exact purpose of renewable plants, namely to reduce fossil fuel burning. However, it does this not by obviating the need for that plant, but instead by reducing the utilisation of power plants which continue to be indispensable. Electricity operators will respond to the reduced utilisation … high capital [cleaner gas] plant is not justified under low utilisation regimes … it is critically important that the carbon saving achieved by the whole system is known, understood, and achieved in practice. The effect of this higher carbon calculation does not appear to be mentioned

#### Every dollar in government-directed spending trades off with innovation

Burnett 12 [Sterling, senior fellow at the National Center for Policy Analysis, “Energy Loserville: U.S. DOE Picks in an Artificial Industry”, MasterResource, A Free Market Energy Blog, 7-9-12,

<http://www.masterresource.org/2012/07/losing-us-green-subsidies/>, RSR]

This latter point is perhaps the greatest weakness of any benefit/cost analysis of any government subsidies. These subsidies substitute the government’s judgment about what the public should want for the public’s own judgment as express through their choices in the marketplace. There are huge opportunity costs to such government directed spending. The money spent developing and promoting a green energy industry (especially one that has subpar development results) is \*money not spent innovating, not available to entrepreneurs to discover the next big thing(whether it be energy source or entertainment device), \* jobs not created in other sectors of the economy(and maybe in some industries that haven’t been created yet), \*money not available for better education or health care,or \* money not available to reduce the annual deficit and overall debt. This, in my opinion, is the real economic loss. More Bad Bets? In the face of these multiple “successes,” the Obama administration wants to double down and throw more good money after bad. It’s never worked before, but hey, there’s always a first time, Right? Election season, and bad ideology, have put the sitting President at odds with reality.

#### 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 Adv

#### Economic growth is key to a stable environment – collapse ensures destruction

Panayotou 2K (Theodore Panayotou 2K. Lecturer in Environmental Policy, is a Faculty Associate at the Center for International Development, a member of Core Faculty of Sustainable Development, and a Faculty Fellow of the Environmental Economics Program at Harvard University, “ECONOMIC GROWTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT,” <http://www.unece.org/ead/pub/032/032_c2.pdf> )

At the other extreme, are **those** who **argue that the fastest road to environmental improvement is along the path of economic growth: with higher incomes comes increased demand for goods and services that are less material intensive, as well as demand for improved environmental quality that leads to the adoption of environmental protection** measures. **As Beckerman puts it, “The strong correlation between incomes, and the extent to which environmental protection measures are adopted, demonstrates that in the longer run, the surest way to improve your environment is to become rich”**.58 **Some went as far as claiming that environmental regulation, by reducing economic growth, may actually reduce environmental quality**.59

#### 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.

#### 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

#### Jobs dictate the direction of the economy.

Madho 12 [Parasnand. “Weekly Economic Indicators: Jobs Data Key For US Economy” Exchanges June 4, 2012 <http://exchanges.nyx.com/node/3372>]. FYI - Steve Grasso, Director of Institutional Sales at Stuart Frankel & Co., and frequent commentator on CNBC

Grasso expects the jobless claims data to come in below the 400K mark, around the forecast, although he has been hearing rumblings about a jump back up over the mental 400K number. This is crucial because he believes the jobs data will continue to dictate where the economy goes. With so many people out of work, he is starting to see a rekindling of the American entrepreneurial spirit, as more and more young people are starting their own businesses. This is very important to the economy, as the unemployment rate among blue collar workers is much higher than in the white collar sector. He urges young people to keep educating themselves to compete globally, particularly at the higher service end jobs. With the selloff today, based on US data, versus European headlines, the US “safe haven status” is in jeopardy. Not only has the market given back all of its gains for the year, is could be poised to come in 5% to 10% lower based on breaking key technical levels this week.

#### Failure to resolve unemployment guarantees collapse

Spicer 12 (Jonathan, Reuters correspondent, April 8, 2012, “High unemployment may dog the US for years”, http://economywatch.msnbc.msn.com/\_news/2012/04/08/11085339-high-unemployment-may-dog-the-us-for-years?lite, 6/2/12, atl)

"**We're living through a juncture in U.S. policy history in which we're making major decisions about what type of society we're likely to be**," said Steven Davis, an economist at the University of Chicago. "**Those decisions will affect things for a generation." Some 40 percent of the nation's unemployed have been out of work for more than six months. That's over twice the rate of long-term unemployment just before the 2007-2009 recession.** Bernanke mostly pins long-term joblessness on weak demand from American consumers and companies. In late March, he pointed to data showing that, compared to before the recession, **the short-term unemployed also are taking much longer to find work**. This, he argued, justifies the Fed's policy of keeping interest rates low to help the economy. **Persistent long-term unemployment is a risk because it might someday make people unemployable**, he said. "**If progress in reducing unemployment is too slow, the long-term unemployed will see their skills and labor force attachment atrophy further, possibly converting a cyclical problem into a structural one**," Bernanke told a conference of economists. Long-term unemployment has other costs for the economy. A paper for the Brookings Institution, a Washington think-tank, finds that **men who lose their job when the unemployment rate is above 8 percent forfeit twice as much in future** [earnings](http://economywatch.msnbc.msn.com/_news/2012/04/08/11085339-high-unemployment-may-dog-the-us-for-years?lite) **than if had they lost their job when the rate was below 6 percent**.

#### Manufacturing not key to the economy – this is comparative between our econ internal links and theirsPorter 12

(Eduardo, NY Times "The Promise Of Today's Factory Jobs," New York Times, April 3, 2012, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/04/business/economy/the-promise-of-todays-factory-jobs.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>, d/a 10-11-12, ZML)

More important, perhaps, manufacturing is not the nation’s only cutting-edge industry. Many of the most innovative firms are not manufacturers but service companies. Apple is very competitive. But so are the companies that design applications running on its iPhones and iPads. Hollywood studios and marketing companies are big exporters. These firms need highly trained workers and pay high wages.¶Mr. Moretti says each job in an “innovation” industry, broadly understood, creates five other local jobs, about three times the number for an average job in manufacturing. Two of them are highly paid professional positions and three are low-paid jobs as waiters or clerks.¶ Innovation — not manufacturing —has always propelled this country’s progress. A strategy to reward manufacturers who increase their payroll in the United States may not be as effective as one to support the firms whose creations — whether physical stuff or immaterial services — can conquer world markets and pay for the jobs of the rest of us.

### Carbon Tax CP

#### No economic impact to increased taxes

Griffin 9 (James, Professor at the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University; Director of the Robert A. Mosbacher Institute for Trade, Economics and Public Policy; he holds the Bob Bullock Chair in Public Policy and Finance and is a director in the Berkeley Research Group, a boutique economic consulting house; Ph.D. in economics from the University of Pennsylvania; he is a Humboldt Fellow and serves on the editorial board of three economics journals; his research has resulted in six books and over 50 refereed journal articles; he has maintained a long-standing interest in energy policy, having co-authored the leading textbook in the field; “A smart energy policy: an economist's Rx for balancing cheap, clean, and secure energy” p.7-8

As to objections about the macroeconomic effects of revenue-neutral energy taxes, the effects would likely be inconsequential for two rasons. First, although consumers as a group would pay more for energy, the income- and payroll-tax reductions would offset these increased energy costs. To be sure, more¶ prodigious energy consumers might not be fully compensated. wherms low en-¶ ergy users could receive a windfall. But these distributional issues should not be¶ dispositive, because of the magnitude of the taxes. Furthermore, because of the relatively moderate level of the initial tax rates, these taxes would not be likely to cause any substantial short-run macroeconomic disruption.

#### Revenue neutrality solves

Griffin 9 (James, Professor at the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University; Director of the Robert A. Mosbacher Institute for Trade, Economics and Public Policy; he holds the Bob Bullock Chair in Public Policy and Finance and is a director in the Berkeley Research Group, a boutique economic consulting house; Ph.D. in economics from the University of Pennsylvania; he is a Humboldt Fellow and serves on the editorial board of three economics journals; his research has resulted in six books and over 50 refereed journal articles; he has maintained a long-standing interest in energy policy, having co-authored the leading textbook in the field; “A smart energy policy: an economist's Rx for balancing cheap, clean, and secure energy” p.7

Despite the clear merits of the proposed energy taxes, many Americans are¶ likely to oppose them on philosophical as well as macroeconomic grounds. To¶ overcome objections to energy taxes. I propose that they be revenue neutral.¶ Under any energy-tax legislation adopted, the tax revenues should be ear-¶ marked for oﬁsetting reductions in income and payroll taxes and increases in the earned income tax credit. The net effect on consumers’ pocketbooks would thus be oﬂset by income-tax reductions. Again, this approach has an important¶ advantage over cap-and-trade proposals because it allows for greater beneﬁts to¶ the public—through relief from income and other taxes—at the expense of¶ carbon-emitting industries. It is no accident that large carbon emitters Favor a¶ cap-and-trade system—they see it as a means of obtaining valuable emissions¶ permits for Free and acquiring for themselves competitive advantages vis-a-vis¶ new entrants that lack the beneﬁt offree emissions permits.¶

#### 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.

#### Carbon caps key to climate talks

Washington Post 8 (Transition's Timing Hits Climate Talks, By Juliet Eilperin¶ Washington Post Staff Writer¶ Monday, December 8, 2008 http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/12/07/AR2008120702426.html)

The delicate state of the global climate talks -- weighted down by the worldwide financial crisis -- highlights the challenges the negotiators face. The Bush administration and its allies successfully resisted setting specific climate goals during the past few negotiating rounds, and there are doubts that Obama can get Congress to approve a sufficiently ambitious national carbon cap by the time delegates meet again next December in Copenhagen. And without a U.S. commitment in place, other nations will be reluctant to sign a deal.¶ "A full, final, ratifiable agreement just isn't in the cards" next year, said Elliot Diringer, director of international strategies for the Pew Center on Global Climate Change. "It's really important to have realistic expectations going into Copenhagen, and then there's a chance of success."

#### Carbon cap key get China on board

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.

### Warming Adv.

#### No resource wars from warming

**Nordås and Gleditsch 7** (Ragnhild Nordås Centre for the Study of Civil War, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo; Nils Petter Gleditsch Department of Sociology and Political Science, Norwegian University of Science and Technology. “Climate Change and Conflict” Political Geography 26 (2007) 627-638 [http://www.ciesin.columbia.edu/confluence/download/attachments/13598722/Nils+Climate+and+Conflict.pdf?version=1](http://www.ciesin.columbia.edu/confluence/download/attachments/13598722/Nils%2BClimate%2Band%2BConflict.pdf?version=1))

The prospect of human-induced climate change encourages drastic neomalthusian scenarios. A number of claims about the conflict-inducing effects of climate change have surfaced in the public debate in recent years. **Climate change has so many potential consequences** for the physical environment **that we could expect** a large number of **possible paths to conflict. However, the causal chains suggested in the literature have so far rarely been substantiated with reliable evidence. Given the combined uncertainties of climate and conflict research, the gaps in our knowledge about the consequences of climate change for conflict and security appear daunting.** Social scientists are now beginning to respond to this challenge. We present some of the problems and opportunities in this line of research, summarize the contributions in this special issue, and discuss how the security concerns of climate change can be investigated more systematically.

#### International climate 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.

## 1NR

### Heidegger

#### Self-fulfilling prophecy: there is no end to technological thought and rationale – it will continue to find more destructive ways to control life and death, eradicating all value to life and making their impacts inevitable

Beckman 2k [Tad: Emeritus Professor of Philosophy, Humanities and Social Sciences at Harvey Mudd College, “Martin Heidegger and Environmental Ethics,” http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/Heidart.html].

The threat of nuclear annihilation is, currently, the most dramatic and ironic sign of technology's "success" and of its overwhelming power; mass itself has been grasped as a standing-reserve of enormous energy. On the one hand we consider ourselves, rightfully, the most advanced humans that have peopled the earth but, on the other hand, we can see, when we care to, that our way of life has also become the most profound threat to life that the earth has yet witnessed. [(14)](http://thuban.ac.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/Heidart.html#N_14_) Medical science and technology have even begun to suggest that we may learn enough about disease and the processes of aging in the human body that we might extend individual human lives indefinitely. In this respect, we have not only usurped the gods' rights of creation and destruction of species, but we may even usurp the most sacred and terrifying of the gods' rights, the determination of mortality or immortality. The gods, it is true, have been set aside in our time; they are merely antiquated conceptions. The gods, it is true, have been set aside in our time; they are merely antiquated conceptions. The "withdrawal of the gods" is a sign of our pervasive power and our progressive "ego-centrism."**The human ego stands at the center of everything and, indeed, sees no other thing or object with which it must reckon on an equal footing. We have become alone in the universe in the most profound sense. Looking outward, we see only ourselves in so far as we see only objects standing-in-reserve for our dispositions.** It is no wonder that we have "ethical problems" with our environment because the whole concept of the environment has been profoundly transformed. **A major portion of the environment in which modern Westerners live, today, is the product of human fabrication and this makes it ever more difficult for us to discover a correct relationship with that portion of the environment that is still given to us. It is all there to be taken, to be manipulated, to be used and consumed,** it seems. But what in that conception limits us or hinders us from using it in any way that we wish? **There is nothing that we can see today that really hinders us from doing anything with the environment, including if we wish destroying it completely and for all time.** This, I take it is the challenge of environmental ethics, the challenge of finding a way to convince ourselves that there are limits of acceptable human action where the environment is involved. But where can we look for the concepts that we need to fabricate convincing arguments?

#### We should read our possibilities as debaters ontologically and open ourselves up to the possibility of Being revealing itself to us non-technologiclly

Heidegger and Spiegel 66. “Heidegger, Der Spiegel Interview” Philosophy Today 20 (Whiter 1976): 267-284. Scanned from Gunther Neske & Emil Kettering (eds), Martin Heidegger and National Socialism, New York: Paragon House, 1990, pp. 41-66.

SPIEGEL: You apparently see, so you have expressed it, a world movement that either brings about or has already brought about the absolute technological state? HEIDEGGER: Yes! But it is precisely the technological state that least corresponds to the world and society determined by the essence of technology. The technological state would be the most obsequious and blind servant in the face of the power of technology. SPIEGEL: Fine. But now the question of course poses itself: Can the individual still influence this network of inevitabilities at all, or can philosophy influence it, or can they both influence it together in that philosophy leads one individual or several individuals to a certain action? HEIDEGGER: Those questions bring us back to the beginning of our conversation. If I may answer quickly and perhaps somewhat vehemently, but from long reflection: Philosophy will not be able to bring about a direct change of the present state of the world. This is true not only of philosophy but of all merely human meditations and endeavors. Only a god can still save us. I think the only possibility of salvation left to us is to prepare readiness, through thinking and poetry, for the appearance of the god or for the absence of the god during the decline; so that we do not, simply put, die meaningless deaths, but that when we decline, we decline in the face of the absent god. SPIEGEL: Is there a connection between your thinking and the emergence of this god? Is there, as you see it, a causal connection? Do you think we can get this god to come by thinking? HEIDEGGER: We cannot get him to come by thinking. At best we can prepare the readiness of expectation. SPIEGEL: But can we help? HEIDEGGER: The preparation of readiness could be the first step. The world cannot be what and how it is through human beings, but neither can it be so without human beings. In my opinion that is connected to the fact that what I call “Being,” using a traditional, ambiguous, and now worn-out word, needs human beings. Being is not Being without humans being needed for its revelation, protection, and structuring. I see the essence of technology in what I call the con-struct. This name, on first hearing easily misunderstood, points, if it is properly considered, back into the innermost history of metaphysics, which still determines our existence [Dasein] today. The workings of the con-struct mean: Human beings are caught [gestellt], claimed, and challenged by a power that is revealed in the essence of technology. The experience that humans are structured [gestellt] by some-thing that they are not themselves and that they cannot control themselves is precisely the experience that may show them the possibility of the insight that humans are needed by Being. The possibility of experience, of being needed, and of being prepared for these new possibilities is concealed in what makes up what is most modern technology’s own. Thinking can do nothing more than to help humans to this insight, and philosophy is at an end. SPIEGEL: In earlier times – and not only in earlier times – it was thought that philosophy was indirectly very effective (seldom directly), that it helped new currents to emerge. Just thinking of Germans, great names like Kant, Hegel, up to Nietzsche, not to mention Marx

, it can be proved that philosophy has had, in roundabout ways, an enormous effect. Do you think this effectiveness of philosophy is at an end? And when you say philosophy is dead, that it no longer exists are you including the idea that the effectiveness of philosophy (if indeed it ever existed) today, at least, no longer exists? HEIDEGGER: I just said that an indirect, but not a direct, effect is possible through another kind of thinking. Thus thinking can, as it were, causally change the condition of the world. SPIEGEL: Please excuse us; we do not want to philosophize (we are not up to that), but here we have the link between politics and philosophy, so please forgive us for pushing you into such a conversation. You just said philosophy and the individual can do nothing except... HEIDEGGER: ... this preparation of readiness for keeping oneself open to the arrival or absence of the god. The experience of this absence is not nothing, but rather a liberation of human beings from what I called the “fallenness into beings” in Being and Time. A contemplation of what is today is a part of a preparation of the readiness we have been talking about. SPIEGEL: But then there really would have to be the famous impetus from outside, from a god or whomever. So thinking, of its own accord and self- sufficiently, can no longer be effective today? It was, in the opinion of people in the past, and even, I believe, in our opinion. HEIDEGGER: But not directly.

#### Conventional political theories that attempt to render the world calculable by inescapable simplification erase the possibility of truth and necessitate violence

Dillon 96 [Michael, professor Politics and International Relations at the University of Lancaster, *The Politics of Security*,pp. 75-76]

I recognise the danger that this movement of mine could be taken to excuse paying insufficiently close attention to Heidegger’s texts, or of failing to understand enough about what Heidegger has tried to say, and of similarly failing to do justice to these other complex and important thinkers. Such a danger will always exist, of course, especially when dealing with a thinker who is not only as difficult and subtle, not to say obscure, as Heidegger, but whose thought also evolved in important ways, exciting powerful responses from other eminent philosophers. Although I may very well fail on all these counts I do not intend, however, to take any liberties either with Heidegger or with the others. Rather, I am mindful, here, of Robert Bernasconi’s wise observation. Issued specifically in respect of Heidegger, it has a certain relevance to these other thinkers as well. ‘One cannot readily say what Heidegger says’, Robert Bernasconi notes, for the simple reason that Heidegger overcomes the ‘what’ of essentia by transforming the way of saying. Hence all writing about Heidegger should begin and end with a disclaimer. The disclaimer, in attempting to be faithful to what claimed [my emphasis] Heidegger, must at the same time disregard his warnings and lift the silence about silence.118 My object, then, is not to provide myself with excuses in advance but to explain instead both how I have tried to go about this work, and that—as I pursued what claimed my attention; specifically the aporia of obligatory freedom as it is simultaneously both disclosed and endangered through the preoccupation with security—the very path of my own thinking, as well as the content of it, began to change. ‘What happens’, Gerald Bruns asks, ‘when you try to follow Heidegger up or down one of his paths of thinking, studying him, trying out his moves, finding yourself caught up in him?’ His response seems to me to be an exemplary one. One of the things that happens, he says, ‘is that you begin to appreciate why people are careful to confine themselves to forms of mental activity that have no history’. By that he meant: purely analytical programs like formal logic, philosophy of language, linguistics, semiotics, most forms of literary criticism, perhaps most of what gets taught in school: programs you can get in and out of quickly and cleanly without the burden of having done anything more blameworthy than test, or apply, a certain method, skill, technique, or training.119 Precisely because it is so dangerous—and dangerous precisely because it is so intimately connected with history—there is often an almost desperate, and even violent, insistence that politics, too, both as a practice and as an object of study, be reduced in this way. In short, technologised. So-called political ‘realists’ and ‘idealists’ alike, for example, and for similar reasons, would reduce the political to the formulaic so as to settle its hash once and for all. I take their responses, however, to be symptomatic of a persistent and ancient desire to escape the sheer difficulty as well as the historically and singularity of the political.

#### Eclipse of being is the biggest impact in the round--life has no meaning in a framework that sustains the standing reserve and denies us an authentic relationship with being

Zimmerman 94 [Michael: Professor of Philosophy at Tulane. Contesting the Earth’s Future, p.104].

Heidegger asserted that human self-assertion, combined with the eclipse of being, threatens the relation between being and human Dasein.53 Loss of this relation would be even more dangerous than a nuclear war that might "bring about the complete annihilation of humanity and the destruction of the earth."54 This controversial claim is comparable to the Christian teaching that it is better to forfeit the world than to lose one's soul by losing one's relation to God. Heidegger apparently thought along these lines: it is possible that after a nuclear war, life might once again emerge, but it is far less likely that there will ever again occur an ontological clearing through which such life could manifest itself. Further, since modernity's one-dimensional disclosure of entities virtually denies them any "being" at all, the loss of humanity's openness for being is already occurring.55 Modernity's background mood is horror in the face of nihilism, which is consistent with the aim of providing material "happiness" for everyone by reducing nature to pure energy.56 The unleashing of vast quantities of energy in nuclear war would be equivalent to modernity's slow-motion destruction of nature: unbounded destruction would equal limitless consumption. If humanity avoided nuclear war only to survive as contented clever animals, Heidegger believedwe would exist in a state of ontological damnation: hell on earth, masquerading as material paradise. Deep ecologists might agree that a world of material human comfort purchased at the price of everything wild would not be a world worth living in, for in killing wild nature, people would be as good as dead. But most of them could not agree that the loss of humanity's relation to being would be worse than nuclear omnicide, for it is wrong to suppose that the lives of millions of extinct and unknown species are somehow lessened because they were never "disclosed" by humanity.