**Their internal link arg doesn’t apply they conced the internal link that Romney labeling would lead to trade wars president is different than presidential canidiate.**

**Trade war would kill manufacturing jobs**

**U.S.-Chinese cooperation is critical to solve global warming internal link turn their adv**

**Saunders 1.**

(Philip, Dir – East Asian Nonproliferation Program, Center for Nonproliferation Studies, Can 9-11 Provide a Fresh Start for Sino-U.S. Relations?, http://cns.miis.edu/pubs/reports/sino911.htm)

**Global warming** is an issue that **can only be addressed through global cooperation**, but cooperation has been elusive. Developing countries insist that developed countries are responsible for the problem and have resisted any binding commitments. Yet **China is** currently **the second largest emitter of carbon dioxide**, and will surpass the United States to become the largest emitter by 2020. **China's** continuing **dependence on coal** as its main source of energy **will exacerbate the problem. Efforts to address the problem of global warming without Chinese participation are unlikely to succeed**. At the same time, the solution in the Kyoto protocol (no restrictions on developing country emissions) is clearly unacceptable to Congress and has been used to justify U.S. rejection of the protocol. **An effective solution requires U.S. and Chinese participation**, which is unlikely if this deadlock cannot be resolved. The two countries could also cooperate on other environmental issues, including mitigating the air pollution caused by coal and ways for Chinese industries to adopt energy-efficient, low pollution technology.

**US-Sino relations are key to peace in Central Asia, predicated on stability of relations trade war would take this out**

**Xu 01**

Xianquan Xu, Senior Research Fellow, Chinese Academy, International Trade and Economic Coop, 2001 ¶ (China, the United States, and the Global Economy, Shuxun Chen & Charles Wolf, p. 269)

**It is in both U.S. and China's interests to maintain stability in** the countries of **Central Asia**n members of the former Soviet Union, in­cluding Mongolia, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Turkmenistan. Most of these newly independent countries suffer to different degrees from economic decline and social unrest. The United States wants to see a continuing orderly transition in these countries to a market economy and a democratic political system. Moreover, given the geographic location, the United States wants to assimilate the new Central Asian states into the international com­munity and avoid any adverse changes in relation to the American-dominated security of the Persian Gulf. Meanwhile, as its economic reach rapidly extends, China is enjoying growing interactions in this area. **China wants to increase its trade** and economic **ties with this area and to develop a local partnership for stability and development** near its western border. **It was in Central Asia that the U**nited **S**tates **and China once successfully cooperated against invasion by the Soviet Union** in Afghanistan **and made a classic example for Sino-U.S. cooperation by combining the** most **advantageous resources from each**. However, **if the relationship deteriorates**, **China could be displeased by U.S. strengthening ties in the region**—China may per­ceive such a move as a new potential threat to its western border.

**Central Asian Wars Go Nuclear**

**Blank 2K**

Stephen Blank,, Director of Strategic Studies Institute at US Army War College, 1999 Central Asian Survey, [“Every Shark East of Suez: Great Power Interests, Policies and Tactics in the Transcaspian Energy Wars”]

Thus manystructural **conditions for** conventional war or protracted **ethnic conflict where third parties intervene now exist in the Transcaucasus**. And similarly many conditions exist for internal domestic strife if the leadership of any of these governments changes or if one of the many disaffected minority groups revolts. Many Third World conflicts generated by local structural factors have a great potential for unintended escalation. Big powers often feel obliged to rescue their proxies and protégés . One or another big power may fail to grasp the stakes for the other side since interests here are not as clear as in Europe. Hence commitments involving the use of nuclear weapons or perhaps even conventional war to prevent defeat of a client are not well established or clear as in Europe. For instance, **in 1993 Turkish noises about intervening** on behalf of Azerbaijan **induced Russian leaders to threaten a nuclear war** in that case. This episode tends to confirm the notion that `future wars involving Europe and America as allies will be fought either over resources in chaotic Third World locations or in ethnic upheavals on the southern fringe of Europe and Russia’ . 95 Sadly, many such causes for conflict prevail across the Transcaspian. Precisely **because Turkey is a Nato members but probably could not prevail in a long war against Russia or if it could, would** conceivably **trigger a potential nuclear blow** (not a small possibility given the erratic nature of Russia’ s declared nuclear strategies), **the danger of major war is higher here than almost every-where else** in the CIS or the so-called arc of crisis from the Balkans to China.

**They say passing PTC key to win swing states but the warrants of their evidence is jobs and State employment rates are irrelevant   
Holbrook 6-17**

Tom is Professor of Political Science at U-W Milwauke, “It’s (not) the (state) economy stupid,” <http://politics-by-the-numbers.blogspot.com/2012/06/its-not-state-economy-stupid.html>

In the top graph, if **you look in the upper left-hand corner--low unemployment and strong support for McCain, you find a collection of mostly Republican states**: Wyoming, Oklahoma, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Utah. **In the lower right-hand corner--high unemployment and low support for McCain, you find a collection of Democratic and competitive states:** Michigan, Rhode Island, California, Oregon, and Nevada. And the same pattern holds for the bottom figure. **In other words, what appears to be a relatively weak, negative relationship between unemployment and support for the incumbent party candidate, likely just reflects the coincidental overlap of unemployment and partisan tendencies**. Indeed, **both relationships are spurious and disappear once you take into account the partisan predispositions** (Republican share of the 2008 vote) of the states. In fact, the partial correlation for the September unemployment rate is positive (ryx,z=.20), though not significant. And it turns out the 2008 is not the only instance of null effects from unemployment. The Table below provides some findings from simple regression models in which the incumbent party vote share is regressed on either the September unemployment rate or the change in the unemployment rate between January and September (separate models), along with the statewide vote share for the incumbent party candidate in the previous election. The cell entries are the unstandardized regression coefficients for each year, along with an asterisk to indicate if the slope is significant at the .05 level. Simply put, **there is nary a shred of evidence to suggest that the unemployment outlook in the states has anything to do with state-level outcomes in presidential elections**. In fact, there are only two cases of significant effects--both for the September unemployment rate--**and one of those is a positive coefficient, suggesting that the incumbent candidate, Jimmy Carter, benefited from higher unemployment**! While one could make a policy-oriented argument in favor of this, it seems like a bit of a stretch**. The most obvious conclusion to draw from this table is that state-to-state variations in unemployment are not likely to have much impact on how the states vote this November**. This is not to say that unemployment doesn't have electoral repercussion. In fact, as I showed last summer, **changes in the national unemployment are closely tied to election outcomes.** Simply put, presidential elections are national elections and it is national conditions--not state-level variation around those conditions--that drive them.

#### Wind is unpopular, 1NC Maxwell says key environmental groups hate Wind because of fears they will kill wildlife.

#### Environmental turnout outweighs. 1NC Lehrer says they make up 19% of the electorate and the shock of Obama passing an expansion of wind disillusions them swinging the election to Romney.

#### Wind unpopular- Not in my backyard

Maxwell ’12

Veery is a third-year law student at UC Hastings, “Wind Energy Development: Can Wind Energy Overcome Substantial Hurdles to Reach the Grid,” West Northwest Journal of Environmental Law and Policy, 18 W.-N.W. J. Env. L. & Pol’y323, lexis

A critical barrier to entry for wind energy development is local hostility. While the American public is very supportive of wind energy in theory, not many people want large turbines in their neighborhood. n34 This social phenomenon is commonly referred to as NIMBY-ism ("Not In My BackYard"), and is a growing problem for wind energy developers. Citizens have attempted to block wind farms, complaining the turbines are a visual blight, are too noisy, and create odd flutter shadows. n35 These complaints have resulted in lawsuits, and at times halted, delayed, or dramatically limited proposed projects. n36¶ The fundamental grievance with wind farms in the United States is siting. The turbines are large, the site construction is invasive, and the projects are often built in relatively rural areas. The turbines look very [\*329] industrial, and therefore present a jarring contrast to the pleasant agricultural landscape they regularly occupy.¶ According to Robert Kahn, a siting expert, "Americans put a high value on wilderness and open space. Sparks fly when lands seen as public viewscapes (even if they are not publicly owned) appear threatened. Unfortunately, these lands are where developable renewable resources are to be found." n37 Renewable resources like wind and solar power tend to be easiest to capture in large open areas, which can overlap with scenic areas and parklands. In order to lessen local opposition, wind developers have attempted to mitigate the negative impacts of their projects. Some companies have even gone so far as to hire artists to try and make the turbines look "artsy' instead of industrial. n38

#### Wind is unpopular- seen as too big

Takashi 6-6

Patrick is Director Emeritus of the Hawaii Natural Energy Institute at the University of Hawaii and co-founder of the Pacific International Center for High Technology Research, “Why is Wind Power Suddenly Unpopular,” <http://planetearthandhumanity.blogspot.com/2012/06/why-is-windpower-suddenly-unpopular.html>

In Hawaii, across the nation and throughout the world, it seems like wind energy conversion systems have suddenly become an issue on the level of new coal and nuclear facilities. In the 50th State, "Big Wind" is roundly being criticized and even Donald Trump is warning about the evils of windpower, as related to China, tourism and Scotland. There were protesters about him being a windbag. Hey, give him a break, as he's having other more important problems, like with Miss Pennsylvania at his Miss USA pageant. Worse, the U.S. Congress, as broken as it is, seems currently negative on the production tax credit, the one piece of legislation that will make or break this technology. So what is really happening? Nothing much new. For one, when the Hawaii Natural Energy Institute advocated this form of renewable electricity a third of a century ago, we were criticized by the Audubon Society (incidentally, they've since gotten smarter about this) for killing birds, resorts (in Kahuku) spoke against this option at hearings for fear their investment would suffer from image problems, noise protesters were always present, more than a few felt that these ugly machines would affect their aesthetics and a few more depicted at the left protest (this was in Canada in April). I might add that wind energy (with geothermal and hydroelectric) is the ONLY "new" sustainable option somewhat competitive with coal and nuclear. Solar PV remains three times the cost of wind. Let's look at the matter of bird kills, for, apparently, the figure in Massachusetts is 100,000 murdered birds/year. Here is the reality:¶ - glass windows: at least 100 million, and, perhaps up to a billion bird deaths/year¶ - house cats: 100 million/year¶ - vehicles: 50 million to 100 million¶ - electric transmission lines: 174 million¶ - hunting: more than 100 million¶ Ever seen any protests against glass windows, cats.....? Oh, by the way, there could well be around 400 billion birds in the world. Nothing about energy is perfect.

#### No Risk of a link turn- Independents vote Prospectively based on what can be accomplished, Wind would be off the table for them

Tomz & Houeling ‘07

Michael is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at Stanford University and Robert P. Van is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of California at Berkley, “The Misfoundations of Voting,” <http://www.stanford.edu/~tomz/working/TomzVanHouweling-2007-08a.pdf>

We contribute to existing theoretical and empirical analyses in three ways. First, we¶ formally derive the complete set of conditions under which the theories lead to distinct predictions about how people vote. Second, we use the formal results to develop a statistical¶ 1model for estimating the prevalence of each voting rule in the electorate. Finally, we systematically test all three theories by conducting experiments that are tailored to our statistical¶ model. The experiments, embedded in public opinion surveys, avoid problems of endogeneity¶ and measurement that have impeded previous research.¶ We estimate the proportion of a nationally representative random sample of adults whose¶ choices about federal health care policy are consistent with each of the three issue-voting¶ logics. We Önd that voters typically employ proximity-based decision rules; they either choose¶ the closest candidate or select the one who, in their estimation, will bring policy nearest to¶ their ideal point. More precisely, 57.7 percent of respondents in our study behave as if¶ they they are following a pure proximity rule. Another signiÖcant proportion, 27.6 percent,¶ discount the announced positions of candidates by taking into account the location of the¶ status quo when voting. Finally, 14.7 percent of respondents appear to follow directional¶ logic.¶ We also found that discounting is more common, and directionalism less common, among¶ ideological centrists and non-partisans. This suggests that centrist voters, who often found¶ themselves choosing between polarized candidates (Fiorina 1995), make relatively sophisticated judgments aimed at bringing policy outcomes in line with their preferences. Overall,¶ our study both supports and qualiÖes the foundational assumptions in models of democratic¶ politics. It also demonstrates the promise of combining formal analysis, statistical modeling,¶ and experiments to answer previously intractable questions about democracy.

#### No risk the plan is popular- People are stupid sound bites will sway

Aol Energy 8-8

“What Voters Don’t Know About Energy,” <http://energy.aol.com/2012/08/08/what-voters-don-t-know-about-energy/>

"We are having all of these big political debates over fossil fuels and a good portion of the population doesn't even know what they are talking about," said Jean Johnson, a senior fellow at Public Agenda and author of the book, "Who Turned Out the Lights?"¶ It's not surprising really; voters are distracted and few have the time or interest to delve into energy complexities. The ailing economy looms as a larger preoccupation.¶ "They have busy lives. They are not sitting over EIA [US Energy Information Administration] books looking at statistics," said Rayola Dougher, senior economic advisor for the American Petroleum Institute, which has a Vote4Energy media campaign underway.¶ As energy becomes politicized this lack of understanding makes the electorate increasingly malleable to the sound bite and easily swayed on issues that have significant economic and environmental ramifications, according to Public Agenda, which recently published a citizens energy guide. This tendency to waffle comes at a particularly bad time. The energy industry is undergoing vast changes that will affect the country for decades; it wants consistent policy and direction before making large investments – and for good reason.¶ "With energy decisions, it takes a long, long, long time to see a result. A power plant lasts 40 to 50 years. They are huge and expensive. You don't build them every day. Even in terms of oil exploration – you don't just find it in Alaska, and we have it in our car tomorrow," Johnson said.¶ ¶ The problem is further exasperated by the tendency of political parties and special interest groups to reduce energy to simple black and white arguments that draw passion. § Marked 20:10 § Those who propose complex solutions find it difficult to be heard above the din.¶ ¶ Forget Nuance¶ ¶ Former Colorado Governor Bill Ritter discovered this firsthand when his administration embraced both renewable energy and natural gas. During Ritter's campaign for Governor, he appeared in a commercial with a wind farm, so therefore was perceived as anti-fossil fuel – even though he wasn't.¶ ¶ "What we were trying to do was promote a variety of resources. Wind was probably the biggest beneficiary, but our agenda was about clean energy broadly, including natural gas," said Ritter, who served as governor from 2007 to 2011 and is now director of the Center for the New Energy Economy at Colorado State University.¶ ¶ His image as anti-fossil fuel grew as he pushed for stiffer extraction rules for the natural gas industry. But later, when Ritter signed a bill that expanded the market for natural gas by shutting down coal-fired plants, people did not know how to peg him.¶ ¶ "We had said all along that we were in favor of this industry [natural gas] surviving and even thriving. But because we were stubborn about the extraction process being environmentally sound, we got slotted into another place," Ritter said. "It became very difficult to communicate a message that people understood. The mindset is that you are either an environmentalist or an industry person."