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#### 1 Interpretation: The ballot is to determine if the enactment of a topical plan is better than the status quo or a competitive option.

#### 2 Violation:

#### A “Resolved” before a colon reflects a legislative forum

Army Officer School, ‘4

(5-12, “# 12, Punctuation – The Colon and Semicolon”, <http://usawocc.army.mil/IMI/wg12.htm>)

**The colon introduces** the following: a.  A list, but only after "as follows," "the following," or a noun for which the list is an appositive: Each scout will carry the following: (colon) meals for three days, a survival knife, and his sleeping bag. The company had four new officers: (colon) Bill Smith, Frank Tucker, Peter Fillmore, and Oliver Lewis. b.  A long quotation (one or more paragraphs): In The Killer Angels Michael Shaara wrote: (colon) You may find it a different story from the one you learned in school. There have been many versions of that battle [Gettysburg] and that war [the Civil War]. (The quote continues for two more paragraphs.) c.  A formal quotation or question: The President declared: (colon) "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." The question is: (colon) what can we do about it? d.  A second independent clause which explains the first: Potter's motive is clear: (colon) he wants the assignment. e.  After the introduction of a business letter: Dear Sirs: (colon) Dear Madam: (colon) f.  The details following an announcement For sale: (colon) large lakeside cabin with dock g. **A formal resolution, after the word "resolved:"¶ Resolved: (colon) That this council petition the mayor.**

#### B USFG is the national government in DC.

Encarta Online Encyclopedia, 2k

(http://encarta.msn.com)

“The federal government **of the U**nited **S**tates **is centered in** Washington **DC”**

#### C Should means there is a practical reason for action

WordNet in ‘97

Princeton University, 1.6

**Should** v 1 : be expected to: “Parties should be fun” 2 : **expresses an** emotional**, practical,** or other **reason for doing something:** “You had better put on warm clothes”; “You should call your mother-in-law”; *“The State ought to repair bridges*”[syn**:** had better, ought]

#### 3 Vote Negative:

#### Limits on what can be debated protect subversion and meaningful debate.

Shively, 2K

(Former Assistant Politics Professor – Texas A&M, Partisan Politics and Political Theory, pp. 181-4, We have the full text of the card if you want to see it)

At the very least, **we must agree about what it is that is being debated before we can debate it.** For instance, once cannot have an argument about euthanasia with someone who thinks euthanasia is a musical group. One cannot successfully stage a sit-in if one’s target audience simply thinks everyone is resting or if those doing the sitting have no complaints. Nor can one demonstrate resistance to a policy if no one knows that it is a policy. In other words, **contest is meaningless if there is a lack of agreement or communication about what is being contested. Resisters, demonstrators, and debaters must have some shared ideas about the subject and/or the terms of their disagreements.** The participants and the target of a sit-in must share an understanding of the complaint at hand. And a demonstrator’s audience must know what is being resisted. In short, **the contesting of an idea presumes some agreement about what that idea is and how one might go about intelligibly contesting it.** In other words, **contestation rests on some basic agreements or harmony.**¶Continues on page 184¶ But, again, the response to the ambiguist must be that **the practice of questioning and undermining rules**, like all other social practices, **needs a certain order. The subversive needs rules to protect subversion. And when we look more closely at the rules protective of subversion, we find that they are roughly the rules of argument** discussed above. In fact, **the rules of argument are roughly the rules of democracy or civility: the delineation of boundaries necessary to protect speech and action from violence, manipulation, and other forms of tyranny.**

#### And, fair division of ground is necessary for meaningful switch-side debate – switch-side debating cultivates a civic attitude which threatens fundamentalism and turns debate into a training ground for progressive politics

Mitchell et al. 07

(Gordon, Eric English, Stephen Llano, Catherine E. Morrison, John Rief, and Carly Woods, Pitt Comm Studies Grad Students, Gordon Mitchell is an Associate Comm Studies Professor @ Pitt, Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies 4)

The problem for Greene and Hicks is that this notion of citizenship becomes tied to a normative conception of American democracy that justifies imperialism. They write, ‘‘The production and management of this field of governance allows liberalism to trade in cultural technologies in the global cosmopolitan marketplace at the same time as it creates a field of intervention to transform and change the world one subject (regime) at a time.’’11 Here, Greene and Hicks argue that this new conception of liberal governance, which epitomizes the ethical citizen as an individual trained in the switch-side technique, serves as a normative tool for judging other polities and justifying forcible regime change. One need look only to the Bush administration’s framing of war as an instrument of democracy promotion to grasp how the switch-side technique can be appropriated as a justification for violence. It is our position, however, that **rather than acting as a cultural technology expanding American exceptionalism, switch-side debating originates from a civic attitude that serves as a bulwark against fundamentalism of all stripes.** **Several prominent voices reshaping the national dialogue on homeland security have come from the academic debate community and draw on its animating spirit of critical inquiry**. For example, Georgetown University law professor **Neal Katyal served as lead plaintiff ’s counsel in Hamdan, which challenged post-9/11 enemy combat definitions**. 12 The foundation for Katyal’s winning argument in Hamdan was laid some four years before, when he collaborated with former intercollegiate debate champion Laurence Tribe on an influential Yale Law Journal addressing a similar topic.13 Tribe won the National Debate Tournament in 1961 while competing as an undergraduate debater for Harvard University. Thirty years later, Katyal represented Dartmouth College at the same tournament and finished third. **The imprint of this debate training is evident in Tribe and Katyal’s contemporary public interventions, which are characterized by meticulous research, sound argumentation, and a staunch commitment to democratic principles**. Katyal’s reflection on his early days of debating at Loyola High School in Chicago’s North Shore provides a vivid illustration. ‘‘I came in as a shy freshman with dreams of going to medical school. Then Loyola’s debate team opened my eyes to a different world: one of argumentation and policy.’’ As Katyal recounts, ‘‘the most important preparation for my career came from my experiences as a member of Loyola’s debate team.’’14 **The success of former debaters like Katyal, Tribe, and others in challenging the dominant dialogue on homeland security points to the efficacy of academic debate as a training ground for future advocates of progressive change**. Moreover**, a robust understanding of the switch-side technique and the classical liberalism which underpins it would help prevent misappropriation of the technique to bolster suspect homeland security policies**. **For buried within an inner-city debater’s files is a secret threat to absolutism: the refusal to be classified as ‘‘with us or against us,’’ the embracing of intellectual experimentation in an age of orthodoxy, and reflexivity in the face of fundamentalism**. But by now, the irony of our story should be apparent\***the more effectively academic debating practice can be focused toward these ends, the greater the proclivity of McCarthy’s ideological heirs to brand the activity as a ‘‘weapon of mass destruction.’’**

#### Dialogue is critical to affirming any value—shutting down deliberation devolves into totalitarianism and reinscribes oppression

Morson 4

http://www.flt.uae.ac.ma/elhirech/baktine/0521831059.pdf#page=331

Northwestern Professor, Prof. Morson's work ranges over a variety of areas: literary theory (especially narrative); the history of ideas, both Russian and European; a variety of literary genres (especially satire, utopia, and the novel); and his favorite writers -- Chekhov, Gogol, and, above all, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy. He is especially interested in the relation of literature to philosophy.

 Bakhtin viewed the whole process of “ideological” (in the sense of ideas and values, however unsystematic) development as an endless dialogue. As teachers, we find it difficult to avoid **a voice of authority,** however much we may think of ours as the rebel’s voice, because our rebelliousness against society at large speaks in the authoritative voice of our subculture.We speak the language and thoughts of **academic educators**, even when we imagine we are speaking in no jargon at all, and that jargon, inaudible to us, sounds with all the overtones of authority to our students. We are so prone to think of ourselves as **fighting oppression** that it takes some work to realize that we ourselves may be felt as oppressive and **overbearing,** and that our own voice may provoke the same reactions that we feel when we hear an authoritative voice with which we disagree. So it is often helpful to think back on the great authoritative oppressors and reconstruct their self-image: helpful, but often painful. I remember, many years ago, when, as a recent student rebel and activist, I taught a course on “The Theme of the Rebel” and discovered, to my considerable chagrin, that many of the great rebels of history were the very same people as the great oppressors. There is a famous exchange between Erasmus and Luther, who hoped to bring the great Dutch humanist over to the Reformation, but Erasmus kept asking Luther how he could be so certain of so many doctrinal points. We must accept a few things to be Christians at all, Erasmus wrote, but surely beyond that there must be room for us highly fallible beings to disagree. Luther would have none of such tentativeness. He knew, he was sure. The Protestant rebels were, for a while, far more intolerant than their orthodox opponents. Often enough, the oppressors are the ones who present themselves and really think of themselves as liberators. Certainty that one knows the root cause of evil: isn’t that itself often the root cause? We know from Tsar Ivan the Terrible’s letters denouncing Prince Kurbsky, a general who escaped to Poland, that Ivan saw himself as someone who had been oppressed by noblemen as a child and pictured himself as the great rebel against traditional authority when he killed masses of people or destroyed whole towns. There is something in the nature of maximal rebellion against authority that produces ever greater intolerance, unless one is very careful. For **the skills of** fighting or **refuting an oppressive power are not** those of **openness, self-skepticism, or real dialogue**. In preparing for my course, I remember my dismay at reading **Hitler’s** Mein Kampf and discovering that his self-consciousness was **precisely** that of the rebel speaking in the name of oppressed Germans, and that much of his amazing appeal – otherwise so inexplicable – was to the German sense that they were rebelling victims. In our time, the Serbian Communist and nationalist leader Slobodan Milosevic exploited much the same appeal. Bakhtin surely knew that Communist totalitarianism, **the Gulag,** and the unprecedented censorship were constructed by rebels who had come to power. His favorite writer, Dostoevsky, used to emphasize that the worst oppression comes from those who, with the rebellious psychology of “the insulted and humiliated,” have seized power – **unless they have somehow cultivated the value of dialogue**, as Lenin surely had not, but which Eva, in the essay by Knoeller about teaching The Autobiography of Malcolm X, surely had. Rebels often make the worst tyrants because their word, the voice they hear in their consciousness, has borrowed something crucial from the authoritative word it opposed, and perhaps exaggerated it: the aura of righteous authority. If one’s ideological becoming is understood as a struggle in which one has at last achieved the truth, one is likely to want to impose that truth with maximal authority; and rebels of the next generation may proceed in much the same way, **in an ongoing spiral of intolerance**.

**Unconditional environmental justice destroys policy priorities, tanking any risk analysis because they try to INCLUDE all viewpoints WITHOUT LIMITS**

**Foreman 98**

Christopher Foreman is a nonresident senior fellow in Governance Studies. Since 2000, he has also been a professor and director of the social policy program at the University of Maryland’s School of Public Policy. His research focuses on the politics of health, race, environmental regulation, government reform, and domestic social policy

Ph.D. (1980), A.M. (1977), A.B. (1974), Harvard University

The Promise and Peril of Environmental Justice

**Conceptual Drawbacks of Environmental Justice** From a rationalizing perspective, a major problem with the environmental justice version of the democratizing critique is that, like ecopopulism more generally, it threatens to **worsen** the problem of environmental policy's **missing priorities**. As Walter Rosenbaum elaborates: like the man who mounted his horse and galloped off in all directions, the EPA has no constant course. With responsibility for administering nine separate statutes and parts of four others, the EPA has no clearly mandated priorities, no way of allocating scarce resources among different statutes or among programs within a single law. Nor does the EPA have a congressional charter, common to most federal departments and agencies, defining its broad organizational mission and priorities.... Congress has shown little inclination to provide the EPA with a charter or mandated priorities, in good part because **the debate** sure to arise on the relative merit and urgency of different environmental problems is an invitation to a political **bloodletting** most legislators would gladly avoid. Intense controversy would be likely among states, partisans of different ecological issues, and regulated interests over which problems to emphasize; the resulting political brawl would upset existing policy coalitions that themselves were fashioned with great difficulty. Moreover, setting priorities invites a prolonged, bitter **debate** over an intensely emotional issue: should the primary objective of environmental protection be to reduce public risks associated with environmental degradation as much as seems practical or—as many environmentalists fervently believe—is the goal to eliminate all significant forms of pollution altogether?18 Environmental justice **inevitably** enlarges this challenge of missing **priorities**, and for similar reasons. As noted earlier, the movement is a delicate coalition of local and ethnic concerns **unable to narrow its grievances** for fear of a similar "political bloodletting."1? Overt de-emphasis or removal of any issue or claim would prompt the affected coalition members (for example, groups, communities, or tribes) to disrupt or depart it. And chances are they would not leave quietly but with evident resentment and perhaps accusatory rhetoric directed at the persons and organizations remaining. Real **priority-setting** runs contrary to **radical egalitarian** value premises, and no one (perhaps least of all a strong democratizer) wants to be deemed a victimizer. Therefore movement rhetoric argues that no community should be harmed and that all community concerns and grievances deserve redress. Scholar-activist Robert Bullard proposes that "the solution to unequal protection lies in the realm of environmental justice for all Americans. No community, rich or poor, black or white, should be allowed to become a 'sacrifice zone."20 When pressed about the need for environmental risk priorities, and about how to incorporate environmental justice into priority setting, Bullard's answer is a vague plea for nondiscrimination, along with a barely more specific call for a "federal 'fair environmental protection act™ that would transform "protection from a privilege to a right."21 Bullard's position is fanciful and self-contradictory, but extremely telling. He argues essentially that the way to establish environmental priorities is precisely by **guaranteeing that such priorities are impossible to implement.** This is symptomatic of a movement for which untrammeled citizen **voice** and overall social **equity** are cardinal values. Bullard's position also epitomizes the desire of movement intellectuals to avoid speaking difficult truths (at least in public) to their allies and constituents. Ironically, in matters of health and risk, environmental justice poses a potentially serious, if generally unrecognized, danger to the minority and low-income communities it aspires to help. By discouraging citizens from thinking in terms of health and risk priorities (that is, by taking the position, in effect, that every chemical or site against which community outrage can be generated is equally hazardous), environmental justice can deflect attention from serious hazards to less serious or perhaps **trivial ones**.
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**THE 1AC IGNORES THAT RACISM IS MERELY ONE AMONGST MANY TOOLS OF AXIOLOGICAL ANTHROPOCENTRISM WHEREBY VIOLENCE CAN ALWAYS BE JUSTIFIED WHEN APPLIED TO RACIALLY INFERIOR GROUPS. ONLY A CRITIQUE WHICH FOCUSES ON REJECTING SUBHUMAN THINKING CAN CONTEST THE MYRIAD FORMS OF RACISM.**

**Deckha 2k10**

[Maneesha, faculty of law, university of Victoria, “it’s time to abandon the idea of human rights”, the scavenger, dec. 10]

While the intersection of race and gender is often acknowledged in understanding the etiology of justificatory narratives for war, the presence of species distinctions and the importance of the subhuman are less appreciated. Yet, the race (and gender) thinking that animates Razack’s argument in normalizing violence for detainees (and others) is also centrally sustained by the subhuman figure. As Charles Patterson notes with respect to multiple forms of exploitation: **Throughout the history of our ascent to dominance as the master species, our victimization of animals has served as the model and foundation for our victimization of each other. The study of human history reveals the pattern: first, humans exploit and slaughter animals; then, they treat other people like animas and do the same to th**em. Patterson emphasizes how **the human/animal hierarchy and our ideas about animals and animality are foundational for intra-human hierarchies and the violence they promote. The routine violence against beings designated subhuman serves as both a justification and blueprint for violence against humans**. For example, in discussing the specific dynamics of the Nazi camps, Patterson further notes how techniques to make the killing of detainees resemble the slaughter of animals were deliberately implemented in order to make the killing seem more palatable and benign. That the detainees were made naked and kept crowded in the gas chambers facilitated their animalization and, in turn, their death at the hands of other humans who were already culturally familiar and comfortable with killing animals in this way. Returning to Razack’s exposition of race thinking in contemporary camps, one can see how **subhuman thinking is foundational to race thinking**. One of her primary arguments is that race thinking, which she defines as **“the denial of a common bond of humanity between people of European descent and those who are not”, is “a defining feature of the world order” today as in the past**. In other words, **it is the “species thinking” that helps to create the racial demarcation. As Razack notes with respect to the specific logic infusing the camps, they “are not simply contemporary excesses born of the west’s current quest for security, but instead represent a more ominous, permanent arrangement of who is and is not a part of the human community”. Once placed outside the “human” zone by race thinking, the detainees may be handled lawlessly and thus with violence that is legitimated at all times. Racialization is not enough and does not complete their Othering experience. Rather, they must be dehumanized for the larger public to accept the violence against them and the increasing “culture of exception” which sustains these human bodily exclusions**. Although nonhumans are not the focus of Razack’s work, the centrality of the subhuman **to the logic of the camps and racial and sexual violence contained therein is also clearly illustrated in her specific example**s. In the course of her analysis, to determine the import of race thinking in enabling violence, Razack quotes a newspaper story that describes the background mentality of Private Lynndie England, the white female soldier made notorious by images of her holding onto imprisoned and naked Iraqi men with a leash around their necks. The story itself quotes a resident from England’s hometown who says the following about the sensibilities of individuals from their town: To the country boys here, if you’re a different nationality, a different race, you’re sub-human. That’s the way that girls like Lynndie England are raised. Tormenting Iraqis, in her mind, would be no different from shooting a turkey. Every season here you’re hunting something. Over there they’re hunting Iraqis. Razack extracts this quote to illustrate how “race overdetermined what went on”, but it may also be observed that species “overdetermined what went on”. **Race has a formative function, to be sure, but it works in conjunction with species difference to enable the violence at Abu Ghraib and other camps. Dehumanization promotes racialization, which further entrenches both identities. It is an intertwined logic of race, sex, culture and species that lays the foundation for the violence**.

**AND, this species-contingent paradigm creates unending genocidal violence against forms of life deemed politically unqualified.**

**KOCHI & ORDAN 2K8**

[tarik and noam, queen’s university and bar llan university, “an argument for the global suicide of humanity”, vol 7. no. 4., bourderlands e-journal]

**Within the picture** many paint **of humanity, events such as the Holocaust are considered as an** exception, an **aberration.** The Holocaust is often portrayed as an example of ‘evil’, a moment of hatred, madness and cruelty (cf. the differing accounts of ‘evil’ given in Neiman, 2004). The event is also treated as one through which humanity comprehend its own weakness and draw strength, via the resolve that such actions will never happen again. However**, if we take seriously the differing ways in which the Holocaust was ‘evil’, then one must surely include along side it the almost uncountable numbers of genocides that have occurred throughout human history**. Hence, **if we are to think of the content of the ‘human heritage’, then this must include the annihilation of indigenous peoples and their cultures across the globe and the manner in which their beliefs, behaviours and social practices have been erased from what the people of the ‘West’ generally consider to be the content of a human heritag**e. Again the history of colonialism is telling here. **It reminds us exactly how normal, regular and mundane acts of annihilation of different forms of human life and culture have been throughout human history. Indeed the history of colonialism**, in its various guises, **points to the fact that so many of our legal institutions and forms of ethical life (i.e. nation-states which pride themselves on protecting human rights through the rule of law) have been founded upon colonial violence, war and the appropriation of other peoples’ land** (Schmitt, 2003; Benjamin, 1986). Further, **the history of colonialism highlights the central function of ‘race war’ that often underlies human social organisation and many of its legal and ethical systems of thought** (Foucault, 2003). **This history of modern colonialism thus presents a key to understanding that events such as the Holocaust are not an aberration and exception but are closer to the norm, and sadly, lie at the heart of any heritage of humanity**. After all, all too often **the European colonisation of the globe was justified by arguments that indigenous inhabitants were racially ‘inferior’ and** in some instances that they were **closer to ‘apes’ than to humans** (Diamond, 2006**). Such violence justified by an erroneous view of ‘race’ is in many ways merely an extension of an underlying attitude of speciesism involving a long history of killing and enslavement of non-human species by humans.** **Such a connection between the two histories of inter-human violence (via the mythical notion of differing human ‘races’) and interspecies violence, is well expressed** in Isaac Bashevis Singer’s comment that **whereas humans consider themselves “the crown of creation”, for animals “all people are Nazis” and animal life is “an eternal Treblinka”** (Singer, 1968, p.750).

**Alternative: the judge should vote negative to REJECT THE HUMAN/ANIMAL DIVIDE.**

**this rejection enables an understanding of the SPECIES-BEING. that SOLVES THE ETHICAL CONTRADICTION OF THEIR SPECIES-LEVEL RACISM.**

**HUDSON 2K4**

[Laura, The Political Animal: Species-Being and Bare Life, mediations journal, http://www.mediationsjournal.org/files/Mediations23\_2\_04.pdf]

**We are all equally reduced to mere specimens of human biology, mute and uncomprehending of the world in which we are thrown. Species-being, or “humanity as a species,” may require this recognition to move beyond the pseudo-essence of the religion of humanism. Recognizing that what we call “the human” is an abstraction** that fails to fully describe what we are, **we may come to find a new way of understanding humanity that recuperates the natural without domination. The bare life that results from expulsion from the law removes even the illusion of freedom. Regardless of one’s location in production, the threat of losing even the fiction of citizenship and freedom affects everyone. This may create new means of organizing resistance** across the particular divisions of society. Furthermore, **the concept of bare life allows us to gesture toward a more detailed, concrete idea of what species-being may look like. Agamben hints that in the recognition of this fact, that in our essence we are all animals, that we are all living dead, might reside the possibility of a kind of redemption. Rather than the mystical horizon of a future community, the passage to species-being may be experienced as a deprivation, a loss of identity. Species-being is not merely a positive result of the development of history; it is equally the absence of many of the features of “humanity” through which we have learned to make sense of our world**. It is an absence of the kind of individuality and atomism that structure our world under capitalism and underlie liberal democracy, and which continue to inform the tenets of deep ecology. The development of species-being requires the collapse of the distinction between human and animal in order to change the shape of our relationships with the natural world. **A true species-being depends on a sort of reconciliation between our “human” and “animal” selves, a breakdown of the distinction between the two both within ourselves and in nature in general. Bare life would then represent not only expulsion from the law but the possibility of its overcoming. Positioned in the zone of indistinction, no longer a subject of the law but still subjected to it through absence, what we equivocally call “the human” in general becomes virtually indistinguishable from the animal or nature.** But through this expulsion and absence, we may see not only the law but the system of capitalism that shapes it from a position no longer blinded or captivated by its spell. **The structure of the law is revealed as always suspect in the false division between natural and political life, which are never truly separable**. Though clearly the situation is not yet as dire as Agamben’s invocation of the Holocaust suggests, **we are all, as citizens, under the threat of the state of exception. With the decline of the nation as a form of social organization, the whittling away of civil liberties and, with them, the state’s promise of “the good life” (or “the good death”) even in the most developed nations, with the weakening of labor as the bearer of resistance to exploitation, how are we to envision the future of politics and society?**
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#### We affirm critical ecological literacy as a methodological pre-requisite to the following statement. Resolves: The 50 States should increase financial incentives for decentralized Solar and Wind energy options in the United States.

#### Call it "Renewable Energy" reifies the consumptive worldview and justifies throwing sewage into our rivers

Spaceman Spiff 07/26/07, 18:07

I hate the term renewable energy ¶ Calling wind and solar power renewable energy is just more of the exact same sloppy thinking that led the world into the energy and environmental problems we're currently mired in. If anyone would pay attention to the laws of thermodynamics, they would realize there is no such fucking thing as renewable energy. ¶ Energy comes from somewhere. You can capture it and use it to do things, but you lose some of that energy to entropy, every single time.¶ Calling solar and wind power renewable lets people imagine these fields of solar panels and wind farms, where we can take energy from the sun and the climate and use it to power our society forever and ever and hooray. ¶ Just like people a hundred years ago assumed (and still do today) that dumping raw sewage into the ocean was consequence-free, because it's the ocean! There's so much of it! Our town's sewage is just a drop in the bucket!¶ Just like people since the Industrial Revolution have assumed burning fossil fuels was consequence-free, because you just dig it up from the dirt. There's so much of it! How could we ever run out, we just dig up some more!¶ Well, guess what. They were wrong about those things, and they're wrong about solar and wind energy being risk-free, consequence-free magic solutions to our energy problems.¶ Solar energy that is being absorbed by panels is solar energy that is not bouncing off the earth and the clouds and entering the climate system. Do you know what the long-term effects of taking increasing fractions of the total solar energy hitting the earth out of the climate system is? I sure don't. Wind energy that is being captured by turbines is wind energy that is not contributing to the climate system. Do you know what the long-term effects of taking increasing fractions of the total energy circulating through global weather patterns is? I sure don't.¶ How is it people can accept the possibility that a butterfly flapping its wings can cause tornadoes on the other side of the world but don't think that fields of wind turbines and solar panels could have some effect too?¶ Don't get me wrong here. Are solar and wind power cleaner (here I mean for the atmosphere) sources of energy than fossil fuels? Yes. Are we going to run out of fossil fuels? Yes. Are solar, nuclear and wind power important parts of a global strategy on ensuring the survival of our people beyond the next century? Yes, just like increased energy efficiency will help delay the onsets of any strategy we try.¶ I just hate it when otherwise intelligent people who are trying to do the right thing cannot see they are guilty of the same ignorant, arrogant shortsightedness as those who believe we will just keep on finding more oil and gas forever and ever and ever.

# Off 4

### Production Shell

#### Obama will win- Polls prove but race could shift if an event comes up

Cook 10-4

Charlie is a National Journal Columnist and writes the Cook Political Report, “Mitt Romney Breaks his Losing Streak,” <http://nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-romney-breaks-his-losing-streak-20121004>

Too many political observers see politics in an entirely binary way: Everything has to be either a “0” or a “1”; a race is either tied or it’s over; every election is either won or stolen. Some people never want to admit that their side lost. And some people think that a poll either tells them what they want to hear or is methodologically flawed—or crooked. It’s like an obnoxious sports fan (often found in Philadelphia) who views a ruling by a referee or umpire as either favorable or a bad call. Denial and simplicity reign.¶ The presidential election is neither tied nor over. Of the 16 most recent national polls using live telephone interviewers calling both respondents with landlines and those with cell phones (between 30 and 40 percent of voters do not have landlines and cannot legally be called by robo-pollsters), one has the race even, two have Obama with a narrow 2-point edge, five have 3-point Obama margins, two have 5-point Obama advantages, another pair have 6-point Obama leads, two have 7-point leads, and one has an 8-point Obama lead. This would strongly suggest that the Obama lead is between 3 and 6 percentage points; such brand-name polls as those by CNN, Fox News, and NBC News/Wall Street Journal are among those in that 3- to 6-point range.¶ Conversations with Democratic and Republican pollsters and strategists suggest that Colorado, Florida, North Carolina, and Virginia are the most competitive swing states. Some high-quality private polling shows Romney with very narrow leads in both North Carolina and Virginia, but a few other equally sophisticated surveys show Obama with narrow advantages in those two states. At least one private survey shows Florida even, but most show the Sunshine State and Colorado with narrow Obama leads, in the small- to mid-single-digit range. Just a hair or two better for Obama but still quite close are Nevada and Wisconsin, followed by Iowa. Things really get ugly for Romney in Ohio and Michigan, and, finally, in Pennsylvania, which is no longer competitive. Ohio shows a 5- to 8-point lead for Obama in private polling. In Michigan, Obama’s lead is slightly wider, and in Pennsylvania, Romney faces close to a 10-point deficit. It is mathematically possible for Romney to reach 270 electoral votes without Michigan, Ohio, or Pennsylvania, but it is in reality exceedingly unlikely.¶ It would take a very consequential event to change the trajectory of this race. Time will tell whether Romney’s strong debate performance on Wednesday night was the event that he needed—particularly in swing states such as Ohio. But at least he energized his supporters and sent a clear message that the race is not over.¶ As for down-ballot races, my hunch is that there is a pretty good chance that we may not know which party will hold a majority in the Senate in the next Congress by breakfast or lunch the day after the election. With 10 seats in the toss-up category—five for each party—the Senate outlook couldn’t be more volatile.¶ Republicans can be confident that they will pick up the open seat in Nebraska, but they have to be very worried about their own open seats in Indiana and Maine. The latter is particularly troublesome for the GOP. Republican incumbents Scott Brown in Massachusetts and Dean Heller in Nevada are in very tight races; the odds of Heller winning are better than those for Brown. The newest entry on the toss-up list is the open Republican seat in Arizona, where Democrat Richard Carmona has pulled even or slightly ahead of GOP Rep. Jeff Flake.¶ Conversely, Democrats have to be most worried about hanging on to the open seat in Connecticut, where former pro-wrestling CEO Linda McMahon now has a narrow lead, and in Montana, where incumbent Jon Tester is locked in a nail-biter. The top of the ticket is a challenge for both McMahon and Tester. Open seats in North Dakota, Virginia, and Wisconsin are statistical dead heats, notwithstanding some public polls that show rather substantial leads for former Democratic Gov. Tim Kaine over former Sen. George Allen in the Old Dominion.¶ A look at the polling data shows two inflection points in the presidential contest and many Senate races. The Democratic convention clearly had a positive impact for Democrats, while Republicans took a real hit after the release of the video of Mitt Romney suggesting that 47 percent of voters are basically deadbeats who see themselves as victims. We are now hearing reports of a similar drop for down-ballot Republicans in some districts, particularly in places like California and New York where Romney was already going nowhere. Many GOP candidates took a hit the week of Sept. 17, then stabilized the following week. They didn’t drop further but they didn’t regain any altitude, either.¶ For now, the GOP majority in the House seems fairly secure; The Cook Political Report currently sees GOP losses in the zero- to 10-seat range, well short of the 25-seat net gain Democrats need to gain control.¶ It’s always difficult to gauge how any event will be interpreted and what impact it will have on a campaign, but there is considerable evidence that the “47 percent” video did make a mark. Democratic pollster Peter Hart and his Republican counterpart Bill McInturff asked in the Sept. 26-30 NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll of 832 likely voters nationwide, “Has what you have seen, read, or heard in the past couple of weeks about Mitt Romney and his campaign for president given you a more favorable impression of him or a less favorable impression of him?” Some 28 percent responded that they felt more complimentary about Romney, but 51 percent indicated that what they heard made them feel less likely to support him.¶ Romney had a six-week stretch where nothing broke his way. Now we’ll see if his debate performance was a turning point—or a brief interruption—in the campaign narrative.

#### Plan is unpopular, solar failures make selling solar difficult

Bloomberg 6-28

“Abound Failure Revives Debate over Obama Solar Policies,” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-29/abound-failure-revives-debate-over-obama-solar-policies.html>

**The failure of a second solar manufacturer that received loan guarantees from the U.S. Energy Department adds to pressure on President Barack Obama to justify incentives for the clean-energy industry that’s being undercut by Chinese competition**. Abound Solar Inc., a U.S. solar manufacturer that was awarded a $400 million loan guarantee in 2010, said yesterday it will suspend operations and file for bankruptcy next week. Enlarge image Abound Solar Inc. solar panels in Germany. Source: Abound Solar Imc. Abound said its thin-film panels couldn’t compete against Chinese products, the same reason cited by Solyndra LLC, which closed its doors in August after receiving a $535 million guarantee from the same program. Half of the four solar manufacturers that received loan guarantees have failed, supporting the argument that backing clean-energy is a mistake, according to Representative Cliff Stearns. “We know why they went bankrupt. We warned them they would go bankrupt,” Stearns, a Florida Republican, told reporters yesterday. “**The larger question is why the administration was pursuing a green-energy policy in which companies are going bankrupt and wasting taxpayer money**.” Stearns is chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee’s oversight panel that has held hearings on the Energy Department’s loan guarantee program. Representative Jim Jordan, an Ohio Republican and chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee’s stimulus oversight panel that has investigated loan guarantees to solar companies, said **Abound’s failure is further proof the Energy Department program was a mistake. “It just adds to the weight of how ridiculous this was,” Jordan told reporters.**

**Approval Rating is key, lines up perfectly with reelection
Silver ’11**

Nate directs five thirty eight and is a statistician, “Approval Ratings and Reelection Odds,” <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/01/28/approval-ratings-and-re-election-odds/>

Earlier this month, we posted the simple version of a finding, based on the historical record, that is worth keeping in mind when you read articles about how Barack Obama’s presidency has (or has not been) been revitalized: It’s just too soon for his approval ratings to tell us very much about his re-election prospects for 2012. This is an overdue follow-up to that article — what you might think of as the slightly-more-complicated version. While **it’s true that approval ratings aren’t of much use now, it’s also the case that, by the time we get close to the election, they will have become a very reliable predictor of Mr. Obama’s chances of winning another term**. Based on Gallup polling, here is what I estimate that the incumbent president’s approval rating was on Election Day in almost every election since 1940. (There is no data for 1944 because Gallup went on wartime hiatus.) There are a few tricks I had to employ to derive these numbers; I’d ask you to take them on faith for a few moments, and then we’ll explain everything later on. **At first glance, the relationship seems nearly perfect: every incumbent with an approval rating of 49 percent or higher won re-election, while every candidate with a rating of 48 percent or lower lost.** In practice, things probably don’t work quite that crisply. For example, Harry Truman, whom we estimate had a 50 percent approval rating on Election Day 1948, won by 4.5 points, and 114 electoral votes, over Thomas E. Dewey, which suggests that he had some margin to spare. And candidate quality clearly makes a difference. Although Robert Dole is sometimes considered a weak Republican nominee, Bill Clinton beat him in 1996 by just 8.5 points, despite Mr. Clinton’s 55 percent approval rating. By contrast, in 1972, Richard Nixon, with an approval rating only a couple of points higher (57 percent), trounced a very weak Democratic nominee, George McGovern, by more than 23 points. Still, the approval rating at which an incumbent candidate goes from being an underdog to a favorite for re-election is somewhere in the high 40s. **The reason the threshold is probably slightly below 50 percent rather than right at 50 percent is that in any approval survey, some people (typically 5 to 10 percent) say they are undecided about the president’s performance**. For instance, at this writing, Barack Obama’s Gallup approval rating is 49 percent but his disapproval rating is just 42 percent, a net margin of +7. If those were the figures on Election Day, he would be a favorite to win unless nearly everybody who was undecided about his performance cast their ballots against him, something that is possible in theory but usually doesn’t occur in practice. Now, then, how did we come up with these numbers? As I said, it’s not quite so straightforward. Gallup has approval ratings data going back to 1937. The problem is that, until fairly recently, they had a habit of stopping their approval ratings polling several months before a presidential election. For instance, in 1956, their last poll of Dwight Eisenhower’s public approval was in early August; they did not survey him again until late November, after he had already defeated Adlai Stevenson. However, we can extrapolate what Mr. Eisenhower’s rating would have been on Election Day 1956 by drawing a smoothed regression line — known in the business as a Loess curve — using the data points before and after that date. The one hitch is that incumbent presidents, whether they win, lose, or don’t run at all, almost always receive a “bounce” in their approval rating after the election, as people either rally around a winner or feel sympathy for the lame duck. The average magnitude of this post-election bounce is 4 points. So, before I fitted the curves, I subtracted 4 points from approval rating polls conducted after Election Day. By applying this process of bounce-adjustment and curve-fitting, we are able to estimate an incumbent president’s Gallup approval rating on Election Day itself or on any day before it, as shown in this nifty-looking graphic: I haven’t labeled the curves by the candidate’s name in the chart, because that which create too much clutter. But I have distinguished those who eventually won re-election (blue lines) from those who lost (red). A couple of cases are worth attention. The red line that you see briefly extending above 80 percent is for George H.W. Bush. His approval ratings, which were already pretty good, shot up following the start of Operation Desert Storm in 1991, when American-led forces drove Iraqi troops back from their occupation of Kuwait. Politically, that made Mr. Bush look like an extremely formidable candidate for re-election: Saturday Night Live ran a sketch later that year entitled “Campaign ’92: The Race To Avoid Being The Guy Who Loses To Bush,” with Democratic candidates at a debate all trying to lose so they would not have to run against him. But Mr. Bush’s approval ratings fell precipitously throughout late 1991 and early 1992, and were below 40 percent by Election Day. If Mr. Bush is the precedent that challengers will cite when their campaign seems to be flailing, the opposite example is the original Comeback Kid, Harry Truman. He’s the blue line that you still see down around 40 percent approval with just five months to go before the election of 1948. It’s hard to know exactly where Mr. Truman’s approval numbers were on Election Day. When Gallup surveyed in late June, he had just 39 percent approval; in January, 1949, after he had beaten Thomas E. Dewey, he was up to 69 percent; and then he reverted back to 50 percent just a couple months later. Our Loess curve estimates that Mr. Truman’s approval rating was probably around 50 percent on Election Day, but this is just a guess. What’s clear is that Mr. Truman was at some point an extremely unpopular president, and he nevertheless — to the great surprise of the Chicago Daily Tribune — defeated Mr. Dewey. Another thing to take from the graphic is how the red and blue lines gradually untangle themselves as the relationship between approval ratings and re-election becomes stronger over time. We can see this a bit more clearly by taking the average approval rating for the 8 winning candidates and the 3 losing ones and tracking them over the two years leading up to the election: I would resist the idea that there is any one magical date when approval ratings go from meaningless to meaningful as predictors of re-election. In the chart, the first time the winners and the losers begin to separate themselves is about 19 months before the election — which would correspond roughly to March of the prior year — but the split would have come a bit earlier if not for Mr. Bush’s Gulf War bounce. There’s also increasing differentiation in the period roughly 10 to 5 months before the election, corresponding with primary season. Still, for the most part, the separation occurs gradually. I’ve also tried to play around with various sorts of logistic regression models that attempt to predict a president’s chances at re-election based solely on his Gallup approval rating and the number of days until the election. Don’t take this terribly seriously — it’s hard to do anything very rigorous based on so few data points (just 11 presidents in the sample), and I can imagine better model designs than the one that I’ve used. But it does yield some ballpark estimates of what this data implies. **For example, a year in advance of the election, the model figures that a president with a 60 percent approval rating is about 90 percent likely to win re-election, whereas a 40 percent rating translates into a win probability of a bit below 40 percent**. So by that point the differences have become fairly meaningful: What does this mean for Barack Obama? Right now, we’re still in the period where the most useful number for estimating his re-election chances is not his approval rating but rather the historical track record of incumbent presidents. As I wrote on Wednesday, since the Civil War, 73 percent of incumbent presidents who sought another term won, as have 70 percent since World War II. Plugging Mr. Obama’s current numbers into the regression model that I described above yields a 65 percent likelihood of re-election — but again, this is a really rough guess, based mostly on the high historical batting average for incumbents rather than anything to do with Mr. Obama himself. What we can say is important is the range in which Mr. Obama’s approval ratings have been varying in recent months: between about 45 and about 50 percent. **If Mr. Obama’s approval rating is at the top of that range, 50 percent, on Nov. 6, 2012 — about where it is now — the model figures that his chances of winning re-election will be greater than 80 percent. But if his approval rating is at the bottom of the range instead, at 45 percent, his chances for a second term will be only about one in three,** and he’ll have to hope that the Republican nominee is a weak one. Much will change between now and then, of course. But Mr. Obama would probably win an election held next Tuesday — and that would not have been true a couple of months ago.

**Romney win leads to most hostile right wing takeover in history and overturns all green energy it also causes- tax cuts for rich, end of Dodd-Frank, no healthcare and end to key education incentives**

**Alterman 8-8**

Eric is a Distinguished Professor of English at Brooklyn College, “President Romney?” [http://www.thenation.com/article/169287/president-romney#](http://www.thenation.com/article/169287/president-romney)

a Romney White House, those digits may go limp with fatigue. **A Romney victory would** likely **bring with it a large majority in the House and** quite possibly a Republican **Senate** as well, and hence a tsunami of regressive legislation. As the longtime nonpartisan analysts Thomas Mann and Norman Ornstein argue, a Republican victory in November will likely prove a key turning point in modern American history. **It will offer Republicans the opportunity**, in Mann’s words, **to put “in place a radical view of policy that goes** well **beyond anything Republicans have proposed in the past**,” one that has moved so far rightward that “no Republican president in the modern era would have felt comfortable being a part of [it].” What’s more, they will likely succeed owing not only to Romney’s eagerness to blow with whatever winds may be buffeting him, but also, as Mann and Ornstein put it, to his party’s “demonstrated willingness to bend, break, or change legislative rules and customs that have stood in the way of radical change in the past.”¶ If you think the Tea Party has gone away, think again. Its members are not holding demonstrations so much anymore because they are staffing campaigns, winning Republican primaries (often against veteran incumbents and well-funded establishment favorites), or replacing the staffers of those they have scared into submission. As Dave Weigel writes in the Washington Monthly, “After 2010, the movement evolved. Activists got jobs with newly elected Republicans. Political organizations like the [corporate and conservative billionaire-funded and -controlled] Americans for Prosperity and FreedomWorks grew their staffs and budgets. Elected Republicans continued to draw on them for strength, support, and warm bodies at campaign events.” Under a Romney administration, many of these ignorant fanatics will be called upon to staff a significant number of the more than 3,000 federal appointments that a president makes, and his hundreds of potential judicial appointments as well.¶ **The result, should Romney become president, will be a mixture of policies that favor the superwealthy**, **punish the poor and middle class, restrict the rights of average Americans**, and—I say this without hyperbole—cause a degree of almost unimaginable and unprecedented chaos in virtually every area of American public life.¶ As president, Romney promises to focus on economic policy, and it is here where his impact may be greatest. The primary purpose of the modern Republican presidency has been to make the extremely rich far richer at the expense of the rest of us, and Mitt Romney promises to outdo all of his predecessors in this regard. George W. Bush’s $2.5 trillion in tax cuts, while ruinous to the nation’s balance of payments, succeeded in distributing only 12.5 percent of those trillions to his friends and cronies in the wealthiest 0.1 percent. **Romney does Bush quite a bit better by proposing**—on top of already unsustainable budget deficits—**an additional $10.7 trillion in tax cuts over the next 10 years, with fully 33 percent directed toward the top one-tenth of 1 percent**. The fine print calls for a reduction in both individual and corporate tax rates, as well as the complete elimination of both the estate tax and the alternative minimum tax. The net result would be that the superwealthy—those who enjoy an income in the vicinity of $3 million annually—keep an additional $250,000. According to the Urban Institute–Brookings Institution Tax Policy Center, the cost will likely exceed $9 trillion in lost revenue in the coming decade.¶ Meanwhile **Romney’s friends on Wall Street can** also expect, under his presidency, to see **the complete defenestration of the Dodd-Frank bill**, which helps (albeit insufficiently)**to protect consumers from the predatory practices of large financial institutions**, while at the same time placing limits on the kinds of malpractice that caused the 2008 financial crisis.¶ **Romney’s budget-busting plans** also **call for a cornucopia of new spending for each of the three major armed services, including** the addition of **100,000 ground troops** for the Army, an additional six new ships each year for the Navy, and more F-35 stealth warplanes for the Air Force. **This adds up to a $2 trillion increase** in the coming decade above what had previously been budgeted. (Congress and President Obama had earlier agreed to a $450 billion reduction.) These increases would come at a moment when the United States spends more on its military than its seventeen next-largest competitors combined. In fact, fully 64 percent of all 4.4 million employees on the federal payroll are already either in the uniformed military or work for the departments of Defense, Veterans Affairs and Homeland Security.¶ How will any of this be paid for? Romney pretends that significant savings will come from closing tax “loopholes,” but this is nonsense. Those loopholes were placed there specifically to reward the donors who pay the costs of our lawmakers’ political campaigns (just like the more straightforward across-the-board tax cuts for the superrich). Tea Party champions, including Senators Jim DeMint of South Carolina and Rand Paul of Kentucky, are trying to prevent the Treasury Department from cracking down even on wealthy expatriate tax cheats. The notion that these loopholes will somehow be eliminated—especially when they continue to be expanded every time the tax code is adjusted—is too childish for adults to take seriously, save perhaps for a few gullible reporters and right-wing pundits.¶ All of the above would put unbearable pressure on an already stretched entitlements budget, as well as on those federal programs for the poor and middle class that have so far escaped the scalpel, while simultaneously raising the tax burden on these households. Regarding the latter, for instance, a tax plan released by Senate Republican Minority Leader Mitch McConnell and Utah Senator Orrin Hatch ends the Child Tax Credit, the American Opportunity Tax Credit (for college tuition) and a more generous Earned Income Tax Credit—which, when added together, would raise taxes on more than 20 million families, according to Seth Hanlon, the director of fiscal reform at the Center for American Progress. It gets worse. **Romney has promised to** use the “reconciliation” process to **repeal Obamacare. But what will replace it?** Well, again, **chaos,** no doubt, **but also the Ryan plan**—named for its author, Wisconsin Republican and Ayn Rand devotee Representative Paul Ryan, and now gospel among the GOP faithful. Romney has called himself “very supportive” of the plan, adding: “I think it’d be marvelous if the Senate were to pick up Paul Ryan’s budget and adopt it and pass it along to the president.” The House of Representatives has already passed it 235 to 193, with only four Republicans in opposition.¶ Among its provisions is a rise in the eligibility age for Medicare for future retirees and a retraction in Medicaid coverage, including its replacement by a voucher system. **The net result would be** not only the jump in the size of the deficit predicted by the Congressional Budget Office, but also, **according to the calculations of the Urban Institute, the loss of Medicaid coverage for 27 million** Americans. Meanwhile, another 30 **million people—many of them children—would lose the insurance** **included in Obamacare**. Add it all up and, according to Harvard health policy researcher (and former Obama administration official) David Blumenthal, writing in The New England Journal of Medicine, “by 2020, 20% of Americans may be uninsured, even as 20% of our gross domestic product is devoted to health care.”¶ America’s children will also feel the wrath of Romney and the radical Republicans when it comes to education policy. **Romney** calls school choice “the civil rights issue of our era.” His education proposals eschew **any new funding for public schools**, preferring to direct it toward private school vouchers, privately managed charter schools and for-profit online schools. Like Wisconsin’s Scott Walker and other Koch-funded right-wing demagogues, Romney blames public school teachers and their unions not only for the failures of the US education system, but also for the fiscal problems facing state and local governments. He hopes to weaken these bastions of Democratic fundraising and people power by using federal funds to reward states for “eliminating or reforming teacher tenure.” (Republican budget plans also slash programs like Head Start.)¶ As education expert Diane Ravitch observes, “Vouchers have been the third rail of education politics since Milton Friedman proposed them in 1955.” But in what she calls a likely “template for the Romney plan,” the Louisiana legislature instituted a voucher system independent of a popular vote. Ravitch explains, “With no increase in funding, all the money for vouchers and private vendors and online charters will be deducted from the state’s public education budget.” Beneficiaries in Louisiana have included outfits like the Eternity Christian Academy, a school with only fourteen students that applied under the voucher system to enroll an additional 135. According to Reuters, its students “sit in cubicles for much of the day and move at their own pace through Christian workbooks, such as a beginning science text that explains ‘what God made’ on each of the six days of creation.” Students are not exposed to the theory of evolution because, as the pastor turned principal explains, “We try to stay away from all those things that might confuse our children.”¶ At the university level, Romney will encourage private sector involvement by inviting commercial banks to profit from the federal student loan program, in keeping with the right-wing Republican fear of (and contempt for) knowledge. Romney also favors the creation of for-profit online universities, recently described in a report by Senator Tom Harkin, chairman of the Senate health and education committee, as institutions characterized by “exorbitant tuition, aggressive recruiting practices, abysmal student outcomes, taxpayer dollars spent on marketing and pocketed as profit, and regulatory evasion and manipulation.”¶ \* \* \*¶ Then there’s the Supreme Court. The Roberts Court is already America’s most conservative since the New Deal. But with the addition of a single Romney nomination, it will become a rubber stamp for the ideological obsessions, corporate demands, and religious fanaticism on display at Tea Party rallies and Fox News–sponsored debates.¶ One need only take note of what former New York Times Supreme Court reporter Linda Greenhouse termed the “breathtaking radicalism” of the four dissenters in the Affordable Care Act decision to see where a Romney-appointed Court will be headed. With their signed opinions in the ACA case, Justices Scalia, Alito, Thomas and Kennedy “outed themselves,” in the words of legal scholar Jeffrey Rosen, “as partisans of the Constitution in Exile—the movement of economic libertarians who want the courts to resurrect pre–New Deal limits on federal power in order to dismantle the regulatory state piece by piece.” **Three** of the **justices will turn 80** or older **during the next four years**, and a fourth will be 77. **One more vote and the Roberts Court will enjoy unchecked power to increase** the legal rights of **corporations to pollute our air and rivers;** mistreat workers and fire them should they complain; **discriminate on the basis of race, gender or sexual orientation**; decertify unions; and control our political discourse with secretive campaign contributions and relentlessly scurrilous advertisements—indeed, to reduce the security of every American citizen. As legal reporter Dahlia Lithwick has written, “**If you care abou**t the future of **abortion** rights, stem cell research, worker protections, **the death penalty, environmental regulation, torture,** presidential power, warrantless surveillance, or any number of other issues, **it’s worth recalling that the last stop on the answer to each** of those matters **will** probably **be** before **someone in a black robe.**”¶ One area where the courts are certain to matter is immigration policy. It was here that Romney chose to burnish his Tea Party credentials most energetically during the primary season. He called Arizona’s draconian SB 1070—the one that allowed anyone’s papers to be checked on suspicion of looking Hispanic—a “model” for the rest of the nation. (This was before the Court found its key provisions unconstitutional.) He came out in favor of “self-deportation”—actually a right-wing euphemism for an immigration strategy of “attrition through enforcement”—and promised to veto the DREAM Act should its supporters somehow manage to pass it. Cognizant of how many votes this belligerent nativism would likely cost him among Hispanic voters, however, Romney has refused to say anything substantive on this issue since wrapping up the nomination. Still, it is no secret where he and his party stand, as immigration is one of the most animating issues for Tea Party enthusiasts.¶ Regarding the foreign policy agenda—which, after all, is where a president has the most freedom of action—an internal dossier from McCain’s presidential campaign noted back in 2008 that “Romney’s foreign affairs résumé is extremely thin, leading to credibility problems.” His disastrous July misadventures abroad did little to disabuse anyone of this view. Romney has surrounded himself with a group of extremely hawkish advisers, who even Colin Powell worries are “quite far to the right.” None had the prescience to oppose America’s disastrous invasion of Iraq, and more than a few give the impression of looking forward to trying something like it again.¶ Like most Republicans—and, to be fair, most Democrats—Romney has had next to nothing to say about America’s major foreign policy headaches of the past decade: Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan. But **if Romney becomes president, you’ll be hard-pressed to find a Vegas oddsmaker willing to take bets against an Israeli, American or American/Israeli attack on Iran**. While the Obama administration’s rhetoric on the question has hardly been reassuring to those who continue to favor diplomacy over bombing, Romney almost always manages to go the president one better. **Romney** has **called Iran’s** **leaders the “greatest threat to the world since** the fall of **the Soviet Union**, and before that, Nazi Germany.” He says he would not even consult Congress before beginning an attack. As he explained on CBS’s Face the Nation in mid-June, “If I’m president, the Iranians will have no question but that I will be willing to take military action if necessary to prevent them from becoming a nuclear threat to the world. I don’t believe at this stage, therefore, if I’m president, that we need to have a war powers approval or special authorization for military force. The president has that capacity now.”¶ True, an attack would likely cause a conflagration in the Middle East, including missile attacks on Tel Aviv (as the Iranians have promised), a violent uprising among the Palestinians, the end of the Palestinian Authority and the unchallenged ascension of Hamas on the West Bank and Hezbollah in Lebanon, and a likely wave of terrorism against Israeli and American targets worldwide. But insofar as **Romney and the Republican Party’s current foreign policy is** concerned—**dominated** as it is **by neoconservative adventurists**, **far-right American Jewish funders** like Sheldon Adelson, and **evangelicals obsessed with Israel’s role in biblical revelation**—whatever Bibi Netanyahu wants, Bibi gets.¶ Outside of the Middle East, Romney’s rhetoric has largely consisted of tough-guy talk of the kind that turns sometimes cooperative, sometimes recalcitrant strategic competitors into potentially threatening adversaries. For instance, he calls Russia “without question, our number one geopolitical foe” and accuses it of “always stand[ing] up for the world’s worst actors.” Likewise, Romney complains that China has “run all over us,” stealing American jobs and waging a “trade war” against the United States. Romney has said that he would haul China before the World Trade Organization on charges that it was manipulating its currency to ensure the relatively cheap prices of its exports.¶ About the Author¶ Just how he plans to do this, given our massive reliance on China to continue to buy Treasury (and private sector) bonds—to say nothing of its role in issues like regional security and environmental degradation—Romney doesn’t specify. But should he try it, we can be reasonably certain of the result: chaos.¶ And while Barack Obama’s environmental commitments, both foreign and domestic, have certainly failed to live up to the promise of his campaign, no one should expect any progress on global environmental issues from President Romney. No matter how alarming the threats we face, Romney’s business-first philosophy combined with the Tea Party’s anti-“gummint” fanaticism has created the political equivalent of a brick wall through which literally no environmental regulation will manage to pass. As the New York Times editorial page observes, the post-Massachusetts Romney emerged a “proclaimed skeptic on global warming, a champion of oil and other fossil fuels, a critic of federal efforts to develop cleaner energy sources and a sworn enemy of the Environmental Protection Agency.” Moreover, as with immigration, his post-primary rhetorical efforts to shed the “climate denier” label have not been accompanied by any serious shifts in policy.¶ Under President Romney, the United States will almost certainly ignore the threat from global warming. Indeed, his party is already seeking to strip the Environmental Protection Agency of its power to regulate carbon emissions. House Republicans have even proposed legislation—called the TRAIN Act (for Transparency in Regulatory Analysis of Impacts on the Nation)—to cut its power to regulate anything at all. **A Republican Congress will also reduce or perhaps entirely eliminate subsidies for green energy,** while preserving the tax breaks and subsidies for the oil and gas industries and opening up almost all US parklands, wilderness areas and offshore waters to drilling.¶ These are merely the highlights—and perhaps the most direct consequences—of a Romney win. But there will be many others as well.¶ \* \* \*¶ Some progressives argue that, nonetheless, President Obama has been such a disappointment that his defeat would not be an unmitigated loss for social justice movements. It’s true that with a Republican in the White House, more progressives would feel freer to give full voice to their complaints about America’s continued violations of civil liberties in its pursuit of suspected terrorists; its widespread use of pilotless drones to kill alleged enemies without due process; its inability to make any progress against global warming; its coddling of the criminals in the Bush administration, as well as those in the banking and housing industries who helped cause the 2008 crisis; and so on. But this freedom would come at a great cost: namely, seeing all of these problems—together with pretty much every other cause that progressives hold dear—worsen to a degree that most of us cannot even imagine. Protests will mount. Denunciations will fill the air. And the circulations of left-oriented publications and websites like this one will skyrocket. But the victims of these policies will suffer. Indeed, the millions of Americans who have been forced to live on the edge of financial collapse, or whose health is dependent on affordable and reliable healthcare, will see their margin of survival disappear.¶ Despite the many disappointments of his presidency, Barack Obama remains a vehicle for progressive change in America, one whose weaknesses reflect the weaknesses of the left in a system dominated by money, democratic dysfunction and a myopic media. Those are our real problems—not the attitude of the individual in the White House. And not one of them will improve once the power of the presidency is bestowed upon those who have created those problems and continue to profit by them. Indeed, nearly all of them will reach (and some may exceed) crisis proportions. And what that will lead to, no one—certainly not your author—can predict, save for one thing: chaos.

# Case

#### Aff can’t solve Environmetnal destruction- Adding solar into USFG policy doesn’t change the desire to pollute or oil’s dominance in the private sector.

#### Takes 5 decades to replace current fossil fuels

Smil ’12

Vaclav is a distinguished Professor in the department of Environment and Geography at the University of Manibota, “A Skeptic Looks at Alternative Energy,” July http://spectrum.ieee.org/energy/renewables/a-skeptic-looks-at-alternative-energy/4

Perhaps the most misunderstood aspect of energy transitions is their speed. Substituting one form of energy for another takes a long time. U.S. nuclear generation began to deliver 10 percent of all electricity after 23 years of operation, and it took 38 years to reach a 20 percent share, which occurred in 1995. It has stayed around that mark ever since. Electricity generation by natural gas turbines took 45 years to reach 20 percent. In 2025 modern wind turbines will have been around for some 30 years, and if by then they supply just 15 percent of the electricity in the United States, it will be a stunning success. And even the most optimistic projects for solar generation don’t promise half that much. The quest for non­carbon sources of electricity is highly desirable, and eventually such sources will predominate. But this can happen only if planners have realistic expectations. The comparison to a giant oil tanker, uncomfortable as it is, fits perfectly: Turning it around takes lots of time. And turning around the world’s fossil-fuel-based energy system is a truly gargantuan task. That system now has an annual throughput of more than 7 billion metric tons of hard coal and lignite, about 4 billion metric tons of crude oil, and more than 3 trillion cubic meters of natural gas. This adds up to 14 trillion watts of power. And its infrastructure—coal mines, oil and gas fields, refineries, pipelines, trains, trucks, tankers, filling stations, power plants, transformers, transmission and distribution lines, and hundreds of millions of gasoline, kerosene, diesel, and fuel oil engines—constitutes the costliest and most extensive set of installations, networks, and machines that the world has ever built, one that has taken generations and tens of trillions of dollars to put in place. It is impossible to displace this supersystem in a decade or two—or five, for that matter. Replacing it with an equally extensive and reliable alternative based on renewable energy flows is a task that will require decades of expensive commitment. It is the work of generations of engineers.

**Solar causes NF3 increases – that causes extreme warming**

**Conniff ‘12**

Guggenheim Fellow, 08 (Richard, National Magazine Award-winning writer, has written for Yale e360 about carbon offsets and clean coal, November 13, “The Greenhouse Gas That Nobody Knew,” http://e360.yale.edu/content/feature.msp?id=2085, d/a 8-2-12, ads)

**When industry began using NF3** **in** high-tech **manufacturing**, **it was hailed as a way to fight global warming. But new research shows that this gas has 17,000 times the warming potential of carbon dioxide and is rapidly increasing in the atmosphere** – and **that's turning an environmental success** story **into a public relations disaster**.¶ Hypothetical question: You’re heartsick about global warming, so you’ve just paid $25,000 to put a solar system on the roof of your home. How do you respond to news that it was manufactured with a chemical that is 17,000 times stronger than carbon dioxide as a cause of global warming?¶ It may sound like somebody’s idea of a bad joke. But last month, **a study from the Scripps Institution of Oceanography reported that** nitrogen trifluoride (**NF3**), with a global warming potential of 17,000, **is now present in the atmosphere at four times the expected level and rapidly rising**. **Use of NF3 is** currently **booming**, **for** products from computer chips and flats-screen LCDs to thin-film **solar photovoltaics**, **an economical and increasingly popular solar power format**.¶ Moreover, the Kyoto Protocol, which limits a half-dozen greenhouse gases, does not cover NF3. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change now lists it among five major new greenhouse gases likely to be included in the next phase of global warming regulation, after 2012. And while that may be reassuring, it also suggests the complicated character of the global warming problem.

#### Wind increases air pollution- Backup generators

Zycher 8-6

Benjamin is a Visiting Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, “The Rathold Eternal,” <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/08/should-wind-tax-credit-stay-or.php>

- Do we really need to note that the wind does not always blow? It is, in a word, intermittent; but the need for electricity is unrelenting. So backup generating capacity---coal, gas, and nuclear plants---is needed to avoid blackouts as more and more wind turbines are connected to the grid. Suffice it to say that the backup capacity is not free---consumers have to pay for it---and because the coal and gas plants have to be cycled up and down depending on wind conditions, they cannot be operated efficiently. The net effect is higher costs, less reliability, and more---yes, more---air pollution. Thus have we achieved the perfect green trifecta, one of many such fruits of modern environmentalism.

**Production process causes more warming**

**De Decker ‘08**

Low-tech Magazine Contributor, 08 (Kris, March 03, “The ugly side of solar panels,” http://www.energybulletin.net/authors/Kris+De+Decker, d/a 8-2-12, ads)\

Producing electricity from solar cells reduces air pollutants and greenhouse gases by about 90 percent in comparison to using conventional fossil fuel technologies, claims a study called "Emissions from Photovoltaic Life Cycles", to be published this month in “Environmental Science & Technology”. Good news, it seems, until one reads the report itself. The researchers come up with a solid set of figures. However, they interpret them in a rather optimistic way. Some recalculations (skip this article if you get annoyed by numbers) produce striking conclusions.¶ **Solar panels** don’t come falling out of the sky – they **have to be manufactured**. Similar to computer chips, **this is a dirty and energy-intensive process**. First, raw **materials have to be mined**: quartz sand for silicon cells, metal ore for thin film cells. Next, **these materials have to be treated**, following different steps (in the case of silicon cells these are purification, crystallization and wafering). Finally, **these upgraded materials have to be manufactured into solar cells**, and assembled into modules. All **these processes produce air pollution and heavy metal emissions, and they consume energy - which brings about more** air pollution, heavy metal emissions and also **greenhouse gases.**

**Intermittency means solar fails – causes coal use – causes more emissions**

**Zycher ‘12**

Pacific Research Institute Senior Fellow, 12¶ (Benjamin, 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, April 19, “Zycher testimony to joint House subcommittee hearing on subsidies for renewable energy,” http://www.aei.org/article/energy-and-the-environment/alternative-energy/zycher-testimony-to-joint-house-subcommittee-hearing-on-subsidies-for-renewable-energy/, d/a 8-1-12,)

Low Availability and Intermittency. **Electric energy in large amounts cannot be ¶ stored at low cost in batterie**s due to technological limitations; only indirect storage in the ¶ form of water in dams is economic. This reality means that **the production and ¶ consumption of electricity in a given power network must be balanced constantly in order** ¶ **to prevent blackouts**, and more generally to preserve system reliability. Because ¶ unexpected surges in demand and/or outages of generating equipment can occur, backup ¶ generation capacity must be maintained; such backup capacity is termed the “operating ¶ reserve” for the given network. This operating reserve is of two types; the first is the ¶ “spinning reserve,” that is, generators already connected to the network, the output of ¶ which can be increased by raising the torque applied to the generating turbines. The ¶ typical system requirement is that spinning reserves be 50 percent or more of total ¶ operating reserves. The second component of operating reserves is the supplemental ¶ reserve, which comprises generation capacity that can be brought on line within five to ¶ ten minutes and/or electric power that can be obtained quickly from other networks or by ¶ withholding power being distributed to other networks. Additional reserve capacity often ¶ is provided by generators that require up to an hour to come on line; this backup capacity ¶ is not included in measures of the operating reserve for a system because of the length of ¶ time required for availability. Electric supply systems respond to growing demands (“load”) over the course of a ¶ day (or year) by increasing output from the lowest-cost generating units first, and then ¶ calling upon successively more-expensive units as electric loads grow toward the daily ¶ (or seasonal) peak. **Because of the uncertainties caused by the unreliability of** wind and ¶ **sunlight**, **most electric** **generation** capacity fueled by renewable energy sources **cannot be** ¶ assumed to be **available upon demand**; system planning and optimization cannot assume ¶ that such power will be available when it is expected to be most economic. Accordingly, ¶ it cannot be scheduled (or “dispatched”). Instead, **it requires backup generation capacity** ¶ to preserve system reliability. ¶ And **so the cost of that needed backup capacity becomes a crucial parameter** ¶ **usually not mentioned in public discussions of** wind and **solar power**. One study, using ¶ figures from the California Independent System Operator, projects that an increase in ¶ California renewable generation capacity between 2009 and 2020 would be about 17.7 ¶ gigawatts (GW) for a 20 percent renewable requirement, and about 22.4 GW for the 33 ¶ percent requirement.¶ 7¶ The projected needs for backup capacity (of varying types) are, ¶ respectively, 0.8 GW (or 4.5 percent) and 4.8 GW (or 21 percent).

### Shell

#### Solar development kills desert tortoise

Lovich & Ennen ‘11

Jeffrey and Joshua, “Wildlife Development and Solar Energy Development in the Desert Southwest, United States,” Bioscience Volume 61 No. 12 Pages 982-992 <http://www.avhidesert.com/pdf/downloaded_file-1.pdf>

Habitat fragmentation. **Until relatively recently, the desert Southwest was characterized by large blocks of continuous and interconnected habitat**. Roads and urban development continue to contribute to habitat fragmentation in this landscape. **Large-scale energy development has the potential to add to and exacerbate the situation, presenting potential barriers to movement and genetic exchange in wildlife populations, including** those of bighorn sheep (Ovis canadensis), deer (Odocoileus spp.), **tortoise**s, and other species of concern and social significance. Research conducted on the effects of oil and gas exploration and development (OGED) on wildlife in the Intermountain West provides a possible analog to USSEDO, since comparable data are not available for the desert Southwest. **The potential effects** on mule deer (Odocoileus hemionus) and other wildlife species **include impediments to free movement, the creation of migration bottlenecks, and a reduction in effective winter range size.** Mule deer responded immediately to OGED by moving away from disturbances, with no sign of acclimation during the three years of study by Sawyer and colleagues (2009). Some deer avoidance resulted in their use of lesspreferred and presumably less-suitable habitats. Despite a lack of data on the direct contributions of USSEDO to habitat fragmentation, USSEDO has the potential to be an impediment to gene flow for some species. Although the extent of this impact is, as yet, largely unquantified in the desert, compelling evidence for the effects of human-caused habitat fragmentation on diverse wildlife species has already been demonstrated in the adjacent coastal region of southern California (Delaney et al. 2010).

#### Desert Tortoise is a keystone species, keeps hundreds of species alive and soil correct

Becker ’12

Kendall is an environmental researcher at the University of Washington, “Renewable Energy, Fire, and the Agassiz’s Desert Tortoise,” <http://scienceinshort.wordpress.com/2012/03/13/renewable-energy-fire-and-the-agassizs-desert-tortoise/>

**At the forefront of this debate is the Agassiz’s desert tortoise. The tortoise is a keystone species; the desert ecosystem revolves around the tortoises’ propensity to burrow. “Literally hundreds of other desert animals benefit from tortoise burrows,” says Dr.** Jeffrey **Lovich, director of the Southwest Biological Science Center** in Flagstaff, Arizona. Voles, enda**ngered lizards, and even rattlesnakes seek shady homes in burrows of dimensions they are incapable of engineering on their own**. **Still more critical to the desert ecosystem is the churning of the soil that occurs as tortoises dig these tunnels**. In an environment devoid of worms, **desert plants rely on tortoises to stir up the soil so more water and oxygen can reach plant roots**. In recent decades desert tortoise numbers have plummeted as encroaching civilization and industry fragment their habitat. **Where a full 1,000 tortoises used to populate each square kilometer, now as few as 100 remain**. With the California Bureau of Land Management currently reviewing 22 applications for solar energy permits, the question of how these facilities impact tortoises and, by extension, the entire desert ecosystem, is a pressing one.

#### Extinction

#### Fraser 10

(Caroline, "Could Re-Wilding Avert the 6th Great Extinction?," 1/5, Scientific American, Adapted from the book REWILDING THE WORLD: Dispatches from the Conservation Revolution by Caroline Fraser, <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=could-re-wilding-avert-6th-great-extinction>)

Why do species matter? Why worry if some go missing? Part of the answer lies in the relationships coming to light between creatures like the canyon coyotes and the chaparral birds. After the nineteenth century’s great age of biological collecting, when collectors filled museums to bursting with stuffed birds and pinned beetles, the twentieth and twenty-first centuries have proved to be an age of connecting. Biologists have begun to understand that nature is a chain of dominoes: If you pull one piece out, the whole thing falls down. Lose the animals, lose the ecosystems. Lose the ecosystems, game over. This was the essential insight of conservation biology, a new scientific field launched with the determination to identify threats to ecosystems and to design the methods to deal with them. E. O. Wilson has called it “a discipline with a deadline.” The Society for Conservation Biology, founded in 1985, became one of the fastest-growing scientific organizations of its time, bringing together diverse specialties from ecology and population genetics to sustainable agriculture and forestry, revolutionizing the once sleepy field of natural history. The tremendous variety of species held in wilderness areas, particularly the tropics, is our bank and lifeline, our agricultural and medical insurance policy. Three-quarters of the world’s food supply comes from twelve plant species, but those species are dependent on thousands of others: pollinators (insects, bats, birds), soil microbes, nitrogen-fixing bacteria, and fungi. The tropical rain forests contain a pool of genetic diversity for important food crops, a source for vital new strains that can be hybridized to fight pests and diseases. Botanists are combing the planet for wild ancestors of soybeans, tomatoes, hard wheat, and grapes, believed to contain valuable genes for drought tolerance and other characteristics, but much diversity has already been lost. Genetic engineering alone cannot replace what hundreds of millions of years of evolution have given us. Wild replacements for pineapples, pomegranates, olives, coffee, and other crops lie in biodiversity-rich areas that must be saved. In terms of medicine, our most important modern pharmaceuticals, including quinine, morphine, aspirin, penicillin, and many other antibiotics, are derived from microbes, plants, and animals found in tropical and marine environments. The first comprehensive scientific treatise on our reliance on other species, Sustaining Life: How Human Health Depends on Biodiversity, published in 2008, confirmed the importance of genetic variety, describing groups of threatened organisms crucial to agriculture and human medicine. Predictably, our close relatives, primates, make up a key group. Contributing to work on smallpox, polio, and vaccine development, primates allow research on potential treatments for hepatitis C and B, Ebola and Marburg viruses, and HIV/AIDS. The list of threatened plants and animals we rely on is weird and varied, including amphibians, bears, gymnosperms (the family of plants that includes pine trees), cone snails, sharks, and horseshoe crabs. Cone snails, a large genus of endangered marine mollusks, inject their prey with paralyzing toxins that are prized in medical research for their use in developing pain medications for cancer and AIDS patients who are unresponsive to opiates. The blood of the horseshoe crab, which carries antimicrobial peptides that kill bacteria, is being tested in treatments for HIV, leukemia, prostate cancer, breast cancer, and rheumatoid arthritis; it also yields cells crucial in developing tests to detect bacteria in medical devices, and its eyes have allowed Nobel Prize–winning researchers to unravel the complexities of human vision. Cone snails and horseshoe crabs are exactly the kinds of species that people tend to dismiss, seeing no utility in them, no connection to human need. This was the attitude expressed in 1990 by Manuel Lujan Jr., secretary of the interior during the George H. W. Bush administration, who asked in exasperation, “Do we have to save every subspecies?” It was the attitude expressed in 2008 by presidential candidate John McCain, who repeatedly declared his opposition to the funding of research on grizzly bear DNA. He got a cheap laugh whenever he said, “I don’t know if that was a paternity issue or a criminal issue.” Medical researchers were not laughing: bears, too, are essential to human medicine. Bear bile yields ursodeoxycholic acid, now used in treating complications during pregnancy, gallstones, and severe liver disease. Denning bears enter a period of lethargy during the winter and recycle body wastes in a process unique in mammals; this process is studied for insights in treating osteoporosis, renal disease, diabetes, and obesity. If species are crucial to medicine, ecosystems are indispensable to the health of the planet. Ecosystems provide the most basic provisioning services— food, firewood, and medicines—along with the so- called regulating services of a fully functional environment, which include cleaning the air, purifying water, controlling floods and erosion, storing carbon, and detoxifying pollutants in soils. When ecosystems are lost, as they have been through felling of forests and conversion of landscape to agriculture on a vast scale, havoc ensues, triggering human and natural catastrophe on an unprecedented scale.