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#### The aff’s market-based approach to sustainability exacerbates social inequality and drives environmental destruction – they block criticism of the market by making it the *solution* to environmental problems, backdoor sanctioning excessive consumption by blaming market distortion for a failure to produce green energy technologies

Gunder 6

(Michael, senior lecturer in the School of Architecture and Planning at the University of Auckland, New Zealand, President of the New Zealand Planning Institute, “Sustainability: Planning’s Saving Grace or Road to Perdition?”, *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 2006; 26; 208)

This article begins by tracing sustainability’s rise to prominence in planning education and its emergence as a dominant planning theme. The article will argue critically that the definition of sustainability can be and often has been deployed selectively by planners or politicians as a materialization of dominant institutional ideologies supportive of growth and capital accumulation that maintains the existing status quo of class inequalities, with limited regard to the environment. Rather than encouraging opportunities for social change that comprehensively might reduce consumer behavior to that consistent with the Earth’s carrying capacity, the discourse of sustainable development often is deployed simply to further the interests of the entrepreneurial supportive state and its institutions. These are promarket interpretations of sustainable development that water down the concept of sustainability to literally that of business as usual, with, at best, an objective to partially reduce urban-consumer energy consumption and waste outputs while still maximizing the potential for all embracing economic growth with little regard to overall resource depletion. This is of particular concern where diverse socioeconomic and environmental issues are constituted under one mantle of a triple (economic, environmental, equity) or quadruple (plus creativity) bottom line of accounting constituting an all-embracing, sustainable-development rubric. This is an approach that promises a balanced consideration of the social and environmental good but gives disproportionate consideration to the importance of economic outcomes (Dyllick and Hockerts 2002, 132). This interpretation of sustainable development constitutes new purpose, legitimacy, and above all, authority for the discipline of planning and its practitioners, but it also risks sustaining existing social and environmental injustices, not to mention inducing new forms of social disparity and environmental degradation. These are injuries that stem from society’s still dominant cultural imperative of the marketplace driven by capitalist competition and globalization (Gunder 2005a). This market-orientated deployment of sustainable development obscures and subsumes dominant economic objectives under the overtly stated imperative to sustain the environment, against which, in itself, few would wish to argue. Further, this approach largely overlooks injustices that planning traditionally attempted to address overtly as important issues of the urban problematic. Under dominant market interpretations of the discourse of sustainable development, planning risks marginalizing its role of serving today’s public good in turn for serving the further depletion of the environment as it continues to sustain wealth accumulation for future generations, regardless of the social or environmental cost that this actually may induce. The article next examines contemporary planning processes that purport to draw on this justification in southeast England; Toronto, Canada; and Melbourne and Sydney, Australia. The article concludes that although attention to ecological sustainability is crucial for continued human survival, issues of social justice, human creativity, and especially, economic well-being cannot be subsumed as merely a quantified subset of sustainability, for the market imperative of growth and competitive globalization still illogically dominates all other considerations (Rees 2002, 2003). The conflation of market and environment creates a risk that the desire for growth will trump the needs of the environment to sustain. Under sustainable development, the arguments of ecological sustainability often are subsumed as mere justifications or legitimizations for policies that are largely market oriented. Here, sustainability’s underlying message that we must change our consumptive behaviors to be consistent with the carrying capacities of the planet largely are overlooked, if not outright negated.

#### Consumption practices ensure extinction – cause overshoot and collapse of the environment, only re-organizing society can solve

Smith 11

(Gar, Editor Emeritus of Earth Island Journal, “NUCLEAR¶ ROULETTE¶ THE CASE AGAINST A¶ “NUCLEAR RENAISSANCE” Pgs. 46)

Even if all of the world’s current energy output could be produced by renewables, this level of¶ energy consumption would still inflict terrible harm on Earth’s damaged ecosystems. In order to¶ survive, we need to relearn how to use less. It is critical that we adopt a Conservation Imperative.¶ Faced with the inevitable disappearance of the stockpiles of cheap energy we have used to move and¶ transform matter, we need to identify society’s fundamental needs and invest our limited energy resources¶ in those key areas. A Post-Oil/Post Coal/Post-Nuclear world can no longer sustain the one-time extravagances¶ of luxury goods, designed-to-be-disposable products, and brain-numbing entertainment devices.¶ The long-distance transport of raw materials, food and manufactured goods will need to decline in favor¶ of local production geared to match local resources and needs. Warfare—the most capital-, resource- and¶ pollution-intensive human activity—must also be diminished. Neither the costly inventory of nuclear¶ arms nor the Pentagon’s imperial network of 700-plus foreign bases is sustainable. There will doubtless¶ still be wars but, in the Post-oil World, they will be either be waged with solar-powered tanks or fought¶ on horseback.¶ Modern economies insist on powering ahead like competing steamboats in an upstream race. We have¶ become addicted to over-consumption on a planet that was not designed for limitless exploitation. As¶ the late environmental leader David Brower noted: “In the years since the Industrial Revolution, we¶ humans have been partying pretty hard. We’ve ransacked most of the Earth for resources….We are living¶ off the natural capital of the planet—the principal, and not the interest. The soil, the seas, the forests, the¶ rivers, and the protective atmospheric cover—all are being depleted. It was a grand binge, but the hangover¶ is now upon us, and it will soon be throbbing.” 224¶ On the eve of India’s independence, Mahatma Gandhi was asked whether his new nation could expect¶ to attain Britain’s level of industrial development. Noting that “it took Britain half the resources of this¶ planet to achieve its prosperity,” Gandhi famously estimated that raising the rest of the world to British¶ levels of consumption would require “two more planets.” The United Nations Development Program¶ recently reconsidered Gandhi’s equation as it applies towards “a world edging towards the brink of¶ dangerous climate change.”¶ Working from the assumed “sustainable” ceiling of climate-warming gases (14.5 Gt CO2 per year),¶ UNEP confirmed that “if emissions were frozen at the current level of 29 Gt CO2, we would need two¶ planets.” Unfortunately, UNEP noted, some countries are producing more CO2 than others. Fifteen¶ percent of the world’s richest residents are using 90 percent of the planet’s sustainable budget of shared¶ resources. According to UNEP’s calculations, just sustaining the current lifestyle of Canada and the U.S.¶ would require the resources of 16 planets—eight planets each. 225

#### Our alternative is to reject the politics of technological production

#### Rather than focusing on production of technology, we should embrace our ability to shape and transform our subjectivity as consumers, embracing voluntary simplicity – this debate offers a crucial moment to produce alternative knowledge about everyday living practices

Alexander ‘11

(Samuel, University of Melbourne; Office for Environmental Programs/Simplicity Institute, “

Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence”, Social Sciences Research Network, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1941087)

The aim of this paper, however, is not to present a thorough analysis of Foucault’s notion of an aesthetics of existence. Several such analyses have appeared in recent times (after years of unfortunate scholarly neglect), and much of this emerging commentary is very probing and insightful.12 But this is not the time to focus on furthering that critical discussion or even providing a comprehensive literature review of it. Instead, after providing a brief exposition of Foucault’s ethics, this paper will undertake to actually apply the idea of an aesthetics of existence to a particular subject of ethical concern, namely, to our role as ‘consumers’ in the context of First World overconsumption. This is an area that raises ethical questions concerning how we ought to live for two main reasons: firstly, due to the impact Western--‐style consumers are having on the natural environment; and secondly, due to the continued existence of poverty amidst plenty. There is, however, another perspective to consider also. A large body of sociological and psychological literature now exists indicating that Western--‐style consumption practices are often failing to provide meaning and fulfillment, even to those who have ‘succeeded’ in attaining a high material standard of living.13 These three consumption--‐related issues – ecological degradation, poverty amidst plenty, and consumer malaise – provide ample grounds for thinking that consumption is a proper subject for ethical engagement, in the Foucauldian sense of ethics as ‘the self enfgaging the self.’ If it is the case that our individual identities have been shaped, insidiously perhaps, by a social system that celebrates and encourages consumption without apparent limit – and it would not be unfair to describe consumer societies in these terms14 – then it may be that ethical practice today calls for a rethinking of our assumptions and attitudes concerning consumption, which might involve a deliberate reshaping of the self by the self. This paper will explore the possibility of such an ethics of consumption in the following ways. First, by explaining how neoclassical economics, which is arguably the most influential paradigm of thought in the world today, conceptualizes consumption as something that benefits both ‘self’ and ‘other’ and, therefore, as something that should be maximized. To the extent that modern consumers have internalized this conception of consumption, an ethics of consumption might involve engaging the self for the purpose of changing the self and creating something new. The second way an ethics of consumption will be explored will be through an examination of the theory and practice of ‘voluntary simplicity,’ a term that refers to an oppositional living strategy or ‘way of life’ with which people, somewhat paradoxically, perhaps, seek an increased quality of life through a reduction and restraint of one’s level of consumption.15 The paradox, so-­‐ called, consists in the attempt to live ‘more with less.’ Since voluntarily living simply means heading in the opposite direction to where most people in consumer societies (and increasingly elsewhere) seem to want to go, one would expect living simply to require a fundamentally creative engagement with life and culture, especially in contemporary consumer societies that seem to be predicated on the assumption that ‘more consumption is always better.’ This need for a fundamentally creative engagement with life is what prompted the present attempt to elucidate the idea of ‘voluntary simplicity as aesthetics of existence,’ and it is this attempt to infuse Foucauldian ethics with an emerging post-­‐consumerist philosophy of life that constitutes the original contribution of this paper. It is hoped that this practical application of Foucault’s ethics might also prompt others to consider how ethical engagement might produce new ways of being that are freer, more fulfilling, and yet less resource-­‐intensive and damaging than the modes of being which are dominant in consumer societies today. Could it be, for example, that the ‘Death of Man,’ to use Foucault’s phrase, was actually the first (and a necessary) phase in the demise of what one might call ‘homo consumicus’? And what forms of life, what modes of being, would or could materialize with the voluntary emergence of ‘homo post-­‐consumicus’? These are the large questions that motivated this study and in the following pages a preliminary attempt is made to grapple with them. The aim, however, is not to legitimate ‘what is already known,’16 since that would not be a very Foucauldian endeavor; rather, the aim is to explore whether or to what extent it is possible to ‘free thought from what it silently thinks,’17 in the hope that this might open up space to ‘think differently,’18 to think otherwise.

# 2

#### Comprehensive immigration reform is a top priority --- Obama will make an aggressive push to get it passed

Volsky, 12/30 (Igor, 12/30/2012, “Obama To Introduce Immigration Reform Bill In 2013,” <http://thinkprogress.org/justice/2012/12/30/1379841/obama-to-introduce-immigration-reform-bill-in-2013/>)

President Obama reiterated his call for comprehensive immigration reform during an interview on Meet The Press, claiming that the effort will be a top goal in his second term. “Fixing our broken immigration is a top priority. I will introduce legislation in the first year to get that done,” Obama said. Administration officials have hinted that Obama will “begin an all-out drive for comprehensive immigration reform, including seeking a path to citizenship” for 11 million undocumented immigrants, after Congress addresses the fiscal cliff. The Obama administration’s “social media blitz” will start in January and is expected “to tap the same organizations and unions that helped get a record number of Latino voters to reelect the president.” Cabinet secretaries and lawmakers from both parties are already holding initial meetings to iron out the details of the proposal and Obama will to push for a broad bill.

#### Obama’s capital and bipartisan cooperation are key to effective reform

DMN, 1/2 (Dallas Morning News, “Editorial: Actions must match Obama’s immigration pledge,” 1/2/2013, <http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/editorials/20130102-editorial-actions-must-match-obamas-immigration-pledge.ece>)

President Barack Obama said all the right things Sunday about immigration reform. The president told NBC’s Meet the Press that he is serious about getting Congress to overhaul the laws governing immigrants. He even declared that he will introduce an immigration bill this year. This newspaper welcomes that announcement. Texans particularly understand the unique challenges that an outdated immigration system presents. Even though the flow of illegal immigrants into the U.S. has subsided in the last few years, the many holes in the system leave families, schools, businesses and law enforcement struggling. And those are just some of the constituents challenged by flawed immigration laws. The president’s words to NBC’s David Gregory are only that — words. What will really matter is whether he puts his muscle into the task this year. We suggest that Obama start by looking at the example of former President George W. Bush. Back in 2006 and 2007, the Republican and his administration constantly worked Capitol Hill to pass a comprehensive plan. They failed, largely because Senate Republicans balked. But the opposition didn’t stop the Bush White House from fully engaging Congress, including recalcitrant Republicans. Obama may have a similar problem with his own party. The dirty little secret in the 2006 and 2007 immigration battles was that some Democrats were content to let Senate Republicans kill the effort. Labor-friendly Democrats didn’t want a bill, either. And they may not want one this year. That reluctance is a major reason the president needs to invest in this fight. He must figure out how to bring enough Democrats along, while also reaching out to Republicans. In short, the nation doesn’t need a repeat of the process through which the 2010 health care legislation was passed. Very few Republicans bought into the president’s plan, leaving the Affordable Care Act open to partisan sniping throughout last year’s election. If the nation is going to create a saner immigration system, both parties need to support substantial parts of an answer. The new system must include a guest worker program for future immigrants and a way for illegal immigrants already living here to legalize their status over time. Some House Republicans will object to one or both of those reforms, so Speaker John Boehner must be persuasive about the need for a wholesale change. But the leadership that matters most will come from the White House. The president has staked out the right position. Now he needs to present a bill and fight this year for a comprehensive solution. Nothing but action will count.

#### Energy incentives are political kryptonite in the current climate

Krauss, 10/23 (Clifford, 10/23/2012, “Bigger Than Either of Them?” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/10/24/business/energy-environment/us-energy-policy-caught-in-the-vise-of-economics-and-politics.html?pagewanted=all)

With the economy still weak and the federal government in financial crisis, new energy tax incentives, mandates and subsidies are pretty much off the table, no matter who is elected in November. Politicians of both parties have learned from the Solyndra fiasco about the risks, financial and political, of spending taxpayer money on solar and other renewables, given their continuing problems competing in the marketplace. Even the wind production tax credit, so crucial to the expansion of wind farms around the country, is about to expire, and wind power companies are letting workers go. Apparently Mr. Obama is not able to save the tax credit from Congressional budget-cutters, and as president, Mr. Romney would not want to save it.

#### Reform is key to US competitiveness

Bush, McLarty & Alden, 09 – co-chairmen and director of a Council on Foreign Relations-sponsored Independent Task Force on U.S. Immigration Policy (7/21/09, Former Florida Gov. Jeb Bush and former White House Chief of Staff Thomas F. McLarty and Edward Alden, “Nation needs comprehensive, flexible immigration reform,” http://www.ajc.com/opinion/nation-needs-comprehensive-flexible-97393.html)

Our immigration system has been broken for too long, and the costs of that failure are growing. Getting immigration policy right is fundamental to our national interests — our economic vitality, our diplomacy and our national security. In the report of the bipartisan Council on Foreign Relations’ Independent Task Force on U.S. Immigration Policy, we lay out what is at stake for the United States. President Barack Obama has made it clear that reform is one of his top priorities, and that is an encouraging and welcome signal. Immigration has long been America’s secret weapon. The U.S. has attracted an inordinate share of talented and hardworking immigrants who are enticed here by the world’s best universities, the most innovative companies, a vibrant labor market and a welcoming culture. Many leaders in allied nations were educated in the U.S., a diplomatic asset that no other country can match. And the contributions of immigrants — 40 percent of the science and engineering Ph.D.s in the U.S. are foreign-born, for example — have helped maintain the scientific and technological leadership that is the foundation of our national security. But the U.S. has been making life much tougher for many immigrants. Long processing delays and arbitrary quota backlogs keep out many would-be immigrants, or leave them in an uncertain temporary status for years. Background and other security checks are taking far too long in many cases. Other countries are taking advantage of these mistakes, competing for immigrants by opening their universities to foreign students and providing a faster track to permanent residency and citizenship.

#### Competiveness key to economy and hegemony

Segal, 04 – Senior Fellow in China Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations

(Adam, Foreign Affairs, “Is America Losing Its Edge?” November / December 2004, http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20041101facomment83601/adam-segal/is-america-losing-its-edge.html)

The United States' global primacy depends in large part on its ability to develop new technologies and industries faster than anyone else. For the last five decades, U.S. scientific innovation and technological entrepreneurship have ensured the country's economic prosperity and military power. It was Americans who invented and commercialized the semiconductor, the personal computer, and the Internet; other countries merely followed the U.S. lead. Today, however, this technological edge-so long taken for granted-may be slipping, and the most serious challenge is coming from Asia. Through competitive tax policies, increased investment in research and development (R&D), and preferential policies for science and technology (S&T) personnel, Asian governments are improving the quality of their science and ensuring the exploitation of future innovations. The percentage of patents issued to and science journal articles published by scientists in China, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan is rising. Indian companies are quickly becoming the second-largest producers of application services in the world, developing, supplying, and managing database and other types of software for clients around the world. South Korea has rapidly eaten away at the U.S. advantage in the manufacture of computer chips and telecommunications software. And even China has made impressive gains in advanced technologies such as lasers, biotechnology, and advanced materials used in semiconductors, aerospace, and many other types of manufacturing. Although the United States' technical dominance remains solid, the globalization of research and development is exerting considerable pressures on the American system. Indeed, as the United States is learning, globalization cuts both ways: it is both a potent catalyst of U.S. technological innovation and a significant threat to it. The United States will never be able to prevent rivals from developing new technologies; it can remain dominant only by continuing to innovate faster than everyone else. But this won't be easy; to keep its privileged position in the world, the United States must get better at fostering technological entrepreneurship at home.

#### Hegemonic decline causes great power wars – 1930’s prove

Zhang & Shi, Researcher @ The Carnegie Endowment, ’11

[Yuhan Zhang, Researcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Lin Shi, Columbia University, Independent consultant for the Eurasia Group, Consultant for the World Bank, “[America’s decline: A harbinger of conflict and rivalry](http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/01/22/americas-decline-a-harbinger-of-conflict-and-rivalry/),” January 22nd 2011, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/01/22/americas-decline-a-harbinger-of-conflict-and-rivalry/>]

Over the past two decades, no other state has had the ability to seriously challenge the US military. Under these circumstances, motivated by both opportunity and fear, many actors have bandwagoned with US hegemony and accepted a subordinate role. Canada, most of Western Europe, India, Japan, South Korea, Australia, Singapore and the Philippines have all joined the US, creating a status quo that has tended to mute great power conflicts. However, [as the hegemony that drew these powers together withers](http://www.cfr.org/publication/23537/belttightening_for_us_foreign_policy.html), so will the pulling power behind the US alliance. The result will be an international order where power is more diffuse, American interests and influence can be more readily challenged, and conflicts or wars may be harder to avoid. As history attests, power decline and redistribution result in military confrontation. For example, in the late 19th century America’s emergence as a regional power saw it launch its first overseas war of conquest towards Spain. By the turn of the 20th century, accompanying the increase in US power and waning of British power, the American Navy had begun to challenge the notion that Britain ‘rules the waves.’ Such a notion would eventually see the US attain the status of sole guardians of the Western Hemisphere’s security to become the order-creating Leviathan shaping the international system with democracy and rule of law. Defining this US-centred system are three key characteristics: enforcement of property rights, constraints on the actions of powerful individuals and groups and some degree of equal opportunities for broad segments of society. As a result of such political stability, free markets, liberal trade and flexible financial mechanisms have appeared. And, with this, many countries have sought opportunities to enter this system, proliferating stable and cooperative relations. However, what will happen to these advances as America’s influence declines? Given that America’s authority, although sullied at times, has benefited people across much of Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans, as well as parts of Africa and, quite extensively, Asia, the answer to this question could affect global society in a profoundly detrimental way. Public imagination and academia have anticipated that a post-hegemonic world would return to the problems of the 1930s: regional blocs, trade conflicts and strategic rivalry. Furthermore, multilateral institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank or the WTO might give way to regional organisations. For example, Europe and East Asia would each step forward to fill the vacuum left by Washington’s withering leadership to pursue their own visions of regional political and economic orders. Free markets would become more politicised — and, well, less free — and major powers would compete for supremacy. Additionally, such power plays have historically possessed a zero-sum element. In the late 1960s and 1970s, US economic power declined relative to the rise of the Japanese and Western European economies, with the US dollar also becoming less attractive. And, as American power eroded, so did international regimes (such as the Bretton Woods System in 1973). A world without American hegemony is one where great power wars re-emerge, the liberal international system is supplanted by an authoritarian one, and trade protectionism devolves into restrictive, anti-globalisation barriers. This, at least, is one possibility we can forecast in a future that will inevitably be devoid of unrivalled US primacy.

#### Comprehensive reform will boost every sector of the economy fast

Hinojosa-Ojeda, 12 --- Founding Director of the North American Integration and Development Center at UCLA (Winter 2012, Raul, Cato Journal, “The Economic Benefits of Comprehensive Immigration Reform,” <http://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/2012/1/cj32n1-12.pdf>)

The Economic Benefits of Comprehensive Immigration Reform

The results of our modeling suggest that comprehensive immigration reform would increase U.S. GDP by at least 0.84 percent per year. Using 10-year GDP projections prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, this translates into a steadily increasing amount of added annual GDP over the coming decade. The 10-year total is at least $1.5 trillion in added GDP, which includes roughly $1.2 trillion in additional consumption and $256 billion in additional investment. Comprehensive immigration reform brings substantial economic gains even in the short run—during the first three years following legalization. The real wages of newly legalized workers increase by roughly $4,400 per year among those in less-skilled jobs during the first three years of implementation, and $6,185 per year for those in higher-skilled jobs. The higher earning power of newly legalized workers translates into an increase in net personal income of $30 billion to $36 billion, which would generate $4.5 to $5.4 billion in additional net tax revenue nationally, enough to support 750,000 to 900,000 new jobs. Ultimately, only the federal government can resolve the status of the undocumented. But for the purposes of our analysis, we examine what would happen on a state and county level if local workforces were fully legalized through comprehensive immigration reform. In California, which faces a $25.4 billion budget shortfall in 2011–12, this scenario would lead to a $27 billion increase in labor income (pre-tax salary and wage earnings) that would generate a $5.3 billion boost in tax revenue for the state and add 633,000 desperately needed jobs to the economy. In Los Angeles County, labor income would increase $10 billion through legalization, leading to $1.9 billion in additional net tax revenue and 211,000 new jobs. In Arizona, the same legalization scheme would generate $5.6 billion more in labor income, leading to $1.68 billion in tax revenue and an additional 261,000 jobs. The wages of native-born workers also increase under the comprehensive immigration reform scenario because the “wage floor” rises for all workers—particularly in industries where large numbers of easily exploited, low-wage, unauthorized immigrants currently work. Wages for native-born U.S. workers increase by roughly $162 per year for the less-skilled and $74 per year for the higher-skilled. Under the temporary worker program scenario, wages fall for both less-skilled and higher-skilled native-born U.S. workers. And under the mass deportation scenario, wages for less-skilled native-born workers actually rise, but only at the cost of significantly fewer jobs as the economy contracts and investment declines. The cost of this scheme to local economies, however, is staggering. If California’s workforce were depleted by mass deportation, the resulting contraction of the economy would mean a loss of $176 billion in labor income and a reduction in gross product of $300 billion, or 17 percent of the state economy. As a result, 3.6 million jobs would be lost. Los Angeles County would be even harder hit, with the $60.1 billion loss in labor income causing a 22 percent reduction in the local economy and the loss of 1.2 million jobs. Arizona’s case is almost as severe, with the $29.5 billion the state would lose in labor income as a result of mass deportation and the $48.8 billion reduction in gross product representing a 20 percent depletion of the economy and the loss of 581,000 jobs. The benefits of additional U.S. GDP growth under the comprehensive immigration reform scenario are spread very broadly throughout the U.S. economy, with virtually every sector expanding. Particularly large increases occur in immigrant-heavy industries such as textiles, ferrous metals, transportation equipment, electronic equipment, motor vehicles and parts, nonelectric machinery and equipment, capital goods, mineral products, and construction. In comparison, every sector experiences significantly smaller gains under the temporary worker scenario, while every sector contracts under the mass deportation scenario.

# 3

#### The government of the state of California should provide cash grants equivalent to a federal Section 1603 Cash Grant to nontaxable entities for community and residential solar power.

#### California is a leader in expanding solar energy --- it should expand production even more

Madsen, et. al, 11 --- Policy Analyst at the Frontier Group (November 2011, Travis Madsen, Frontier Group, Michelle Kinman and Bernadette Del Chiaro, Environment California Research & Policy Center, “Building a Brighter Future: California’s Progress Toward a Million Solar Roofs,” http://www.environmentcalifornia.org/sites/environment/files/reports/Building%20a%20Brighter%20Future.pdf)

California’s Million Solar Roofs Initiative is succeeding. Thanks in large part to this visionary program, launched in January 2007, solar panels are multiplying on rooftops across the state. As of mid-October 2011, California’s solar industry is on the cusp of celebrating a major milestone – the installation of more than 1,000 megawatts (MW) of rooftop solar photovoltaic capacity in total.\*¶ The Million Solar Roofs Initiative has helped California install more solar electric generation capacity than all but five nations in the world. At the same time, the program is building a strong and healthy solar industry in the state, creating local jobs, and helping to drive down the price of solar energy.¶ California has only begun to scratch the surface of the massive potential of solar energy. State leaders should ensure that the Million Solar Roofs Initiative continues to succeed during its final five years, and lay the groundwork for further expansion of solar energy in the future.

#### California modeled by nation and other countries

NRDC, 6 (5/23/2006, National Resources Defense Council, “CALIFORNIA LEADS THE WORLD: PIONEERING SOLUTIONS TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS,” http://www.e2.org/ext/doc/CALeadershipfactsheet.pdf;jsessionid=7316837D6515320EB6B13427B89C8FFE)

California has long led the nation and the world in ground-breaking environmental solutions that provide economic benefits. Time and again, California’s policy leadership has spurred other states, the nation, and other countries to take similar action. Today, California has the opportunity to lead again on the most pressing issue of our time: global warming.¶ If the Golden State were a country, it would be the 6th largest economy in the world, and the 12th largest emitter of global warming pollution. While California alone cannot stop global warming, California’s leadership and the cumulative effect of the state’s actions can have a significant impact and can protect the state from global warming’s impacts. And by leading this effort, California can bring jobs and economic benefits to the state by gaining a competitive advantage in the fast-growing clean energy market.¶ California’s Clean Cars Law Now Applies to One-Third of the North American Market¶ When California takes action, the impact is felt around the country. In 2002, California was the first state to limit global warming pollution from cars. The standards will reduce emissions from new vehicles by approximately 30% by 2016, while also saving California consumers more than $4 billion by 2020. Today, ten other states and Canada have followed California’s lead. So California’s standards now apply to more than one-third of the North American car market. Together, these programs will reduce global warming emissions in 2020 by more than 64 million tons of carbon dioxide per year, an amount greater than the national emissions of more than 100 countries.¶ California’s Pioneering Efficiency Standards Adopted by U.S. and Other Countries¶ California was the first state in the nation to adopt efficiency standards for appliances in 1977. Florida, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, and other states followed suit, leading to national standards in 1987. Today, these standards provide enormous energy savings and lower energy bills for the entire country. For example, the national refrigerator standards, which trace their origin to California, have saved more than 130,000 MW of electricity supply compared to projections, equivalent to more than 250 power plants. In 2004, California adopted the latest upgrade to its efficiency standards for household appliances; the same standards were adopted by the federal government in 2005.¶ California also led the nation in adopting efficiency standards for new buildings in 1978. These standards, the strongest in the United States, have been adopted by countries around the world, saving energy far beyond California’s borders. For example, Russia’s new construction building code is reducing the country’s energy use by more than 40 percent. And China adopted lighting efficiency requirements based directly on California’s standards, which significantly magnifies the impact of the state’s standards, reducing global warming pollution by approximately 110 million tons of carbon dioxide per year after ten years.¶ Californians Support Tough Action to Combat Global Warming¶ A bipartisan majority of Californians believe that global warming is a real concern, according to a recent survey by the Public Policy Institute of California. Three in four Californians agree that global warming will have serious effects on the state’s economy and quality of life. And a majority of Californians support state policy to combat global warming.¶ California Should Continue its Leadership to Address Global Warming¶ Other states have pledged to curb their global warming emissions, but if California acts now we will be the first to take decisive action, once again setting a model for the nation to follow. The state can build on its admirable record of leadership on clean cars, energy efficiency, renewable energy and other policies that provide environmental and economic benefits. By working together, California’s leaders will continue the state’s world-class leadership in tackling the most serious environmental problems, and lead the fight to stop global warming.

# Grid

#### No internal link- storms, accidents, and intentional attacks would still hurt the grid because it remains interconnected-

#### **No impact to cyber-attacks or blackouts**

Birch, former AP correspondent, 2012,

10-1, Douglas, former foreign correspondent for the Associated Press and the Baltimore Sun who has written extensively on technology and public policy. “Forget Revolution,” <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/10/01/forget_revolution?page=full>

But the scenarios sketched out above are not solely the realm of fantasy. This summer, the United States and India were hit by two massive electrical outages -- caused not by ninja cyber assault teams but by force majeure. And, for most people anyway, the results were less terrifying than imagined.¶ First, the freak "derecho" storm that barreled across a heavily-populated swath of the eastern United States on the afternoon of June 29 knocked down trees that crushed cars, bashed holes in roofs, blocked roads, and sliced through power lines.¶ According to an August report by the U.S. Department of Energy, 4.2 million homes and businesses lost power as a result of the storm, with the blackout stretching across 11 states and the District of Columbia. More than 1 million customers were still without power five days later, and in some areas power wasn't restored for 10 days. Reuters put the death toll at 23 people as of July 5, all killed by storms or heat stroke.¶ The second incident occurred in late July, when 670 million people in northern India, or about 10 percent of the world's population, lost power in the largest blackout in history. The failure of this huge chunk of India's electric grid was attributed to higher-than-normal demand due to late monsoon rains, which led farmers to use more electricity in order to draw water from wells. Indian officials told the media there were no reports of deaths directly linked to the blackouts.¶ But this cataclysmic event didn't cause widespread chaos in India -- indeed, for some, it didn't even interrupt their daily routine. "[M]any people in major cities barely noticed the disruption because localized blackouts are so common that many businesses, hospitals, offices and middle-class homes have backup diesel generators," the New York Times reported.¶ The most important thing about both events is what didn't happen. Planes didn't fall out of the sky. Governments didn't collapse. Thousands of people weren't killed. Despite disruption and delay, harried public officials, emergency workers, and beleaguered publics mostly muddled through.¶ The summer's blackouts strongly suggest that a cyber weapon that took down an electric grid even for several days could turn out to be little more than a weapon of mass inconvenience.¶ "Reasonable people would have expected a lot of bad things to happen" in the storm's aftermath, said Neal A. Pollard, a terrorism expert who teaches at Georgetown University and has served on the United Nation's Expert Working Group on the use of the Internet for terrorist purposes. However, he said, emergency services, hospitals, and air traffic control towers have backup systems to handle short-term disruptions in power supplies. After the derecho, Pollard noted, a generator truck even showed up in the parking lot of his supermarket.¶ The response wasn't perfect, judging by the heat-related deaths and lengthy delays in the United States in restoring power. But nor were the people without power as helpless or clueless as is sometimes assumed.¶ That doesn't mean the United States can relax. James Lewis, director of the technology program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, believes that hackers threaten the security of U.S. utilities and industries, and recently penned an op-ed for the New York Times calling the United States "defenseless" to a cyber-assault. But he told Foreign Policy the recent derecho showed that even a large-scale blackout would not necessarily have catastrophic consequences.¶ "That's a good example of what some kind of attacks would be like," he said. "You don't want to overestimate the risks. You don't want somebody to be able to do this whenever they felt like it, which is the situation now. But this is not the end of the world."

#### Too difficult to launch a cyber-attack and economic, military factors check full-scale attacks

Birch, former AP correspondent, 2012,

10-1, Douglas, former foreign correspondent for the Associated Press and the Baltimore Sun who has written extensively on technology and public policy. “Forget Revolution,” <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/10/01/forget_revolution?page=full>

But pulling off a cyber assault on that scale is no easy feat. Weiss agreed that hackers intent on inflicting this kind of long-term interruption of power would need to use a tool capable of inflicting physical damage. And so far, the world has seen only one such weapon: Stuxnet, which is believed to have been a joint military project of Israel and the United States.¶ Ralph Langner, a German expert on industrial-control system security, was among the first to discover that Stuxnet was specifically designed to attack the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition system (SCADA) at a single site: Iran's Natanz uranium-enrichment plant. The computer worm's sophisticated programs, which infected the plant in 2009, caused about 1,000 of Natanz's 5,000 uranium-enrichment centrifuges to self-destruct by accelerating their precision rotors beyond the speeds at which they were designed to operate.¶ Professionals like Weiss and others warned that Stuxnet was opening a Pandora's Box: Once it was unleashed on the world, they feared, it would become available to hostile states, criminals, and terrorists who could adapt the code for their own nefarious purposes. But two years after the discovery of Stuxnet, there are no reports of similar attacks against the United States. What has prevented the emergence of such copycat viruses?¶ A 2009 paper published by the University of California, Berkeley, may offer the answer. The report, which was released a year before Stuxnet surfaced, found that in order to create a cyber weapon capable of crippling a specific control system ­­-- like the ones operating the U.S. electric grid -- six coders might have to work for up to six months to reverse engineer the targeted center's SCADA system.¶ Even then, the report says, hackers likely would need the help of someone with inside knowledge of how the network's machines were wired together to plan an effective attack. "Every SCADA control center is configured differently, with different devices, running different software/protocols," wrote Rose Tsang, the report's author.¶ Professional hackers are in it for the money -- and it's a lot more cost-efficient to search out vulnerabilities in widely-used computer programs like the Windows operating system, used by banks and other affluent targets, than in one-of-a-kind SCADA systems linked to generators and switches.¶ According to Pollard, only the world's industrial nations have the means to use the Internet to attack utilities and major industries. But given the integrated global economy, there is little incentive, short of armed conflict, for them to do so. "If you're a state that has a number of U.S. T-bills in your treasury, you have an economic interest in the United States," he said. "You're not going to have an interest in mucking about with our infrastructure."¶ There is also the threat of retaliation. Last year, the U.S. government reportedly issued a classified report on cyber strategy that said it could respond to a devastating digital assault with traditional military force. The idea was that if a cyber attack caused death and destruction on the scale of a military assault, the United States would reserve the right to respond with what the Pentagon likes to call "kinetic" weapons: missiles, bombs, and bullets.¶ An unnamed Pentagon official, speaking to the Wall Street Journal, summed up the policy in less diplomatic terms: "If you shut down our power grid, maybe we will put a missile down one of your smokestacks."¶ Deterrence is sometimes dismissed as a toothless strategy against cyber attacks because hackers have such an easy time hiding in the anonymity of the Web. But investigators typically come up with key suspects, if not smoking guns, following cyber intrusions and assaults -- the way suspicions quickly focused on the United States and Israel after Stuxnet was discovered. And with the U.S. military's global reach, even terror groups have to factor in potential retaliation when planning their operations.

#### Global economy is resilient – integration solves war

Zakaria Editor Newsweek ‘9

(Fareed-, Dec. 12, Newsweek, “The Secrets of Stability”, http://www.newsweek.com/id/226425/page/1; Jacob)

One year ago, the world seemed as if it might be coming apart. The global financial system, which had fueled a great expansion of capitalism and trade across the world, was crumbling. All the certainties of the age of globalization—about the virtues of free markets, trade, and technology—were being called into question. Faith in the American model had collapsed. The financial industry had crumbled. Once-roaring emerging markets like China, India, and Brazil were sinking. Worldwide trade was shrinking to a degree not seen since the 1930s. Pundits whose bearishness had been vindicated predicted we were doomed to a long, painful bust, with cascading failures in sector after sector, country after country. In a widely cited essay that appeared in The Atlantic this May, Simon Johnson, former chief economist of the International Monetary Fund, wrote: "The conventional wisdom among the elite is still that the current slump 'cannot be as bad as the Great Depression.' This view is wrong. What we face now could, in fact, be worse than the Great Depression." Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all. A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets. So consider this: the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual?" This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s, when governments played a tiny role in national economies. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles: the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force. When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think. The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature. The first is the spread of great-power peace. Since the end of the Cold War, the world's major powers have not competed with each other in geomilitary terms. There have been some political tensions, but measured by historical standards the globe today is stunningly free of friction between the mightiest nations. This lack of conflict is extremely rare in history. You would have to go back at least 175 years, if not 400, to find any prolonged period like the one we are living in. The number of people who have died as a result of wars, civil conflicts, and terrorism over the last 30 years has declined sharply (despite what you might think on the basis of overhyped fears about terrorism). And no wonder—three decades ago, the Soviet Union was still funding militias, governments, and guerrillas in dozens of countries around the world. And the United States was backing the other side in every one of those places. That clash of superpower proxies caused enormous bloodshed and instability: recall that 3 million people died in Indochina alone during the 1970s. Nothing like that is happening today. Peace is like oxygen, Harvard's Joseph Nye has written. When you don't have it, it's all you can think about, but when you do, you don't appreciate your good fortune. Peace allows for the possibility of a stable economic life and trade. The peace that flowed from the end of the Cold War had a much larger effect because it was accompanied by the discrediting of socialism. The world was left with a sole superpower but also a single workable economic model—capitalism—albeit with many variants from Sweden to Hong Kong. This consensus enabled the expansion of the global economy; in fact, it created for the first time a single world economy in which almost all countries across the globe were participants. That means everyone is invested in the same system. Today, while the nations of Eastern Europe might face an economic crisis, no one is suggesting that they abandon free-market capitalism and return to communism. In fact, around the world you see the opposite: even in the midst of this downturn, there have been few successful electoral appeals for a turn to socialism or a rejection of the current framework of political economy. Center-right parties have instead prospered in recent elections throughout the West. The second force for stability is the victory—after a decades-long struggle—over the cancer of inflation. Thirty-five years ago, much of the world was plagued by high inflation, with deep social and political consequences. Severe inflation can be far more disruptive than a recession, because while recessions rob you of better jobs and wages that you might have had in the future, inflation robs you of what you have now by destroying your savings. In many countries in the 1970s, hyperinflation led to the destruction of the middle class, which was the background condition for many of the political dramas of the era—coups in Latin America, the suspension of democracy in India, the overthrow of the shah in Iran. But then in 1979, the tide began to turn when Paul Volcker took over the U.S. Federal Reserve and waged war against inflation. Over two decades, central banks managed to decisively beat down the beast. At this point, only one country in the world suffers from -hyperinflation: Zimbabwe. Low inflation allows people, businesses, and governments to plan for the future, a key precondition for stability. Political and economic stability have each reinforced the other. And the third force that has underpinned the resilience of the global system is technological connectivity. Globalization has always existed in a sense in the modern world, but until recently its contours were mostly limited to trade: countries made goods and sold them abroad. Today the information revolution has created a much more deeply connected global system. Managers in Arkansas can work with suppliers in Beijing on a real-time basis. The production of almost every complex manufactured product now involves input from a dozen countries in a tight global supply chain. And the consequences of connectivity go well beyond economics. Women in rural India have learned through satellite television about the independence of women in more modern countries. Citizens in Iran have used cell phones and the Internet to connect to their well-wishers beyond their borders. Globalization today is fundamentally about knowledge being dispersed across our world. This diffusion of knowledge may actually be the most important reason for the stability of the current system. The majority of the world's nations have learned some basic lessons about political well-being and wealth creation. They have taken advantage of the opportunities provided by peace, low inflation, and technology to plug in to the global system. And they have seen the indisputable results. Despite all the turmoil of the past year, it's important to remember that more people have been lifted out of poverty over the last two decades than in the preceding 10. Clear-thinking citizens around the world are determined not to lose these gains by falling for some ideological chimera, or searching for a worker's utopia. They are even cautious about the appeals of hypernationalism and war. Most have been there, done that. And they know the price.

#### If not, Eurozone makes collapse inevitable

Gulf News 10/9/12 (“Eurozone is dragging down world economy” <http://gulfnews.com/opinions/editorials/eurozone-is-dragging-down-world-economy-1.1087112>)

While the international financial crisis has affected all states that are part of global trade and commerce, there is no “one-size-fits-all” solution for those countries facing economic difficulties. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) is set to reduce its global growth forecast as the Eurozone financial crisis continues to be a drag on international economy. Especially worrying is the expected slowdown in East Asia, whose countries are among the emerging economies, billed to spur growth, even as Europe, Japan and the US battled recession and stagnation. It is clear that emerging countries have not “decoupled” from the advanced economies and in the globalised world, all fates are tied. The World Bank is — correctly — prescribing different solutions for different parts of the globe. For Asia and those emerging economies that can sustainably afford it, it is prescribing fiscal stimulus: State spending on economic development. This should be complemented by monetary easing — lower interest rates — where possible. The US, which is struggling to boost its anaemic growth, is also committed to low interest rates and inflating the price of assets for the foreseeable future. In Europe, however, austerity programmes and cutbacks in government spending are not having the desired effects. Eurozone authorities are spending too much time and money in trying to stabilise the financial system and not enough on stimulating the real economy. Governments must better coordinate their efforts and develop policies that work for them to tackle the economic crisis that will be with us for the foreseeable future.

#### Failed states not a global threat – no terrorism, crime, or disease risk

Traub, Foreign Policy, ’11 (James, July/August, “Think Again: Failed States” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/06/20/think\_again\_failed\_states)

"Failed States Are a Threat to U.S. National Security." Only some of them. It has been a truism of U.S. foreign policy since the 9/11 terrorist attacks that the United States is, in the words of President George W. Bush's 2002 National Security Strategy, "threatened less by conquering states than we are by failing ones." Defense Secretary Robert Gates has said that over the next 20 years, the gravest threats to America will come from failing states "that cannot meet the basic needs -- much less the aspirations -- of their people." Both as candidate and as president, Barack Obama has repeated this claim and has sought to reorient policy toward the prevention of state failure. But the truth is that some state failure poses a real danger to the United States and the West, and some does not. Consider the Democratic Republic of the Congo, where some 5 million or more people have died in the wars that have convulsed the country since the mid-1990s -- the single most horrific consequence of state failure in modern times. What has been the consequence to Americans? The cost of coltan, a material mined in Congo and used in cell phones, has been extremely volatile. It's hard to think of anything else. Even the role of failed states in global terrorism may have been overstated. To start, terrorism is only a problem in failed states with significant Muslim populations -- admittedly, 13 of the top 20 in this year's Failed States Index. But the correlation between failure and global menace is weaker than we think. Islamist militants in unequivocally failed Muslim states such as Somalia, or profoundly weak ones such as Chad, have thus far mostly posed a threat to their own societies. They are surely less of a danger to the West than Pakistan or Yemen, both at least somewhat functional countries where state ideology and state institutions abet terrorists. In his new book, Weak Links, scholar Stewart Patrick concludes that "a middle-ranking group of weak -- but not yet failing -- states (e.g., Pakistan, Kenya) may offer more long-term advantages to terrorists than either anarchic zones or strong states." (See "The Brutal Truth.") Terrorists need infrastructure, too. The 9/11 attacks, after all, were directed from Afghanistan, but were financed and coordinated in Europe and more stable parts of the Muslim world, and were carried out mostly by citizens of Saudi Arabia. Al Qaeda is a largely middle-class organization. A similar pattern plays out in the world of transnational crime. Take the three-cornered drug market that links cocaine growers in Latin America, traffickers in West Africa, and users in Europe. The narcotraffickers have found the failed states of West Africa, with their unpatrolled ports and corrupt and undermanned security forces, to be perfect transshipment points for their product. Drugs are dumped out of propeller planes or unloaded from ships just off the coast of Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, or Sierra Leone, and then broken into smaller parcels to be shipped north. But the criminal gangs operate not out of these Hobbesian spaces but from Ghana and Senegal -- countries with reliable banking systems, excellent air connections, pleasant hotels, and innumerable opportunities for money laundering. The relationship is analogous to that between Afghanistan, whose wild spaces offer al Qaeda a theater of operations, and Pakistan, whose freewheeling urban centers provide jihadists with a home base.

#### No spillover from state collapse

Patrick, Program on International Institutions and Global Governance at CFR, ’11 (Stewart, May, “Weak Links Fragile States, Global Threats, and International Security” Excerpt from forthcoming book, http://www.cfr.org/international-peace-and-security/weak-links/p24311?excerpt=1)

IMPLICATIONS The book’s Conclusion makes three main points. First, the relationship between state fragility and transnational threats is more complicated and contingent than the con­ventional wisdom would suggest. It depends on the threat in question, the specific sources of state weakness, and the will of a regime—not simply its inherent capacity—to assume sovereign functions. Globally, most fragile states do not present significant security risks, except to their own people, and the most important spillovers that pre­occupy U.S. national security officials are at least as likely to emanate from stronger developing countries, rather than the world’s weakest countries. Where such linkages do exist, the most salient governance gaps tend to be in the political and security arenas—notably high levels of corruption, weak rule of law, and a history of violent conflict—rather than in the economic and social welfare spheres (such as absence of economic growth or failure to meet basic human needs). And when poor state performance is associated with transnational threats, it often reflects weak commit­ment by the ruling regime to meet obligations to its citizens and the international community, rather than an inherent lack of capability.

#### No conflict from economic decline – recession proves

Barnett, 09 – Senior Managing Director of Enterra Solutions LLC, Contributing Editor and Online Columnist for Esquire (Thomas P.M, “The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis,” Aprodex, Asset Protection Index, 8/25/09 <http://www.aprodex.com/the-new-rules--security-remains-stable-amid-financial-crisis-398-bl.aspx>)

When the global financial crisis struck roughly a year ago, the blogosphere was ablaze with all sorts of scary predictions of, and commentary regarding, ensuing conflict and wars -- a rerun of the Great Depression leading to world war, as it were. Now, as global economic news brightens and recovery -- surprisingly led by China and emerging markets -- is the talk of the day, it's interesting to look back over the past year and realize how globalization's first truly worldwide recession has had virtually no impact whatsoever on the international security landscape. None of the more than three-dozen ongoing conflicts listed by GlobalSecurity.org can be clearly attributed to the global recession. Indeed, the last new entry (civil conflict between Hamas and Fatah in the Palestine) predates the economic crisis by a year, and three quarters of the chronic struggles began in the last century. Ditto for the 15 low-intensity conflicts listed by Wikipedia (where the latest entry is the Mexican "drug war" begun in 2006). Certainly, the Russia-Georgia conflict last August was specifically timed, but by most accounts the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympics was the most important external trigger (followed by the U.S. presidential campaign) for that sudden spike in an almost two-decade long struggle between Georgia and its two breakaway regions. Looking over the various databases, then, we see a most familiar picture: the usual mix of civil conflicts, insurgencies, and liberation-themed terrorist movements. Besides the recent Russia-Georgia dust-up, the only two potential state-on-state wars (North v. South Korea, Israel v. Iran) are both tied to one side acquiring a nuclear weapon capacity -- a process wholly unrelated to global economic trends. And with the United States effectively tied down by its two ongoing major interventions (Iraq and Afghanistan-bleeding-into-Pakistan), our involvement elsewhere around the planet has been quite modest, both leading up to and following the onset of the economic crisis: e.g., the usual counter-drug efforts in Latin America, the usual military exercises with allies across Asia, mixing it up with pirates off Somalia's coast). Everywhere else we find serious instability we pretty much let it burn, occasionally pressing the Chinese -- unsuccessfully -- to do something. Our new Africa Command, for example, hasn't led us to anything beyond advising and training local forces. So, to sum up: No significant uptick in mass violence or unrest (remember the smattering of urban riots last year in places like Greece, Moldova and Latvia?); The usual frequency maintained in civil conflicts (in all the usual places); Not a single state-on-state war directly caused (and no great-power-on-great-power crises even triggered); No great improvement or disruption in great-power cooperation regarding the emergence of new nuclear powers (despite all that diplomacy); A modest scaling back of international policing efforts by the system's acknowledged Leviathan power (inevitable given the strain); and No serious efforts by any rising great power to challenge that Leviathan or supplant its role. (The worst things we can cite are Moscow's occasional deployments of strategic assets to the Western hemisphere and its weak efforts to outbid the United States on basing rights in Kyrgyzstan; but the best include China and India stepping up their aid and investments in Afghanistan and Iraq.) Sure, we've finally seen global defense spending surpass the previous world record set in the late 1980s, but even that's likely to wane given the stress on public budgets created by all this unprecedented "stimulus" spending. If anything, the friendly cooperation on such stimulus packaging was the most notable great-power dynamic caused by the crisis. Can we say that the world has suffered a distinct shift to political radicalism as a result of the economic crisis? Indeed, no. The world's major economies remain governed by center-left or center-right political factions that remain decidedly friendly to both markets and trade. In the short run, there were attempts across the board to insulate economies from immediate damage (in effect, as much protectionism as allowed under current trade rules), but there was no great slide into "trade wars." Instead, the World Trade Organization is functioning as it was designed to function, and regional efforts toward free-trade agreements have not slowed. Can we say Islamic radicalism was inflamed by the economic crisis? If it was, that shift was clearly overwhelmed by the Islamic world's growing disenchantment with the brutality displayed by violent extremist groups such as al-Qaida. And looking forward, austere economic times are just as likely to breed connecting evangelicalism as disconnecting fundamentalism. At the end of the day, the economic crisis did not prove to be sufficiently frightening to provoke major economies into establishing global regulatory schemes, even as it has sparked a spirited -- and much needed, as I argued last week -- discussion of the continuing viability of the U.S. dollar as the world's primary reserve currency. Naturally, plenty of experts and pundits have attached great significance to this debate, seeing in it the beginning of "economic warfare" and the like between "fading" America and "rising" China. And yet, in a world of globally integrated production chains and interconnected financial markets, such "diverging interests" hardly constitute signposts for wars up ahead. Frankly, I don't welcome a world in which America's fiscal profligacy goes undisciplined, so bring it on -- please! Add it all up and it's fair to say that this global financial crisis has proven the great resilience of America's post-World War II international liberal trade order. Do I expect to read any analyses along those lines in the blogosphere any time soon? Absolutely not. I expect the fantastic fear-mongering to proceed apace. That's what the Internet is for.

# Prices

#### No credible evidence for speculation in renewable markets – the aff advantage ITSELF is unfounded speculation

GED 12 [Green Energy Development]

(The Renewable Energy Advisor, www.greenenergydevelopment.org/press/Bubble.pdf)

Wall Street, investors and other critics have suggested that renewable energy or "green" energy (hereafter "Renewable Energy") companies represent the beginning of the next financial bubble. This is sheer unfounded speculation from people with either a vested interest in manipulating public perception about issues critical to the future of mankind, or utter nonsense from people completely ignorant about our unsustainable methods of energy production. Indeed, no credible evidence is ever provided when making this claim. In fact, this claim is generally in response to someone noticing a diminished appetite for renewable or "green" energy investment from investors. Such unfounded claims tend to perpetuate this investor sentiment and create a self-fulfilling prophecy.

#### The renewable energy market cannot result in a bubble

GED 12 [Green Energy Development]

(The Renewable Energy Advisor, www.greenenergydevelopment.org/press/Bubble.pdf)

In the recent past, investors and the public at large have experienced a number of financial bubbles, including the most recent housing market bubble and the previous financial ".com" bubble. Although there is some debate as to the exact cause of financial bubbles, some consistent factors typically characterize them: (1) an unexplained rise in the value of an asset class; (2) irrational valuing, without analysis or consideration to actual asset value; and (3) excess demand. Indeed- once the bubble deflates, which it always does, a contraction or consolidation must occur to alleviate the excess. It is this retraction that causes deflation in asset values and, ultimately, losses for investors. These factors and causes of a financial bubble are not often discussed, and whether or not those conditions exist with regard to renewable energy has never been examined. In other words, can the conjecture that renewable energy is a "financial bubble" be justified and rationalized? We owe it to ourselves (and our descendents) to find out. As mentioned above, past financial bubbles have exhibited a hand full of identifiable traits. Most would agree that financial bubbles are the result of unfounded speculation, greed, and economic or monetary policy manipulations that, we assume, go awry. Since causes of bubbles include greed, a quest for a quick dollar, opportunity, and "speculative ignorance", it is left to the reader's intuition to determine which of these played the dominant role in the creation of previous financial bubbles. Indeed, in the previous ".com" financial bubble, investors were investing in companies that had little more than an idea (and in some cases a business plan), but little in terms of assets or a viable value proposition. However, due to the excitement of the Internet and the substantial success of some early ".com" ventures, investors gambled large sums of money in companies that were not yet mature enough to be investment grade. The ".com" bubble was the result of greed and speculative ignorance. Another more recent example is the "housing bubble". This financial bubble was the result of a combination of monetary policy decisions to keep interest rates at incredibly low levels, the urging of lending institutions to relax lending standards, and an economic model based on constant growth. The former misguided actions were supposedly done to "allow more Americans to realize the American dream of home ownership" which increased home values to unrealistic and unsustainable levels. As we can all now see. the consequence of this scenario was the bursting of the housing bubble, and is a prime example of a combination of (financial institution and home-buyer) greed and policy manipulations gone awry. An argument could also be made for a high degree of "speculative ignorance" as a contributing factor since obviously the longer term outcome of these policy decisions were not clearly thought out by both policymakers as well as individuals securing the assets. Neither of these financial bubble examples could have occurred if the overall economic model was not based on continuous growth. RENEWABLE ENERGY IS A REVOLUTION With this basic foundation, let's examine why renewable energy is not the basis for another financial bubble, and in fact, "cannot" result in a financial bubble as some would have us believe. Renewable energy is a revolution. The question must be asked "what makes a revolution"? Like financial bubbles, revolutions are multifaceted and history shows that they have common elements that include: (1) innovation/ingenuity; (2) critical social need motivation, and (3) purpose. Unlike financial bubbles, where their bursting is recorded as historical facts, revolutions create the course of recorded as historical facts, revolutions create the course of overall history in which those financial bubbles occur. To drive this point home, let's examine a previous "revolution1' that we've all participated in, and one that has also led us to our current scenario with regards to energy.

#### The plan doesn’t transition the US to a 100% solar based economy- Wall Street would speculate over other forms of energy like oil- it’s not about the price, their ev indicts the existence of speculation

#### No excessive energy speculation

Kilian, Professor @ University of Michigan, 2012,

April 12, Lutz, Professor of Economics, University of Michigan; and Research Fellow at CEPR. “Speculation in oil markets? What have we learned?” <http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/7892>

Another argument has been based on the relative size of the oil futures market and the physical market for oil. For example, it is often asserted that the daily trading volume in oil futures markets is several times as high as daily physical oil production, fuelling the suspicion that speculators are dominating this market. Academic research, however, shows that this ratio – after taking account of the number of days to delivery for the oil futures contract – is a fraction of about one half of daily US oil usage rather than a multiple, invalidating this argument. An alternative approach due to Holbrook Working (1960) has been to quantify speculation as an index measuring the percentage of speculation in excess of what is minimally necessary to meet short and long hedging demand. A high Working index number, however, does not necessarily indicate excessive speculation. One benchmark in evaluating this index is the historical values of this index for other commodity markets. By that standard the index numbers for the oil market even at their peak remain in the midrange of historical experience. Moreover, there does not appear to be a simple statistical relationship between this index of speculation and the evolution of the price of oil. For example, the correlation between the Working index of speculation and daily price changes is near zero.

#### Growing demand causes rising prices- outweighs speculation

Fattouh et al., Oxford Institute for Energy Studies, 2012,

March, Bassam Fattouh, Oxford Institute for Energy Studies and SOAS. Lutz Kilian, University of Michigan and CEPR. Lavan Mahadeva, Oxford Institute for Energy Studies. “THE ROLE OF SPECULATION IN OIL MARKETS: WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED SO FAR?” http://www.voxeu.org/sites/default/files/file/DP8916.pdf

The same point has been illustrated by a large number of papers. Brunetti and Büyükşahin (2009), ¶ for example, examine the same question as Singleton with a data set showing individual positions taken ¶ by traders. Unlike Singleton, they find no evidence that financial investor flows predict movements in oil ¶ futures prices or price volatility. Rather such speculative trading was associated with reduced volatility. ¶ Likewise, Büyükşahin and Harris (2011) find no evidence that the positions of hedge funds or other noncommercial investors predict changes in the futures price; rather futures price changes precede changes in ¶ positions. Brunetti, Büyükşahin, and Harris (2011) study specific categories of traders and test whether ¶ positions taken by speculators such as hedge funds and swap dealers cause changes in oil futures prices or ¶ price volatility. Their results are consistent with speculators providing valuable liquidity to the market and ¶ with speculators reacting to market conditions rather than vice versa. Similarly, Irwin and Sanders (2011) ¶ show that there is no statistically significant relationship between growth in the volume of oil futures ¶ contracts on the one hand and oil futures returns, their realized volatility and their implied volatility on the ¶ other hand. When a relationship is found at all, it is negative rather than positive, which is at odds with ¶ the results in Singleton (2011). Similar results are also reported in Stoll and Whaley (2011) and Sanders ¶ and Irwin (2011) based on a different data set. ¶ Finally, even if we were to accept the results in Singleton (2011), his evidence is not necessarily ¶ evidence of speculation. It is equally consistent with the existence of frictions in the processing of ¶ information. This point has been stressed in a more general context by Hirshleifer (1988, 1989). Given the ¶ presence of setup costs (possibly related to informational costs) that limit the participation of noncommercial traders in the futures market, the risk premium depends both on systematic risk and on a ¶ residual risk linked to hedging pressure, with increased hedging pressure increasing the size of the risk ¶ premium and affecting oil futures and spot prices. Chang (1985) and De Roon el al. (2000) provide ¶ evidence that in many markets producers’ hedging positions are correlated with commodity futures price ¶ changes, consistent with the existence of such frictions. In related work, Hong and Yogo (2012) document ¶ that the open interest in the oil futures market contains information about future economic activity and ¶ inflation expectations that is not immediately reflected in asset prices. The change in the open interest is ¶ a more reliable predictor of higher economic activity (and hence higher asset prices) than oil futures ¶ prices. It also helps predict changes in the spot price of oil. Hong and Yogo interpret this evidence as an ¶ indication that the anticipation of higher economic activity raises demand for hedging, which in turn ¶ drives up open interest.

#### They only provide a 20% boost to production costs- that’s not nearly enough to ensure investment waves transition to solar- financial incentives would push them to profitable fossil fuel ventures

#### Speculative price hikes are self-repairing

Krugman, Nobel Prize in Economics, 2008,

May, Paul, holder of the Nobel Prize in Economics. professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton University. Mr. Krugman received his B.A. from Yale University in 1974 and his Ph.D. from MIT in 1977. He has taught at Yale, MIT and Stanford. At MIT he became the Ford International Professor of Economics. “The Oil Nonbubble,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/05/12/opinion/12krugman.html?ex=1368244800&en=c899176fff63fce4&ei=5124&partner=permalink&exprod=permalink>

Now, speculators do sometimes push commodity prices far above the level justified by fundamentals. But when that happens, there are telltale signs that just aren’t there in today’s oil market. Imagine what would happen if the oil market were humming along, with supply and demand balanced at a price of $25 a barrel, and a bunch of speculators came in and drove the price up to $100. Even if this were purely a financial play on the part of the speculators, it would have major consequences in the material world. Faced with higher prices, drivers would cut back on their driving; homeowners would turn down their thermostats; owners of marginal oil wells would put them back into production. As a result, the initial balance between supply and demand would be broken, replaced with a situation in which supply exceeded demand. This excess supply would, in turn, drive prices back down again — unless someone were willing to buy up the excess and take it off the market. The only way speculation can have a persistent effect on oil prices, then, is if it leads to physical hoarding — an increase in private inventories of black gunk. This actually happened in the late 1970s, when the effects of disrupted Iranian supply were amplified by widespread panic stockpiling. But it hasn’t happened this time: all through the period of the alleged bubble, inventories have remained at more or less normal levels. This tells us that the rise in oil prices isn’t the result of runaway speculation; it’s the result of fundamental factors, mainly the growing difficulty of finding oil and the rapid growth of emerging economies like China. The rise in oil prices these past few years had to happen to keep demand growth from exceeding supply growth.

#### No internal link- people would still speculate over solar energy

#### Manufacturing decline inevitable and it’s not key

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

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

#### Their resource wars impact is about peak oil- you don’t solve competition over petroleum

#### No scientific data to support scarcity-induced conflict theory\*\*

Buhaug et al, Professor Centre for the Study of Civil War at Peace Research Institute Oslo, ’12 (Halvard, Winter, “Climate Wars? Assessing the Claim That Drought Breeds Conflict” International Security, Vol 36 No 3, ProjectMuse)

In his acceptance lecture on the occasion of the Nobel Peace Prize award, President Barack Obama stated, “There is little scientific dispute that if we do nothing, we will face more drought, more famine, more mass displacement—all of which will fuel more conflict for decades.”79 So far, there is little scientific evidence to support this claim. The results presented in this article demonstrate that there is no direct, short-term relationship between drought and civil war onset, even within contexts presumed most conducive to violence. At the same time, the analysis solidifies claims of recent scholarship on the importance of ethnically inclusive institutions for maintaining peace. Ethnopolitical exclusion is strongly and robustly related to the local risk of civil war. These findings contrast with efforts to blame violent conflict and atrocities on exogenous non-anthropogenic events, such as drought or desertification. The primary causes of intrastate armed conflict and civil war are political, not environmental. Consequently, the future security of Africa depends not on climate mitigation but on political and socioeconomic development. A likely objection to this conclusion relates to the magnitude of things to come; the rate and extent of past warming and drying will increase manifold in coming decades, so we cannot use historical data to project future trends. This may hold some truth, as there are limits to the coping capacity of any (agrarian) society. Crops grow only under given climatic conditions, and livestock perish in the absence of water and pasture. At the same time, gloomy interjections tend to ignore technological, societal, and political developments that might mediate (or accentuate) adverse environmental change. Increasing urbanization relieves some of the pressure on rural lands; technological innovation, DNA manipulation, irrigation, and desalination plantations promise significant increases in agricultural productivity (even though implementing such technologies successfully may prove challenging); and increasing economic interdependence and the spread of liberal democratic values would [End Page 105] suggest a more equitable distribution of resources and better disaster preparedness and response. The last ten to fifteen years have seen a striking drop in the frequency of civil wars in Africa, at a time when temperatures have risen to unprecedented levels and drying has prevailed across much of the continent. Although a drought is unlikely to directly cause civil war, climate change will affect human security in a broader sense. Drought and other climatic shocks frequently cause dismay and poverty, and more extreme weather in the years to come suggests more human suffering. For this reason alone, we should invest more in solid research on the social dimensions of climate change. But to raise alarm about coming “climate wars” may do more harm than good,80 as it could lead to a militarization of the issue and raising of barriers to prevent immigration, thereby harming those who are most in need of assistance. Finally, future research needs to apply a broader understanding of political violence and armed conflict than is normally the case today. Given data limitations and a perception that major, state-based conflicts carry greater potential for political instability and state collapse than small-scale interethnic skirmishes, recent scholarship has focused almost exclusively on civil wars.81 This is reflected in the contemporary discourse on climate security, which is dominated by a state-centric approach. In contrast, narratives and news reports of conflict over diminishing resources frequently concern clashes between rivaling ethnic groups or between pastoralists and sedentary farmers. The conflicts in Assam in India, Darfur in Sudan, Kenya, Mali, and Mauritania, all central cases in the environmental security literature, were at least initially interethnic conflicts without explicit state involvement. Key questions in this regard are how environmental conditions and rapid environmental change affect intercommunal relations and local land use disputes, and what role the state plays in ending or fueling these conflicts. [End Page 106]

#### No arms races

Waltz Poli Sci Cal‘3

(Kenneth, Adjunct Senior Research Scholar at Columbia University, The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed, p. 29-30)

One may believe that old American and Soviet military doctrines set the pattern that new nuclear states will follow. One may also believe that they will suffer the fate of the United States and the former Soviet Union, that they will compete in building larger and larger nuclear arsenals while continuing to accumulate conventional weapons. These are doubtful beliefs. One can infer the future from the past only insofar as future situations may be like past ones. For three main reasons, new nuclear states are likely to decrease, rather than to increase, their military spending.

First, nuclear weapons alter the dynamics of arms races. In a competition of two or more parties, it may be hard to say who is pushing and who is being pushed, who is leading and who is following. If one party seeks to increase its capabilities, it may seem that others must too. The dynamic may be built into the competition and may unfold despite a mutual wish to resist it. But need this be the case in a strategic competition among nuclear countries? It need not be if the conditions of competition make deterrent logic dominant. Deterrent logic dominates if the conditions of competition make it nearly impossible for any of the competing parties to achieve a first- strike capability. Early in the nuclear age, the implications of deterrent strategy were clearly seen. "When dealing with the absolute weapon," as William T. R. Fox put it, "arguments based on relative advantage lose their point."29 The United States has sometimes designed its forces according to that logic. Donald A. Quarles, when he was President Eisenhower's secretary of the Air Force, argued that "sufficiency of air power" is determined by "the force required to accomplish the mission assigned." Avoidance of total war then does not depend on the "relative strength of the two opposed forces." Instead, it depends on the "absolute power in the hands of each, and in the substantial invulnerability of this power to interdiction." 30 In other words, if no state can launch a disarming attack with high confidence, force comparisons are irrelevant. Strategic arms races are then pointless. Deterrent strategies offer this great advantage: Within wide ranges neither side need respond to increases in the other side's military capabilities.

#### Prolif doesn’t cause conflict- it induces caution

Knopf National Security Affairs Naval Postgraduate School ‘2

(Jeffrey W., October, “Recasting the proliferation optimism-pessimism debate,” Security Studies, Vol. 12, No. 1, p. 45-46)

The dread of suffering nuclear devastation has two implications. First, states “have every incentive”16 to meet the three criteria for stability. Because of the possible consequences if they do not, they will make sure that they have second-strike forces and that their command and control arrangements are adequate to prevent accidents and unauthorized use. The second implication of great costs is caution. Optimists argue that states will be exceedingly careful not to take actions that risk nuclear war. They will not attempt preventive attacks if there is even the remotest chance that the other side already possesses a few nuclear weapons. Moreover, states will not launch major conventional attacks against a nuclear-armed adversary. Because of the risk of escalation to the nuclear level, states will be wary of direct military clashes of any kind. This is where optimists get the positive case for proliferation. Once stable nuclear deterrence exists, optimists claim, major conventional war either becomes impossible or at minimum its likelihood is greatly reduced.

As a second broad assertion underpinning their case, optimists contend that meeting the three criteria for stability is easy. Nuclear weapons are relatively small and can easily be made mobile, meaning that survivable forces can readily be created by moving or hiding weapons.17 Because even a single nuclear weapon can cause enormous destruction, effective deterrence will exist if just a few of them are survivable. Finally, survivability is in the eye of a potential attacker. If a state is not 100 percent certain that it knows the location of all of another side’s weapons and that it can successfully destroy all of them, then any attack simply becomes too dangerous to consider. In short, in the optimist view, a little uncertainty goes a very long way.