### 1

#### Rare earth demand is rising slowly now.

Seeking Alpha 8/29 [Qineqt, Team of investment professionals including former hedge fund manager, trader and analyst at top tier $10 billion hedge fund. Members include investment professionals who oversaw research and trading organization of 50+. Avoid Molycorp Until Its Liquidity Position Improves August 29, 2012 http://seekingalpha.com/article/834711-avoid-molycorp-until-its-liquidity-position-improves]

According to a recent MIT study, the demand for two of these REMs, neodymium and dysprosium, is expected to increase significantly in future, as the world transitions to renewable energy sources. This is because neodymium is an essential ingredient of magnets used in wind turbines, while dysprosium is used in some electric vehicles' motors. The research predicted that the demand for neodymium and dysprosium is expected to increase by as much as 700% and 2,600% over the next 25 years. While these raw materials are abundantly available in the ground, their supply needs to be paced up so as to match the rate of increase in expected demand. However, the development of a mine takes a decade or more, and unless noteworthy steps are taken in the short-term, such as new mines' development and recycling, a bottleneck will very likely lead to severe price hikes in future.

#### Sudden energy investment skyrockets rare earth prices – devastates manufacturers and deters innovation across all industries.

Epstein 12 [Nicholas Epstein, Chicago Policy Review, Medium Rare: What’s Cooking in the Rare Earth Element Market? Evaluating Rare Earth Element Availability: A case with Revolutionary Demand From Clean Technologies Elisa Alonso, Andrew M. Sherman, Timothy J. Wallington, Mark P. Everson, Frank R. Field, Richard Roth, and Randolph E. Kirchain Environmental Science & Technology. 2012.Jul 12th, 2012 http://chicagopolicyreview.org/2012/07/12/medium-rare-whats-cooking-in-the-rare-earth-element-market/]

REE supplies are vulnerable for several reasons. Most importantly, one nation, China, controls 98 percent of the world’s REE production. Further, REEs are found together in geological formations. As a result, REEs are co-mined, so production is highly concentrated geographically. Lastly, Rare Earth extraction has negative environmental impacts and China’s poor labor standards add social concerns to the supply market. The authors identify circumstances under which REEs may experience revolutionary demand, that is, when new sudden technological innovations sharply increase the demand for REEs. They explain that **revolutionary demand changes can lead to supply and price instability** in the materialsmarket. This effect is **harmful to manufacturers**, who depend on a consistent supply-chain, and **deters additional innovation.**

#### China will respond by cutting off rare earth supply – culminates in U.S.-China war.

Cohen 7 [David Cohen, New Scientist, 5-23-7 “Earth's natural wealth: an audit” http://environment.newscientist.com/channel/earth/mg19426051.200-earths-natural-wealth-an-audit.html]

These may sound like drastic solutions, but as Graedel points out in a paper published last year (Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, vol 103, p 1209), "Virgin stocks of several metals appear inadequate to sustain the modern 'developed world' quality of life for all of Earth's people under contemporary technology." And **when resources run short, conflict is often not far behind**. It is widely acknowledged that one of the key motives for civil war in the Democratic Republic of the Congo between 1998 and 2002 was the riches to be had from the country's mineral resources, including tantalum mines - the biggest in Africa. The war coincided with a surge in the price of the metal caused by the increasing popularity of mobile phones (New Scientist, 7 April 2001, p 46). Similar **tensions over supplies of other rare metals are not hard to imagine**. The Chinese government is supplementing its natural deposits of rare metals by investing in mineral mines in Africa and buying up high-tech scrap to extract metals that are key to its developing industries. The US now imports over 90 per cent of its so-called "rare earth" metals from China, according to the US Geological Survey. If China decided to cut off the supply, that would create a **big risk of conflict**, says Reller.

#### Extinction.

White 11 [Mr. Hugh White is professor of strategic studies at the Australian National University in Canberra and a visiting fellow at the Lowy Institute in Sydney. The Obama Doctrine WSJ, 11/25/11 http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204452104577057660524758198.html]

One risk is that escalating strategic competition will disrupt the vital economic relationship between the U.S. and China. Many hope that the two countries' deep interdependence will prevent their rivalry getting out of hand. But that will only happen if both sides are willing to forgo strategic objectives to protect their economic cooperation. With the Obama Doctrine, the President has declared that he has no intention of doing that. Why should we expect the Chinese to act any different? So it is more likely that escalating rivalry will soon start to erode economic interdependence between the two nations, at great cost to both. The other risk is the growing chance of conflict. A war with China over Taiwan or the Spratly Islands is simple to start but hard to end, and could **very easily escalate**. China is a nuclear-armed power capable of destroying American cities, and the **threshold** for nuclear exchanges in a U.S.-China clash **might be dangerously unclear and disastrously low.**

### 2

#### Obama will win but it isn’t in the bag yet – literally all of the polls agree with us

LAPIDOS 9-27

JULIET LAPIDOS September 27, 2012, It Must Be the Polls http://takingnote.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/27/it-must-be-the-polls/

Nearly every national poll shows President Obama leading Mitt Romney. Gallup, Ipsos and Bloomberg all have the president up by six points. The RAND Corporation puts Mr. Obama up by seven and a half. Only Rasmussen has Mr. Romney up nationally among likely voters, by two points. Swing state surveys also give Mr. Obama the advantage, with new polls from The New York Times, CBS and Quinnipiac showing Mr. Obama up between 9 and 11 points in Florida, Ohio and Pennsylvania. There’s still more than a month until the election. Mr. Obama could lose. Mr. Romney could win. Hanging chads could leave the result up to the Supreme Court. But at the moment it’s rational to conclude that Mr. Obama has a better chance of winning. Unless you’re on the Romney campaign, or you’re a right-wing pundit, in which case it’s only natural—in a stages of grief sort of way—to conclude that the polls are all wrong.

#### Obama is staying away now but the plan loses the public – Solyndra spillover

Aardvark 12

Tory Aardvark 9-5-12 Talking About Climate Change Is Political Suicide http://toryaardvark.com/2012/09/05/talking-about-climate-change-is-political-suicide/

Back in 2008 Obama’s Green credentials were impeccable, a man for whom the “science” of climate change was forever settled, Obama was perceived by the watermelons as the man who would help force their Green agenda on the world. As the race for the Presidency hots up you would expect Big Green policies and fear stories to be a big part of the whole shebang, yet, as a reporter for ecomentalist NGO Grist has found out, Climate Change is most definitely not on the agenda for Obama: Michelle Obama, Julián Castro, Deval Patrick, and other headliners on the convention’s opening night had the audience and the pundits swooning. But none of the major speakers made even a passing reference to climate change or other green issues. The one prime-time speaker who mentioned environmental protection was Rhode Island Gov. Lincoln Chafee, a one-time Republican gone rogue. I hit up some delegates for their insights on the omission, starting with a Houstonian next to me in the nosebleed section of the Time Warner Cable Arena. Had she heard any commentary on climate and energy? Had I missed something? She looked at me blankly. “No,” she said. “I think that’s scheduled for another night.” Scheduled for another night, that is a big No then. An environmental lawyer from Oklahoma City told me, “Nobody’s talking about the environment because it’s political suicide. Voters want jobs, and after Solyndra, you just can’t convince voters that cleantech will do anything but lose them.”

#### The election is critical for US-Russian co-operation – Romney destroys relations, Obama improves them

Larison 12

Daniel Larison is a Ph.D. graduate from the University of Chicago,He is contributing editor at The American Conservative and writes a column for The Week online. June 20, 2012 “The Presidential Election’s Effects on U.S.-Russian Relations” http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/the-presidential-elections-effects-on-u-s-russian-relations/?print=1

Andrew Weiss considers [1] the reasons for U.S.-Russian tensions, and finds the presidential elections in both countries to be partly responsible: A third big drag on U.S.-Russian relations comes from the so-called silly season that accompanies presidential campaigns in both countries. Of course, 2012 was always supposed to be a dead year in U.S.-Russian relations. Back-to-back presidential campaigns have overshadowed just about everything on the bilateral agenda, and practically no one in Washington or Moscow had been predicting that significant progress could be made this year on the toughest issues. Take missile defense, for example. Putin has shown little interest in cutting deals on major arms control issues with a U.S. president who might not be around in just a few months time to implement them. Not only does Putin have no strong incentive to take risks in pursuing new deals with Obama before the election, but he has good reason to believe that a Romney administration would halt or reverse most or all of Obama’s initiatives related to Russia. If Romney wins in November, Putin has even less incentive to cooperate with the U.S., because he will assume (correctly) that the incoming administration is going to be much more antagonistic. Arms control isn’t likely to be a top priority in a Romney White House. To the extent that he has said anything about arms control, Romney is openly hostile to new agreements and unwilling to make even the smallest concessions on missile defense. The good news is that U.S.-Russian relations might start to recover once the election is over, but that depends on the outcome. Romney’s election would represent the confirmation of Russian hard-liners’ suspicions that the post-2008 thaw in relations was a fluke and couldn’t be sustained. Indeed, the Republican nominee seems to have crafted his Russia policy to maximize distrust and paranoia in Moscow. The 2008 and 2012 campaigns have been unusual in the post-Cold War era for the intensity of anti-Russian sentiment expressed by the Republican nominees in these cycles. If it had just been the 2008 cycle, it could have attributed to McCain’s longstanding anti-Russian attitudes and dismissed as such. The re-emergence of Russophobia as a major theme of Republican foreign policy makes that impossible. Weiss also points to the danger that Putin will contribute to wrecking the relationship for opportunistic domestic reasons: Still, Putin knows how to cater to the two-thirds of the Russian electorate that voted for him in March and reside primarily in Russia’s smaller cities and countryside. He may find it hard to resist the temptation to play upon their worst fears and anti-Western stereotypes. Sacrificing the past several years of dramatic improvement in the U.S.-Russian relationship may seem like a small price to pay if it breathes new life and legitimacy into his rule. If Romney is elected, his desire to scrap good relations with Russia would make it extremely easy for Putin to do just that.

#### Russia-US standoff would Russia cause proliferation, terrorism, and nuclear war.

Alexei Arbatov, Ph.D., fellow, Russian Academy of Sciences, fmr. Deputy Chair, Duma Defense Committee, September 2007. [Russia in Global Affairs (2), Is a New Cold War Imminent? P. **http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/20/1130.html**]

Other “centers of power” would immediately derive benefit from the growing Russia-West standoff, using it in their own interests. China would receive an opportunity to occupy even more advantageous positions in its economic and political relations with Russia, the U.S. and Japan, and would consolidate its influence in Central and South Asia and the Persian Gulf region. India, Pakistan, member countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and some exalted regimes in Latin America would hardly miss their chance, either. A multipolar world that is not moving toward nuclear disarmament is a world of an expanding Nuclear Club. While Russia and the West continue to argue with each other, states that are capable of developing nuclear weapons of their own will jump at the opportunity. The probability of nuclear weapons being used in a regional conflict **will increase significantly.** International Islamic extremism and terrorism will increase dramatically; this threat represents the reverse side of globalization. The situation in Afghanistan, Central Asia, the Middle East, and North and East Africa will further destabilize. The wave of militant separatism, trans-border crime and terrorism will also infiltrate Western Europe, Russia, the U.S., and other countries. The **surviving disarmament treaties** (the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty, and the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty) **will collapse**. In a worst-case scenario, there is the chance that an adventuresome regime will initiate a missile launch against territories or space satellites of one or several great powers with a view to triggering an exchange of nuclear strikes between them. Another high probability is the threat of a terrorist act with the use of a nuclear device in one or several major capitals of the world.

### 3

#### Counterplan text:

#### The 50 United States state governments should provide Cash Grants equivalent to the federal Section 1603 Cash Grants to nontaxable entities and individuals for community and residential solar power.

#### States can solve production through cash grants

Climate Policy Initiative Uday Varadarajan et al Brendan Pierpont Andrew Hobbs Kath Rowley September 2012 “Supporting Renewables while Saving Taxpayers Money”, http://www.ourenergypolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/Supporting-Renewables-while-Saving-Taxpayers-Money.pdf

For the first question, we provide an estimate of the impact of federal incentives—the extent to which federal incentives help bring the cost of electricity from solar and wind projects down towards market prices for electricity. We address the second question by comparing the cost to federal and state governments of providing the same level of benefit to a project using various currently employed incentives. Finally, we use insights gained from the first two analyses to propose an alternative incentive mechanism for wind—a Taxable Cash for Production (TCP) incentive—which can provide the same benefits as the current production tax credit (PTC), but at lower cost to federal and state governments.

### 4

#### Relying on incentive structures to foster a green neoliberalism makes warming, international competition, structural violence and war inevitable

Abramsky (visiting fellow at the Institute of Advanced Studies in Science, Technology and Society; fmr. coordinator of the Danish‑based World Wind Energy Institute) 10

(Koyla, Racing to "Save" the Economy and the Planet: Capitalist or Post­ capitalist Transition to a Post‑petrol World?, in Sparking A Worldwide Energy Revolution, ed. Koyla Abramsky, pg. 26-7)

The fact that coal and oil are finite resources means that there is a long‑term tendency in the direction of their phase‑out, regardless of what intentional short‑term interventions are carried out or not. Many proponents of renewable energy simply advocate leaving this phase‑6ut process to the market. It is hoped that rising oil and coal prices will make these fuels increasingly less attractive. Efforts are focused on developing a renewable energy sector that is able to compete, **rather than directly confronting, suppressing, and ultimately dismantling the coal and oil industries.** However, leaving the phase‑out of oil and coal to the market has at least three crucial implications.

 First, such a phase‑out is likely to actually prolong the use of fossil fuels. As long as these energy sources are profitable to extract and to use, they will be. Down to the last remaining drops of oil or lumps of coal. Although resources are finite, they are still relatively abundant Even those analysts who give the most pessimistic (though realistic) perspectives on resource availability, such as those included in this book, do not predict a complete exhaustion of resources in the very near future. And, from the perspective of climate change, a prolongation of fossil fuel use is the exact opposite of what needs to happen, phase‑out must be sped up, not prolonged.

Linked to this, the second consequence of a market‑based phase‑out of oil and coal will mean that the remaining oil and coal resources are frittered away for immediate profit rather than to build the infrastructure for a transition process. Given that building a new energy system will require massive amounts of energy inputs in a very concentrated period of time, this is a recipe for disaster.

The third important consequence is that leaving the transition process to the market is likely to be increasingly coercive and conductive if competition is left to determine who controls the last of these resources and for what purposes they are used. This means competition between workers globally, competition between firnis, and competition between states. This translates to massive inequalities, hierarchies, and austerity measures being imposed on labor (both in and outside the energy sectan); massive bankruptcies of smaller firms and concentration and centralization of capital; and last, but not least, **military conflicts between states.**

 Accepting a market‑based phase out of oil and coal is accepting in advance that the rising price of energy and a transition away from coal and oil is **paid by labor and not capital**, when in actual fact the question of who pays still remains to be determined. The answer will only come through a process of collective global struggle, which occurs along class lines within the world‑economy. It is important to correctly identify these lines of struggle at the outset, otherwise it will be a struggle lost before the fight even begins. Collectively planning energy use and fossil fuel phase‑out is proving to be an enormously difficult social process, but it is likely to be far less socially regressive if based on cooperation, solidarity, and collectively‑defined social needs, rather than if it is based around competition and profit.

#### And unregulated market competition makes economic collapse, inequality and extinction inevitable

Wise et al. (Director of Doctoral Program in Migration Studies & Prof of Development Studies; Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico) 10

(Raúl Delgado Wise, Humberto Márquez Covarrubias, Rubén Puentes, Reframing the debate on migration, development and human rights: fundamental elements, October, 2010, www.migracionydesarrollo.org)

At the end of the first decade of the 21st century, a general crisis centered in the United States affected the global capitalist system on several levels (Márquez, 2009 and 2010). The consequences have been varied:

Financial. The overflowing of financial capital leads to speculative bubbles that affect the socioeconomic framework and result in global economic depressions. Speculative bubbles involve the bidding up of market prices of such commodities as real estate or electronic innovations far beyond their real value, leading inevitable to a subsequent slump (Foster and Magdof, 2009; Bello, 2006). Overproduction. Overproduction crises emerge when the surplus capital in the global economy is not channeled into production processes due to a fall in profit margins and a slump in effective demand, the latter mainly a consequence of wage containment across all sectors of the population (Bello, 2006). Environmental. Environmental degradation, climate change and a predatory approach to natural resources contribute to the destruction of the latter, along with a fundamental undermining of the material bases for production and human reproduction (Fola- dori and Pierri, 2005; Hinkelammert and Mora, 2008). Social. Growing social inequalities, the dismantling of the welfare state and dwindling means of subsistence accentuate problems such as poverty, unemployment, violence, insecurity and labor precariousness, increasing the pressure to emigrate (Harvey, 2007; Schierup, Hansen and Castles, 2006).

The crisis raises questions about the prevailing model of globalization and, in a deeper sense, the systemic global order, which currently undermines our main sources of wealth—labor and nature—and overexploits them to the extent that **civilization itself** is at risk. The responses to the crisis by the governments of developed countries and international agencies promoting globalization have been short-sighted and exclusivist. Instead of addressing the root causes of the crisis, they have implemented limited strategies that seek to rescue financial and manufacturing corporations facing bankruptcy. In addition, government policies of labor flexibilization and fiscal adjustment have affected the living and working conditions of most of the population. These measures are desperate attempts to **prolong the privileges of ruling elites at the risk of imminent and increasingly severe crises**. In these conditions, migrants have been made into scapegoats, leading to repressive anti- immigrant legislation and policies (Massey and Sánchez, 2006). A significant number of jobs have been lost while the conditions of remaining jobs deteriorate and deportations increase. Migrants’ living standards have drastically deteriorated but, contrary to expectations, there have been neither massive return flows nor a collapse in remittances, though there is evidence that migrant worker flows have indeed diminished.

#### Our alternative is to reject the Aff’s endorsement of incentive structures

#### Rejecting incentive structures is an act of economic imagination that can create real alternatives within the existing economy

White and Williams (senior lecturer of economic geography at Sheffield Hallam University; professor of public policy in the Management School at the University of Sheffield) 12

(Richard J. and Cohn C., Escaping Capitalist Hegemony: Rereading Western Economies in The Accumulation of Freedom, pg. 131-32)

The American anarchist Howard Ehrlich argued, "We must act as if the future is today." What we have hoped to demonstrate here is that non‑capitalist spaces are present and evident in contemporary societies. We do not need to imagine and create from scratch new economic alternatives that will successfully confront the capitalist hegemony thesis, or more properly the capitalist hegemony myth. Rather than capitalism being the all powerful, all conquering, economic juggernaut, the greater truth is that the "other" non‑capitalist spaces have grown in proportion relative in size to the capitalism realm.

This should give many of us great comfort and hope in moving forward purposefully for, as Chomsky observed: "[a]lternatives have to be constructed within the existing economy, and within the minds of working people and communities."' In this regard, the roots of the heterodox economic futures that we desire do exist in the present. Far from shutting down future economic possibilities, a more accurate reading of "the economic" (which decenters capitalism), coupled with the global crisis that capitalism finds itself in, should give us additional courage and resolve to unleash our economic imaginations, embrace the challenge of creating "fully engaged" economies. These must also take greater account of the disastrous social and environmental costs of capitalism and its inherent ethic of competition. As Kropotkin wrote:

**Don't compete!**‑competition is always injurious to the species, and you have plenty of resources to avoid it! Therefore combine‑practice mutual aid! That is the surest means for giving to each and all to the greatest safety, the best guarantee of existence and progress, bodily, intellectual, and moral .... That is what Nature teaches us; and that is what all those animals which have attained the highest position in the respective classes have done. That is also what man [ski‑the most primitive man‑has been doing; and that is why man has reached the position upon which we stand now."

A more detailed and considered discussion of the futures of work, however, is beyond the scope of this chapter. What we have hoped to demonstrate is that in reimagining the economic, and recognizing and valuing the non‑capitalist economic practices that are already here, we might spark renewed enthusiasm, optimism, insight, and critical discussion within and among anarchist communities. The ambition here is similar to that of Gibson‑Graham, in arguing that:

The objective is not to produce a finished and coherent template that maps the economy "as it really is" and presents... a ready made "alternative economy." Rather, our hope is to disarm and dislocate the naturalized dominance of the capitalist economy and make a space for new economic beeomings‑ones that we will need to work to produce. If we can recognize a diverse economy, we can begin to imagine and create diverse organizations and practices as powerful constituents of an enlivened noncapitalist policies of place.

### Grid

Their author admits renewables are too volatile and the entire grid needs to be revamped – requires trillions, not just cash grants for solar

MICHAEL BRUCH Head of R&D Risk Consulting and LARRY HUNTER Risk Engineer Allianz Risk Consulting Worldwide risk consulting, risk management and loss investigation services for corporate, industrial and specialty risks. Energy risks: Power trip http://www.agcs.allianz.com/assets/PDFs/GRD/GRD%20individual%20articles/Power\_blackout\_risks\_article.pdf

Drawbacks of renewable energy

While renewable energy is on the rise in many countries, a major drawback is the “volatility” of supply. This leads to several challenges. The unsteady production of energy, especially from wind or solar power, strains the stability of the network. Further, if wind turbines need to be stopped for safety reasons in extreme weather conditions, this can cause power gaps equal to the loss of two nuclear power plants within just one hour. In such cases, conventional reserve power plants would need to step in instantly. Last but not least, renewable energy has to be transmitted from sparsely populated areas to the metropolitan centers of demand. To handle these enormous technical challenges, grids need to become much smarter. “Governments should develop new grids with metering, control and commu nication functions to handle the future growth of re - new able energies,” says Larry Hunter. They should also promote storage facilities for excess energy such as pumped storage hydropower plants or underground vaults for compressed air. Overhauling national grids comes at a considerable cost. Estimates suggest that European Union (EU) member states need to invest between €23 and €28 billion over the next five years in their national grid networks, particularly as the demand for power supply is now cross-border. However, the fact that the European electricity grid consists of multiple regulatory bodies, owners and operators makes it difficult to form a consensus on prioritizing areas for investment – and responsibility. More widely, the International Energy Agency (IEA) says that the world will need to invest US$13.6 trillion between now and 2030 to boost power supply to meet increasing demand. The IEA says that 50 percent of this amount needs to be invested in transmission and distribution and another 50 percent in the generation of electricity distribution.

#### Alt cause to blackouts

#### 1. Low river levels

The Guardian, John Vidal is an environmentalist, 5-31-2011 [“Europe's dry spring could lead to power blackouts, governments warn” <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/may/31/europe-dry-spring-power-blackouts>] vpotluri

One of the driest springs ever recorded in northern Europe could lead to power blackouts this summer, with nuclear reactors going offline because of low river levels. The exceptionally dry weather will also raise food prices and has already forced water restrictions on millions of people, say governments, farm groups and meteorological organisations across the continent.

#### 2. Fires, floods and fires cause blackouts

Associated Press, Dina Capiello, 3-29-2011 [“AP IMPACT: Long blackouts pose risk to US reactors” The Post and Courier <http://www.postandcourier.com/news/2011/mar/29/ap-impact-long-blackouts-pose-risk-us-reactors/?print>] vpotluri

In one nightmare simulation presented by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in 2009, it would take less than a day for radiation to escape from a reactor at a Pennsylvania nuclear power plant after an earthquake, flood or fire knocked out all electrical power and there was no way to keep the reactors cool after backup battery power ran out. That plant, the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station outside Lancaster, has reactors of the same older make and model as those releasing radiation at Japan’s Fukushima Dai-ichi plant, which is using other means to try to cool the reactors.

#### Huge blackouts in the past decade didn’t collapse the economy

IEEE is the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc, 8-15-2003, [“IEEE-USA’s Call for Reliability Legislation Underscored by Largest U.S. Power Outage” <http://www.ieeeusa.org/communications/releases/2003/081503pr.html>] vpotluri

Electric power reliability problems have led to more blackouts in recent years than historically experienced in North America. Customers in 14 western states underwent scattered outages twice in the summer of 1996. Major outages occurred during the summer of 1999 in different regions of North America, including Chicago and New York. More recently, California experienced rotating blackouts, price spikes and near bankruptcy of several utilities starting in mid-2000 and continuing into 2001.

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war.

Jervis 11 [Robert, Adlai E. Stevenson Professor of International Politics in the Department of Political Science, and a Member of the Arnold A. Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University. Force in Our Times Saltzman Working Paper No. 15 July 2011 http://www.siwps.com/news.attachment/saltzmanworkingpaper15-842/SaltzmanWorkingPaper15.PDF]

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy, and bring back old-fashioned beggar-thy-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a pre-existing high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, **it will not make war thinkable.**

#### No impact to another recession.

Keystone Research 11 [Main Street Newsletter, “3 Ways the Next Recession Will Be Different”, http://keystoneresearch.org/media-center/media-coverage/3-ways-next-recession-will-be-different]

All of this has only renewed concerns among analysts and average Americans that the U.S. would suffer a dreaded double-dip recession, but according to several economists MainStreet spoke with, even if we do enter into another recession later this year or in early 2012, it won’t be nearly as damaging as the Great Recession of 2008.“If there is another recession, I think it wouldn’t be as severe and it would also be shorter,” says Gus Faucher, senior economist at Moody’s Analytics. “And the reason for that is a lot of the imbalances that drove the previous recession have been corrected.” As Faucher and others point out, banks are better capitalized now, the housing market has shed (however painfully) many delinquent homeowners who signed up forsubprime mortgages before the recession and U.S. corporations have trimmed their payrolls and are sitting on ample cash reserves to help weather another storm. At the same time, consumers have gradually improved their own balance sheets by spending less and paying off more of their debt.

#### No long term black out – government response solves – disaster response proves

#### Utility companies will artificially lower prices to crowd out distributive projects

Bronin 10 Sara C. Bronin Associate Professor of Law, University of Connecticut “Curbing Energy Sprawl with Microgrids” December, 2010 Connecticut Law Review 43 Conn. L. Rev. 547 lexis

Beyond lawmaking, utilities have a profound impact on the financial feasibility of distributed generation. This impact arises from utilities’ ability to set tariffs and policies on end users within their jurisdiction. The Department of Energy has documented numerous examples of utilities charging unfair and outsized backup tariffs—supplemental, backup, and standby tariffs that distributed generators are required to pay to ensure access to the grid.114 Sometimes, the proposed tariffs have even exceeded the equivalent cost of the energy produced by the distributed generator.115 In addition, utilities, which enjoy monopolies over buying back excess energy, have tended to offer very low buyback rates.116 Low buyback rates mean that power produced during off-peak periods which is not used by the microgrid cannot necessarily be fed back into the central grid, and sold back to the utility, at rates that would help offset the costs of investing in distributed generation. Finally, utilities sometimes refuse to serve users of distributed generation, by refusing to connect them to the grid. Backup generators that would alleviate worries of being without power—that is, protect microgrid users in a worst-case scenario—tend to add so many costs that entire projects are abandoned. The negative impact of these practices on the financial feasibility of distributed generation, and by extension microgrids, is clear. If past behavior is any indication, utility companies will continue to obstruct any reform that would facilitate microgrids.

#### Local zoning laws block implementation \*also says states solve

Bronin 10 Sara C. Bronin Associate Professor of Law, University of Connecticut “Curbing Energy Sprawl with Microgrids” December, 2010 Connecticut Law Review 43 Conn. L. Rev. 547 lexis

Neighbors, like utility companies, also have significant influence on the future of microgrids, although neighbors influence local law and policy more than state law and policy. More specifically, neighbors have played and will play a big part in land use issues, which are traditionally local in nature.

I have written elsewhere about localities’ role in siting alternative energy technology and will summarize my findings here.117 Of nearly forty thousand local governments nationwide, less than a hundred have squarely addressed renewable energy technologies like the ones that could be deployed in a microgrid.118 Tens of thousands of localities have either barred or ignored such technologies, in the laws either as written or as applied.119 Local laws that thwart alternative energy projects include zoning ordinances, aesthetic controls, and historic preservation rules.120

Examples of local groups using these laws to erect barriers to alternative energy equipment, particularly with respect to wind energy, abound.121 For Instance, a city in Oklahoma changed its ordinances to prevent a wind farm from locating there,122 while a New York town enacted a moratorium on wind turbine towers.123 Even outside of formal legal actions, neighbors have managed to wrangle informal agreements and concessions from wind energy generators fearful of formal protests.124

Wind turbines may be taller and bulkier than other alternative energy generating technologies, but each technology has physical features that may make its proximity undesirable to potential neighbors: Solar collectors can be unsightly; microturbines can create a disconcerting hum; fuel cells are essentially large, trailer-sized boxes that are hardly beautiful; geothermal wells must be drilled fifteen hundred feet underground with loud equipment. To be sure, technology is improving, and many old stereotypes no longer apply. But in too many communities, neighbor involvement in local decision-making processes can help to kill microgrid projects that the utilities, and unfavorable state laws, do not. The equipment that supports microgrids has to go somewhere. If too many neighbors object and the equipment cannot be located in previously developed locations, where the infrastructure to support it already exists, then energy sprawl will continue to spread.

As Parts II and III clarified, the need to facilitate alternative energy microgrids, and the distributed generation technologies that comprise them, is clear. In those communities that explicitly bar alternative energy technologies, concerted efforts must be made to reverse course. In those communities that ignore alternative energy technologies, ambiguities must be resolved through careful redrafting of local laws. For a variety of reasons, however, localities are unlikely to move forward with major reforms.125 In this limited respect, given the extra-local nature of energy sprawl, states may have a role in encouraging localities to facilitate microgrids—without ignoring neighbor objections—through carefully written state enabling statutes.126

### Financial Speculation

#### Default to util – extinction outweighs.

Harries, 94 – Editor @ The National Interest (Owen, Power and Civilization, The National Interest, Spring, lexis)

Performance is the test. Asked directly by a Western interviewer, “In principle, do you believe in one standard of human rights and free expression?”, Lee immediately answers, “Look, it is not a matter of principle but of practice.” This might appear to represent a simple and rather crude pragmatism. But in its context it might also be interpreted as an appreciation of the fundamental point made by Max Weber that, in politics, it is “the ethic of responsibility” rather than “the ethic of absolute ends” that is appropriate. While an individual is free to treat human rights as absolute, to be observed whatever the cost, governments must always weigh consequences and the competing claims of other ends. So once they enter the realm of politics, human rights have to take their place in a hierarchy of interests, including such basic things as national security and the promotion of prosperity. Their place in that hierarchy will vary with circumstances, but no responsible government will ever be able to put them always at the top and treat them as inviolable and over-riding. The cost of implementing and promoting them will always have to be considered.

#### Moral absolutism fails.

Isaac, 2 – Professor of Poli Sci @ U Indiana, Bloomington (Jeffrey, Ends, Means and Politics, Dissent, Vol 49, Iss. 2, Spring)

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable**,** reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one’s intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence**,** then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice**.** This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with “good” may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of “good” that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one’s goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers**.** It promotes arrogance. And it **undermines political effectiveness**.

#### No resource wars.

Tertrais 12 [Bruno, Senior Research Fellow at the Fondation pour la Recherche Strat gique (FRS) The Demise of Ares: The End of War as We Know It? The Washington Quarterly • 35:3 pp. 722]

Future **resource wars are unlikely.** There are fewer and fewer conquest wars. Between the Westphalia peace and the end of World War II, nearly half of conflicts were fought over territory. Since the end of the Cold War, it has been less than 30 percent. 61 The invasion of Kuwaita nationwide bank robberymay go down in history as being the last great resource war. The U.S.-led intervention of 1991 was partly driven by the need to maintain the free flow of oil, but not by the temptation to capture it. (Nor was the 2003 war against Iraq motivated by oil.) As for the current tensions between the two Sudans over oil, they are the remnants of a civil war and an offshoot of a botched secession process, not a desire to control new resources. China’s and India’s energy needs are sometimes seen with apprehension: in light of growing oil and gas scarcity, is there not a risk of military clashes over the control of such resources? This seemingly consensual idea rests on two fallacies. One is that there is such a thing as oil and gas scarcity, a notion challenged by many energy experts. 62 As prices rise, previously untapped reserves and non-conventional hydrocarbons become economically attractive. The other is that spilling blood is a rational way to access resources. As shown by the work of historians and political scientists such as Quincy Wright, the economic rationale for war **has always been overstated.** And because of globalization, it has become cheaper to buy than to steal. We no longer live in the world of 1941, when fear of lacking oil and raw materials was a key motivation for Japan’s decision to go to war. In an era of liberalizing trade, many natural resources are fungible goods. (Here, Beijing behaves as any other actor: 90 percent of the oil its companies produce outside of China goes to the global market, not to the domestic one.) 63 There may be clashes or conflicts in regions in maritime resource-rich areas such as the South China and East China seas or the Mediterranean, but they will be driven by nationalist passions, not the desperate hunger for hydrocarbons. Only in civil wars does the question of resources such as oil, diamonds, minerals, and the like play a significant role; this was especially true as Cold War superpowers stopped their financial patronage of local actors. 64 Indeed, as Mueller puts it in his appropriately titled The Remnants of War, ‘‘Many [existing wars] have been labeled ‘new war,’ ‘ethnic conflict,’ or, most grandly ‘clashes of civilization.’ But in fact, most. . .are more nearly opportunistic predation by packs, often remarkably small ones, of criminals, bandits, and thugs.’’ 65 It is the abundance of resources, not their scarcity, which fuels such conflicts. The risk is particularly high when the export of natural resources represents at least a third of the country’s GDP. 66

#### Don’t solve financial speculation – their impact evidence is in the context of predatory lending and other bad practices, not goldman making money off of the PTC.

#### No more natural gas volatility- laundry list

**Skutnik, 12** -- University of Tennessee nuclear engineering professor

(Steve, "The End of Natural Gas Price Volatility?" 2-13-12, theenergycollective.com/skutnik/76356/end-natural-gas-price-volatility, accessed 10-5-12, mss)

Conoco Phillips recently put up a great video on youtube making the point that NG has been volatile in the past due to reasons mostly having little to do with the nature of production (instead, the nature of the use), and that the volatility will be less in the future given **recent developments**. Here is the video: Because these are such important points that get to the core of the issue, I want to list them. I'm going to tackle the 2 arguments I mentioned above. Why Natural Gas is Volatile in the first place: It's a commodity and all commodities have price volatility It is a margin fuel for power production (because it has the highest variable cost) Once before, the long-term price of NG made a major move upward after much investment into NG power plants that left decision makers regretting that and leaving them skeptical of NG commitment in the future Why it will be less volatile in the future: We have more storage than in the past We can bring in LNG (liquified natural gas, a way to import the commodity) to up to 25% of our demand Shale gas is like a manufacturing process, and it's something you can ramp up very rapidly The on-shore production is not subject to weather related disruptions, like hurricanes which have **historically been the reasons for major disruptions** The abundance of resources and diversity of supply makes long-term price **much more stable and confident**

#### Relative inequality decreasing

Kenny 10 [Charles, a contributing editor to Foreign Policy, is author of the forthcoming book Getting Better: Why Global Development Is Succeeding and How We Can Improve the World Even More, Best. Decade. Ever. SEPT. / OCT. 2010 http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/08/16/best\_decade\_ever?page=full]

But these horrific events, though mortal and economic catastrophes for many millions, don't sum up the decade as experienced by most of the planet's 6-billion-plus people. For all its problems, the first 10 years of the 21st century were in fact **humanity's finest**, a time when more people lived better, longer, more peaceful, and more prosperous lives than ever before. Consider that in 1990, roughly half the global population lived on less than $1 a day; by 2007, the proportion had shrunk to 28 percent -- and it will be lower still by the close of 2010. That's because, though the financial crisis briefly stalled progress on income growth, it was just a hiccup in the decade's relentless GDP climb. Indeed, average worldwide incomes are at their highest levels ever, at roughly $10,600 a year -- and have risen by as much as a quarter since 2000. Some 1.3 billion people now live on more than $10 a day, suggesting the continued expansion of the global middle class. Even better news is that growth has been faster in poor places like sub-Saharan Africa than across the world as a whole. There are still 1 billion people who go to bed each night desperately hungry, but cereal prices are now a fraction of what they were in the 1960s and 1970s. That, alongside continued income growth, is why the proportion of the developing world's population classified as "undernourished" fell from 34 percent in 1970 to 17 percent in 2008, even at the height of a global spike in food prices. Agricultural productivity, too, continues to climb: From 2000 to 2008, cereal yields increased at nearly twice the rate of population growth in the developing world. And though famine continues to threaten places such as Zimbabwe, hundreds of millions of people are eating more -- and better -- each day.