# Round 1 vs Liberty AB

## 1AC

### The Plan

#### The United States Department of Agriculture should create a set-aside for Central Appalachia in the Rural Energy for America Program to increase financial incentives for energy production of wind power.

### Adv – Sustainability

#### ADVANTAGE one: Sustainability

#### Wind power paves the way for it - Central Appalachia will be the model for the transition

**Haltom 10** - Co-director of Coal River Muntain Watch [Vernon Haltom, “Can a Wind Farm Transform Appalachia's Energy Future?,” Solutions Journal, Volume 1 | Issue 4 | Page 71-77 | Jul 2010, pg. http://tinyurl.com/9e3fyr8

The communities of the Coal River Valley suffered a heartbreaking catastrophe on April 5, 2010, when Massey Energy's Upper Big Branch longwall mine exploded, killing 29 miners in the worst U.S. mine disaster in 40 years. The disaster at Upper Big Branch should remind the nation that with our current dependence on coal for electricity generation comes a responsibility to ensure that miners and the surrounding communities are protected from the negligence of company executives. At Coal River Mountain Watch, we want to take the debate a step further by offering an alternative vision for the community, one that has the potential to transform Coal River Valley and offer a powerful symbol of a viable energy future for the nation.

In March 2008, local residents banded together to fight for a wind farm instead of a mountaintop removal coal mining site operated by Massey. Generations of residents around Coal River Mountain have seen the detrimental effects of reliance on one industry. The boom-and-bust cycles of coal have caused bustling communities to become ghost towns. With the current reliance on technology such as longwall mining and mountaintop removal, miners have largely been replaced with machines and explosives. In 1980, 55,500 miners in West Virginia extracted over 121 million tons of coal, while in 2008, only about 21,000 miners extracted nearly 166 million tons. Comparing a map of the counties that have yielded the most coal to the Appalachian Regional Commission's map of distressed counties illustrates a clear correlation. Contrary to industry claims that coal provides prosperity, economic facts indicate that it provides poverty. Presently the state has a 9.5 percent unemployment rate, while less than 4 percent of the workforce is employed by mining and logging.

The plan for Coal River Mountain would destroy over 6,000 acres of the mountain, bury streams with 18 valley fills, destroy water supplies, and eliminate sustainable resources, including the commercial wind potential. The mountaintop removal operation would provide coal and temporary mining jobs for only 17 years. In contrast, a wind farm would preserve the abundant timber and non-timber forest products, protect the water, allow traditional and new sustainable economic opportunities, and provide clean energy and green jobs forever.

As we call on our leaders to reduce carbon emissions and to invest in the development of clean energy sources, we must also call on them to invest in the future of the miners and the communities that have provided the energy upon which our nation was built and continues to be fueled today. This means asking the federal government to reinvigorate the original intent of the Appalachian Regional Development Initiative, strengthen the capacity and purview of the Appalachian Regional Commission, and invest in the health, education, training, entrepreneurship, and environment of Appalachian communities and residents. It means addressing the root causes of persistent poverty and unemployment in the region and not being afraid to anger the coal industry and the local and state politicians who uphold it to the detriment of the citizens and the miners. But most of all, it calls for making a commitment to a sustainable economic transition for the coalfields and supporting every means possible to achieve it.

Building a Positive Vision

Coal River Mountain lies at the western end of Raleigh County, in the heart of the Coal River watershed, and is bounded by the two major tributaries of the Big Coal River: Marsh Fork on the south and west of the mountain and Clear Fork on the north and east. Kayford Mountain, where thousands of acres of mountaintop have been removed, lies across the Clear Fork to the north, and Cherry Pond Mountain, likewise devastated by mountaintop removal, lies across the Marsh Fork to the southwest. Several small, unincorporated towns—Rock Creek, Naoma, Sundial, Birchton, and Pettus—lie along the Marsh Fork, and the towns of Artie, Colcord, and Dorothy are situated along the Clear Fork. Whitesville, at the eastern edge of Boone County, sits just below the convergence of the two tributaries at the western edge of the mountain. Coal River Mountain itself has long been home to underground mines, a few small, old strip mines, and, since 1995, the Brushy Fork slurry impoundment. However, most of the mountain remains relatively unspoiled and has provided generations of residents with lumber, firewood, berries, ginseng and other valuable medicinal herbs, wild game, and fish. From the air, the Coal River Mountain stands in lush contrast to its barren, dusty neighbors.

The Upper Big Branch mine, the site of the recent disaster, lies beneath the expansive Twilight surface mine complex on Cherry Pond Mountain, just across from Coal River Mountain. In 2006, Massey Energy quietly received approval for the Bee Tree surface mine on Coal River Mountain. In the latter months of 2006, David Orr, a professor at Oberlin College in Ohio and a prominent environmental advocate and writer, worked with CRMW's North Carolina–based ally Appalachian Voices to commission a study of the wind potential on Coal River Mountain. WindLogics, a nationally recognized wind modeling and development firm, conducted the study and found that the ridges along Coal River Mountain exhibited strong Class 4 to Class 7 average annual wind speeds. Class 4 winds serve as a minimum threshold for industrial-scale wind development. When Massey applied for the Eagle 2 Surface Mine, the second of four planned permits on the mountain, Coal River Mountain Watch requested and was granted an informal conference in August 2007 for citizens to voice their opposition to the proposal. Nearly 100 residents attended the hearing, and over 30 spoke out against the permit. None spoke in favor of it. In 1997 and 2001, several Clear Fork residents had endured heavy flooding, exacerbated by runoff from mountaintop removal and valley fills on the opposite side of the Clear Fork. They feared the destruction of their community if both sides of the valley were dominated by streams buried under valley fills. Several citizens voiced support for a wind farm as an alternative to mountaintop removal. Dr. Matt Wasson of Appalachian Voices described the WindLogics study and provided copies to decision makers at the Department of Environmental Protection.

Seizing the opportunity offered by the mountain's wind resources, members of Coal River Mountain Watch, with the support of the Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition, Appalachian Voices, the Sierra Club, and the Student Energy Action Coalition, came together in March 2008 to make plans for a wind farm. Using the WindLogics wind map of the mountain, and with technical advice provided by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory and the American Wind Energy Association, CRMW's wind project coordinator, Rory McIlmoil, constructed a model wind farm utilizing ArcGIS and Google Earth software. The model suggested that Coal River Mountain had enough wind potential and land area to accommodate 220 two-megawatt wind turbines, resulting in a total generation capability of 440 megawatts. Meanwhile, CRMW's community organizer, Lorelei Scarbro, provided information about the project and hosted community meetings that generated substantial local support. The two, along with supportive community members, made presentations to elected and appointed leaders, from the city level to the governor's office, and held a rally at the state capitol that resulted in more than 10,000 signatures on a petition. The project received Co-op America's 2008 Building Economic Alternatives award. CNN reported on the project and interviewed CRMW organizer Lorelei Scarbro at her home and at the adjacent family cemetery on Coal River Mountain.

To determine what was at stake, Coal River Mountain Watch commissioned Downstream Strategies, an environmental consulting firm from Morgantown, West Virginia, to conduct a comparative economic analysis of the costs and benefits of mountaintop removal and wind development on Coal River Mountain.

That study concluded that a 328-megawatt wind farm, enough to power 70,000 homes, would generate more long-term jobs and significantly greater local tax revenues than the proposed mining would, while imposing far fewer costs on human health and the environment. In fact, the study estimated that the externalized costs of the proposed mining, which would be drained from the local economy, would amount to $600 million over the life of the mining and beyond. According to the Downstream Strategies executive summary,

"For each scenario, the local economic benefits are quantified based on increased jobs, earnings, and economic output. In addition to these economic benefits, costs due to excess deaths and illnesses from coal production and local environmental problems are quantified and added to earnings to demonstrate how each scenario impacts the citizens of Raleigh County.

Other externalities—including global environmental costs; forestry; tourism; property values; and gathering, hunting, and heritage—are not quantified in this report. However, quantification of these additional externalities would tend to favor the development of a wind farm over mountaintop removal mines."

The wind farm would provide nearly 50 times the tax revenue to the county that a mountaintop removal site would: $1.74 million per year from the wind farm's property tax revenues, compared to $36,000 per year for 17 years from the mountaintop removal operation. And the wind farm would provide at least 277 temporary construction jobs and 39 permanent jobs, while the jobs provided by the Massey surface mine would fluctuate in number from 79 to 248 and continue for only 17 years. The wind farm would also allow underground mining to continue.

The study also illustrated the root of the social and economic problems that have plagued coalfield communities ever since the coal industry moved in: the only beneficiaries of the mountaintop removal option would be Massey Energy and the two private land companies that own over 90 percent of the land and coal, whereas the wind farm would benefit the people—the residents of the entire county.

When the wind farm project organizers presented the study results to the Raleigh County Commission, they brought as visual aids two giant checks: one for $1.74 million per year forever from a wind farm, and one for $36,000 per year for 17 years from a mountaintop removal operation. The commission refused to take a position that would pit another energy source against coal. Commissioner John Aliff said, "To be quite honest, the coal industry has been good for the commission."

In the 2009 West Virginia legislative session, 41 of the state's 100 delegates co-sponsored a resolution in support of the wind project. This included four of the five delegates representing Raleigh County, where the wind farm is proposed. Again, coal lobbyist pressure and coal-friendly legislators ensured that the resolution died in committee.

However, local, national, and international support rose to new levels. As the threat to the mountain increased, community members lobbied for the wind resolution and joined with other national allies like Rainforest Action Network and Citizens Lead for Energy Action Now (CLEAN) in an e-mail campaign to West Virginia's governor, Joe Manchin, the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection (WVDEP), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the White House to halt mountaintop removal and valley fill permits on the mountain. The EPA has responded to the groups' concerns and is currently investigating operations on Coal River Mountain. In February 2009, NASA climate scientist James Hansen posted a short paper entitled "Tell President Obama about Coal River Mountain." He and actress/activist Daryl Hannah spoke at a June 23, 2009, rally for clean energy at the base of the mountain. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., headlined a December 7, 2009, rally where hundreds gathered to defend Coal River Mountain. Coal River Wind put a public service announcement on hulu.com, where it can be seen by millions, and collaborated with Appalachian Voices and Google Earth to create a virtual flyover tour and description of the Coal River Wind project. The virtual flyover was shown to delegates at the 2009 international climate conference in Copenhagen and is part of a series of Google Earth "tours" that illustrate climate change issues and solutions. The series includes only a couple of projects per continent. The online petition presently has over 17,000 signatures.

Citizen activists have also taken action to shut down the blasting where federal and state officials did not. For nine days in January 2010, two activists associated with the Mountain Justice movement and Climate Ground Zero campaign lived on platforms 60 feet high in trees near the blasting area. In spite of continuous air horn harassment, the two remained until voluntarily coming down in advance of an imminent winter storm. Activists engaged in dozens of other acts of nonviolent civil disobedience in 2009 and 2010 in the Coal River Valley, resulting in over 120 arrests. In addition to the tree-sit, seven actions took place on Coal River Mountain, ranging from simple trespass to activists chaining themselves to equipment.

The Next Steps in the Campaign

Surface mining has now begun on a small portion of Coal River Mountain. But there is still a chance to preserve the mountain for wind power. So far, the CRMW campaign's biggest problem has been the intransigence of Massey Energy. If the cloud created by the Upper Big Branch disaster has any silver lining, it is the national scrutiny brought to bear on mine safety and the belated return of government regulation. As we are finding out, loopholes in mining regulations and lax enforcement allowed Massey Energy to avoid strengthened oversight and inspection, which could have prevented that tragedy.

But federal regulators in the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA), and our elected politicians in Congress and the White House, allowed those loopholes to remain. For example, MSHA regulators ordered Massey to withdraw miners 61 times since the beginning of 2009. In 2009, more than 10 percent of MSHA's enforcement actions at this mine were for "unwarrantable failure" to comply with safety regulations—five times the national average of about 2 percent. In its preliminary briefing to President Obama, MSHA said, "In what is perhaps the most troubling statistic, in 2009, MSHA issued 48 withdrawal orders at the Upper Big Branch Mine for repeated significant and substantial violations that the mine operator either knew, or should have known, constituted a hazard. Massey failed to address these violations over and over again until a federal mine inspector ordered it done. The mine's rate for these kinds of violations is nearly 19 times the national rate." Massey CEO Don Blankenship tried to downplay the severity of the violations, saying that "violations are unfortunately a normal part of the mining process."

A buildup of methane, and possibly coal dust, stands out as a likely cause of the explosion, and the Wall Street Journal reported that the investigation will consider the effects of mountaintop removal blasting above the mine, which may have affected seals. Politicians such as Senator Robert C. Byrd have weighed in, and New York State Comptroller Thomas DiNapoli has called for Blankenship to resign.

In 2008, Massey Energy sought and received permission from the WVDEP to revise a permit on Coal River Mountain. The revision allows coal extraction on a small portion of the mountain without the need for a valley fill. However, the WVDEP did not consider the revision significant enough to allow public comment or a public hearing, and ignored the revision's effects on the remainder of the permit.

On April 1, 2010, the EPA delivered the best news yet for the campaign, issuing strict guidance for limiting water pollution from valley fills. The guidance focused on conductivity, a measure of dissolved pollutants in the water. The limit is so strict that EPA Secretary Lisa Jackson said, "You're talking about no, or very few, valley fills that are going to meet standards like this…. The intent here is to tell people what the science is telling us, which is it would be untrue to say that you can have numbers of valley fills, anything more than, say, very minimal valley fills, and not expect to see irreversible damage to stream health."

In addition to the impacts on stream chemistry, the guidelines consider environmental justice impacts to human communities. While they are still open for public comment, including comment from pro-coal politicians, and have not been finalized, the guidelines took effect immediately and apply to new permits and renewal permits. Along with the new guidelines, the EPA provided scientific documentation of the impacts mountaintop removal has on stream health, echoing a January 2010 study published in the journal Science by several renowned scientists that calls for a ban on mountaintop removal.

This news greatly improves the odds for Coal River Mountain's survival. Massey's original proposed permits included at least 18 valley fills that would fill a total of nine miles of headwater streams with mining waste laden with toxic heavy metals. If Massey were prohibited from filling the valleys, the scale of surface mining would be drastically reduced, preserving most of the mountain for a wind farm. The new requirements could lead Massey and the land companies to renegotiate their contracts, preserving the surface for a profitable wind farm while still allowing underground mining.

While citizens find encouragement in the EPA's new guidance, they also recognize the fact that mountaintop removal is still allowed and that a new administration could rescind this guidance. To make curtailment of mountaintop removal last, CRMW and other citizen groups are still pushing the Clean Water Protection Act (CWPA) in the U.S. House of Representatives and the Appalachia Restoration Act (ARA) in the Senate, which would curtail mountaintop removal.. The CWPA presently has 170 cosponsors and the ARA has 11. This progress is largely due to citizen lobby days sponsored by the Alliance for Appalachia, a 13-group regional coalition of which Coal River Mountain Watch is a core member. The Alliance conducts an annual lobby week, providing training and congressional meetings for approximately 200 citizens, and several mini-lobby events throughout the year. The Alliance also arranges meetings with government agencies, such as the EPA and the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.

Appalachian Transition

We still need your help to ensure that the changes taking place through EPA regulation stick. Anyone can take action and sign our petition at [www.coalriverwind.org](http://www.coalriverwind.org). Citizens all over the country can ask the EPA to deny any valley fill permits on Coal River Mountain that may be submitted, and everyone can contact their U.S. representatives and senators and ask them to support the Clean Water Protection Act and the Appalachia Restoration Act.

Coalfield communities need options for employment and livelihood beyond coal. The focus should be on giving them a choice and providing measures and incentives to support the development of those choices. It is time to turn our eyes toward Appalachia as an engine of transition and a model of sustainability, rather than a source of sorrow. If that means that the rest of the country has to pay a higher price for electricity due to a strengthening of oversight and enforcement of coal mine regulations, and if it means having more of our tax dollars go toward supporting economic transition in the coalfields, then for the sake of the miners and the future of Central Appalachian communities, that is a price we should be willing and honored to pay.

Eventually, more likely sooner than the rosy estimates of the coal industry, the coal is going to run out. According to the federal Energy Information Administration, coal production in Central Appalachia is expected to decline by nearly half within the next 10 years due to the depletion of the most accessible, lowest-cost coal seams. Another report by Downstream Strategies, titled "The Decline of Central Appalachian Coal and the Need for Economic Diversification," notes that "should substantial declines occur as projected, coal‐producing counties will face significant losses in employment and tax revenue, and state governments will collect fewer taxes from the coal industry." Without a strong focus on supporting economic transition in Central Appalachia, local economies will rapidly decline along with coal production.

Because of this, the report suggests that "state policymakers across the Central Appalachian region should…take the necessary steps to ensure that new jobs and sources of revenue will be available in the counties likely to experience the greatest impact from the decline. While there are numerous options available, the development of the region's renewable energy resources and a strong focus on energy efficiency offer immediate and significant opportunities to begin diversifying the economy."

The decisions we make now in the region will determine whether we make the best use of those renewable resources or squander the opportunity, whether we provide for long-term sustainability for communities or ravage them, and whether we preserve a planet that can support our civilization or plummet headlong into climate catastrophe. Coal River Mountain still stands as a majestic, tangible symbol of these clear choices, but it requires the decision of more citizens to make that phone call, write that letter, make that donation, and turn off that light in order to remain standing.

#### Appalachia is key to a global transition

**Flaccavento 10** - Founder of Appalachian Sustainable Development (ASD) and SCxALE, Inc [[Anthony Flaccavento](http://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/user/4896), “The Transition of Appalachia,” Solutions Journal, Volume 1 | Issue 4 | Page 34-44 | Aug 2010, pg. http://tinyurl.com/39kwh4h

Thirdly, the approach of the “environmental movement”, while helping to mitigate some of the worst abuses, has created its own form of estrangement: preservation rather than sustainable livelihoods. Largely urban and suburban environmentalists have focused on protection of the ecosystem from human degradation, often alienating farmers, loggers, fisherman and rural communities for whom “the environment” represents their livelihood, or a substantial part of it. As Wendell Berry has pointed out, this focus on protecting parts of the environment from people instead of developing the means to live within the ecosystem stems from the same hyper-specialized mindset that created many ecological and social problems in the first place.

Fortunately there is a different culture and mindset emerging in Appalachia and the nation, one that seeks to restore connections between farm and table, rural and urban; that recognizes that consumption choices have consequences for which we must begin to take responsibility; that “responsible consumption”, though essential, is inadequate without civic and political engagement; and that diverse, relatively self-reliant regional economies will do much less harm to other places and other people while making our own communities more just, resilient, perhaps even more satisfying in the years ahead.

Appalachia can and must play a pivotal role in this global economic and social transformation, both for the sake of its own people and because of its critical national role in energy and environmental choices. If a region known primarily for coal mining, tobacco farming and clear cut logging can come to exemplify sustainable development, it will be difficult to ignore.

#### Global collapse and extinction coming – We must establish a model for sustainability.

**Gowdy 07** - Professor of Economics @ Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute [John Gowdy, “Avoiding Self-Organized Extinction: Toward a Co-Evolutionary Economics of Sustainability,” Red Orbit, April 26, 2007, pg. http://tinyurl.com/apnknbt

A current line of research addressing the question of sustainability is analyzing in detail the history of entire cultures. The study of whole societies is, of course, a long- established tradition in anthropology. Especially influential today in cultural resource-institutional evolution is the pioneering work of Leslie White (1949) and Julian Steward (1955). Archaeological data and historical documents can provide the centuries-long time scales needed to examine the conditions for sustainability or collapse. Particularly revealing are studies of the long-term consequences of substituting technology for increasing resource scarcity (Erickson and Gowdy 2000; Tainter 1988). A striking fact is the sheer number of post-hunter-gatherer cultures that followed the pattern of overshoot and collapse. These include all the major Mesopotamian civilizations, the Mayans, the Anasazi of the US southwest, and the Indus valley. They all experienced a period of rapid resource use, rapid population growth then a relatively sudden economic, social and biological collapse (Diamond 2005).

Many cultures exploited their environments to a point at which they were so vulnerable they were unable to maintain the cultures they had so painstakingly established (Tainter 2000). Probably the best-known example is Easter Island. Over the course of about 500 years Polynesian settlers so eroded the resource base that the peak population of about 10,000 people was reduced to a few hundred living in a state of con\stant warfare and deprivation (Bahn and Flenley 1992; Erickson and Gowdy 2000; van Tilberg 1994). The burning question in the Easter Island case is why the population could not correctly assess their situation and change their socially destructive behaviour. It is a very small island – from the highest vantage point it is possible to see the whole island – and the destruction caused by deforestation should have been obvious. A similar pattern of overshoot and collapse also occurred on the islands of Mangaia (Kirch et al. 1992), Mangareva, Pitcairn and Henderson (Diamond 1997).

Some past societies, like Easter Island, have moved rapidly along the overshoot-and-collapse curve. Others took much longer to make the transition from a stable state to instability and collapse. But some post-hunter-gatherer societies managed to avoid the trap altogether. One society that apparently escaped the fate of so many others is the South Pacific island culture of Tikopia. Archaeological data indicate that Tikopia was headed down and had rapid population growth – but somehow managed to achieve a stable existence. Archaeological and ethnographic evidence indicates that the South Pacific Island of Tikopia is one of only a few cases of a successful transition from nonsustainability to sustainability (Erickson and Gowdy 2000). The island was settled about 3,000 BP and the first inhabitants quickly transformed the landscape through forest clearing and slash and burn agriculture. Many species of native birds were hunted to extinction and it appeared that the island was headed down the same overshoot and collapse path as in Easter Island. But somehow the people of Tikopia were apparently able to assess the precarious situation they were in and take corrective measures to prevent collapse. Sometime around AD 1700 archaeological evidence shows that pigs and dogs were eliminated from the island (Kirch and Yen 1982:353). Slash and burn agriculture was replaced with a ‘complex system of fruit and nut trees forming an upper canopy, with aroids, yams, and other shade tolerant crops under these.’ Some varieties of fish that once formed a significant portion of the diet were no longer eaten and from the ethnographic record considered tapu. The Tikopians also adopted a variety of customs to insure sustainable resource use and zero population growth (Firth 1967).

Something fairly unique about Tikopia allowed this culture to overcome institutional sunk costs and move to a sustainable way of living. This had something to do with the interaction between the characteristics of the resource base and the selection mechanisms for institutional change and institutional lock-in. The critical question then, in addressing the environmental and social stability of human cultures, is how disparate patterns of individual behaviour are selected and propagated by specific cultures. Rewards and punishments are used in human cultures to pass on traits that may be culturally desirable in the short run but may be disastrous in the end. In the cases of social collapse, sustainable patterns of behaviour are filtered out by cultural selection mechanisms and unsustainable patterns are reinforced. Understanding how this process works is critical to formulating effective sustainable social and environmental policies.

THE SUSTAINABttITY OF GLOBAL CAPITALISM: A CAUTIOUSLY PESSIMISTIC VIEW

The word collapse is widely used to describe the fall of past civilizations (Diamond 2005; Tainter 1988) but the demise of most of these societies was not sudden or final. Remnant populations survived and they were usually able to migrate to other areas, sometimes without a dramatic decline in material well-being. But past societies collapsed local ecosystems and now humans are in danger collapsing global systems. Still it would be foolish to predict the imminent collapse of global capitalism. Such predictions have been made many times before and yet the system rolls on apparently unaffected by any of the potential calamities listed above. Yet if we ask not ‘when’ but ‘whether’ the current world system will collapse, the answer would seem to be a clear ‘yes.’ That answer comes not only from an examination of the current consensus on twenty-first century scenarios on climate change, fossil fuel exhaustion and the diffusion of Weapons of Mass Destruction technology, but also on a growing body of research on past societies that have exhibited the same general pattern as our own.

So what can be done, if anything, to make the radical changes needed to avoid social collapse? Are current suggestions for sustainability policies feasible? The answer has to be a cautious ‘no’. But there is a glimmer of hope if the neo-liberal worldview driving public policy catches up with contemporary economic theory.

Sustainability and incremental policies – A well established theory in economics is the theory of the second best (Lipsey and Lancaster 1956). Basically this theorem states that if the conditions for efficiency are violated in several markets, correcting the conditions in one market alone will likely move the economy further away from an efficient solution. Applied to sustainability it means that changing one thing alone will not move us closer to sustainability and may move us further away. For example, greatly improving energy efficiency would have the effect of reducing demand and lowering energy prices, so that more energy would be used (this is the rebound or Jevons effect).

Sustainable consumption – It is argued above that, because of demonstration effects and habituation, higher incomes do not make people happier. However, just because economic growth does not make us happier this does not mean that stopping growth will not affect our happiness. Many of us have become habituated to a steady stream of new products. Like any addiction we need more and more of the fix just to keep us in the same place. Moving to no-growth or steady state economy requires policies to address the psychological dependence on consumption being fostered by the global marketplace. A first step would be to strictly control advertising designed to foster a culture of consumption.

Sustainability and the illusion of the steady state- In the current context of globalization and economic ‘rationalization’, for one country to slow or stop economic growth would amount to unilateral disarmament. When economic growth slows, so does capital formation, meaning that a nongrowing country’s capital stock would quickly become outdated and non-competitive. Neither should the link between military power and economic growth be ignored. The world is now a single socio-economic system and as long as nations compete with each other for markets and military power it may not be desirable for one country or even one large region to move to a steady state economy. Added to this is the growth imperative of empires, including contemporary Western capitalism. When past empires ceased to grow, a variety of related destructive forces came into play.

Do cultures have free will? A dominant pattern of cultural evolution since the advent of agriculture is overshoot and collapse. Cultures seem to become locked into patterns of behaviour that were successful in early stages of development but dysfunctional in later stages. Over time cultures build up a complex superstructure of material capital, learned patterns of behaviour, and ethical systems. ‘Sunk costs’ include not only capital and technology but also social systems of beliefs justifying the established way of doing things. These social systems reinforce the power elites that invariably control complex societies. Those who have the most to lose by dramatic changes have the power to reward those who accept the status quo and punish those who do not.

Those few cultures, such as Tikopia, that were able to change course did so because they were apparently able to modify behavioural incentives to reward sustainable behaviour. Two kinds of societies that were able to do this are egalitarian societies with small populations that worked by bottom up consensus and top-down hierarchical societies like Tokugawa, Japan that could impose sustainability by decree (Diamond 2005). Neither of these models is feasible in today’s global market economy of competing nations.

These concluding comments may seem pessimistic but the history of the collapse of past societies – and the mounting evidence of our own unsustainability-strongly suggests that piecemeal change will not be enough. It is better to face the future realistically from where we are rather than to pretend that limited measures within a businesses-usual framework will get us through the population and resource bottleneck of the current century.

#### A recent study by 22 scientists concurs. It improves on previous models and concludes that we are causing rapid and irreversible critical transitions

**Barnosky et al 12** - Professor of Integrative Biology @ UC Berkeley [Dr. Anthony D. Barnosky (Professor of Paleontology @ UC Berkeley), Dr. Elizabeth A. Hadly (Professor of Biology @ Stanford University, Jordi Bascompte (Integrative Ecology Group @ Estación Biológica de Doñana) Eric L. Berlow (TRU NORTH Labs), James H. Brown (Professor of Biology @ The University of New Mexico), Mikael Fortelius (Professor of Geosciences and Geography @ University of Helsinki), Wayne M. Getz (Professor of Environmental Science@ UC Berkeley), John Harte (Professor of Environmental Science@ UC Berkeley) Alan Hastings (Professor of Environmental Science@ UC Davis) Pablo A. Marquet (Departamento de Ecología, Facultad de Ciencias Biológicas, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile) Neo D. Martinez (Pacific Ecoinformatics and Computational Ecology Lab) Arne Mooers (Professor of Biological Sciences @ Simon Fraser University, Peter Roopnarine (California Academy of Sciences), Geerat Vermeij (Professor of Geology @ UC Davis) John W. Williams (Professor of Geography @ University of Wisconsin), Rosemary Gillespie (Professor of Environmental Science@ UC Berkeley) Justin Kitzes (Professor of Environmental Science@ UC Berkeley), Charles Marshall (Department of Integrative Biology, UC Berkeley), Nicholas Matzke(Department of Integrative Biology, UC Berkeley), David P. Mindell (Department of Biophysics and Biochemistry @ UC San Francisco), Eloy Revilla (Department of Conservation Biology, Estación Biológica de Doñana) & Adam B. Smith (Center for Conservation and Sustainable Development, Missouri Botanical Garden) “Approaching a state shift in Earth’s biosphere,” Nature 486, (07 June 2012) pg. 52–58

Humans now dominate Earth, changing it in ways that threaten its ability to sustain us and other species[1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref1), [2](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref2), [3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3). This realization has led to a growing interest in forecasting biological responses on all scales from local to global[4](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref4), [5](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref5), [6](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref6), [7](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref7).

However, most biological forecasting now depends on projecting recent trends into the future assuming various environmental pressures[5](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref5), or on using species distribution models to predict how climatic changes may alter presently observed geographic ranges[8](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref8), [9](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref9). Present work recognizes that relying solely on such approaches will be insufficient to characterize fully the range of likely biological changes in the future, especially because complex interactions, feedbacks and their hard-to-predict effects are not taken into account[6](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref6), [8](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref8), [9](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref9), [10](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref10), [11](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref11).

Particularly important are recent demonstrations that ‘critical transitions’ caused by threshold effects are likely[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12). Critical transitions lead to state shifts, which abruptly override trends and produce unanticipated biotic effects. Although most previous work on threshold-induced state shifts has been theoretical or concerned with critical transitions in localized ecological systems over short time spans[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [13](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref13), [14](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref14), planetary-scale critical transitions that operate over centuries or millennia have also been postulated[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), [12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [15](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref15), [16](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref16), [17](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref17), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18). Here we summarize evidence that such planetary-scale critical transitions have occurred previously in the biosphere, albeit rarely, and that humans are now forcing another such transition, with the potential to transform Earth rapidly and irreversibly into a state unknown in human experience.

Two conclusions emerge. First, to minimize biological surprises that would adversely impact humanity, it is essential to improve biological forecasting by anticipating critical transitions that can emerge on a planetary scale and understanding how such global forcings cause local changes. Second, as was also concluded in previous work, to prevent a global-scale state shift, or at least to guide it as best we can, it will be necessary to address the root causes of human-driven global change and to improve our management of biodiversity and ecosystem services[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), [15](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref15), [16](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref16), [17](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref17), [19](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref19).

It is now well documented that biological systems on many scales can shift rapidly from an existing state to a radically different state[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12). Biological ‘states’ are neither steady nor in equilibrium; rather, they are characterized by a defined range of deviations from a mean condition over a prescribed period of time. The shift from one state to another can be caused by either a ‘threshold’ or ‘sledgehammer’ effect. State shifts resulting from threshold effects can be difficult to anticipate, because the critical threshold is reached as incremental changes accumulate and the threshold value generally is not known in advance. By contrast, a state shift caused by a sledgehammer effect—for example the clearing of a forest using a bulldozer—comes as no surprise. In both cases, the state shift is relatively abrupt and leads to new mean conditions outside the range of fluctuation evident in the previous state.

Threshold-induced state shifts, or critical transitions, can result from ‘fold bifurcations’ and can show hysteresis[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12). The net effect is that once a critical transition occurs, it is extremely difficult or even impossible for the system to return to its previous state. Critical transitions can also result from more complex bifurcations, which have a different character from fold bifurcations but which also lead to irreversible changes[20](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref20).

Recent theoretical work suggests that state shifts due to fold bifurcations are probably preceded by general phenomena that can be characterized mathematically: a deceleration in recovery from perturbations (‘critical slowing down’), an increase in variance in the pattern of within-state fluctuations, an increase in autocorrelation between fluctuations, an increase in asymmetry of fluctuations and rapid back-and-forth shifts (‘flickering’) between states[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [14](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref14), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18). These phenomena can theoretically be assessed within any temporally and spatially bounded system. Although such assessment is not yet straightforward[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18), [20](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref20), critical transitions and in some cases their warning signs have become evident in diverse biological investigations[21](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref21), for example in assessing the dynamics of disease outbreaks[22](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref22), [23](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref23), populations[14](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref14) and lake ecosystems[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [13](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref13). Impending state shifts can also sometimes be determined by parameterizing relatively simple models[20](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref20), [21](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref21).

In the context of forecasting biological change, the realization that critical transitions and state shifts can occur on the global scale[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), [12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [15](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref15), [16](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref16), [17](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref17), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18), as well as on smaller scales, is of great importance. One key question is how to recognize a global-scale state shift. Another is whether global-scale state shifts are the cumulative result of many smaller-scale events that originate in local systems or instead require global-level forcings that emerge on the planetary scale and then percolate downwards to cause changes in local systems. Examining past global-scale state shifts provides useful insights into both of these issues.

Earth’s biosphere has undergone state shifts in the past, over various (usually very long) timescales, and therefore can do so in the future ([Box 1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#bx1)). One of the fastest planetary state shifts, and the most recent, was the transition from the last glacial into the present interglacial condition[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18), which occurred over millennia[24](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref24). Glacial conditions had prevailed for ~100,000 yr. Then, within ~3,300 yr, punctuated by episodes of abrupt, decadal-scale climatic oscillations, full interglacial conditions were attained. Most of the biotic change—which included extinctions, altered diversity patterns and new community compositions—occurred within a period of 1,600 yr beginning ~12,900 yr ago. The ensuing interglacial state that we live in now has prevailed for the past ~11,000 yr.

Occurring on longer timescales are events such as at least four of the ‘Big Five’ mass extinctions[25](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref25), each of which represents a critical transition that spanned several tens of thousands to 2,000,000 yr and changed the course of life’s evolution with respect to what had been normal for the previous tens of millions of years. Planetary state shifts can also substantially increase biodiversity, as occurred for example at the ‘Cambrian explosion’[26](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref26), but such transitions require tens of millions of years, timescales that are not meaningful for forecasting biological changes that may occur over the next few human generations ([Box 1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#bx1)).

Despite their different timescales, past critical transitions occur very quickly relative to their bracketing states: for the examples discussed here, the transitions took less than ~5% of the time the previous state had lasted ([Box 1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#bx1)). The biotic hallmark for each state change was, during the critical transition, pronounced change in global, regional and local assemblages of species. Previously dominant species diminished or went extinct, new consumers became important both locally and globally, formerly rare organisms proliferated, food webs were modified, geographic ranges reconfigured and resulted in new biological communities, and evolution was initiated in new directions. For example, at the Cambrian explosion large, mobile predators became part of the food chain for the first time. Following the K/T extinction, mammalian herbivores replaced large archosaur herbivores. And at the last glacial–interglacial transition, megafaunal biomass switched from being dominated by many species to being dominated by Homo sapiens and our domesticated species[27](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref27).

All of the global-scale state shifts noted above coincided with global-scale forcings that modified the atmosphere, oceans and climate ([Box 1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#bx1)). These examples suggest that past global-scale state shifts required global-scale forcings, which in turn initiated lower-level state changes that local controls do not override. Thus, critical aspects of biological forecasting are to understand whether present global forcings are of a magnitude sufficient to trigger a global-scale critical transition, and to ascertain the extent of lower-level state changes that these global forcings have already caused or are likely to cause.

Global-scale forcing mechanisms today are human population growth with attendant resource consumption[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), habitat transformation and fragmentation[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), energy production and consumption[28](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref28), [29](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref29), and climate change[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18). All of these far exceed, in both rate and magnitude, the forcings evident at the most recent global-scale state shift, the last glacial–interglacial transition ([Box 1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#bx1)), which is a particularly relevant benchmark for comparison given that the two global-scale forcings at that time—climate change and human population growth[27](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref27), [30](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref30)—are also primary forcings today. During the last glacial–interglacial transition, however, these were probably separate, yet coincidental, forcings. Today conditions are very different because global-scale forcings including (but not limited to) climate change have emerged as a direct result of human activities.

#### Only wind solves – It provides a viable alternative to mountaintop removal and pave the way for sustainable development

**Haegele 08** [Greg Haegele, “An Alternative to Mountaintop Removal Coal Mining in West Virginia,” Tree Hugger, July 18, 2008, pg. http://www.treehugger.com/renewable-energy/an-alternative-to-mountaintop-removal-coal-mining-in-west-virginia.html

Lorelei Scarbro lives in a place most of us would envy - on 10 acres of lush, green southern West Virginia mountain, where deer, turkeys and other wildlife make regular appearances.

Now Scarbro's land is threatened by mountaintop removal coal mining. If you're not familiar with this practice – it is the most destructive kind of coal mining out there. Companies literally blow up the tops of mountains to reach the coal beneath - leaving a barren, rocky landscape. The companies fill nearby valleys and streams with the waste rock - ruining entire watersheds and frequently the water supplies of nearby communities as well. (You can learn more about this type of mining by visiting our [coal website](http://www.sierraclub.org/mtr).)In Scarbro's case, Marfork Coal Company, a subsidiary of Massey Energy, has applied for four permits (two have been approved) to mine 6,600 acres of Coal River Mountain, including land bordering Scarbro's. The permits would also allow for the construction of at least 19 valley fills, which means mining waste would be desposited in nearly every headwater stream originating from the mountain.

Scarbro and a coalition of environmental and community organizations aren't taking this news from Massey lying down. [Coal River Mountain Watch](http://www.crmw.net) (CRMW) and these groups have an alternative they say the state coal association claims coal opponents never have: [The Coal River Wind Project.](http://www.coalriverwind.org)

The Coal River Wind Project is a proposed 440-Megawatt wind farm consisting of 220 wind turbines to be constructed on the land slated to be blown away for coal mining, and the coalition has done extensive studies on the area to show just how viable an alternative this wind farm would be. According to the project's study, the wind farm would:

• Create 440 megawatts of power, enough to power more than 150,000 homes in West Virginia. • Create more than 200 local employment opportunities during the construction phase, and 40-50 permanent operations and maintenance jobs during the life of the wind farm. • Provide Raleigh County and West Virginia with a source of clean, renewable energy, as well as a sustained tax income that could be used for the construction of new schools for the county. • Allow for concurrent uses of the mountain that could revitalize the local economy and bring sustainable economic development for the surrounding communities.

Adding that the jobs would be longer lasting than the proposed mining jobs, Scarbro said, "This is the viable alternative."

For Rory McIlmoil, who works for CRMW with Scarbro, if the mountain must be developed to meet the growing energy needs of the state, then why wouldn't you choose the option that's less destructive, much cleaner, and creates a more viable economy in the long run?

"This is definitely a 'much lesser of two evils' in terms of environmental impact," said McIlmoil. "The strip-mines will lead to the clearing of over 6,000 acres of native hardwood forest, whereas our maximum estimate for the clearing that would be related to the wind farm is 200 acres."

McIlmoil can get even more detailed in the numbers for turbine siting, just ask him. He's also tallied the wildlife impact.

"And when you talk about the birds and the bats, the loss of 6,600 acres of natural habitat is likely to have a much greater impact on populations than the wind farm would, especially considering the fact that a 10,000-plus acre mountaintop removal site (Kayford Mountain) sits to the north of Coal River Mountain and another 8,000-plus acre site sit to the southwest (the Twilight Mining Complex). So Coal River Mountain is basically a habitat buffer zone between two existing mountaintop removal sites."

Scarbro and other Coal River Wind Project supporters have met with officials from just about every city, state and private agency and organization you can imagine to garner support for the plan - and many like the idea. They also have nationwide support from a number of organizations (including the Sierra Club national and local groups).

McIlmoil added the wind farm isn't just an idea - they even have developers highly interested in it.

Now McIlmoil, Scarbro and the coalition want to meet with Massey Energy and the company that owns the Coal River Mountain property to see if this wind farm plan can become a reality.

"We're hoping (the meeting) happens soon so we can sit down and try to work out possibilities here," said Scarbro.

The coalition behind this wind project has covered all the bases - even answering the question about whether post mountaintop removal land can be used for wind turbines: Scarbro said studies show that post-mountaintop removal land is too unstable for turbines, and trying to stabilize the land would make the building costs exceptionally higher. And because the mountain would be significantly lower than before, building turbines makes no sense due to the dramatic loss of wind power potential.

McIlmoil and Scarbro need all the support they can get, so we urge you to [check out their website](http://www.coalriverwind.org) and help them build a wind farm instead of watching yet another Appalachian mountain get blown away.

"This is not just about green jobs, even though we desperately need those,"said Scarbro. "It's not just about renewable energy, even though we desperately need that. This is about saving the mountain and keeping it intact. We want to save vegetation, wildlife, and continue the Appalachian way of life - hunting, fishing, gathering herbs, and more. These are things we can't do if Massey comes in and destroys everything in its path."

#### State-based support for environmental movements is crucial. States have the most power and legitimacy for directing corporate activity and curbing unjust distribution of pollution.

John **BARRY** **AND** Robyn **ECKERSLEY** Poli Sci @ Melbourne **‘5** *Ecological Crisis and the state* p.x-xiii

Against the background of these developments, this book provides a revisionist intervention in the debates about the state and the global ecological crisis. Its primary audience is scholars, students, and activists interested in national and global environmental politics who consider the state to be a lost cause or who are deeply pessimistic about the prospects for state-based governance systems to redress the global ecological crisis. This current of pessimism has been particularly strong in ecoanarchist, bioregional, antiglobalization, and ecorealist literatures and movements, and it is also an implicit premise in the burgeoning new field of global political ecology. While we accept that there are many good reasons to be pessimistic about the ecological potential of states, our concern is that such pessimism too often becomes an excuse for political resignation to the idea of a weakened and ineffectual state, and to the idea that ecological degradation is inevitable. The animating idea of this book is to question this political resignation, to highlight the uneven and deeply contested role and character of the state in orchestrating and responding to economic and environmental pressures, and to explore some of the more hopeful signs and opportunities for ecological progress on the part of states at both the domestic and transnational levels. Our ultimate concerns are to discover to what extent it might be possible to "reinstate the state" as a facilitator of progressive environmental change rather than environmental destruction, to redress what we believe is a somewhat lopsided and unduly negative critique of the state by many radical political ecologists and radical environmental activists, and to develop a more nuanced and even-handed understanding of the ecological and democratic potential of states. However, questions concerning whether a nondominating state is feasible and conceivable, and the general legitimacy and future potential of the state, are also of major concern to political theorists and those concerned with progressive politics generally. Our scholarly intervention, then, is essentially a strategic one: to highlight and interrogate the multiple and sometimes fragmented dimensions of the state, both domestically and internationally, and to pinpoint where possible some promising sites of engagement and renewal. The contributors to this volume all proceed from a critical perspective and, despite their differences, are united in their effort to develop constructive insights for institutional and environmental policy reform, based on a critical assessment of the capacity and democratic potential of states as both individual governance structures and units in a broader structure of regional and international multilateral governance. Given our strategic concern to draw out the positive possibilities of the greening of the state in a global context, we deliberately avoided imposing a tight analytical template on the contributors. Restricting the focus to, say, the juridical/constitutional state, or to the economy and the state or the state system, or to the state's administrative or security apparatus would have foreclosed possible avenues of constructive inquiry by our contributors and defeated our purpose. Thus our collection is illustrative rather than exhaustive of the potential for state-based ecological renewal. We also wanted the volume to reflect a diversity of (broadly critical and constructive) understandings of the state that extend to scholarship in the fields of domestic policy, comparative politics, political economy (including international political economy), international relations, development studies, and political theory. Our purpose is not to discount other potential avenues of ecological reform beyond the state, such as grassroots community environmental initiatives, the development of green consumerism and green investment, environmental best practice on the part of businesses, or the development of alternative codes of practice on the part of transnational environmental nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). Rather, we are concerned to explore how states might better facilitate these and other initiatives (including hybrid state-nonstate initiatives) as part of a more concerted effort to orchestrate local and global ecological sustainability. So, while our primary focus of attention is the state, we also explore what might be called synergistic connections between state and nonstate actors, and how they might be promoted by states acting both individually and collectively. We do not want to be starry-eyed about the green potential of the modern state, and we acknowledge the significant political and structural barriers to its realization. But it would be a great pity if environmental activists and NGOs were to turn their backs on what still remains the primary and most pervasive form of political governance in the world today. Despite the changes wrought by globalization, democratic states still have more steering capacity and legitimacy to regulate the activities of corporations and other social agents along ecologically sustainable lines in more systematic ways than any nonstate alternative. Democratic states therefore emerge as the preeminent (although not necessarily exclusive) institution to assume the role of protecting public environmental goods such as human health, ecosystem integrity, biodiversity, and the global commons. This notion is somewhat reminiscent of the Hegelian notion of the state as the embodiment of public reason and ethics. This is a far cry from the liberal idea of the state as a neutral umpire, the anarchist idea of the state as an inherently oppressive institution, or the orthodox Marxist idea of the state as an instrument of the ruling class. Of course, states themselves are neither unitary entities nor moral subjects. They do not stand above civil society but rather are deeply fragmented entities that are enmeshed with civil society and the economy. And notions of public environmental goods remain deeply contested. It is therefore helpful to think of the state, nationally, as a "container of social processes," providing a set of a set of facilities "through which society can exercise some leverage upon itself. "1 Internationally, states act as the most significant nodes in a complex network of governance that depends on the legal systems of states. This book explores to what extent the ecological potential of states has been realized, how it might be realized, and what political and institutional changes might be necessary to move closer toward this green democratic regulatory ideal. Most books on the role of the state in environmental management and governance have focused on domestic policy or on regional/global policy and international regimes. This book offers a dual focus in order to direct attention to the kinds of mutually reinforcing ideas and practices that might produce (or impede) environmentally responsible practices in general. With these considerations in mind, we bring together domestically focused work in green political theory, environmental policy, and comparative politics with environmentally focused scholarship in international relations, international political economy, and regionalization to explore the existing and potential role of the state in securing environ- mental protection. Given the highly contested and culturally specific character of environmental values and goals, we have not sought to pin down the meanings of environmentally responsible, green, or ecological state in advance of the discussion. Rather, we have left this to the contributors to explore in the context of their own case studies and conceptual analyses.

### Adv – Politics

#### Advantage two: progressivism

#### Coal is politically locked in – it causes right-wing dominance of Appalachia

Wilson, 1/13/13 – Reid Wilson, political reporter, editor in chief of National Journal Hotline [“The Shift Of King Coal”. National Journal. http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/on-the-trail/the-shift-of-king-coal-20130114]

That's because in Appalachia, coal is still king.

Last June, Senate observers were surprised when Rockefeller, a long-time backer of his state's dominant industry, stood on the Senate floor lambasting energy companies for launching "carefully orchestrated messages that strike fear into the hearts of West Virginians." He attacked coal operators for denying the need to address climate change, and for resisting a lower-carbon environment.

Those familiar with Appalachian politics were surprised too -- that Rockefeller, by attacking King Coal, had effectively announced his retirement that day.

The shift away from the Democratic Party underway today isn't the first time Appalachia has changed its political identity. After the Civil War, coal country was reliably Republican. During the war, West Virginia itself seceded from the Commonwealth of Virginia to stay with the Republican Union. Between 1896 and 1928, West Virginia voted as Republican as Northeastern states; it voted Democratic only once, in 1912.

But the Coal Wars of the 1920s helped boost a mine workers' union that grew in size and political influence. And while the union dominated, it supplied a reliable stream of votes to the Democratic Party. Between 1932 and 1996, Republicans won West Virginia only in 1956, 1972 and 1984, all amid national waves. Kentucky, where the coal industry is equally powerful, was similarly a reliably Democratic state; it voted Republican only twice between 1900 and 1952, and it cast its electoral votes for Jimmy Carter in 1976 and Bill Clinton in both 1992 and 1996.

"Appalachia, particularly Kentucky, East Tennessee and Pennsylvania, were very Republican after the Civil War and remained that way for a very long time," said Mike Duncan, the former chairman of the Republican National Committee and a native of Kentucky coal country. "The mining wars and unionization flipped them hard Democrat in the 1930s."

Clinton was the last Democrat to win either state. During his administration, the environmental movement began to gain traction and importance within the Democratic Party, and the party itself gravitated more toward the liberal coasts than it had previously. And the Environmental Protection Agency, a bureau created by a Republican president, began asserting its will more broadly, issuing regulations that the coal industry opposed. That combination of factors, Republicans and Democrats alike agree, conspired to give the impression of a Democratic Party that no longer had Appalachia's interests at heart.

"When you attack guns and coal, you're attacking what they in the mountains consider their birthright," said Jim Cauley, a Democratic strategist and Kentucky native who managed President Obama's campaign for U.S. Senate in 2004. "They'll feel like you're attacking their culture."

The evidence of old Appalachia is still present: 56 percent of Kentucky voters are registered Democrats; 54 percent of West Virginia voters are Democrats. But the evidence of new Appalachia is presenting itself in every subsequent election: In 2010, Republicans won two of the state's three Congressional seats, the first time they claimed a majority since the Reagan wave of 1980. In 2012, an otherwise good year for Democrats, Republican Andy Barr defeated Democratic Rep. Ben Chandler in a Lexington-based district in Kentucky, and West Virginia's Democratic attorney general lost his re-election bid.

That same year, President Obama won just 30 of the 421 counties that belong to the Appalachian Regional Commission, according to a National Journal analysis of election results. Just one of those 30 counties, Elliott, was in Kentucky; Obama lost every county in West Virginia. He only came within ten points of Republican nominee Mitt Romney in three of the state's 55 counties.

"The Democratic Party has lost touch with the working class Appalachian person," Duncan said. Those voters, he added, were the foundation of what Richard Nixon called the Silent Majority.

Democrats still have a presence in Appalachia. The governors of Kentucky and West Virginia are both Democrats, and Democrats control three of the two states' four legislative chambers (Republicans won control of the Kentucky state Senate in 2000). But the region's conservatism means an Appalachian Democrat is much different from a Democrat from another part of the country; as he sought re-election in 2012, Sen. Joe Manchin ran an advertisement in which he literally shot Democratic-backed cap and trade legislation with a rifle.

Rockefeller's retirement opens another opportunity for Republicans to grow their burgeoning Appalachian stronghold. Rep. Shelley Moore Capito, the daughter of the governor whose three terms bookended Rockefeller's in the 1970s and 1980s, announced she would run for the seat even before Rockefeller dropped out.

The arc of history changes some things and leaves others strangely intact. Appalachia has moved from Republican to Democratic to Republican again over the course of post-Civil War America, because even in the era of trans-Canadian pipelines, oil fracking and renewable energies, King Coal still reigns supreme.

#### Wind incentives will short-circuit the conservative rebellion against Obama and empower progressives

**Elk 09** - Union organizer and labor journalist who writes for Harper's Magazine, the American Prospect, the Huffington Post and In These Times. He has appeared as a comme­ntator on CNN, Fox News, and NPR. [[Mike Elk](http://www.ourfuture.org/users/new-4013), “Stop The Teabaggers, Give Them Green Jobs: Lessons From the Coalfields of West Virginia,” Campaign for America’s Future, August 27, 2009 - 4:40pm ET, pg. http://tinyurl.com/mq62jx

West Virginia shows us how we could easily win over this key segment of society, working class whites, with a New Deal-style industrial policy. Currently, [81,000](http://www.ourfuture.org/blog-entry/2009083525/a%20href=) in the United States working as coal miners.

On election night 2000, the biggest shocker for me wasn't Florida, but that West Virginia had voted for a conservative Republican presidential candidate for the first time in nearly 70 years.

For decades, West Virginia, with one of the highest rates of unionization in the country, regularly voted for progressive candidates, even being one of only nine other states in 1988 to vote for the epitome of a Massachusetts liberal - Michael Dukakis. To know the story of West Virginia is to know why the progressive movement is failing to win over white working class voters. Because of their primary concern: jobs.

Driving around West Virginia as a young union organizer with Marshall University labor historian Gordon Simmons, I quickly learned that underneath its beautiful mountain lay a history of exploitation, broken promises and economic degradation. Despite being "the Saudi Arabia of Coal," West Virginia is engaged in a yearly neck and neck race with Mississippi for being [the poorest state in the country](http://money.cnn.com/2007/08/28/real_estate/wealthiest_state).

As a result of coal mining, West Virginia has a cancer rate that is [nearly 70% higher than the national average](http://www.grist.org/article/green-theatre-taking-off-broadway-off-coal/). Every day more than [three million pounds of ammonium nitrate explosives (a highly carcinogenic substance)](http://itsgettinghotinhere.org/2009/02/23/from-west-virginia-to-obama-stop-mountaintop-removal) are exploded in mountaintop removal. This is the equivalent of a Hiroshima bomb worth of explosives being dropped on West Virginia every month. Over [100 billion gallons of toxic sludge](http://news.newamericamedia.org/news/view_article.html?article_id=1bbe4b5f450365c1084c27172d95db6d) are contained in poorly regulated, coal sludge reservoirs from mountaintop mining contaminating local water supplies, leading to mind boggling rates of cancer.

A fact that is equally startling as the destruction of the mountains, is the destruction of jobs in West Virginia. Coal mining jobs have gone [down by 75%](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/daryl-hannah/why-i-was-arrested-in-coa_b_224531.html) with the shift to the highly mechanized, mountaintop removal. In the early 1950’s, there were [145,000 miners employed](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/daryl-hannah/why-i-was-arrested-in-coa_b_224531.html) in West Virginia; in 2004 there were just over [16,000 miners employed](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/daryl-hannah/why-i-was-arrested-in-coa_b_224531.html). While employment has decreased in coal mining, [coal production has actually increased dramatically](http://www.ilovemountains.org/resources/#mtreconomy) as a result of the environmentally destructive procedures of mountaintop removal.

Clearly, West Virginians would prefer jobs that didn't destroy their communities and health, but are forced into coal mining because few other jobs exist. As a result, West Virginians desperately fear losing these jobs. The fossil fuel lobby exploits this fear to kill investments in clean energy jobs. The industry uses events like the upcoming free concert called ["Friends of America"](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dave-cooper/rocker-ted-nugent-to-emce_b_258696.html) hosted by Sean Hannity, which has press materials implicitly attacking clean energy legislation, hysterically warning, [“we must keep these [coal mining] jobs from being regulated out of existence](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dave-cooper/rocker-ted-nugent-to-emce_b_258696.html)”.

These industries always say that regulating them will cost jobs - even when it is proven that jobs will be created. This is because they have created a situation where people are hanging on by a thread, paid so little that they desperately cling to what they have and other people are starving in front of them.

The ability of these AstroTurf groups to mobilize people fearing the loss of their jobs led to the dramatic weakening of the Waxman-Markey climate bill and quite possibly health care. We often make fun of teabaggers showing up at town halls, but fail to realize that the reason they are motivated to rebel against change because all change has ever meant to them is job loss and the destruction of their communities.

West Virginia shows us how we could easily win over these key segments of society with a New Deal-style industrial policy. Racial tensions and prejudices in West Virginia have long been as severe as in other places in the South. However as a result of heavy unionization, West Virginians learned to look beyond race to take on the true oppressors - big corporations. West Virginians also remembered the importance that the New Deal played in transforming their lives. It gave them jobs, electricity, roads, and helped to bring the region into the 20th Century.

As result, West Virginians stuck firmly with FDR’s Democratic Party and voted consistently for Democrats for the following five decades. While the once solid Democratic South became the Republican South after passage of Civil Rights legislation, West Virginia -- despite its strong racial tensions -- remained an island of Democratic support, until 2000.

In the 1990s, the generations that had survived the Great Depression, the New Deal, and World War Two began to die out, and a Democratic president forged the job-killing NAFTA trade deal. Support for Democrats in West Virginia suddenly began to weaken. All the new generation knew was rising unemployment and broken promises at the hand of liberal politicians promising them jobs, but instead taking what jobs they had away.

The failure of the progressive movement to advocate for the improvement of the economic conditions of the white working class created a vacuum that allowed right-wing demagoguery to flourish. West Virginians turned to conservative Republicans who promised to protect their country, their most cherished recreational activity - hunting, and the churches at the center of their communities because no one else seemed to be protecting their communities.

In 2000, Republicans in West Virginia portrayed environmentalist Al Gore, who played a key role in passing NAFTA, as a job-killer who would destroy West Virginia's coal-based economy. Ever since then, West Virginia has voted consistently Republican in presidential elections, while at the same time continuing to elect Democratic Senators and Congressman who promised to protect coal producing jobs and fight to keep manufacturing in West Virginia.

In response to the shifting winds against progressives in West Virginia, local activists have called for New Deal-style projects like the [Coal River Wind Project](http://www.coalriverwind.org/) which seeks to create a sustainable, green economy not based on the boom and bust cycles of coal. Recent studies show that Appalachia will be mined out of coal in [20-30 years](http://www.coalriverwind.org). In contrast the wind energy is sustainable industry that is here to stay and could create far more jobs.

It’s estimated that only a $30 billion investment through Senator Sherrod Brown's IMPACT Act [would create 2.5 million jobs](http://www.ourfuture.org/blog-entry/2009083525/%3Chttp://www.ourfuture.org/blog-entry/2009072808/building-clean-energy-economy-impact-act%3E) - many of them high, paying manufacturing jobs. The IMPACT Act could help replace the nearly [2 million manufacturing jobs that have been lost](http://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.nr0.htm) since the recession began in December 2007.

A New Deal-style industrial policy is crucial as well for winning over the politically elusive, white working class. The New Deal was successful in creating a lasting political coalition because it created lasting political constituencies. As a result of the wide range of people it helped: Social Security for seniors, labor unions for workers, subsidies for small farmers, and jobs for the unemployed, these groups were brought into the Democratic party and stayed there for nearly forty years.

However, a recent poll of non-college educated white males, showed that [only 35% approved of Obama’s performance](http://www.ourfuture.org/blog-entry/2009083525/%3Chttp://politics.theatlantic.com/2009/08/where_obama_is_losing_ground.php%3E) . Some liberal commentators like Ron Brownstein of the Atlantic Magazine claim that [we don't need the white working class](http://www.ourfuture.org/blog-entry/2009083525/%3Chttp://politics.theatlantic.com/2009/08/where_obama_is_losing_ground.php%3E) to build a lasting progressive movement. Some argue that we shouldn't waste our effort to reach out to them because we can build majority built simply based upon minorities, women, college educated professionals, and youth.

To that I simply say is if the progressive movement wants to have a lasting impact we should include everyone as the New Deal coalition did. By advocating for New Deal - style industrial policies we can bring in the white working class as part of our movement, help with efforts at racial healing, and could create a lasting political movement that could last for another forty years. Such tactics were successful in the past in bringing the white working class into the party and will be successful in the future.

If the progressive movement put as much energy into advocating for a New Deal-style industrial policy as they have attacking and debunking the teabaggers, there wouldn't be teabaggers at these town hall meetings.

Yes, New Deal-style industrial policy will bring people into the progressive movement. But the real reason we why we need an industrial policy is similar to the one we had under the New Deal: it was the right thing to do. The New Deal helped people. made their lives better, created the middle class, set up regulations that protected people ,and created the solid foundations for the economic revival and amazing growth that followed.

It's time that we again as a progressive movement, embrace an aggressive New Deal-style industrial policy. It's important to just to our growth as a movement, but to our economic growth, our efforts at racial reconciliation, and our betterment as a nation. These are the lessons that West Virginia has to offer us.

#### A credible counterweight is key – the GOP has become ideologically polarized

**Mann & Ornstein 12** - Chair and a senior fellow in Governance Studies @ [Brookings Institution](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brookings_Institution) & political scientist and resident scholar @ American Enterprise Institute [[Thomas E. Mann](http://www.npr.org/books/authors/151524793/thomas-e-mann) & [Norman J. Ornstein](http://www.npr.org/books/authors/151524801/norman-j-ornstein), It's Even Worse Than It Looks, pg. http://tinyurl.com/8ucplnz

Six years ago, we wrote The Broken Branch, which sharply criticized the Congress for failing to live up to its responsibilities as the first branch of government. Based on four decades of watching Congress, ours was a sympathetic perspective, one that reflected our appreciation of the inherent messiness of the legislative process within the constitutional system. Reconciling diverse interests and beliefs in America's extended republic necessarily involves adversarial debates and difficult negotiations.

But there was no denying the impact of broad changes in America's wider political environment — most importantly the ideological polarization of the political parties — on how Congress went about its work. We documented the demise of regular order, as Congress bent rules to marginalize committees and deny the minority party in the House opportunities to offer amendments on the floor; the decline of genuine deliberation in the lawmaking process on such important matters as budgets and decisions to go to war; the manifestations of extreme partisanship; the culture of corruption; the loss of institutional patriotism among members; and the weakening of the checks-and-balances system.

While we observed some improvement after the Democrats regained control of Congress in the 2006 midterm elections, the most problematic features of the system remained. We thought them unlikely to abate absent a major national crisis that inspired the American public to demand that the warring parties work together. America got the crisis — the most serious economic downturn since the Great Depression — and a pretty clear signal from the voters, who elected Barack Obama by a comfortable margin and gave the Democrats substantial gains in the House and Senate. What the country didn't get was any semblance of a well-functioning democracy. President Obama's postpartisan pitch fell flat, and the Tea Party movement pulled the GOP further to its ideological pole. Republicans greeted the new president with a unified strategy of opposing, obstructing, discrediting, and nullifying every one of his important initiatives. Obama reaped an impressive legislative harvest in his first two years but without any Republican engagement or support and with no apparent appreciation from the public. The anemic economic recovery and the pain of joblessness and underwater home mortgages led not to any signal that the representatives ought to pull together, but rather to yet another call by voters to "throw the bums out." The Democrats' devastating setback in the 2010 midterm elections, in which they lost six Senate seats and sixty-three in the House, produced a Republican majority in the House dominated by right-wing insurgents determined to radically reduce the size and role of government. What followed was an appalling spectacle of hostage taking — most importantly, the debt ceiling crisis — that threatened a government shutdown and public default, led to a downgrading of the country's credit, and blocked constructive action to nurture an economic recovery or deal with looming problems of deficits and debt.

In October 2011, Congress garnered its lowest approval rating (9 percent) in polling history. Public trust in the government's capacity to solve the serious problems facing the country also hit record lows. Almost all Americans felt their country was on the wrong track and were pessimistic about the future. The public viewed both parties negatively, and President Obama's job approval rating was mired in the forties. The widespread consensus was that politics and governance were utterly dysfunctional. In spite of the perilous state of the global economy — and with it the threat of another financial crisis and recession — no one expected the president and Congress to accomplish anything of consequence before the 2012 election.

Paradoxically, the public's undifferentiated disgust with Congress, Washington, and "the government" in general is part of the problem, not the basis of a solution. In never-ending efforts to defeat incumbent officeholders in hard times, the public is perpetuating the source of its discontent, electing a new group of people who are even less inclined to or capable of crafting compromise or solutions to pressing problems. We have been struck by the failure of the media, including editors, reporters, and many "expert" commentators, to capture the real drivers of these disturbing developments, and the futility of efforts by many nonpartisan and bipartisan groups to counter, much less overcome, them. We write this book to try to clarify the source of dysfunctional politics and what it will take to change it. The stakes involved in choosing who will lead us in the White House, the Congress, and the Supreme Court in the years ahead are unusually high, given both the gravity of the problems and the sharper polarization of the parties.

In the pages that follow, we identify two overriding sources of dysfunction. The first is the serious mismatch between the political parties, which have become as vehemently adversarial as parliamentary parties, and a governing system that, unlike a parliamentary democracy, makes it extremely difficult for majorities to act. Parliamentary-style parties in a separation-of-powers government are a formula for willful obstruction and policy irresolution. Sixty years ago, Austin Ranney, an eminent political scientist, wrote a prophetic dissent to a famous report by an American Political Science Association committee entitled "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System." The report, by prominent political scientists frustrated with the role of conservative Southern Democrats in blocking civil rights and other social policy, issued a clarion call for more ideologically coherent, internally unified, and adversarial parties in the fashion of a Westminster-style parliamentary democracy like Britain or Canada. Ranney powerfully argued that such parties would be a disaster within the American constitutional system, given our separation of powers, separately elected institutions, and constraints on majority rule that favor cross-party coalitions and compromise. Time has proven Ranney dead right — we now have the kinds of parties the report desired, and it is disastrous.

The second is the fact that, however awkward it may be for the traditional press and nonpartisan analysts to acknowledge, one of the two major parties, the Republican Party, has become an insurgent outlier — ideologically extreme; contemptuous of the inherited social and economic policy regime; scornful of compromise; unpersuaded by conventional understanding of facts, evidence, and science; and dismissive of the legitimacy of its political opposition. When one party moves this far from the center of American politics, it is extremely difficult to enact policies responsive to the country's most pressing challenges.

Recognizing these two realities and understanding how America got here is key to taking the right steps to overcome dysfunctional politics.

#### The tea party mindset of ideological rigidity has infused Republican politics – its grip has tightened since the election

Kornacki 12/27 (Steve, senior political writer, has been published in several newspapers, including the NYT and WSJ. “Triumph of the Tea Party mindset.” Salon, December 27, 2012. <http://www.salon.com/2012/12/27/triumph_of_the_tea_party_mindset/>.)

Two stories that might seem to contradict each other ran in the New York Times this week. One declared the Tea Party movement “significantly weakened” in the wake of November’s elections and on its way to becoming “just another political faction.” The other noted that Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell might be concerned about a potential 2014 primary challenge – enough to filibuster any fiscal cliff plan that President Obama and Democrats draw up, no matter how modest.

The problem, of course, is that the Tea Party’s power resides in Republican primaries, where conservative purists wreaked considerable havoc in the past two election cycles. This included, famously, McConnell’s home state of Kentucky, where the minority leader’s protégé was crushed in a 2010 GOP Senate primary by Rand Paul. Now McConnell has to worry about suffering a similar fate in two years, especially if his handling of the current fiscal impasse evokes cries of treason from the base. How could this square with claims of fading clout for the Tea Party?

Actually, there’s a way. It just depends on how you understand the Tea Party.

Defined as a literal movement, with an active membership pressing a specific set of demands, the Tea Party absolutely is in decline. Tea Party events have become less crowded, less visible and less relevant to the national political conversation. As the Times story notes, the movement’s die-hards are embracing increasingly niche pet issues. The term “Tea Party” has come to feel very 2010.

But if you think of the Tea Party less as a movement and more as a mindset, it’s as strong and relevant as ever. As I wrote back in ’10, the Tea Party essentially gave a name to a phenomenon we’ve seen before in American politics – fierce, over-the-top resentment of and resistance to Democratic presidents by the right. It happened when Bill Clinton was president, it happened when Lyndon Johnson was president, it happened when John F. Kennedy was president. When a Democrat claims the White House, conservatives invariably convince themselves that he is a dangerous radical intent on destroying the country they know and love and mobilize to thwart him.

The twist in the Obama-era is that some of the conservative backlash has been directed inward. This is because the right needed a way to explain how a far-left anti-American ideologue like Obama could have won 53 percent of the popular vote and 365 electoral votes in 2008. What they settled on was an indictment of George W. Bush’s big government conservatism; the idea, basically, was that Bush had given their movement a bad name with his big spending and massive deficits, angering the masses and rendering them vulnerable to Obama’s deceptive charms. And the problem hadn’t just been Bush – it had been every Republican in office who’d abided his expansion of government, his deals with Democrats, his Wall Street bailout and all the rest.

Thus did the Tea Party movement represent a two-front war – one a conventional one against the Democratic president, and the other a new one against any “impure” Republicans. Besides a far-right ideology, the trait shared by most of the Tea Party candidates who have won high-profile primaries these past few years has been distance from what is perceived as the GOP establishment. Whether they identify with the Tea Party or not, conservative leaders, activists and voters have placed a real premium on ideological rigidity and outsider status; there’s no bigger sin than going to Washington and giving ground, even just an inch, to the Democrats.

It’s hard to look around right now and not conclude that the Republican Party is still largely in the grip of this mindset. Yes, since the election, there have been GOP voices – some of them genuinely surprising – speaking out in favor of giving President Obama the income tax rate hike that he’s looking for. But the January 1 deadline is now just days after and, crucially, there’s been no action. And it’s looking more and more like there won’t be.

This is the case even though Obama apparently indicated that he’d settle for only raising rates on income over $400,000, that he’d dial back his new revenue request by $400 billion, that he’d be OK with not extending the payroll tax holiday, and that he’d sign on a form of chained-CPI for Social Security benefits. Oh, and despite the fact that if nothing happens, all of the Bush tax rates will expire on January 1, with no changes triggered for Social Security or any safety net program. Despite all of this, Republicans in the House still said no to Obama last week, and then wouldn’t even allow Speaker John Boehner to bring a bill to the floor to simply extend the Bush rates for income under $1 million. And McConnell and the Senate GOP still seem unwilling to go any farther than their House counterparts.

This is exactly what the Tea Party mindset produces. For one thing, the House GOP conference (and to a lesser extent, the Senate GOP) contains no shortage of Tea Party true-believers – men and women who embody the spirit of the movement and have no qualms about going to war with party leadership if they believe their principles are at risk. And they are backed by a conservative information complex – media outlets and personalities, commentators, activists and interest group leaders – ready to cast them as heroes in any fight with “the establishment.”

All of this is more than enough to instill real fear in Republicans on Capitol Hill who aren’t true believers – but who do like their jobs and want to keep them. McConnell falls in this category. Boehner evidently does too. And so do many, many other Republicans who don’t want to look back and regret the day they cast a vote that ended their careers. The fact that the Tea Party, as a literal entity, seems to be dying is actually a sign of how successful it’s been. Its spirit now rules the Republican Party.

#### Tea Party influence erodes liberal internationalism, causes protectionism, and risks strikes on Iran

**Mead 11** – Professor of Foreign Affairs and the Humanities @ Bard College [Walter Russell Mead, “The Tea Party and American Foreign Policy: What Populism Means for Globalism,” Foreign Affairs, March/April 2011Volume 9o • Number 2

Any increase in Jacksonian political strength makes a military response to the Iranian nuclear program more likely. Although the public’s reaction to the progress of North Korea’s nuclear program has been relatively mild, recent polls show that up to 64 percent of the U.S. public favors military strikes to end the Iranian nuclear program. Deep public concerns over oil and Israel, combined with memories of the 1979 Iranian hostage crisis among older Americans, put Iran’s nuclear program in Jacksonians’ cross hairs. Polls show that more than 50 percent of the public believes the United States should defend Israel against Iran—even if Israel sets off hostilities by launching the first strike. Many U.S. presidents have been dragged into war reluctantly by aroused public opinion; to the degree that Congress and the public are influenced by Jacksonian ideas, a president who allows Iran to get nuclear weapons without using military action to try to prevent it would face political trouble. (Future presidents should, however, take care. Military engagements undertakenwithout a clear strategy for victory can backfire disastrously. Lyndon Johnson committed himself to war in Southeast Asia because he believed, probably correctly, that Jacksonian fury at a communist victory in Vietnam would undermine his domestic goals. The story did not end well.)

On other issues, Paulites and Palinites are united in their dislike for liberal internationalism —the attempt to conduct international relations through multilateral institutions under an ever-tightening web of international laws and treaties. From climate change to the International Criminal Court to the treatment of enemy combatants captured in unconventional conflicts, both wings of the Tea Party reject liberal internationalist ideas and will continue to do so. The U.S. Senate, in which each state is allotted two senators regardless of the state’s population, heavily favors the less populated states, where Jacksonian sentiment is often strongest. The United States is unlikely to ratify many new treaties written in the spirit of liberal internationalism for some time to come.

The new era in U.S. politics could see foreign policy elites struggling to receive a hearing for their ideas from a skeptical public. “The Council on Foreign Relations,” the pundit Beck said in January 2010, “was a progressive idea of, let’s take media and eggheads and figure out what the idea is, what the solution is, then teach it to the media, and they’ll let the masses know what should be done.” Tea Partiers intend to be vigilant to insure that elites with what the movement calls their “one-world government” ideas and bureaucratic agendas of class privilege do not dominate foreign policy debates. The United States may return to a time when prominent political leaders found it helpful to avoid too public an association with institutions and ideas perceived as distant from, and even hostile to, the interests and values of Jacksonian America.

Concern about China has been growing for some time in American opinion, and the Jacksonian surge makes it more likely that the simmering anger and resentment will come to a boil. Free trade is an issue that has historically divided populists in the United States (agrarians have tended to like it; manufacturing workers have not); even though Jacksonians like to buy cheap goods at Walmart, common sense largely leads them to believe that the first job of trade negotiators ought to be to preserve U.S. jobs rather than embrace visionary “win-win” global schemes. Pg. 42-43

#### Iran war escalates

White, July/August 2011 (Jeffrey—defense fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, What Would War With Iran Look Like, National Interest, p. <http://www.the-american-interest.com/article-bd.cfm?piece=982>)

A U.S.-Iranian war would probably not be fought by the United States and Iran alone. Each would have partners or allies, both willing and not-so-willing. Pre-conflict commitments, longstanding relationships, the course of operations and other factors would place the United States and Iran at the center of more or less structured coalitions of the marginally willing. A Western coalition could consist of the United States and most of its traditional allies (but very likely not Turkey, based on the evolution of Turkish politics) in addition to some Persian Gulf states, Jordan and perhaps Egypt, depending on where its revolution takes it. Much would depend on whether U.S. leaders could persuade others to go along, which would mean convincing them that U.S. forces could shield them from Iranian and Iranian-proxy retaliation, or at least substantially weaken its effects. Coalition warfare would present a number of challenges to the U.S. government. Overall, it would lend legitimacy to the action, but it would also constrict U.S. freedom of action, perhaps by limiting the scope and intensity of military operations. There would thus be tension between the desire for a small coalition of the capable for operational and security purposes and a broader coalition that would include marginally useful allies to maximize legitimacy. The U.S. administration would probably not welcome Israeli participation. But if Israel were directly attacked by Iran or its allies, Washington would find it difficult to keep Israel out—as it did during the 1991 Gulf War. That would complicate the U.S. ability to manage its coalition, although it would not necessarily break it apart. Iranian diplomacy and information operations would seek to exploit Israeli participation to the fullest. Iran would have its own coalition. Hizballah in particular could act at Iran’s behest both by attacking Israel directly and by using its asymmetric and irregular warfare capabilities to expand the conflict and complicate the maintenance of the U.S. coalition. The escalation of the Hizballah-Israel conflict could draw in Syria and Hamas; Hamas in particular could feel compelled to respond to an Iranian request for assistance. Some or all of these satellite actors might choose to leave Iran to its fate, especially if initial U.S. strikes seemed devastating to the point of decisive. But their involvement would spread the conflict to the entire eastern Mediterranean and perhaps beyond, complicating both U.S. military operations and coalition diplomacy.

#### Extinction

Giribets 12 [Miguel Giribets, “If US Attacks Iran, Human Survival May Be at Risk (Part III),” Argen Press, 10 January 2012, pg. http://watchingamerica.com/News/141596/if-us-attacks-iran-human-survival-may-be-at-risk-part-iii/]

The dangers of global war are clear. On one side, hundreds of Russian technicians would die working on Iranian nuclear facilities, to which Russia could not stand idly by. According to Chossudovsky: "Were Iran to be the object of a "pre-emptive" aerial attack by allied forces, the entire region, from the Eastern Mediterranean to China's Western frontier with Afghanistan and Pakistan, would flare up, leading us potentially into a World War III scenario. The war would also extend into Lebanon and Syria. It is highly unlikely that the bombings, if they were to be implemented, would be circumscribed to Iran's nuclear facilities as claimed by US-NATO official statements. What is more probable is an all out air attack on both military and civilian infrastructure, transport systems, factories, public buildings.

"The issue of radioactive fallout and contamination, while casually dismissed by US-NATO military analysts, would be devastating, potentially affecting a large area of the broader Middle East (including Israel) and Central Asian region." As an example, a few years ago Burma moved its capital Rangoon to Pyinmana, because it believed that the effects of nuclear radiation caused by an attack on Iran would be less there. Radiation and nuclear winter could have uncontrollable consequences for humans. Put plainly, the survival of the human race would be put at stake if the U.S. attacks Iran.

#### Progressives must be in control to promote an inclusive world order that integrates rising powers and fosters multilateral cooperation

Kupchan, ’12 - Charles Kupchan, Professor of International Affairs at Georgetown, Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations [“Grand Strategy: The Four Pillars of the Future”. Democracy, Issue #23, Winter 2012. http://tinyurl.com/ccd6y5n]

Making Room for the Rising Rest

As emerging powers continue their ascent, dampening rivalries and fashioning a new rules-based order will require strategic vision and purposeful U.S. engagement. Rising powers, whether democratic or not, will not obediently take their place within the liberal order erected during the West’s watch. The rising rest differ with the West on fundamental issues, including the sources of domestic legitimacy, when and under what conditions violations of sovereignty are warranted, and the relationship between states and markets. Accordingly, they will want to recast the international system in ways that advantage their interests and ideological preferences.

Russia and China do not equate legitimacy with Western standards of liberal democracy, and both powers were critical of NATO’s intervention in Libya and vetoed a UN resolution condemning Syria’s crackdown on protestors. For decades, Turkey aligned itself with Europe and the United States, but Ankara is now charting its own path, flexing its muscles in the Middle East, and adopting a confrontational stance toward Israel. India is ostensibly America’s new strategic partner, but it votes with the United States in the UN General Assembly only about 25 percent of the time.

The task ahead for the West is not corralling emerging powers into the existing international order—a futile undertaking—but instead working together with them to arrive at a new set of global rules. Because progressives appreciate the merits of pluralism, they are well suited to help negotiate a bargain among states that embrace quite diverse conceptions of domestic and international governance. As Adam Mount and I argued in these pages in 2009 (“The Autonomy Rule,” Issue #12), equating legitimacy with responsible rule rather than only liberal democracy, fashioning a more equitable brand of capitalism, and strengthening the capacity and authority of regional institutions are the types of compromises around which a new order is likely to take shape. Progressives understand that pluralism and tolerance help resolve some of the most difficult challenges of domestic governance, and that these values can do the same for international politics.

Progressives should apply the logic of constructive engagement not just to those powers headed for the top ranks. As civil societies in many parts of the Arab world clamor for political freedom and economic opportunity, Washington should encourage and assist democratic movements even as it acknowledges that incremental liberalization is preferable to chaotic change and that more democracy in the Middle East may well mean more political Islam. Progressives should also support patient engagement when dealing with dangerous or unfriendly regimes. The reset with Russia has led to military cooperation on Afghanistan, diplomatic coordination on Iran, and a new pact limiting the size of nuclear arsenals. Obama’s outreach to Cuba has admittedly proceeded in fits and starts, but Havana has introduced a program of economic privatization and released dozens of political prisoners. Washington has been cautiously improving ties with Myanmar as its government relaxes its grip on power. And even if engagement with the likes of Iran and North Korea ultimately leads nowhere, Washington’s prior diplomatic efforts would help provide a political foundation for a more hard-line approach should that prove necessary.

Among Republicans, the ascent of illiberal powers promises to reinforce neoconservative and isolationist tendencies. Neoconservatives recoil at the prospect of working with autocracies like China, Russia, and Saudi Arabia; such regimes, they argue, should be brought to heel and transformed into liberal polities, not treated as stakeholders. Engagement is even less justifiable when dealing with pariahs like Iran and North Korea.

While perhaps emotionally satisfying, the neoconservative preference for regime change is a recipe for self-defeating adventurism; America’s recent forays into nation-building have produced scant benefits at enormous costs. The assumption that illiberal regimes yield only when forced into submission also flies in the face of history. The most notable geopolitical breakthroughs of the twentieth century came not through coercion, but bold diplomacy—Anwar Sadat and Menachem Begin in Jerusalem, Richard Nixon and Mao Zedong in Beijing, Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev in Reykjavik. Moreover, stabilizing the global economy, ensuring energy supplies, combating nuclear proliferation and terrorism—these and many other international challenges require working with, not isolating, non-democracies.

The Republican Party’s neo-isolationist wing, rather than seeking to turn illiberal regimes into democracies, would simply shun them. The Tea Party would want to avoid the domestic exertions and diplomatic constraints entailed in engaging rising powers not created in America’s image. Such isolation would, however, not only mean missing opportunities for pragmatic cooperation, but also ceding too much ground to non-democratic regimes. Even as the United States works with illiberal powers to forge a new rules-based order, it must actively promote democracy and liberal values globally. Pluralism, tolerance, and the power of persuasion are as important to advancing liberty and equality abroad as they are at home—something that progressives fully understand.

#### Failure to satisfy rising powers causes nuclear war

Kugler 06 – Professor of world politics @ Claremont Graduate University [Jacek Kugler (Consultant to the IMF, the World Bank, State Department, and Department of Defense. His publications on the causes and consequences of war use formal modeling and empirical analysis), “The Asian Ascent: Opportunity for Peace or Precondition for War?,” [International Studies Perspectives](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/journal/118516737/home), [Volume 7, Issue 1](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/journal/118606983/issue), Pages 36-42

Given the fundamental importance of demographic and economic forces in establishing the roster of states capable of fundamentally affecting the structure of world politics, whatever resolution there might be to the Global War on Terror will not alter the major challenge faced by the United States. In the long run, China’s demographic and hence economic power cannot be denied. By the same reasoning, the Middle East has no long-run demographic or economic power. The U.S. courts long-term peril by being obsessively distracted by short-term objectives. To ensure real peace, the U.S. would be much better advised to preserve strong links with the EU, maintain and improve cordial relations with Russia, and most importantly, open a sincere dialogue with India and China designed to maximize their support for the existing status quo. To be sure, positive, but limited, steps have been taken by the United States. American support for China’s entry into the World Trade Organization was important because it helps integrate China’s growing economy more fully into the capitalist world economy. Similar recognition for India, not to mention support for Indian membership on the United Nations Security Council, would also be beneficial. Because Taiwan and Korea have replaced the Cold War’s Berlin as focal points for potential Great Power conflict, finding an accommodation that meets the desires of the main parties with respect to them is central to the preservation of long-term peace. The economic, demographic, and political science research summarized above suggests that American foreign policy attention must center on China and India as the major future contenders for global leadership. Although China retains a political ideology inconsistent with democracy, there are good reasons to expect and thus to work toward change to a participatory system based on increasing prosperity (Feng 2003; Feng and Zak 2003). India is the largest democracy in the world, but like China it is still not a major partner of the Western world. While these relationships may develop and prosper on their own, the relative amount of attention paid to these rising giants compared with the Global War on Terror is simply insupportable.Neither convergence arguments nor power transition theory suggests that future Great Power war between Asia and the West is inevitable. The research described here offers evidence about probabilistic relationships between parity and status quo evaluations on the one hand, and war on the other. Thus, while China's overtaking of the U.S. may be relatively certain, the result of that overtaking is not. Power transition research supports claims that overtakings are dangerous when policy makers fail to accommodate them. A conflict between China or India and the United States as the Asian giants emerge from the shadows of underdevelopment is not inevitable. Rather, the political negotiations among contenders determine whether potential challengers can be made satisfied with the rules and norms governing world politics. If the declining dominant state is able to engineer a satisfactory compromise between the demands of the rising state and its own requirements (as Britain and the U.S. did when peacefully passing the mantle of international leadership), war is not expected. If the two sides remain intransigent, war is expected. It is clear that such a war in the twenty-first century would have a very high probabilityof involving nuclear weapons. A clear counter expectation can be drawn from classical nuclear deterrence arguments. They involve a fundamental assumption that as the costs of war increase, the probability of war decreases. Nuclear weapons are then alleged to alter calculations substantially because they raise the expected costs of war so high that war becomes unthinkable. According to this logic, a global war between a newly predominant China and a declining U.S. will never occur thanks to the pacifying influence of the balance of terror. A new Cold War is anticipated by this nuclear deterrence argument. Consistent with this theory, various scholars have advocated the proliferation of nuclear weapons as one method to prevent wars ([Intriligator and Brito 1981; Waltz 1981; Bueno de Mesquita and Riker 1982](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/cgi-bin/fulltext/118606987/main.html,ftx_abs#b5)). An odd paradox is raised by the fact that many world leaders accept nuclear deterrence claims, such as that about the stability of mutual assured destruction (MAD), while rejecting the logical concomitant that proliferation of nuclear weapons to more and more states is desirable. What follows logically has stubbornly resisted practical implementation. Thus, using some other logic, leaders of nuclear nations seem to agree that deterrence is stable under MAD but nevertheless also agree that nuclear proliferation must be prevented in order to preserve peace. If decision makers really believed MAD is stable, it is impossible to understand why they would oppose nuclear proliferation to Iran, thereby creating stable nuclear parity in the Middle East. This inconsistency was noted years ago by [Rosen (1977)](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/cgi-bin/fulltext/118606987/main.html,ftx_abs#b13), but subsequently conveniently overlooked. Theory and policy may frequently be at odds, but seldom when the costs of such logical inconsistency are so high. Power transition theorists are inherently suspicious of MAD arguments about nuclear stability because they essentially resurrect traditional balance of power arguments. Rather than focusing on conventional balance as a pacifying influence, nuclear deterrence proponents of MAD suggest that a nuclear balance will maintain the peace. Given a fortuitous absence of wars among nuclear states thus far, it is impossible to test arguments such as that about MAD. But what we can observe is not promising. It is not only policy makers who doubt the veracity of MAD when they deny the logical consequence of "beneficial" proliferation. Recent formal presentations of deterrence arguments strongly suggest that a preponderance of nuclear capabilities—specifically in the possession of satisfied states—is more amenable to peace than is MAD ([Zagare and Kilgour 2000](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/cgi-bin/fulltext/118606987/main.html,ftx_abs#b19)). Power transition theorists, informed by their own as well as by decades of demographic and economic research, strongly doubt that nuclear parity between the U.S. and a risen but dissatisfied China could preserve the peace. Conclusions It is entirely reasonable to anticipate that Asia will dominate world politics by the end of the century. The most important issue facing American decision makers is how to handle the anticipated overtaking. The research summarized here indicates that the one element of Asia's ascent that Western decision makers can manipulate is Asia's relative acceptance of the international system's existing norms and values. War is not an inevitable certainty. The opportunity for peace is at hand. If Western decision makers can persuade Chinese and Indian leaders through word and deed to join with the current global status quo, peace and prosperity should endure. If**,** on the other hand, China and India cannot be persuaded to join the existing structure of relations, then the chances for conflict increase around mid-century. The research summarized here suggests this is true even in the face of the enormous costs that reasonably would be anticipated from a nuclear war**.**

#### This coalitional politics is necessary to progressive change [YELLOW HIGHLIGHTING]

Michael **KAZIN** History @ Georgetown **’11** “Has the US Left Made a Difference” *Dissent* Spring p. 52-54

But when political radicals made a big difference, they generally did so as decidedly **junior** **partners** in a **coalition** **driven by establishment reformers**. Abolitionists did not achieve their goal until midway through the Civil War, when Abraham Lincoln and his fellow Republicans realized that the promise of emancipation could speed victory for the North. Militant unionists were not able to gain a measure of power in mines, factories, and on the waterfront until Franklin Roosevelt needed **labor votes** during the New Deal. Only when Lyndon Johnson and other liberal Democrats conquered their fears of disorder and gave up on the white South could the black freedom movement celebrate passage of the civil rights and voting rights acts. **For a political movement to gain any major goal, it needs to win over a section of the governing elite** (it doesn’t hurt to gain support from some wealthy philanthropists as well). Only on a handful of occasions has the Left achieved such a victory, and never under its own name. The divergence between political marginality and cultural influence stems, in part, from the kinds of people who have been the mainstays of the American Left. During just one period of about four decades—from the late 1870s to the end of the First World War— could radicals authentically claim to represent more than a tiny number of Americans who belonged to what was, and remains, the majority of the population: white Christians from the working and lower-middle class. At the time, this group included Americans from various trades and regions who condemned growing corporations for controlling the marketplace, corrupting politicians, and degrading civic morality. But this period ended after the First World War—due partly to the epochal split in the international socialist movement. Radicals lost most of the constituency they had gained among ordinary white Christians and have never been able to regain it. Thus, the wageearning masses who voted for Socialist, Communist, and Labor parties elsewhere in the industrial world were almost entirely lost to the American Left—and deeply skeptical about the vision of solidarity that inspired the great welfare states of Europe. Both before and after this period, the public face and voice of the Left emanated from an uneasy alliance: between men and women from elite backgrounds and those from such groups as Jewish immigrant workers and plebeian blacks whom most Americans viewed as dangerous outsiders. This was true in the abolitionist movement—when such New England brahmins as Wendell Phillips and Maria Weston Chapman fought alongside Frederick Douglass and Sojourner Truth. And it was also the case in the New Left of the 1960s, an unsustainable alliance of white students from elite colleges and black people like Fannie Lou Hamer and Huey Newton from the ranks of the working poor. It has always been difficult for these top and- bottom insurgencies to present themselves as plausible alternatives to the major parties, to convince more than a small minority of voters to embrace their program for sweeping change. Radicals did help to catalyze mass movements. But furious internal conflicts, a penchant for dogmatism, and hostility toward both nationalism and organized religion helped make the political Left a taste few Americans cared to acquire. However, some of the same qualities that alienated leftists from the electorate made them pioneers in generating an alluringly rebellious culture. Talented orators, writers, artists, and academics associated with the Left put forth new ideas and lifestyles that stirred the imagination of many Americans, particularly young ones, who felt stifled by orthodox values and social hierarchies. These ideological pioneers also influenced forces around the world that adapted the culture of the U.S. Left to their own purposes—from the early sprouts of socialism and feminism in the1830s to the subcultures of black power, radical feminism, and gay liberation in the 1960s and 1970s. Radical ideas about race, gender, sexuality, and social justice did not need to win votes to become popular. They just required an audience. And leftists who were able to articulate or represent their views in creative ways often found one. Arts created to serve political ends are always vulnerable to criticism. Indeed, some radicals deliberately gave up their search for the sublime to concentrate on the merely persuasive. But as George Orwell, no aesthetic slouch, observed, “the opinion that art should have nothing to do with politics is itself a political attitude.” In a sense, the radicals who made the most difference in U.S. history were not that radical at all. What most demanded, in essence, was the fulfillment of two ideals their fellow Americans already cherished: individual freedom and communal responsibility. In 1875, Robert Schilling, a German immigrant who was an official in the coopers, or caskmakers, union, reflected on why socialists were making so little headway among the hard-working citizenry: ….everything that smacks in the least of a curtailment of personal or individual liberty is most obnoxious to [Americans]. They believe that every individual should be permitted to do what and how it pleases, as long as the rights and liberties of others are not injured or infringed upon. [But] this personal liberty must be surrendered and placed under the control of the State, under a government such as proposed by the social Democracy. Most American radicals grasped this simple truth. They demanded that the promise of individual rights be realized in everyday life and encouraged suspicion of the words and power of all manner of authorities—political, economic, and religious. Abolitionists, feminists, savvy Marxists all quoted the words of the Declaration of Independence, the most popular document in the national canon. Of course, leftists did not champion self-reliance, the notion that an individual is entirely responsible for his or her own fortunes. But they did uphold the modernist vision that Americans should be free to pursue happiness unfettered by inherited hierarchies and identities. At the same time, the U.S. Left—like its counterparts around the world—struggled to establish a new order animated by a desire for social fraternity. The labor motto “An injury to one is an injury to all” rippled far beyond picket lines and marches of the unemployed. But American leftists who articulated this credo successfully did so in a patriotic and often religious key, rather than by preaching the grim inevitability of class struggle. Such radical social gospelers as Harriet Beecher Stowe, Edward Bellamy, and Martin Luther King, Jr., gained more influence than did those organizers who espoused secular, Marxian views. Particularly during times of economic hardship and war, radicals promoted collectivist ends by appealing to the wisdom of “the people” at large. To gain a sympathetic hearing, the Left always had to demand that the national faith apply equally to everyone and oppose those who wanted to reserve its use for privileged groups and undemocratic causes. But it was not always possible to wrap a movement’s destiny in the flag. “America is a trap,” writes the critic Greil Marcus, “its promises and dreams…are too much to live up to and too much to escape.” In a political culture that valued liberty above all, the Left had more difficulty arguing for the collective good than for an expansion of individual rights. Advocates of the former could slide into apologizing for totalitarian rule in the Soviet Union and elsewhere. But to give primacy to individual freedom could deprive the Left of its very reason to exist. In trying to advance both ideals, radicals confronted a yawning contradiction: in life as opposed to rhetoric, the desire for individual liberty routinely conflicts with the yearning for social equality and altruistic justice. The right of property holders and corporations to do what they wish with their assets clashes with environmentalists’ desire to preserve the natural habitat, with the desire of labor unionists to restrict an employer’s right to hire and fire, and with the freedom of consumers of any race to buy any house they can affordLeftists who claimed to favor both liberty and equality could not resolve such conflicts. Neither could major-party politicians. But Whigs, Republicans, and Democrats basked in the glow of legitimacy, which often shielded them from charges of hypocrisy that bedeviled the Left.

### Solvency

#### USDA special category solves development and modeling

**MACED 10** [Mountain Association for Community Economic Development, “Economic Transition in Central Appalachia: Ideas for the Appalachian Regional Development Initiative” April 8, 2010

2. Expand local renewable energy production

Central Appalachia’s historic reliance on coal has also meant little progress in diversifying into renewable energy sources. However, the region possesses real potential for renewable energy from a number of sources. Wind power is possible at a distributed scale and at utility scale on ridgetops in Central Appalachia. At least 3,830 MW of wind potential exists on private land in West Virginia.8 The best wind potential in all of Kentucky is in the counties in the southeastern coalfields.9 A recent National Renewable Energy Laboratory study indicated that at the higher hub heights of modern wind turbines, the wind potential in the region’s states is greater than was often previously assumed.10

Leaders of Kentuckians For The Commonwealth in the towns of Benham and Lynch have launched the Benham and Lynch Community Energy Initiative to address the need for renewable power and energy efficiency in these small former company towns in the heart of the coalfields. The Initiative has partnered with the Massachusetts Institute o Technology and MACED to conduct initial research on the potential of local wind generation. The nearby mountains have the highest wind potential in all of Kentucky. The communities are also pursuing energy efficiency projects, as the town of Benham uses the highest amount of electricity per residential customer of any utility in the state.11 See more about the Benham and Lynch proposal in the appendix. In southern West Virginia, the leaders of Coal River Wind have developed a model and a proposal for a 328 MW wind farm on Coal River Mountain as an alternative to mountaintop removal mining in the same location.12 An economic impact analysis suggests greater long-term jobs and economic impact from the wind farm than from mining--particularly if local production of turbine components can be incorporated.13

Community-scale woody biomass for energy is also a significant opportunity. The ARC estimates that the total annual biomass resources for the Appalachian states at over 108 million tons.14 Solar potential exists in Central Appalachia particularly in distributed applications for solar thermal and solar PV. Small and micro-hydroelectric power has a significant potential. The Idaho National Laboratory has estimated 518 MWa of potential in Kentucky and 484 MWa in West Virginia.15

The region is also a potential site for the manufacturing of components for solar, wind and other energy sources. An ARC report found that counties in Appalachia as a whole currently possess almost 200,000 jobs in parts manufacturing industries that could be modified to produce renewable energy components. Those jobs represent 3,000 manufacturers within the region with the potential to be retooled to become part of the renewable energy industry. 28,000 of those jobs are in counties currently categorized as economically distressed or at risk of becoming distressed.16 Also, non-profits like¶ MACED and the Kentucky Highlands Investment Corporation (KHIC) are providing training, financing and technical assistance for renewable energy entrepreneurs in solar, biofuels and other areas such as through KHIC’s recent Energy Boot Camp program.17

Recommendations:

Provide grant funding and financing for community-scale renewable energy demonstrations in the areas of wind, solar, low-impact woody biomass and low impact hydro.

Community-scale renewable energy production that is locally owned has the potential to maximize the economic benefits of energy production for local communities. In addition, community-scale projects can be high-efficiency, reusing waste heat in the case of biomass projects and minimizing line loss. A program to create local demonstrations across the region, including at public buildings and institutions like hospitals, in small town main street areas, and at a county scale could go a long way in leveraging new beneficial energy activity. A proposal from East Kentucky Biodiesel to create a pilot pyrolysis/gasification facility utilizing biomass grown on former surface mine land, explained on page 19, has the potential to be the first stage of a regional network of community-scale bioenergy production. A wide range of USDA and DOE programs promoting renewable energy and energy efficiency projects could be set aside or repurposed for efforts of this kind.

Expand USDA Rural Utility Service (RUS) financing for renewable energy production (and energy efficiency) to utilities located in Central Appalachia.

President Obama’s 2011 budget proposes additional funds to USDA “to help transition fossil fuel-dependent utilities to renewable energy.”18 Central Appalachian utilities are among the most fossil fuel dependent in the country, reliant on coal in aging power plants for well over 90 percent of their electricity. A 2009 study by the Ochs Center for Metropolitan Studies showed that East Kentucky Power Cooperative, a major provider of electricity in the Appalachian Kentucky, could create 8,750 jobs and inject $1.7 billion into the regional economy through a program of energy efficiency investments and expanded renewable energy capacity.19 A combination of grants and loans through RUS (and similar USDA programs like REDLG) to Central Appalachian utilities could help them begin to make this transition and create new jobs and economic opportunities in the process. One potential step forward in this direction is the new Rural Energy Savings Program legislation filed by in the House by Rep. James Clyburn and in the Senate by Sen. Jeff Merkley.20 It would create a pool of RUS funds for rural electric coops to create on-bill financing programs.

Create a special category and set-aside of USDA Rural Energy for America (REAP) grants and guaranteed loans for renewable energy and energy efficiency projects in Central Appalachia.

The USDA REAP program provides valuable, much needed funds for small businesses, farmers and others to pursue renewable energy projects and energy efficiency improvements. Even with expanded funding for this program, however, valuable projects including ones MACED has helped support are being denied funding. Those projects that are receiving REAP grants are creating important models in the region. Organizations like MACED and the Natural Capital Investment Fund in West Virginia can also provide financing to small businesses that can be packaged with REAP grants, which will help leverage federal dollars and increase impact.

Fund community-based wind monitoring efforts to help communities assess the feasibility of wind power.

Wind power along the ridgelines of Central Appalachia is widely recognized as an important regional opportunity. However, there is a lack of site-specific data for communities to understand the actual opportunities for wind development in the region, holding back project development. A program of grants and equipment loans could help communities better assess these opportunities. Support the establishment of renewable energy component manufacturing in the coalfields of Central Appalachia.

Manufacturing of component parts for the wind and solar supply chain offer some of the greatest economic opportunities for the nation as a whole. However, the lack of manufacturing infrastructure in the heart of Central Appalachia threatens to leave the region out of these opportunities. An initiative should be developed with the goal of establishing at least one significant supply chain manufacturer in the coalfields of Central Appalachia. This initiative should include research to identify if there are any opportunities with existing manufacturers in the region. If no such opportunities arise, the focus should be on the feasibility of establishing a new facility. New approaches like the Cleveland model of community-based, worker-owned companies in new green industries are promising ways to create jobs that help low-income workers accrue long-term wealth.21 A project to establish a model facility in a coalfield community could go a long way in creating good opportunities and promoting a needed discussion about the region’s energy future.

Provide competitive grants for school-based renewable energy projects eligible for schools in Central Appalachia.

A number of potential models exist for renewable energy production at the school level, which can save schools money and create important opportunities for student and community learning. The model of Russell High School in Greenup County, Kentucky, is one example of the use of wind and solar demonstrations to save money and provide training for vocational students. Opportunities also exist to fund fuels-for-schools initiatives (like those in the western U. S.) utilizing local, sustainably harvested woody biomass as a building heat source. Support workforce training and enterprise development in the new renewable energy industries.

MACED and other entrepreneurial development organizations like the Natural Capital Investment Fund have worked with a number of entrepreneurs in the region interested in starting new companies in wind, biomass, or solar. These folks lack access to training that would deepen their understanding of the technologies, and often lack the business management skills to make their fledgling enterprises survive. In Kentucky, for example, state tax credits were recently enacted for renewable energy installations like solar panels, but included requirements that installers be North American Board of Certified Energy Practitioner (NABCEP) certified. Only a handful of people in the entirestate have that certification. Federal workforce and business services dollars could support targeted scholarship, training, and technical assistance programs that could help more renewable energy businesses get off the ground. As mentioned in the energy efficiency section above, the Department of Labor green jobs training programs such as the Green Capacity Building program, Energy Training Partnerships, and Pathways out of Poverty program could be allocated for such investments. Pg. 8-11

#### Energy policy advocacy is a tool not a trap. Even if we have no chance to cause the energy changes we wish, we should build momentum and support for these ideas.

Elizabeth **SHOVE** Sociology @ Lancaster **AND** Gordon **WALKER** Geography @ Lancaster **‘7** “CAUTION! Transitions ahead: politics, practice, and sustainable transition management” *Environment and Planning C* 39 (4)

For academic readers, our commentary argues for loosening the intellectual grip of ‘innovation studies’, for backing off from the nested, hierarchical multi-level model as the only model in town, and for exploring other social scientific, but also systemic theories of change. The more we think about the politics and practicalities of reflexive transition management, the more complex the process appears: for a policy audience, our words of caution could be read as an invitation to abandon the whole endeavour. If agency, predictability and legitimacy are as limited as we’ve suggested, this might be the only sensible conclusion.However, we are with Rip (2006) in recognising the value, productivity and everyday necessity of an ‘illusion of agency’, and of the working expectation that a difference can be made even in the face of so much evidence to the contrary. The outcomes of actions are unknowable, the system unsteerable and the effects of deliberate intervention inherently unpredictable and, ironically, it is this that sustains concepts of agency and management. As Rip argues ‘illusions are productive because they motivate action and repair work, and thus something (whatever) is achieved’ (Rip 2006: 94). Situated inside the systems they seek to influence, governance actors – and actors of other kinds as well - are part of the dynamics of change: even if they cannot steer from the outside they are necessary to processes within. This is, of course, also true of academic life. Here we are, busy critiquing and analysing transition management in the expectation that somebody somewhere is listening and maybe even taking neotice. If we removed that illusion would we bother writing anything at all? Maybe we need such fictions to keep us going, and maybe – fiction or no - somewhere along the line something really does happen, but not in ways that we can anticipate or know.

## 2AC

### 2AC Orientalism

#### Just because knowledge arises in a racist context doesn’t mean the knowledge itself is racist or incorrect.

Fred **Halliday** IR @ LSE **’93** “ ‘Orientalism’ and its Critics” *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 20 (2) p. 159-161

The third difficulty with Said's approach is the methodological assumption it makes about the relation between the genesis of ideas and their validity, namely that because ideas are produced in a context of domination, or directly in the service of domination, they are thereby presumed to be invalid. Analogous ideas are to be found in much contemporary debate about ethnocentric and Eurocentric ideas, in the social sciences or elsewhere. Since Said's book was written, this theme has acquired much greater diffusion through cultural nationalism, post-modernism and so on. In the Middle East it can be found in the writings of Islamic writers, such as Khomeini, ever calling on people to be 'alert' biddr, against this corruption, and in the writings of many nationalist intellectuals, be this the later Anouar Abdel-Malek in Egypt or Jalal Al-e Ahmad in Iran, with his concept of westoxification or gharbzadegf. This is, to say the least, a rather contestable assertion, if taken in the context not of the Middle East in particular, or of nationalist assertion, but in its proper academic context-namely, the sociology of knowledge. If I have my disagreements with the epistemological assumptions underlying the approach of Lewis and his fellow writers on 'Islam', I am equally at odds with the epistemological assumptions of Said and the post-modernists. One can do worse than look again at the discussion of this matter by Karl Mannheim in his Ideology and Utopia:37 there are many difficulties with Mannheim's work, not least his view of the free-floating intellectual, but his (liscussion of the relation between genesis and validity is very pertinent here. As he points out, removing some of the polemic from Marx's discussion of ideology, the fact that a particular discovery or idea was produced by a particular interest group, or context-bound individual, tells us nothing about its validity. Medicine, aeronautics, or good food may be produced in such contexts of time, place, culture: they are not therefore to be rejected. The same, with appropriate variations, can apply to social science. Of course, the majority of social science ideas in the world today come from Western Europe and the US and were produced in the context of imperialism and capitalism: it would be odd if this were not so. But this tells us little about their validity. The terms 'Eurocentric' and 'ethnocentric', far too easily bandied about to-day, confuse a statement on historical origin with a covert assessment that needs justification in its own terms. And in one very important sense Eurocentrism is a valid starting point: the economic, social and political system that prevails in the world to-day, with all its variations, including those of the Far East, is a European product and was spread through the combination of economic, military and political pressure known as imperialism. As Karl Marx and Bill Warren alike would have pointed out, Europe has created a world after its own image, like it or not.38 The implications of this issue of origin for the debate on Orientalism should be clear. The first is that in much of the critique of Western writing on the Middle East the assumption is made that because ideas are produced by exploiters this knowledge is therefore invalid. But elementary reflection would suggest that, apart from any possible independence or autonomy of the investigator, the very fact of trying to subjugate a country would to some degree involve producing an accurate picture of it. If you want to dominate a country, you need to know where its mines and oases are, to have a good map, to be aware of its ethnic and linguistic composition and so forth. The experts who came with Napoleon to Egypt in 1798 were part of an imperial project, but the knowledge they produced, whatever its motives, financing, use, had objective value. The same can be said, pari passu, with much later writing on the region. To put it bluntly: if you plan to rob a bank, you would be well advised to have a pretty accurate map of its layout, know what the routines and administrative practices of its employees are, and, preferably, have some idea of who you can suborn from within the organization. This brings me to another point where, perhaps because of professional bias, Said would seem to engage in an injudicious elision- namely, that treatment of texts produced within the social sciences and in related activities such as journalism or travel writing, and literature. Of course, there are similarities and mutual influences; but while one is a necessarily fictional activity, without controls in reality or direct links to the acts of administration, domination, exploitation, the former is so controlled. To assume that the same critique of discourses within literature can be made of those within social science is questionable; it may indeed reflect the hubris, rather too diffuse at the imoment, of theorists deriving their validation from cultural studies. This brings me to the fourth, and final, area of difficulty with the critique of Orientalism, namely its analysis, or rather absence thereof, of the ideas and ideologies of the Middle East itself. Said himself has, in his other writings, been a trenchant critic of the myths of the Middle East and of its politicians, and nowhere more so than in his critique of the poverty of the intellectual life of the Arab world: while the rulers have constructed numerous international airports, he once pointed out, they have failed to construct one good library. But the absence of such a critique in his Orientalism does allow for a more incautious silence, since it prevents us from addressing how the issues discussed by the Orientalists and the relations between East and West are presented in the region itself. Here it is not a question of making any moral equivalence between the myths of the dominators and of the dominated, but of recognizing two other things: first, that when it comes to hypostasis, stereotyping, the projection of timeless and antagonistic myths, this is in no sense a prerogative of the dominator, but also of the dominated; and, secondly, that if we analyse the state of the discourse on the contemporary Middle East, then the contribution of these ideologies of the dominated has been, and remains, enormous, not least because those outside the region who try to overcome the myths of the Orient rather too quickly end up colluding with, or accepting, the myths of the dominated within the region.39 One of the most cogent critiques of Said, made with this in mind, was that of Sadeq al-Azm, published a decade ago in Khamsin.40 If there is a condition such as gharbzadegi, there is also one which I would call sharqzadegz, the uncritical reproduction of myths about the region in the name of anti-imperialism, solidarity, understanding, and so on. Here, of course, the myth-makers of the region see their chance, since they can impose their own stereotypes by taking advantage of confusion within their own countries and without. No-one familiar with the political rhetoric of the region will need much convincing of this tendency to hypostatisation from below: a few hours in the library with the Middle Eastern section of the Summary of World Broadcasts will do wonders for anyone who thinks reification and discursive interpellation are the prerogative of Western writers on the region. The uses made of the term 'the West', to (lenote one single, rational, antagonistic force; the rantings of Islamrists about jdhiliyya; the invalidation of ideas and culture because they are, or are supposed to be, from the VWest; the uncritical but often arbitrary imposition of controls and customs that are supposed to be genuinely from the region; an expression of somie turathl (heritage) or other; the railings against Zionists, Persians, kafirs, traitors and so on with which Middle Eastern political leaders happily puncture their speeches, without apparent qualm or contradiction, or awareness that they themselves are promoting prejudiceall confirm this point. Of course, this hypostatisation is most evident in the discussion of the idea of 'Islam' itself, for no-one is more insistent on the unitary, determinant, timeless, and, in his version, orthodox interpretation of Islam than the fundamentalist. Equally, while brave and critical souls in the West have tried to break the usage of the term 'Muslim' as a denotation of an ethnic or cultural identity, whether in its British or French colonial usages, the reifiers of the region are keen to re-establish this link. In this they are joined by communal politicians in western Europe, who purport to treat all 'Muslims' as one social, cultural or even ethnic group.

#### Their alt has no way to compare truth claims. Evidence is imperfect but we can still weigh it.

Joshua **TEITELBAUM** Senior Fellow @ Moshe Dayan Center for Middle East and African Studies (Tel Aviv University) **AND** Meir **LITVAK** Middle Eastern and African History @ Tel Aviv **‘6** “Students, Teachers and Edward Said: Taking Stock of Orientialism” *Middle East Review of International Affairs* 10 (1) p. 33

"REPRESENTATION" AND HISTORICAL TRUTH

Said 's focus on Orientalism as a discourse of power, and apparently his background as a literary critic (and not as a historian), led him to argue that the "things to look at are style, figures of speech, setting, narrative devices, historical and social circumstances, ***not* the correctness of the representation** nor its fidelity to some great original." In other words: "The phenomenon of Orientalism as I study it here deals principally, not with a correspondence between Orientalism and the Orient, but with the internal consistency of Orientalism and its ideas about the Orient…despite or beyond any correspondence, or lack thereof, with a 'real' Orient. "47 This approach, which is largely influenced by the post- modern discourse popular in the field of literary criticism-- Said's primary expertise--leads him to ignore the possibility that representation includes **reliable and precise information** as well. He never analyzes profoundly or refutes the Middle Eastern studies literature, he merely argues over its style and motives. Halliday, as a positivist scholar who believes that historical reality is the important factor and not simply representation, doubts whether the discourse criticism in literature can be used for social sciences as well and questions whether historical research can be treated like literary analysis. Halliday even argues that Said's basic approach is similar to those whom Said accuses of "Orientalism, " since both put a priority on what is termed (in different theoretical frameworks) ideology, discourse, or political culture. 48 Lewis is most severe in his criticism of Said's epistemological conception, which is influenced by Michel Foucault and which draws on post- modernist ideas. According to Said 's approach, says Lewis, every discourse is an expression of a motive to rule, and all knowledge is distorted. Therefore, absolute truth does not exist or is not attainable. Thus, the truth is not important and even the facts are not important, nor is the evidence. Most important is the approach--the motives and intentions--of those who use knowledge. 49

### A2 Fear/Apocalypse K

#### The 1AC is a *challenge* message not a threat message. That increases salience, collective action, and creative problem-solving.

Robert **BRULLE** Sociology & Envt’l Science @ Drexel **’10** “From Environmental Campaigns to Advancing the Public Dialog: Environmental Communication for Civic Engagement” *Environmental Communication* 4 (1) p. 92

From Identity to Challenge Campaigns One of the most common assumptions in designing identity-based environmental communication campaigns is that fear appeals are counterproductive. As Swim et al. (2009, p. 80) note: ‘‘well meaning attempts to create urgency about climate change by appealing to fear of disasters or health risks frequently lead to the exact opposite of the desired response: denial, paralysis, apathy, or actions that can create greater risks than the one being mitigated.’’ While the author goes on to qualify and expand this line of argument, this has been taken as an absolute in the popular press and much of the grey literature produced by nonprofit organizations and foundations. However, the academic literature portrays a much more complex picture: whereas apocalyptic rhetoric has been shown to be able to evoke powerful feelings of issue salience (O’Neill & Nicholson-Cole, 2009, p. 373), reassuring messages, such as those advocated by ecoAmerica, have the least ability to increase issue salience (de Hoog, Stroebe, & de Wit, 2007; Lowe et al., 2006; Meijinders, Cees, Midden, & Wilke, 2001; Witte & Allen, 2000). Additionally, apocalyptic messages do not necessarily result in denial. A number of empirical studies show that individuals respond to threat appeals with an increased focus on collective action (Eagly & Kulesa, 1997; Langford, 2002; Leiserowitz, Kates, & Parris, 2006, p. 437; Maiteny, 2002; Shaiko, 1999; Swim et al., 2009, p. 94). Tomaka, Blascovich, Kelsey, and Leitten (1993, p. 248) distinguish between threat and challenge messaging: threat messages ‘‘are those in which the perception of danger exceeds the perception of abilities or resources to cope with the stressor. Challenge appraisals, in contrast, are those in which the perception of danger does not exceed the perception of resources or abilities to cope.’’ If a meaningful response to a threat can be taken that is within the resources of the individual, this results in a challenge, which ‘‘may galvanize creative ideas and actions in ways that transform and strengthen the resilience and creativity of individuals and communities’’ (Fritze, Blashki, Burke, & Wieseman, 2008, p. 12). While fear appeals can lead to maladaptive behaviors, fear combined with information about effective actions can also be strongly motivating (O’Neill & Nicholson-Cole, 2009, p. 376; Witte & Allen, 2000).

#### Combination of fear and hope avoids eco-authoritarianism.

John **BARRY** Reader Politics @ Queen’s University (Belfast) **’12** *The Politics of Actually Existing Unsustainability* p. 230-231

In my view it would be dishonest and disingenuous if it were not acknowledged that green politics is partly based on fear as well: fear of resource scarcity and environmental devastation and the collapse or severe compromising of valued forms of human life based around democratic government, equality, social justice, and so on. The threat of impending catastrophe animates the green movement to greater or lesser extents. 'Hard greens' possessed of an ecorealist bent are not thin on the ground in contemporary political discourse as indicated in the Introduction. Contemporary 'hard greens' such as John Gray (Barry, 2006a) or James Lovelock, or certain strands of 'eco-primitivism' (Somma, 2009; Zerzan, 1994; Jensen, 2002, 2010; Humphrey, 2009), who sometimes advocate authoritarian solutions, are testament to the vibrancy of this fear-based green politics. And it has to be recalled that early ecological thinkers such as Garrett Hardin, William Ophuls, Robert Heilbroner, and others such as Edward Abbey and Teddy Goldsmith, were also motivated (either reluctantly or enthusiastically) by a sense that non-democratic politics was the only way to either avoid or cope with the impending ecological catastrophe. But this threat does not undermine the republican project, any more than it undermines the liberal project. And overall, while such ecoauthoritarian positions are unrepresentative of the large body of green thinking, they ought to be acknowledged by greens as one strand of ecological political thinking. However, their existence does not undermine the essential democratic and democratizing character of green political thinking (Barry, 1999a). In fact, the crisis of unsustainability may call for more and different forms of democratic politics and participation rather than less of the same, as the eco-authoritarians wrongly hold. It is, of course, also the case that green politics is based on hope and not just fear, and it is one of the main advantages of using the nomenclature of 'green' as opposed to 'environmental' politics is that it explicitly speaks to the nonenvironmental principles of green politics around human rights, democracy, and citizenship and so on (Barry, 2007a). Green politics as a politics of hope and emancipation (Eckersley, 1992) is one which takes a realistic and empirically informed view of the limits and challenges facing human societies and the possibilities for progressive social transformation. That is, the 'fear' that animates green politics should not be viewed as some reactionary Malthusian concern with non-negotiable 'scarcity' (from external nature)-often a standard critique of green politics from the liberal left, based on a historically informed misunderstanding of green politics (Barry, 1999b, 2007a). At the same time, the fear which characterizes green politics should neither be understood as some equally reactionary conservative fear of dangerous and unchangeable features of 'human nature' which are driving us to ecological catastrophe.

#### Ecological crisis rhetoric isn’t alarmist – current data are without precedent.

Thomas **PRINCEN** School of Natural Resources and Environment @ Michigan **’10** *Treading Softly* p. 6-7

To my mind, these changes are quite unlike those of the past. And what they portend for the future is quite unimaginable. My thirty-plus years of observation and study, of teaching and tinkering have led me to conclude, only in the last few years, that fundamental shifts are now occurring, and more are on the way. It is not just that things are changing; indeed, they always have. It is that they are changing in ways previously unimaginable to scientists, business leaders, policy makers, and citizens alike. In the scientific community, terms like surprise (which now has a technical definition), threshold (as in, "cross that threshold and your environment is completely different"), irreversibility (there is no going back, no recovery), nonsubstitutability (things like an atmosphere and water cannot be replaced), unprecedented rates of change (trends of the past are poor indicators of the present, let alone the future), and that allpurpose, ever-popular crisis (both fast and slow): these terms are now commonplace. This is not alarmism; it is a reflection of many people's struggle to fathom fundamental shifts, changes for which there are few if any precedents, and thus unimaginable, and for which appropriate social responses are equally unprecedented and unimaginable. So, for example, bark beetles, once restricted to two-year cycles by winter cold, are now reproducing annually. It is not just that they are devastating broad swaths of Rocky Mountain forests but that those forests may never recover. Frogs are disappearing worldwide. It is not just that it is a shame to lose species; species have always gone extinct, after all. It is that the mysteries of their disappearance, combined with their status as amphibian "canaries in the mineshaft," due to their thin porous skin, render conventional conservation irrelevant for frogs and perhaps also for a good many other terrestrial vertebrates. We cannot save one species at a time or even one habitat at a time when systemic instability is the issue. Sea levels are rising, already prompting island nations and other communities in low-lying areas to prepare to migrate. It is not that migrations have not occurred before, but that, with 6 billion people on earth, all the good places are taken. In these cases, and in so many more in the physical and biological realms, no one knows what to do, except proclaim more-of-the-same, only new and improved, greener and cleaner. Turning to the social realm, the shifts are murkier, more contested, and yet no less fundamental. A ISO-year "law" of oil supply says that when oil supplies are tight, prices go up, which stimulates investment, exploration, and technological innovation, bringing on more supply, all of which pushes prices back down. The cycle may take months or a few years, but it is a cycle, as inevitable as the business cycle itself, or the life cycle. Now, according to the International Energy Agency, the investments are not being made.2 And even a few mainstream commentators are violating a taboo: they are saying that world oil supply has peaked, or is about to, which is to say that all the cheap oil is gone. Whatever the case, hardly anyone predicts a return to cheap, abundant oil.

#### Case outweighs—climate change is a greater risk than green biopolitics.

Robyn ECKERSLEY Politcs @ Melbourne ‘4 *The Green State* p. 89-93

Green poststructuralists have likewise sought to deconstruct the disciplinary effects of biopower and green governmentality, while green critics of technocracy have lamented the cult of the expert the so-called the scientization of politics, and the concomitant disenfranchisement of the lay public and vernacular knowledge in affairs of state administration." The bureaucratic rationality of the administrative state is inn as too rigid, hierarchical, and limited to deal with the variability, nonreducability, and complexity of ecological problems." Bureaucratic rationality responds to complex problems by breaking them down, comparnncntalizing them, and assigning them to different agencies that respond to a hierarchical chain of command. This often leads to the routine displacement of prob- lems acn bureaucratic system boundaries,' Once we add to these developments the more recent revolution in public sector management, we have good reasons to concur with Paul Hint that the traditional liberal architecture has increasingly "become a gross misdescription of the structure of modern societies?" The tenuous link between popular political participation and control and technocratic state administration has also been a major theme in the work of Ulrich Beck. Indeed, Beck (like Martin Janickel argues that politicians and state functionaries act in ways that seek to mask problems rather than solve them. Ecological problems pens because they are generated by the same economic, scientific, and political institutions that are called upon to solve them. While the state cannot but acknowl- edge the ecological crisis, it nonetheless continues to function as qir were not present by denying, donplaying, and naturalizing ecological prob- lems and declining to connect such problems with the basic structure and dynanücs of rccmomic and bureaucratic rationality. According to Beck, this organized irresponsibility can sometimes take on a Kafkaesque form. The state seeks to manufacture security by providing social insurance systems-health services, unemployment benefits, pensions, and workers compensation-but it can provide no protection against major hazards that can pierce the thin veneer of normality and expose the inadequacies of the welfare stare As Beck puts it 'What good is a legal system which prosecutes technically manageable small risks, but legalises large scak hazards on the strength of its authority, foisting them on everyone, including even those multitudes who still resist them?' It might be tempting to conclude from this general critique that states are part of the problem rather than the solution to ecological degradation. With its roots in the peace and antinuclear movements, the green movement has long been critical of the coercive modality of state power-including the state-military-industrial complex-and might therefore be understandably sceptical toward the very poiisibility of reforming or transforming states into mare democratic and ecologically responsive structures of gosemment The notion that the state might come to represent an ecological savior and trustee appears both fanciful and dangerous rather than empowering. Yet such an anti-statist posture cannot withstand critical scrutiny from a critical ecological perspective. The problem seems to be that while states have been associated with violence, insecurity, bureaucratic domination, injustice, and ecological degradation, there is no reason to assume that any alternatives we might imagine or develop will necessarily be free of, or less burdened by, such problems. As Medley Bull warns, violence, insecurity, injustice, and ecological degradation pre-date the state system, and we cannot rule out the possibility that they are likely to survive the demise of the state system, regardless of what new political structures may arise." Now it could be plausibly argued that these problems might be Lessened under a more democratic and possibly decentralized global political architecture (as hioregionalists and other green decentralists have argued). However, there is no basis upon which to assume that they will be lessened any more than under a more deeply democratized state system. Given the seriousness and urgency of many ecological problems (e.g., global warming), building on the state governance structures that already exist seems to be a more fruitful path to rake than any attempt to move beyond or around states in the quest for environmental sustainab.ility.2t' Moreover, as a matter of principle, it can be argued that environmental benefits are public goods that ought best be managed by democratically organized public power, and not by private power." Such an approach is consistent with critical theory's concern to work creatively with current historical practices and associated understandings rather than fashion utopias that have no purchase on such practices and understandings. In short, there is more mileage to be gained by enlisting and creatively developing the existing norms,, rules, and practices of state governance in ways that make start power more democratically and ecologically accountable than designing a new architecture of global governance de novo (a daunting and despairing proposition). Skeptics should take heart from the fact that the organized coercive power of democratic states is not a totally untamed power, insofar as such power must be exercised according to the rule of law and principles of democratic oversight. This is not to deny that state power can sometimes he seriously abused (e.g., by the police or national intelligence agencies). Rather, it is merely to argue that such powers are not un- limited and beyond democratic control and redress. The focus of criti- cal ecological attention should therefore be on how effective this control and redress has been, and how it might be strengthened. The same argument may be extended to the bureaucratic arm of the state. In liberal democratic stares, with the gradual enlargement, spe- cialization, and depersonalization of state administrative power have also come legal norms and procedures that limit such power according to the principle of democratic accountability. As (,ianfranco Poggi has observed, at the same time as the political power of the state has become more extensive in terms of its subject matter and reach, so too have claims for public participation in the exercise of this power widened? This is also to acknowledge the considerable scope for further, more deep-seated democratic oversight. Indeed, it is possible to point to a raft of new ecological discursive designs that have already emerged as partial antidotes to the technocratic dimensions of the administrative state, such as community right-to-know legislation, CornmtlnLtV environmental monitoring and reporting, third-party litigation rights, environmental and technology impact assessment, statutory policy advisory committees, citizens' juries, consensus conference.,-, and public environmental inquiries. Each of these initiatives may he understood as attempts to con- front both public and private power with its consequences, to widen the range of voices and perspectives in stare administration, to expose or prevent problem displacement, and/or to ensure that the sites economic, social, and political power that create and/or are responsible for ecological risks are made answerable to all those who may suffer the consequences This is precisely where an ongoing green critical locus on the state can remain productive.

### A2 Climate Security

#### Climate security discourse shifts the paradigm of security from competition to cooperation.

Hugh DYER School of Politics and Interational Studies @ Leeds ‘8 “The Political Significance of 'Energy Security' and 'Climate Security'” Paper presented at British International Studies Association 33rd Annual Conference <http://www.bisa.ac.uk/2008/pps/Dyer.pdf>.

Assumptions of structure Here we want to map a shift in the political point of reference for essential assumptions about the structure of the international system. Both ‘energy security’ and ‘climate security’ play to an existing set of assumptions about international relations being defined essentially in terms of a condition of security (or, more to the point, insecurity), and consequent political relationships and political issues defined in terms of security, which rest on a very limited and short-term conception of what and who is to be secured. The dominance of this underlying assumption about the essence of world politics colours everything else – all kinds of relationships and issues, whether or not they seem to bear directly on ‘security’ or be consequent upon it. It should be noted that a trend towards ‘securitization’ of issues normally thought about, spoken of, and acted upon in different terms brings with it both dangers and opportunities (see the critiques by Buzan, Wæver, Williams, and others). The double-edged sword of securitizing energy and climate issues is forged from the element of urgency or emergency invoked by the ‘security’ category, which could justify either unwelcome extraordinary action or complete inaction by states even as it provides (potentially) welcome political focus, resources, and timely implementation. While the former are unlikely to meet tests of moral rectitude (except of the very limited state-centric protectionist and status-quo preservationist kind), the latter would represent a refreshing sense of the importance of living up to broader political obligations of the sort that energy and climate crises invoke. The complexity and novelty of this combination of policy challenges requires innovative interdisciplinary theoretical tools drawing on work in security studies and eco-political thought to develop a more holistic 'eco-logical security' perspective (see, e.g., Pirages and Cousins, 2005) on the global agenda for achieving climate security and energy security in a coordinated manner. The notion and concept of ‘ecological security’ is in wide circulation (even some government departments use this title; e.g. in the Ukraine), but its meaning is also thus diffuse. This is either a problem in terms of establishing a shared political vision and agenda, or an opportunity for cooperation through creativity and inventiveness. For example, innovations on 'securitisation' – e.g. for better or worse in respect of development assistance, and now climate change – and notions of 'ecological debt' might even suggest financial securitisation of internalised climate costs; something attractive to modern financial markets, no doubt. There can be little doubt now (after Stern, 2006) about the cost implications of climate change, and the likely impact on economic growth, but this could simply lead us to think about the economic opportunities this presents. Any notion of economic change that doesn’t involve growth seems anathema under current economic assumptions, but those assumptions are likely to change dramatically under the twin pressures of energy and climate crises. Change itself is not problematic, and even economic growth has always drawn on the opportunities change brings in terms of new technologies, new social practices, and new markets. So the prospect of economic change should not be too troubling (and for those disadvantaged by the current global economy, an equitable change would be welcome). If change is alright, growth probably isn’t, or at least not in its current guise – so this will require a change of perspective on ‘growth’ such that it does not signify ‘more of the same’, in terms of ever increasing consumption of the earth’s resources and reductions in natural capacities. Growth in human opportunities and diversity of practices would be welcome and economically beneficial, if these do not require fossil fuels and carbon sinks. It is no longer bizarre to speak of a ‘low-carbon economy’, or even a ‘post-petroleum economy’, and neither involves the cessation of economic activity; they simply involve change. Equally, it is not novel to speak of ‘economic security’ as a high priority (though for whom is not always so obvious), but whatever that entails now it certainly won’t be the same in the future. Since the various kinds of security we seek, including that related to energy and climate, are so clearly tied up with the cessation of unsustainable practices in both economics and politics it requires no leap of the imagination to grasp that some form of sustainability is needed – it only remains to establish the strategic goals and mechanisms to deliver on these obvious requirements. ‘Energy security’ and ‘climate security’ have thus entered the discourse as strategic goals, while the corresponding mechanisms are as yet at best ill- formed, and perhaps incoherent, which rather suggests that the element of sustainability has not yet been taken seriously. Rather than ‘securitization’, the practical dilemmas in the climate and energy context suggest that ‘security’ indicates commitment, reflecting an underlying shift in priorities. To the extent that this reflects appreciation of unsustainable inequity, and a shift toward ecological values, it is a politically significant turn. To the extent that it implicates ‘green’ economic practices and political action, it is a shift in structural assumptions. There is already considerable concern and cooperative activity, but it must also cope with predominately structural obstacles. Beyond the practical problem of coping with existing structures, or changing them, is the deeper problem of assuming foundational points of reference for any given structural reality such that challenging or changing it is difficult or impossible. So there is an intellectual, or attitudinal, hurdle to leap at the outset – we’d have to accept that some deeply held assumptions are simply not viable (sustainable), and learn to let them go. I have suggested elsewhere that while ‘perspectives on politics in the absence of immutable external foundations may be quite widely accepted… there is a great temptation in public discourses to deal with uncertainty by positing certainties, and to play fundamentalist trump cards of different kinds’ (Dyer, 2008). Switching from one foundational reference to another is not likely to work, and the anti-foundational perspective taken here suggests a pragmatic approach to developing the most effective social practices as we learn them, and adjusting structures to support them. An institutional context illustrates the discourse, in so far as ‘some controversial principles, such as whether to approach from an anthropocentric perspective or from a biocentric approach, or whether the viewpoint was from the individual or community, were the focus of considerable debate’. Not surprisingly, there is an air of realism about the application of ethical principles on renewable energy: ‘although a normative declaration would be nice, it was not feasible in the current political environment’ (UNESCO 2007; 7). The pragmatism is, nevertheless, appropriate since there is no progress to be made by assuming that an appreciation of the political significance of energy and climate security only bears on abstractions – the point is that the underlying values reflected in political agendas should be flushed out, and the most appropriate values promoted and acted upon in a pragmatic fashion as interests. For example, it was noted that ‘barriers to renewable energy systems were institutional, political, technical and financial’ and also that there is ‘potential conflict between bioregional, potentially unstable energy systems and countries’ desires for energy independence and self-reliance’; this suggests the need for a ‘global eco-ethics’ (UNESCO 2007; 8). Pragmatism is inherent in thinking through the political significance of such challenges: ‘From the ethical point of view, nuclear power presented many problems at each point of the complex supply chain, including uranium mining, enrichment, and risk management in a functioning plant. It was a highly centralized and state-controlled source of energy that did not promote participatory democracy’. It can also be seen that ‘nuclear and fossil-fuel based power also triggered international conflicts’. By contrast, ‘renewable energies such as solar, wind, small hydro, biomass, geothermal and tidal energy are often decentralized and can be used in remote areas without a solid energy supply system’ (UNESCO 2007; 8-9). The political significance of energy security and climate security dilemmas is that they cause us to see change as a challenge, rather than impossible; a challenge to be met by reconsidering our value-orientations – which changes everything. Elsewhere I’ve noted that goals which the state purports to serve (health, wealth, security) are seen differently in an environmental light, and this could lead to substantial change in political practices (Dyer, 2007). Another pragmatist, John Dewey, ‘argued that the public interest was to be continuously constructed through the process of free, cooperative inquiry into the shared good of the democratic community’ and Minteer suggests that this is a necessary approach ‘in making connections between normative arguments and environmental policy discourse’ (Minteer, 2005). This reflects Hayward’s argument that environmental values are supported by enlightened human interests, and furthermore this link must exist to promote ecological goods, and that consequently there are serious implications in fully integrating environmental issues into our disciplinary concerns (Hayward, 1998). I’ve argued before that environmental politics dislodges conventional understandings of agency, and in ‘this wider socio-political-economic context, ecological significance may be the determining factor in the end’ (Dyer, 2007). Hargrove (1989) makes an argument for anthropocentric, aesthetic sources of modern environmental concern by identifying attitudes that constrained (‘idealism’, ‘property rights’) and supported (scientific and aesthetic ideals) our environmental perspectives. If this argument doesn’t stretch us much beyond ourselves, there is no reason these anthropocentric orientations couldn’t be built upon as a foundation for more specifically ecocentric perspectives. The key here is to identify the underlying ‘security’ assumptions which thwart efforts to cope with energy and climate issues coherently and effectively, and to advocate those assumptions that serve genuine long-term human security interests (inevitably, in an ecological context). In this way can we take stock of the existing structures that constrain and diminish human agency – while conceiving of those that would liberate and secure it in sustainable ways. As the reality of the situation slowly dawns on us, various political, moral, economic and social actors are beginning to consider and test new strategies for coping – the real question is whether they are just playing to beat the clock, or if they’ve stopped long enough to reconsider the rules and purposes of the strategic context in which they act.

### 2ac Security

**Security as a global public good helps avoid politics dominated by fear. Abandoning liberal security only empowers neocons.**

Ian **LOADER** Criminology All Souls College @ Oxford (England) **AND** Neil **WALKER** Regius Professor of Public Law and the Law of Nature and Nations @ Edinburgh Law **‘7** *Civilizing Security* p. 5-18

Faced with such inhospitable conditions, one can easily lapse into fatalistic despair, letting events simply come as they will, or else seek refuge in the consolations offered by the total critique of securitization practices – a path that some critical scholars in criminology and security studies have found all too seductive (e.g. Bigo 2002, 2006; Walters 2003). Or one can, as we have done, supplement social criticism with the hard, uphill, necessarily painstaking work of seeking to specify what it may mean for citizens to live together securely with risk; to think about the social and political arrangements capable of making this possibility more rather than less likely, and to do what one can to nurture practices of collective security shaped not by fugitive market power or by the unfettered actors of (un)civil society, but by an inclusive, democratic politics. Social analysts of crime and security have become highly attuned to, and warned repeatedly of, the illiberal, exclusionary effects of the association between security and political community (Dillon 1996; Hughes 2007). They have not, it should be said, done so without cause, for reasons we set out at some length as the book unfolds. But this sharp sensitivity to the risks of thinking about security through a communitarian lens has itself come at a price, namely, that of failing to address and theorize fully the virtues and social benefits that can flow from members of a political community being able to put and pursue security in common. This, it seems to us, is a failure to heed the implications of the stake that all citizens have in security; to appreciate the closer alignment of self-interest and altruism that can attend the acknowledgement that we are forced to live, as Kant put it, inescapably side-by-side and that individuals simultaneously constitute and threaten one another’s security; and to register the security-enhancing significance and value of the affective bonds of trust and abstract solidarity that political communities depend upon, express and sustain. All this, we think, offers reasons to believe that security offers a conduit, perhaps the best conduit there is, for giving practical meaning to the idea of the public good, for reinventing social democratic politics, even for renewing the activity of politics at all. These, of course, may prove to be naïve hopes, futile whistling in a cold and hostile wind. It is in addition true that the project of civilizing security is ultimately a question not of social theory but of political praxis. But if such a project is ever to be thematized as a politics it requires, or at least can be furthered by, some form of theoretical articulation; one which reminds us, as C. L. R. James (1963) might have said, that those who know only of security of security nothing know. It is with this overarching purpose in mind that we have been moved to write in the way that we have about security today. Our argument in this book is that security is a valuable public good, a constitutive ingredient of the good society, and that the democratic state has a necessary and virtuous role to play in the production of this good. The state, and in particular the forms of public policing governed by it, is, we shall argue, indispensable to the task of fostering and sustaining liveable political communities in the contemporary world. It is, in the words of our title, pivotal to the project of civilizing security. By invoking this phrase we have in mind two ideas, both of which we develop in the course of the book. The first, which is relatively familiar if not uncontroversial, is that security needs civilizing. States – even those that claim with some justification to be ‘liberal’ or ‘democratic’ – have a capacity when self-consciously pursuing a condition called ‘security’ to act in a fashion injurious to it. So too do non-state ‘security’ actors, a point we return to below and throughout the book. They proceed in ways that trample over the basic liberties of citizens; that forge security for some groups while imposing illegitimate burdens of insecurity upon others, or that extend the coercive reach of the state – and security discourse – over social and political life. As monopoly holders of the means of legitimate physical and symbolic violence, modern states possess a built-in, paradoxical tendency to undermine the very liberties and security they are constituted to protect. Under conditions of fear, such as obtain across many parts of the globe today, states and their police forces are prone to deploying their power in precisely such uncivil, insecurity instilling ways. If the state is to perform the ordering and solidarity nourishing work that we argue is vital to the production of secure political communities then it must, consequently, be connected to forms of discursive contestation, democratic scrutiny and constitutional control. The state is a great civilizing force, a necessary and virtuous component of the good society. But if it is to take on this role, the state must itself be civilized – made safe by and for democracy. But our title also has another, less familiar meaning – the idea that security is civilizing. Individuals who live, objectively or subjectively, in a state of anxiety do not make good democratic citizens, as European theorists reflecting upon the dark days of the 1930s and 1940s knew well (Neumann 1957). Fearful citizens tend to be inattentive to, unconcerned about, even enthusiasts for, the erosion of basic freedoms. They often lack openness or sympathy towards others, especially those they apprehend as posing a danger to them. They privilege the known over the unknown, us over them, here over there. They often retreat from public life, seeking refuge in private security ‘solutions’ while at the same time screaming anxiously and angrily from the sidelines for the firm hand of authority – for tough ‘security’ measures against crime, or disorder, or terror. Prolonged episodes of violence, in particular, can erode or destroy people’s will and capacity to exercise political judgement and act in solidarity with others (Keane 2004: 122–3). Fear, in all these ways, is the breeding ground, as well as the stock-in-trade, of authoritarian, uncivil government. But there is more to it than that. Security is also civilizing in a further, more positive sense. Security, we shall argue, is in a sociological sense a ‘thick’ public good, one whose production has irreducibly social dimensions, a good that helps to constitute the very idea of ‘publicness’. Security, in other words, is simultaneously the producer and product of forms of trust and abstract solidarity between intimates and strangers that are prerequisite to democratic political communities. The state, moreover, performs vital cultural and ordering work in fashioning the good of security conceived of in this sense. It can, under the right conditions, create inclusive communities of practice and attachment, while ensuring that these remain rights-regarding, diversity respecting entities. In a world where the state’s pre-eminence in governing security is being questioned by private-sector interests, practices of local communal ordering and transnational policing networks, the constitution of old- and new-fashioned forms of democratic political authority is, we shall argue, indispensable to cultivating and sustaining the civilizing effects of security. Security and its discontents Raising these possibilities is, of course, to invite a whole series of obvious but nonetheless significant questions: what is security? What does it mean to be or to feel secure? Who or what is the proper object of security – individuals, collectivities, states, humanity at large? What social and political arrangements are most conducive to the production of security? It is also to join – in a global age that is now also an age of terror – a highly charged political debate about the meanings and value of security as a good, and about how it may best be pursued. It is these questions, and this debate, that we want to address in this book. Security has become the political vernacular of our times. This has long been so in respect of ‘law and order’ within nation states. Authoritarian regimes are routinely in the habit of using the promise and rhetoric of security as a means of fostering allegiance and sustaining their rule – delivering safe streets while (and by) placing their citizens in fear of the early morning knock at the door (Michnik 1998). Democratic societies too have over the last several decades come to be governed through the prism of crime – a phenomenon especially marked in the USA, Britain and Australasia, though not without resonance in other liberal democratic states (Garland 2001; Simon 2006; see also Newburn and Sparks 2004). But security has also since 9/11, and the ‘war on terror’ waged in response to it, become a pervasive and contested element of world politics, impacting significantly on the ‘interior’ life of states and international and transnational relations in ways, as we shall see, that escalate the breakdown of once settled distinctions between internal and external security, war and crime, policing and soldiering (Kaldor 1999; Bigo 2000a). Today, security politics is riven by disagreements over the pros and cons of self-consciously seeking security using predominantly policing and military means; by disputes about how and whether to ‘balance’ security with such other goods as freedom, justice and democracy; and by conflicts between a conception of security as protection from physical harm and wider formulations of ‘human’ or ‘global’ security. In the face of these debates we are aware that the title and ambitions of this text are likely to meet with one of three possible responses. They will be seen by some as offensive to the benign intentions and purposes of governments and security actors. They may be viewed, alternatively, as the naïve, wrong-headed pursuit of an oxymoron. Or they may be dismissed – by those who share our broad ambition to civilize security – as too limited in their grasp of what the idea of security can and should mean. We want to probe a little further into each of these anticipated reactions. In so doing, we can begin to pinpoint the limitations of certain established dispositions towards, and public discourses about, security, as well as indicating how the debate about security can be moved to a different – we think more fruitful – place.1 The first – currently hegemonic – response issues from a lobby that seeks fairly unambiguously to promote security and that takes exception to the idea that security needs civilizing. Security, on this view, is an unqualified human good. The protection of its people from internal and external threats stands consequently as the first and defining priority of government. Far from needing to be balanced with democratic rights and freedoms, security is a precondition for the enjoyment of such goods. Far from needing ‘civilizing’, security is the foundation stone and hallmark of civilization. Security, moreover, can and should be directly and consciously pursued using what Joseph Nye (2002) calls ‘hard power’ – by enabling, resourcing and enthusiastically backing the military, intelligence agencies and the police. It is these agencies that will protect the state and its citizens, and these agencies whose purposes and effectiveness must not be hamstrung by excessive legal rights and safeguards that give succour to the enemy, or by forms of democratic deliberation that obstruct decisive executive action. This – stripped to its essentials – is the discourse that has animated countless ‘wars on drugs’ and ‘crackdowns’ on crime and disorder in both democratic and authoritarian states over recent decades, and which since 9/11 has fuelled and justified what may turn out to be a permanent ‘war on terror’. This disposition towards, and identification with, security has long antecedents dating back to Jean Bodin and Thomas Hobbes, and is deeply sedimented in the present (Robin 2004). It represents the clearsighted and hard-headed outlook of a good many politicians and police officers. It holds – for anxious citizens – a deep emotional allure. But it is not without some serious shortcomings, two of which warrant an introductory note. It proceeds, first of all, in ways that gloss over the paradoxes that attend the pursuit of security (Berki 1986: ch. 1; Zedner 2003). It has little to say, and rarely pauses to reflect upon, the most profound of these; namely, that the state’s concentration of coercive power makes it simultaneously a guarantor of and a threat to the security of individuals. Security, as Berki (1986: 13) puts it, is inescapably a problem for and a problem of the state – a condition we deal with more fully in later chapters (see also N. Walker 2000: ch. 1). Nor does the security lobby grasp clearly the implications of how human beings are mutually implicated in one another’s in/security – as both an everpresent potential threat to the security of each, and at the same time a necessary precondition for giving effect to such security. Still less does the security lobby register and absorb the fact that security is, in an important sense, destined to remain beyond our grasp – ‘more within us as a yearning, than without us as a fact’ (Ericson and Haggerty 1997: 85). Not only does this mean that there can never – in a paradox rich with implications – be ‘enough’ security measures, which hold out a promise of protection while always also signifying the presence of threat and danger. It also warns us that responding to demands for order in the terms in which they present themselves (i.e. zero-tolerant police, tougher sentencing, more prisons, ‘wars’ against drugs, or crime, or terror) can be little more than a bid to quench the unquenchable. The effacing of paradoxes such as these is closely connected to – indeed a key contributor towards – the second and most deleterious shortcoming of the security lobby. This is its tendency to make security pervasive, to proceed in ways that treat and thereby produce ‘security’ – or, more accurately, security rhetoric and activity – as a dominant, emotionally charged element of political culture and everyday life. Security – as Buzan et al. (1998) usefully remind us – is not only a condition of social existence, a description of social relations marked by order and tranquillity. It is also a political practice, a speech act, one way of framing and naming problems. To call something ‘security’ – to make what Buzan et al. (1998: 25) call a ‘securitizing move’ – is to suggest, and to seek to mobilize audiences behind, the idea that ‘we’ face an existential threat that calls for immediate, decisive, special measures. It is, in other words, to seek to lift the issue at hand – whether it is crime, or drugs, or migration – out of the realm of normal democratic politics, to claim that as an emergency it demands an urgent, even exceptional, response. The security lobby – blessed as it invariably is with ‘blind credulity and passionate certainty’ (Holmes 1993: 250) – makes precisely this move. It connects with and articulates public insecurities about crime, or disorder, or terror in terms that institutionalize anxiety as a feature of everyday life and link security to a conception of political community organized around binary oppositions between us/them, here/there, friends/enemies, inside/outside. In encouraging ‘emotional fusion between ruler and ruled’ around the question of fear (Holmes 1993: 49), it generates a climate that inhibits – even actively deters – critical scrutiny of the state’s claims and practices. By translating security into Security, into a matter of cops chasing robbers, soldiers engaging the enemy, it risks fostering vicious circles of insecurity (atrocity – fear – tough response – atrocity – fear – and so on) that ratchet up police powers, security technologies and their attendant rhetoric in ways that it becomes difficult then to temper or dismantle. In all these ways, the security lobby makes ‘security’ talk and action pervasive, or what we shall call shallow and wide, reproducing ‘security’ on the surface of social consciousness and rendering it dependent on the visible display of executive authority and police power. In so doing, it fails to get close to the heart of what it is that makes individuals objectively (or intersubjectively) and subjectively secure – it is unable, that is, to understand, still less to create, the conditions under which security becomes axiomatic, or deep and narrow. For us, these are vital distinctions, ones that we revisit and develop as our argument unfolds. The second response to our stated ambitions – the one likely to regard the enterprise as hopelessly misplaced – is concerned above all to counter security. This emanates from what we may call the ‘liberty lobby’ which disputes the suggestion that security can be civilized. Security, on this view, is a troubling, dangerous idea. Security politics – especially in the form we have just set out – is seen as authoritarian and potentially barbarous – ‘contrary to civil well-being’ (Keane 2004: 46). It is a politics that privileges state interests (and conceptions of security) over those of individuals; that is inimical to democratic values; that possesses a seductive capacity to trample – in the name, and with the support, of ‘the majority’ – over civil liberties and minority rights; that is, in short, conducive to the very violence that it purports to stamp out. Security, consequently, is something that must either be curbed in the name of liberty and human rights or, given its close police and military associations, abandoned as a value altogether. Let us briefly introduce two strands of this critical disposition. The first – common to human rights movements across the globe – seeks to constrain the power of security by questioning its imperatives, and fencing in its demands, with an insistence on protecting or enhancing the democratic freedoms and individual rights that security politics is indifferent to, throws into a utilitarian calculus, chips away at, or suspends. From this standpoint, habeas corpus, access to legal advice, limits on detention and police interrogative powers, jury trials, rights of appeal and the like are the expression and tools of a desire to preserve a space for individual liberty in the face of the forceful demands of an overweening state and global state system – whether in ‘normal’ or ‘exceptional’ times.2 A second stance – associated with those working under the loose banner of ‘critical security studies’ (Krause andWilliams 1997) – deepens and radicalizes the impulse and insights of the first. This holds that security is irredeemably tainted by its police/military parentage, and by its authoritarian desires for certainty. On this view, security is a political technology that must ‘continue to produce images of insecurity in order to retain its meaning’ (A. Burke 2002: 18) in ways that make it, at a conceptual level, inimical to democratic politics; or else it is a practice deeply tarred by its intimate empirical relation to the formation and reproduction of state-centric interests and xenophobic, anti-democratic political subjectivities and collective identities (R. B. J. Walker 1997). The conclusion in either case is the same. Security, it is claimed, has to be abandoned, the dual analytical and political task being to unsettle and deconstruct security as a category so as to find ways of thinking and acting beyond it (Dillon 1996; Aradau 2004). There is much of value in this critique of uncivil security – a great deal, in fact, which we are sympathetic towards. But these critical stances also share certain lacunae. Each, in particular, expressly or implicitly intimates that security – understood as being and feeling free from the threat of physical harm – is a problem, a conservative sensibility and project that is all too often hostile to the values and institutional practices of democracy and liberty (Huysmans 2002). The result is that each operates as a negative, oppositional force, one that evacuates the terrain that the security lobby so effectively and affectively occupies in favour of a stance that strives either to temper its worst excesses, or to trash and banish the idea altogether – a stance that appeals in part because so few others appear motivated to defend the liberties which are being imperilled. There is, on this view, little or no mileage in seeking to think in constructive terms about the good of security and the kind of good that security is. There is little point in fashioning a theory and praxis that explores the positive – democracy and liberty-enhancing – ways in which security and political community may be coupled; in reflecting upon what it means, and might take, to make security axiomatic to lived social relations. There can, in short, be no politics of civilizing security. Proponents of the third – ‘human’ or ‘social security’ – response share with us both a desire to transcend this received security–liberty dichotomy and, in their own way, an ambition to civilize security. On this view, however, such a project requires that security be rescued from a taken-for-granted association with the ‘threat, use and control of military force’ (Walt 1991: 212), and extended to other domains of social and political life (e.g. de Lint and Virta 2004).3 We can usefully highlight two variants of this position – one international, the other domestic. The former takes its cue from the United Nations Human Development Report 1994, which introduced, and sought to mobilize opinion behind, the concept of ‘human security’, an idea which has subsequently been taken up in further work conducted under the auspices of the United Nations and the European Union (Commission on Human Security 2003; Barcelona Group 2004; cf. Paris 2001). It seeks to decouple security from questions of war and peace and deploy it as a device aimed at urging governments to treat as emergencies such chronic threats as hunger, homelessness, disease and ecological degradation – the latter, for instance, being described by the Commission on Global Governance (1995: 83) as ‘the ultimate security threat’. The domestic version of the argument draws from the insight that there is no policing or penal solution to the problem of order the conclusion that crime control – or harm reduction – is ultimately a matter of, and dissolves into, questions of economic and social policy more generally. This is a commonly held disposition within both sociological criminology and social democratic politics, one which has in recent years informed a critique of situational crime prevention, crime science and other forms of technocratic crime control, and underpinned the promotion of multi-agency, social crime prevention (Crawford 1997; Hope and Karstedt 2003). On this view, security conceived of in a ‘shallow’ manner as freedom from physical harm or threat is both inseparable from a more profound sense of ‘well-being’ or ‘ontological’ security and, therefore, also dependent upon the broader institutions and services of social welfare (Fredman forthcoming). There is, once more, much to applaud in this attempt to extend the meanings and application of the idea of security. It reminds us that freedom from physical coercion is but a part of any rounded conception of human flourishing. And it pinpoints the limited and often counter-productive role that security politics and policing institutions play within this wider project. But there are difficulties with this attempt to broaden and extend security. It too – like the liberty lobby – tends to abandon the contest over how to render individuals and groups free from the threat and fear of physical coercion – in this case by a hasty and undue relegation of the significance of security in its ‘shallow’ sense. But it also, more importantly, transcends the security–liberty opposition in a fashion that risks making security pervasive in new ways. It does so, in respect of intranational crime, by connecting security to better education, full employment, or improved social conditions in a manner that tends to colonize, or ‘criminalize’, public policy such that the latter loses sight of its own values and objectives and comes instead to be thought about, funded and judged as an instrument of crime or harm reduction. The quest for ontological security, in other words, itself risks being ‘securitized’ in ways that render security pervasive in a more expansive sense than already indicated: as simultaneously deep and wide, such that any reconsideration of its preconditions is treated as a threat, prompting both parochial, xenophobic reactions and calls for more security in the shallow – police- and punishment centred – sense. Internationally, human security discourse likewise risks extending the dynamics and dangers of ‘securitization’, with all its antipolitical talk of existential threats and attendant calls for emergency measures, from the military to the political, economic, societal and environmental sectors (Buzan 1991; Buzan et al. 1998). By extending the reach of security in these ways, this position evacuates the terrain of contemporary security politics (and with it the struggle to make security axiomatic) in favour of a politics that risks turning all politics into security politics. In this book we take up the challenge of developing a fourth position – of thinking constructively about the relationship between security and political community through reconceptualizing security not as some kind of eigen-value embracing the whole of politics, but as a more modestly conceived but still ‘thick’ public good. We also indicate how – under conditions of pluralization and globalization – we may realize this revised conception of security in terms of institutional principles and design. In making good on these ambitions, we clearly need to counter the charge that ‘civilizing’ security (or anything else for that matter) inevitably carries with it a class and colonial baggage – amounting to a mission to bring ‘our’ standards and ways of doing things to a backward, barbarian ‘them’, whether at home or abroad. We try to do so as the book unfolds. For now it is sufficient to record the intuition that guides our enquiry: namely, that there is something to be gained from thinking through the connection between a family of words – civil, civility, civilizing, civilization – that have to do with taming violence and fostering respectful dialogue, and another family – politics, polity, policy, police – that have to do with the regulatory and cultural frameworks within which such democratic peace building may best take place (Keane 2004: chs. 3–4).4 Our aim is not to effect a banal compromise, or occupy some implausible middle ground, between the outlooks of the security and liberty lobbies. We want instead to step outside the terms of the confrontation in a bid to move discussion of security to a different place altogether. In his work on authenticity, Charles Taylor describes this as an ‘act of retrieval’, a phrase that captures well the activity we have in mind. A work of retrieval, Taylor says: suggests . . . that we identify and articulate the higher ideal behind the more or less debased practices, and then criticize these practices from the standpoint of their own motivating ideal. In other words, instead of dismissing this culture altogether, or just endorsing it as it is, we ought to attempt to raise its practice by making more palpable to its participants what the ethic they subscribe to really involves. (1991: 72) To engage in such retrieval in respect of security requires neither ‘root and branch condemnation’, nor ‘uncritical praise’, still less ‘a carefully balanced trade-off’ between the received ideas and practices of security and liberty (1991: 23). It demands instead taking security seriously as a ‘moral’ category and engaging in a struggle to define its ‘proper meaning’ as a ‘motivating ideal’ (1991: 73). This requires, or so it seems to us, that we recover and develop two somewhat buried or neglected meanings of security. We need, first of all, to emphasize, as the human security scholars have rightly done, the idea of the individual as the basic moral unit and referent of security – an idea that originates in the political theory of modernity.5 That individuation of security necessarily implies and so alerts us to the irreducibly subjective dimension of security, an idea that led Montesquieu to opine that ‘political freedom consists in security, or at least in the opinion one has of one’s security’ (cited in Rothschild 1995: 61; see also McSweeney 1998: ch. 1). This in turn provides a cue for a second act of retrieval; namely, of the root Latin meaning of securitas as freedom from concern, care or anxiety, a state of self-assurance or well-founded confidence. What this recovered cluster of meanings indicates is that security possesses subjective as well as objective dimensions, and that in both dimensions the ‘surfaces’ of physical security are intricately connected to the ‘depths’ of ontological security. And it is this intimate link between security and generic questions of social connectedness and solidarity that elevates it above terms like order, protection and safety as an orchestrating theme for our enquiry. The sense that security is about the relationship individuals have to the intimates and strangers they dwell among and the political communities they dwell within, and that it may therefore be connected in mutually supportive ways to the values and practices of ‘belonging’ and ‘critical freedom’ (Tully 2002), is what inspires our attempt to construct an alternative theory and praxis of security.

#### Perm do both.

#### energy security discourse fosters interdependence-internal link turns their security impacts.

Maria Julia TROMBETTA Delft University of Technology ‘8 “The meaning and function of climate security” Paper prepared for the second WISC Conference Lujbljana 23-26 July 2008

What is at stake in the climate security discourse is the possibility of reintroducing a mechanism to deal with transformation and contingencies within a system that tends to rely on the one hand on governing through emergencies, on the other hand on insurance and compensation. The securitization of climate is an attempt to evoke the symbolic power of an environmental discourse based on interdependence and prevention to establish a framework for security governance at global level. It is about renegotiating the spaces in which risk management and market mechanisms prevail, and those in which intervention is legitimated. Securitization remains that very political moment. Its implications largely depend on what is securitized, the means employed to provide security and the logic of security that underlines the process. Arguments linking security and climate change have been promoted by actors interested in both prioritizing environmental problems and transforming security logics. On the one hand, they suggested a move from an antagonist perspective which implies that “my security is others’ insecurity” to one in which “my security depends on others’ security” And yet they brought into the security discourse a precautionary approach aimed at preventing emergencies and largely inspired by the precautionary principle which characterises environmental norms and practices. These discourses supported the creation, at international level, mechanisms of security governance, similar to the safety regulations, environmental standards and social security that characterize domestic policies. On the other hand these arguments were suggesting breaking the link between security and military means; in this sense they were influential on actors like the EU which tended to have limited military capabilities. This has led to a transformation of security practices which has affected other sectors than the environment. A logic of security cannot be translated from one sector to another. Security discourses and logics are related with the specific issues that are considered as threats, the actors involved in the process of securitization and the means these actors are able and legitimized to employ. Conclusion This paper has suggested that the transformation of climate change into a security issue relays on security discourses which includes considerations on the materiality of the impacts, the growing awareness of environmental problems, and the means to deal with these issues. In turn these discourses challenge existing security practices. An approach like securitization provides relevant insights because it allows an exploration of the struggle and mechanisms that are behind the process of transformation of an issue into a security issue. Securitization however, as understood by the Copenhagen School, tends to consider the logic and practices associate with national security as fixed. In this way it imposes a problematic logic based on an antagonist approach to security which is based on the inscription of enemies in a context and the creation of emergencies. This logic, even if it still relevant, does not applies to all the attempts to transform an issue into a security issue. The limits of assuming that this logic applies all the times the word security is evoked are evident in the attempts to securitize a non traditional issue like climate change.

**War outweighs structural violence- their impact can’t turn ours**

**Boulding 90** (Kenneth E., Conflict: Readings in Management and Resolution, Ed: John Burton, pg. 40-41)

I must confess that when I first became involved with the peace research enterprise 25 years ago I had hopes that it might produce something like the Keynesian revolution in economics, which was the result of some rather simple ideas that had never really been thought out clearly before (though they had been anticipated by Malthus and others), coupled with a substantial improvement in the information system with the development of national income statistics which reinforced this new theoretical framework. As a result, we have had in a single generation a very massive change in what might be called the "conventional wisdom" of economic policy, and even though this conventional wisdom is not wholly wise, there is a world of difference between Herbert Hoover and his total failure to deal with the Great Depression, simply because of everybody's ignorance, and the moderately skillful handling of the depression which followed the change in oil prices in 1-974, which, compared with the period 1929 to 1932, was little more than a bad cold compared with a galloping pneumonia. In the international system, however, there has been only glacial change in the conventional wisdom. There has been some improvement.Kissinger was an improvement on John Foster Dulles. We have had the beginnings of detente, and at least the possibility on the horizon of stable peace between the United States and the Soviet Union, indeed in the whole temperate zone-even though the tropics still remain uneasy and beset with arms races, wars, and revolutions which we cannot really afford. Nor can we pretend that peace around the temperate zone is stable enough so that we do not have to worry about it. The qualitative arms race goes on and could easily take us over the cliff. The record of peace research in the last generation, therefore, is one of very partial success. It has created a discipline and that is something of long-run consequence, most certainly for the good. It has made very little dent on the conventional wisdom of the policy makers anywhere in the world. It has not been able to prevent an arms race, any more, I suppose we might say, than the Keynesian economics has been able to prevent inflation. But whereas inflation is an inconvenience, the arms race may well be another catastrophe. Where, then, do we go from here? Can we see new horizons for peace and conflict research to get it out of the doldrums in which it has been now for almost ten years? The challenge is surely great enough. It still remains true that war, the breakdown of Galtung's "negative peace," remains the greatest clear and present danger to the human race, a danger to human survival far greater than poverty, or injustice, or oppression, desirable and necessary as it is to eliminate these things.

### Case o/w

Sustainability- carrying capacity of the planet- that’s Boreksy

Progressivism- iran strikes + transition wars

#### Biological death outweighs social death

**Bernstein ‘2** (Richard J., Vera List Prof. Phil. – New School for Social Research, “Radical Evil: A Philosophical Interrogation”, p. 188-192)

This is precisely what Jonas does in The Phenomenon of Life, his rethinking of the meaning of organic life. He tealizes that his philosophical project goes against many of the deeply embedded prejudices and dogmas of contemporary philosophy. He challenges two well-entrenched dogmas: that there is no metaphysical truth, and that there is no path from the "is" to the "ought". To escape from ethical nihilism, we must show that there is a metaphysical ground of ethics, an objective basis for value and purpose in being itself. These are strong claims; and, needless to say, they are extremely controversial. In defense of Jonas, it should be said that he approaches this task with both boldness and intellectual modesty. He frequently acknowledges that he cannot "prove" his claims, but he certainly believes that his "premises" do "more justice to the total phenomenon of man and Being in general" than the prevailing dualist or reductionist alternatives. "But in the last analysis my argument can do no more than give a rational grounding to an option it presents as a choice for a thoughtful person — an option that of course has its own inner power of persuasion. Unfortunately I have nothing better to offer. Perhaps a future metaphysics will be able to do more." 8 To appreciate how Jonas's philosophical project unfolds, we need to examine his philosophical interpretation of life. This is the starting point of his grounding of a new imperative of responsibility. It also provides the context for his speculations concerning evil. In the foreword to The Phenomenon of Life, Jonas gives a succinct statement of his aim. Put at its briefest, this volume offers an "existential" interpretation of biological facts. Contemporary existentialism, obsessed with man alone, is in the habit of claiming as his unique privilege and predicament much of what is rooted in organic existence as such: in so doing, it withholds from the organic world the insights to be learned from the awareness of self. On its part, scientific biology, by its rules confined to the physical, outward facts, must ignore the dimension of inwardness that belongs to life: in so doing, it submerges the distinction of "animate" and "inanimate." A new reading of the biological record may recover the inner dimension — that which we know best -- for the understanding of things organic and so reclaim for psycho-physical unity of life that place in the theoretical scheme which it had lost through the divorce of the material and the mental since Descartes. p. ix) Jonas, in his existential interpretation of bios, pursues "this underlying theme of all of life in its development through the ascending order of organic powers and functions: metabolism, moving and desiring, sensing and perceiving, imagination, art, and mind — a progressive scale of freedom and peril, culminating in man, who may understand his uniqueness anew when he no longer sees himself in metaphysical isolation" (PL, p. ix). The way in which Jonas phrases this theme recalls the Aristotelian approach to bios, and it is clear that Aristotle is a major influence on Jonas. There is an even closer affinity with the philosophy of nature that Schelling sought to elaborate in the nineteenth century. Schelling (like many post- Kantian German thinkers) was troubled by the same fundamental dichotomy that underlies the problem for Jonas. The dichotomy that Kant introduced between the realm of "disenchanted" nature and the realm of freedom leads to untenable antinomies. Jonas differs from both Aristotle and Schelling in taking into account Darwin and contemporary scientific biology. A proper philosophical understanding of biology must always be compatible with the scientific facts. But at the same time, it must also root out misguided materialistic and reductionist interpretations of those biological facts. In this respect, Jonas's naturalism bears a strong affinity with the evolutionary naturalism of Peirce and Dewey. At the same time, Jonas is deeply skeptical of any theory of evolutionary biology that introduces mysterious "vital forces" or neglects the contingencies and perils of evolutionary development.' Jonas seeks to show "that it is in the dark stirrings of primeval organic substance that a principle of freedom shines forth for the first time within the vast necessity of the physical universe" (PL 3). Freedom, in this broad sense, is not identified exclusively with human freedom; it reaches down to the first glimmerings of organic life, and up to the type of freedom manifested by human beings. " 'Freedom' must denote an objectively discernible mode of being, i.e., a manner of executing existence, distinctive of the organic per se and thus shared by all members but by no nonmembers of the class: an ontologically descriptive term which can apply to mere physical evidence at first" (PL 3). This coming into being of freedom is not just a success story. "The privilege of freedom carries the burden of need and means precarious being" (PL 4). It is with biological metabolism that this principle of freedom first arises. Jonas goes "so far as to maintain that metabolism, the basic stratum of all organic existence, already displays freedom — indeed that it is the first form freedom takes." 1 ° With "metabolism — its power and its need — not-being made its appearance in the world as an alternative embodied in being itself; and thereby being itself first assumes an emphatic sense: intrinsically qualified by the threat of its negative it must affirm itself, and existence affirmed is existence as a concern" (PL 4). This broad, ontological understanding of freedom as a characteristic of all organic life serves Jonas as "an Ariadne's thread through the interpretation of Life" (PL 3). The way in which Jonas enlarges our understanding of freedom is indicative of his primary argumentative strategy. He expands and reinterprets categories that are normally applied exclusively to human beings so that we can see that they identify objectively discernible modes of being characteristic of everything animate. Even inwardness, and incipient forms of self; reach down to the simplest forms of organic life. 11 Now it may seem as if Jonas is guilty of anthropomorphism, of projecting what is distinctively human onto the entire domain of living beings. He is acutely aware of this sort of objection, but he argues that even the idea of anthropomorphism must be rethought. 12 We distort Jonas's philosophy of life if we think that he is projecting human characteristics onto the nonhuman animate world. Earlier I quoted the passage in which Jonas speaks of a "third way" — "one by which the dualistic rift can be avoided and yet enough of the dualistic insight saved to uphold the humanity of man" (GEN 234). We avoid the "dualistic rift" by showing that there is genuine continuity of organic life, and that such categories as freedom, inwardness, and selfhood apply to everything that is animate. These categories designate objective modes of being. But we preserve "enough dualistic insight" when we recognize that freedom, inwardness, and selfhood manifest themselves in human beings in a distinctive manner. I do not want to suggest that Jonas is successful in carrying out this ambitious program. He is aware of the tentativeness and fallibility of his claims, but he presents us with an understanding of animate beings such that we can discern both continuity and difference.' 3 It should now be clear that Jonas is not limiting himself to a regional philosophy of the organism or a new "existential" interpretation of biological facts. His goal is nothing less than to provide a new metaphysical understanding of being, a new ontology. And he is quite explicit about this. Our reflections [are] intended to show in what sense the problem of life, and with it that of the body, ought to stand in the center of ontology and, to some extent, also of epistemology. . . The central position of the problem of life means not only that it must be accorded a decisive voice in judging any given ontology but also that any treatment of itself must summon the whole of ontology. (PL 25) The philosophical divide between Levinas and Jonas appears to be enormous. For Levinas, as long as we restrict ourselves to the horizon of Being and to ontology (no matter how broadly these are conceived), there is no place for ethics, and no answer to ethical nihilism. For Jonas, by contrast, unless we can enlarge our understanding of ontology in such a manner as would provide an objective grounding for value and purpose within nature, there is no way to answer the challenge of ethical nihilism. But despite this initial appearance of extreme opposition, there is a way of interpreting Jonas and Levinas that lessens the gap between them. In Levinasian terminology, we can say that Jonas shows that there is a way of understanding ontology and the living body that does justice to the nonreducible alterity of the other (l'autrui). 14 Still, we might ask how Jonas's "existential" interpretation of biological facts and the new ontology he is proposing can provide a metaphysical grounding for a new ethics. Jonas criticizes the philosophical prejudice that there is no place in nature for values, purposes, and ends. Just as he maintains that freedom, inwardness, and selfhood are objective modes of being, so he argues that values and ends are objective modes of being. **There is a basic value inherent in organic being, a basic affirmation, "The Yes' of Life**" (IR 81). 15 "**The self-affirmation of being becomes emphatic in the opposition of life to death. Life is the explicit confrontation of being with not-being**. . . . The 'yes' of all striving is here sharpened by the active `no' to not-being" (IR 81-2). Furthermore — and this is the crucial point for Jonas — **this affirmation of life that is in all organic being has a binding obligatory force upon human beings**. This blindly self-enacting "yes" gains obligating force in the seeing freedom of man, who as the supreme outcome of nature's purposive labor is no longer its automatic executor but, with the power obtained from knowledge, can become its destroyer as well. He must adopt the "yes" into his will and impose the "no" to not-being on his power. But precisely this transition from willing to obligation is the critical point of moral theory at which attempts at laying a foundation for it come so easily to grief. Why does now, in man, that become a duty which hitherto "being" itself took care of through all individual willings? (IR 82). We discover here the transition from is to "ought" — from the self-affirmation of life to the binding obligation of human beings to preserve life not only for the present but also for the future. But why do we need a new ethics? The subtitle of The Imperative of Responsibility — In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age — indicates why we need a new ethics. Modern technology has transformed the nature and consequences of human ac-tion so radically that the underlying premises of traditional ethics are no longer valid. For the first time in history human beings possess the knowledge and the power to destroy life on this planet, including human life. Not only is there the new possibility of total nuclear disaster; there are the even more invidious and threatening possibilities that result from the unconstrained use of technologies that can destroy the environment required for life. The major transformation brought about by modern technology is that the consequences of our actions frequently exceed by far anything we can envision. Jonas was one of the first philosophers to warn us about the unprecedented ethical and political problems that arise with the rapid development of biotechnology. He claimed that this was happening at a time when there was an "ethical vacuum," when there did not seem to be any effective ethical principles to limit ot guide our ethical decisions. In the name of scientific and technological "progress," there is a relentless pressure to adopt a stance where virtually anything is permissible, includ-ing transforming the genetic structure of human beings, as long as it is "freely chosen." We need, Jonas argued, a new categorical imperative that might be formulated as follows: "Act so that the effects of your action are compatible with the permanence of genuine human life"; or expressed negatively: "Act so that the effects of your action are not destructive of the future possibility of such a life"; or simply: "**Do not compromise the conditions for an indefinite continuation of humanity on earth**"; or again turned positive: "In your present choices, include the future wholeness of Man among the objects of your will." (IR 11)

### A2 ethics

#### Ethics requires engagement with politics and consequences. Insular moralism is useless.

Isaac 2—Jeffrey Isaac, Professor of Political Science at Indiana University [Spring 2002, “Ends, Means, and Politics,” *Dissent*, http://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/?article=601]

What is striking about much of the political discussion on the left today is its failure to engage this earlier tradition of argument. The left, particularly the campus left—by which I mean “progressive” faculty and student groups, often centered around labor solidarity organizations and campus Green affiliates—has become moralistic rather than politically serious. Some of its moralizing—about Chiapas, Palestine, and Iraq—continues the third worldism that plagued the New Left in its waning years. Some of it—about globalization and sweatshops— is new and in some ways promising (see my “Thinking About the Antisweatshop Movement,” Dissent, Fall 2001). But what characterizes much campus left discourse is a substitution of moral rhetoric about evil policies or institutions for a sober consideration of what might improve or replace them, how the improvement might be achieved, and what the likely costs, as well as the benefits, are of any reasonable strategy. One consequence of this tendency is a failure to worry about methods of securing political support through democratic means or to recognize the distinctive value of democracy itself. It is not that conspiratorial or antidemocratic means are promoted. On the contrary, the means employed tend to be preeminently democratic—petitions, demonstrations, marches, boycotts, corporate campaigns, vigorous public criticism. And it is not that political democracy is derided. Projects such as the Green Party engage with electoral politics, locally and nationally, in order to win public office and achieve political objectives. But what is absent is a sober reckoning with the preoccupations and opinions of the vast majority of Americans, who are not drawn to vocal denunciations of the International Monetary Fund and World Trade Organization and who do not believe that the discourse of “anti-imperialism” speaks to their lives. Equally absent is critical thinking about why citizens of liberal democratic states—including most workers and the poor—value liberal democracy and subscribe to what Jürgen Habermas has called “constitutional patriotism”: a patriotic identification with the democratic state because of the civil, political, and social rights it defends. Vicarious identifications with Subcommandante Marcos or starving Iraqi children allow left activists to express a genuine solidarity with the oppressed elsewhere that is surely legitimate in a globalizing age. But these symbolic avowals are not an effective way of contending for political influence or power in the society in which these activists live. The ease with which the campus left responded to September 11 by rehearsing an all too-familiar narrative of American militarism and imperialism is not simply disturbing. Itis a sign of this left’s alienation from the society in which it operates (the worst examples of this are statements of the Student Peace Action Coalition Network, which declare that “the United States Government is the world’s greatest terror organization,” and suggest that “homicidal psychopaths of the United States Government” engineered the World Trade Center attacks as a pretext for imperialist aggression. See http://www.gospan.org). Many left activists seem more able to identify with (idealized versions of) Iraqi or Afghan civilians than with American citizens, whether these are the people who perished in the Twin Towers or the rest of us who legitimately fear that we might be next. This is not because of any “disloyalty.” Charges like that lack intellectual or political merit. It is because of a debilitating moralism; because it is easier to denounce wrong than to take real responsibility for correcting it, easier to locate and to oppose a remote evil than to address a proximate difficulty. The campus left says what it thinks. But it exhibits little interest in how and why so many Americans think differently. The “peace” demonstrations organized across the country within a few days of the September 11 attacks—in which local Green Party activists often played a crucial role—were, whatever else they were, a sign of their organizers’ lack of judgment and common sense. Although they often expressed genuine horror about the terrorism, they focused their energy not on the legitimate fear and outrage of American citizens but rather on the evils of the American government and its widely supported response to the terror. Hardly anyone was paying attention, but they alienated anyone who was. This was utterly predictable. And that is my point. The predictable consequences did not matter. What mattered was simply the expression of righteous indignation about what is wrong with the United States, as if September 11 hadn’t really happened. Whatever one thinks about America’s deficiencies, it must be acknowledged that a political praxis preoccupation with this is foolish and self-defeating. The other, more serious consequence of this moralizing tendency is the failure to think seriously about global politics. The campus left is rightly interested in the ills of global capitalism. But politically it seems limited to two options: expressions of “solidarity” with certain oppressed groups—Palestinians but not Syrians, Afghan civilians (though not those who welcome liberation from the Taliban), but not Bosnians or Kosovars or Rwandans—and automatic opposition to American foreign policy in the name of anti-imperialism. The economic discourse of the campus left is a universalist discourse of human needs and workers rights; but it is accompanied by a refusal to think in political terms about the realities of states, international institutions, violence, and power. This refusal is linked to a peculiar strain of pacifism, according to which any use of military force by the United States is viewed as aggression or militarism. case in point is a petition circulated on the campus of Indiana University within days of September 11. Drafted by the Bloomington Peace Coalition, it opposed what was then an imminent war in Afghanistan against al-Qaeda, and called for peace. It declared: “Retaliation will not lead to healing; rather it will harm innocent people and further the cycle of violence. Rather than engage in military aggression, those in authority should apprehend and charge those individuals believed to be directly responsible for the attacks and try them in a court of law in accordance with due process of international law.” This declaration was hardly unique. Similar statements were issued on college campuses across the country, by local student or faculty coalitions, the national Campus Greens, 9- 11peace.org, and the National Youth and Student Peace Coalition. As Global Exchange declared in its antiwar statement of September 11: “vengeance offers no relief. . . retaliation can never guarantee healing. . . and to meet violence with violence breeds more rage and more senseless deaths. Only love leads to peace with justice, while hate takes us toward war and injustice.” On this view military action of any kind is figured as “aggression” or “vengeance”; harm to innocents, whether substantial or marginal, intended or unintended, is absolutely proscribed; legality is treated as having its own force, independent of any means of enforcement; and, most revealingly, “healing” is treated as the principal goal of any legitimate response. None of these points withstands serious scrutiny. A military response to terrorist aggression is not in any obvious sense an act of aggression, unless any military response—or at least any U.S. military response—is simply defined as aggression. While any justifiable military response should certainly be governed by just-war principles, the criterion of absolute harm avoidance would rule out the possibility of any military response. It is virtually impossible either to “apprehend” and prosecute terrorists or to put an end to terrorist networks without the use of military force, for the “criminals” in question are not law-abiding citizens but mass murderers, and there are no police to “arrest” them. And, finally, while “healing” is surely a legitimate moral goal, it is not clear that it is a political goal. Justice, however, most assuredly is a political goal. The most notable thing about the Bloomington statement is its avoidance of political justice. Like many antiwar texts, it calls for “social justice abroad.” It supports redistributing wealth. But criminal and retributive justice, protection against terrorist violence, or the political enforcement of the minimal conditions of global civility—these are unmentioned. They are unmentioned because to broach them is to enter a terrain that the campus left is unwilling to enter—the terrain of violence, a realm of complex choices and dirty hands. This aversion to violence is understandable and in some ways laudable. America’s use of violence has caused much harm in the world, from Southeast Asia to Central and Latin America to Africa. The so-called “Vietnam Syndrome” was the product of a real learning experience that should not be forgotten. In addition, the destructive capacities of modern warfare— which jeopardize the civilian/combatant distinction, and introduce the possibility of enormous ecological devastation—make war under any circumstances something to be feared. No civilized person should approach the topic of war with anything other than great trepidation. And yet the left’s reflexive hostility toward violence in the international domain is strange. It is inconsistent with avowals of “materialism” and evocations of “struggle,” especially on the part of those many who are not pacifists; it is in tension with a commitment to human emancipation (is there no cause for which it is justifiable to fight?); and it is oblivious to the tradition of left thinking about ends and means. To compare the debates within the left about the two world wars or the Spanish Civil War with the predictable “anti-militarism” of today’s campus left is to compare a discourse that was serious about political power with a discourse that is not. This unpragmatic approach has become a hallmark of post–cold war left commentary, from the Gulf War protests of 1991, to the denunciation of the 1999 U.S.-led NATO intervention in Kosovo, to the current post–September 11 antiwar movement. In each case protesters have raised serious questions about U.S. policy and its likely consequences, but in a strikingly ineffective way. They sound a few key themes: the broader context of grievances that supposedly explains why Saddam Hussein, or Slobodan Milosevic, or Osama bin Laden have done what they have done; the hypocrisy of official U.S. rhetoric, which denounces terrorism even though the U.S. government has often supported terrorism; the harm that will come to ordinary Iraqi or Serbian or Afghan citizens as a result of intervention; and the cycle of violence that is likely to ensue. These are important issues. But they typically are raised by left critics not to promote real debate about practical alternatives, but to avoid such a debate or to trump it. As a result, the most important political questions are simply not asked. It is assumed that U.S. military intervention is an act of “aggression,” but no consideration is given to the aggression to which intervention is a response. The status quo ante in Afghanistan is not, as peace activists would have it, peace, but rather terrorist violence abetted by a regime—the Taliban—that rose to power through brutality and repression. This requires us to ask a question that most “peace” activists would prefer not to ask: What should be done to respond to the violence of a Saddam Hussein, or a Milosevic, or a Taliban regime? What means are likely to stop violence and bring criminals to justice? Calls for diplomacy and international law are well intended and important; they implicate a decent and civilized ethic of global order. But they are also vague and empty, because they are not accompanied by any account of how diplomacy or international law can work effectively to address the problem at hand. The campus left offers no such account. To do so would require it to contemplate tragic choices in which moral goodness is of limited utility. Here what matters is not purity of intention but the intelligent exercise of power. Power is not a dirty word or an unfortunate feature of the world. It is the core of politics. Power is the ability to effect outcomes in the world. Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world, one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. 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.

### 2AC social death

#### The invocation of social death as ontologically inevitable inscribes a pessimism towards politics which makes agency impossible and oversimplifies the history of resistance [both]

Brown 9 Vincent, Prof. of History and African and African-American Studies @ Harvard Univ., December, "Social Death and Political Life in the Study of Slavery," American Historical Review, p. 1231-1249

Specters of the Atlantic is a compellingly sophisticated study of the relation be- tween the epistemologies underwriting both modern slavery and modern capitalism, but the book’s discussion of the politics of anti-slavery is fundamentally incomplete. While Baucom brilliantly traces the development of “melancholy realism” as an op- positional discourse that ran counter to the logic of slavery and finance capital, he has very little to say about the enslaved themselves. Social death, so well suited to the tragic perspective, stands in for the experience of enslavement. While this heightens the reader’s sense of the way Atlantic slavery haunts the present, Baucom largely fails to acknowledge that the enslaved performed melancholy acts of accounting not unlike those that he shows to be a fundamental component of abolitionist and human rights discourses, or that those acts could be a basic element of slaves’ oppositional activities. In many ways, the effectiveness of his text depends upon the silence of slaves—it is easier to describe the continuity of structures of power when one down- plays countervailing forces such as the political activity of the weak. So Baucom’s deep insights into the structural features of Atlantic slave trading and its afterlife come with a cost. Without engagement with the politics of the enslaved, slavery’s history serves as an effective charge leveled against modernity and capitalism, but not as an uneven and evolving process of human interaction, and certainly not as a locus of conflict in which the enslaved sometimes won small but important victories.11¶ Specters of the Atlantic is self-consciously a work of theory (despite Baucom’s prodigious archival research), and social death may be largely unproblematic as a matter of theory, or even law. In these arenas, as David Brion Davis has argued, “the slave has no legitimate, independent being, no place in the cosmos except as an instrument of her or his master’s will.”12 But the concept often becomes a general description of actual social life in slavery. Vincent Carretta, for example, in his au- thoritative biography of the abolitionist writer and former slave Olaudah Equiano, agrees with Patterson that because enslaved Africans and their descendants were “stripped of their personal identities and history, [they] were forced to suffer what has been aptly called ‘social death.’ ” The self-fashioning enabled by writing and print “allowed Equiano to resurrect himself publicly” from the condition that had been imposed by his enslavement.13 The living conditions of slavery in eighteenth-century Jamaica, one slave society with which Equiano had experience, are described in rich detail in Trevor Burnard’s unflinching examination of the career of Thomas Thistle- wood, an English migrant who became an overseer and landholder in Jamaica, and who kept a diary there from 1750 to 1786. Through Thistlewood’s descriptions of his life among slaves, Burnard glimpses a “world of uncertainty,” where the enslaved were always vulnerable to repeated depredations that actually led to “significant slave dehumanization as masters sought, with considerable success, to obliterate slaves’ personal histories.” Burnard consequently concurs with Patterson: “slavery completely stripped slaves of their cultural heritage, brutalized them, and rendered ordinary life and normal relationships extremely difficult.”14 This was slavery, after all, and much more than a transfer of migrants from Africa to America.15 Yet one wonders, after reading Burnard’s indispensable account, how slaves in Jamaica or- ganized some of British America’s greatest political events during Thistlewood’s time and after, including the Coromantee Wars of the 1760s, the 1776 Hanover conspiracy, and the Baptist War of 1831–1832. Surely they must have found some way to turn the “disorganization, instability, and chaos” of slavery into collective forms of belonging and striving, making connections when confronted with alien- ation and finding dignity in the face of dishonor. Rather than pathologizing slaves by allowing the condition of social death to stand for the experience of life in slavery, then, it might be more helpful to focus on what the enslaved actually made of their¶ situation.¶ Among the most insightful texts to explore the experiential meaning of Afro- Atlantic slavery (for both the slaves and their descendants) are two recent books by Saidiya Hartman and Stephanie Smallwood. Rather than eschewing the concept of social death, as might be expected from writing that begins by considering the per- spective of the enslaved, these two authors use the idea in penetrating ways. Hart- man’s Lose Your Mother: A Journey along the Atlantic Slave Route and Smallwood’s Saltwater Slavery: A Middle Passage from Africa to American Diaspora extend social death beyond a general description of slavery as a condition and imagine it as an experience of self. Here both the promise and the problem with the concept are most fully apparent.16¶ Both authors seek a deeper understanding of the experience of enslavement and its consequences for the past, present, and future of black life than we generally find in histories of slavery. In Hartman’s account especially, slavery is not only an object of study, but also the focus of a personal memoir. She travels along a slave route in Ghana, from its coastal forts to the backcountry hinterlands, symbolically reversing the first stage of the trek now commonly called the Middle Passage. In searching prose, she meditates on the history of slavery in Africa to explore the precarious nature of belonging to the social category “African American.” Rendering her re- markable facility with social theory in elegant and affective terms, Hartman asks the question that nags all identities, but especially those forged by the descendants of slaves: What identifications, imagined affinities, mythical narratives, and acts of re- membering and forgetting hold the category together? Confronting her own alienation from any story that would yield a knowable genealogy or a comfortable identity, Hartman wrestles with what it means to be a stranger in one’s putative motherland, to be denied country, kin, and identity, and to forget one’s past—to be an orphan.17 Ultimately, as the title suggests, Lose Your Mother is an injunction to accept dis- possession as the basis of black self-definition.¶ Such a judgment is warranted, in Hartman’s account, by the implications of social death both for the experience of enslavement and for slavery’s afterlife in the present. As Patterson delineated in sociological terms the death of social personhood and the reincorporation of individuals into slavery, Hartman sets out on a personal quest to “retrace the process by which lives were destroyed and slaves born.”18 When she contends with what it meant to be a slave, she frequently invokes Patterson’s idiom: “Seized from home, sold in the market, and severed from kin, the slave was for all intents and purposes dead, no less so than had he been killed in combat. No less so than had she never belonged to the world.” By making men, women, and children into commodities, enslavement destroyed lineages, tethering people to own- ers rather than families, and in this way it “annulled lives, transforming men and women into dead matter, and then resuscitated them for servitude.” Admittedly, the enslaved “lived and breathed, but they were dead in the social world of men.”19 As it turns out, this kind of alienation is also part of what it presently means to be African American. “The transience of the slave’s existence,” for example, still leaves its traces in how black people imagine and speak of home:¶ We never tire of dreaming of a place that we can call home, a place better than here, wherever here might be . . . We stay there, but we don’t live there . . . Staying is living in a country without exercising any claims on its resources. It is the perilous condition of existing in a world in which you have no investments. It is having never resided in a place that you can say is yours. It is being “of the house” but not having a stake in it. Staying implies transient quarters, a makeshift domicile, a temporary shelter, but no attachment or affiliation. This sense of not belonging and of being an extraneous element is at the heart of slavery.20¶ “We may have forgotten our country,” Hartman writes, “but we haven’t forgotten our dispossession.”21¶ Like Baucom, Hartman sees the history of slavery as a constituent part of a tragic present. Atlantic slavery continues to be manifested in black people’s skewed life chances, poor education and health, and high rates of incarceration, poverty, and premature death. Disregarding the commonplace temporalities of professional historians, whose literary conventions are generally predicated on a formal distinction between past, present, and future, Hartman addresses slavery as a problem that spans all three. The afterlife of slavery inhabits the nature of belonging, which in turn guides the “freedom dreams” that shape prospects for change. “If slavery persists as an issue in the political life of black America,” she writes, “it is not because of an antiquated obsession with bygone days or the burden of a too-long memory, but because black lives are still imperiled and devalued by a racial calculus and a political arithmetic that were entrenched centuries ago.”22¶ A professor of English and comparative literature, Hartman is in many respects in a better position than most historians to understand events such as the funeral aboard the Hudibras. This is because for all of her evident erudition, her scholarship is harnessed not so much to a performance of mastery over the facts of what hap- pened, which might substitute precision for understanding, as to an act of mourning, even yearning. She writes with a depth of introspection and personal anguish that is transgressive of professional boundaries but absolutely appropriate to the task. Reading Hartman, one wonders how a historian could ever write dispassionately about slavery without feeling complicit and ashamed. For dispassionate accounting—exemplified by the ledgers of slave traders—has been a great weapon of the powerful, an episteme that made the grossest violations of personhood acceptable, even necessary. This is the kind of bookkeeping that bore fruit upon the Zong. “It made it easier for a trader to countenance yet another dead black body or for a captain to dump a shipload of captives into the sea in order to collect the insurance, since it wasn’t possible to kill cargo or to murder a thing already denied life. Death was simply part of the workings of the trade.” The archive of slavery, then, is “a mortuary.” Not content to total up the body count, Hartman offers elegy, echoing in her own way the lamentations of the women aboard the Hudibras. Like them, she is concerned with the dead and what they mean to the living. “I was desperate to reclaim the dead,” she writes, “to reckon with the lives undone and obliterated in the making of human commodities.”23¶ It is this mournful quality of Lose Your Mother that elevates it above so many histories of slavery, but the same sense of lament seems to require that Hartman overlook small but significant political victories like the one described by Butter- worth. Even as Hartman seems to agree with Paul Gilroy on the “value of seeing the consciousness of the slave as involving an extended act of mourning,” she remains so focused on her own commemorations that her text makes little space for a consideration of how the enslaved struggled with alienation and the fragility of belonging, or of the mourning rites they used to confront their condition.24 All of the ques- tions she raises about the meaning of slavery in the present—both highly personal and insistently political—might as well be asked about the meaning of slavery to slaves themselves, that is, if one begins by closely examining their social and political lives rather than assuming their lack of social being. Here Hartman is undone by her reliance on Orlando Patterson’s totalizing definition of slavery. She asserts that “no solace can be found in the death of the slave, no higher ground can be located, no perspective can be found from which death serves a greater good or becomes any- thing other than what it is.”25 If she is correct, the events on the Hudibras were of negligible importance. And indeed, Hartman’s understandable emphasis on the personal damage wrought by slavery encourages her to disavow two generations of social history that have demonstrated slaves’ remarkable capacity to forge fragile com- munities, preserve cultural inheritance, and resist the predations of slaveholders. This in turn precludes her from describing the ways that violence, dislocation, and death actually generate culture, politics, and consequential action by the enslaved.26¶ This limitation is particularly evident in a stunning chapter that Hartman calls “The Dead Book.” Here she creatively reimagines the events that occurred on the voyage of the slave ship Recovery, bound, like the Hudibras, from the Bight of Biafra to Grenada, when Captain John Kimber hung an enslaved girl naked from the mizzen stay and beat her, ultimately to her death, for being “sulky”: she was sick and could not dance when so ordered. As Hartman notes, the event would have been unre- markable had not Captain Kimber been tried for murder on the testimony of the ship’s surgeon, a brief transcript of the trial been published, and the woman’s death been offered up as allegory by the abolitionist William Wilberforce and the graphic satirist Isaac Cruikshank. Hartman re-creates the murder and the surge of words it inspired, representing the perspectives of the captain, the surgeon, and the aboli tionist, for each of whom the girl was a cipher “outfitted in a different guise,” and then she puts herself in the position of the victim, substituting her own voice for the unknowable thoughts of the girl. Imagining the experience as her own and wistfully representing her demise as a suicide—a final act of agency—Hartman hopes, by this bold device, to save the girl from oblivion. Or perhaps her hope is to prove the impossibility of ever doing so, because by failing, she concedes that the girl cannot be put to rest. It is a compelling move, but there is something missing. Hartman discerns a convincing subject position for all of the participants in the events sur- rounding the death of the girl, except for the other slaves who watched the woman die and carried the memory with them to the Americas, presumably to tell others, plausibly even survivors of the Hudibras, who must have drawn from such stories a basic perspective on the history of the Atlantic world. For the enslaved spectators, Hartman imagines only a fatalistic detachment: “The women were assembled a few feet away, but it might well have been a thousand. They held back from the girl, steering clear of her bad luck, pestilence, and recklessness. Some said she had lost her mind. What could they do, anyway? The women danced and sang as she lay dying.”¶ Hartman ends her odyssey among the Gwolu, descendants of peoples who fled the slave raids and who, as communities of refugees, shared her sense of dispos- session. “Newcomers were welcome. It didn’t matter that they weren’t kin because genealogy didn’t matter”; rather, “building community did.” Lose Your Mother con- cludes with a moving description of a particular one of their songs, a lament for those who were lost, which resonated deeply with her sense of slavery’s meaning in the present. And yet Hartman has more difficulty hearing similar cries intoned in the past by slaves who managed to find themselves.27¶ Saltwater Slavery has much in common with Lose Your Mother. Smallwood’s study of the slave trade from the Gold Coast to the British Americas in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries likewise redeems the experience of the people traded like so many bolts of cloth, “who were represented merely as ciphers in the political arithmetic,” and therefore “feature in the documentary record not as subjects of a social history but as objects or quantities.”28 Each text offers a penetrating analysis of the market logic that turned people into goods. Both books work with the concept of social death. However, Smallwood examines the problem of social death for the enslaved even more closely than Hartman does.29¶ Like Hartman, Smallwood sees social death as a by-product of commodification. “If in the regime of the market Africans’ most socially relevant feature was their exchangeability,” she argues, “for Africans as immigrants the most socially relevant feature was their isolation, their desperate need to restore some measure of social life to counterbalance the alienation engendered by their social death.” But Small- wood’s approach is different in a subtle way. Whereas for Hartman, as for others, social death is an accomplished state of being, Smallwood veers between a notion of social death as an actual condition produced by violent dislocation and social death as a compelling threat. On the one hand, she argues, captivity on the Atlantic littoral was a social death. Exchangeable persons “inhabited a new category of mar- ginalization, one not of extreme alienation within the community, but rather of ab- solute exclusion from any community.” She seems to accept the idea of enslaved commodities as finished products for whom there could be no socially relevant relationships: “the slave cargo constituted the antithesis of community.” Yet elsewhere she contends that captives were only “menaced” with social death. “At every point along the passage from African to New World markets,” she writes, “we find a stark contest between slave traders and slaves, between the traders’ will to commodify people and the captives’ will to remain fully recognizable as human subjects.”30 Here, I think, Smallwood captures the truth of the idea: social death was a receding ho- rizon—the farther slaveholders moved toward the goal of complete mastery, the more they found that struggles with their human property would continue, even into the most elemental realms: birth, hunger, health, fellowship, sex, death, and time.¶ If social death did not define the slaves’ condition, it did frame their vision of apocalypse. In a harrowing chapter on the meaning of death (that is, physical death) during the Atlantic passage, Smallwood is clear that the captives could have no frame of reference for the experience aboard the slave ships, but she also shows how des- perate they were to make one. If they could not reassemble some meaningful way to map their social worlds, “slaves could foresee only further descent into an endless purgatory.” The women aboard the Hudibras were not in fact the living dead; they were the mothers of gasping new societies. Their view of the danger that confronted them made their mourning rites vitally important, putting these at the center of the women’s emerging lives as slaves—and as a result at the heart of the struggles that would define them. As Smallwood argues, this was first and foremost a battle over their presence in time, to define their place among ancestors, kin, friends, and future progeny. “The connection Africans needed was a narrative continuity between past and present—an epistemological means of connecting the dots between there and here, then and now, to craft a coherent story out of incoherent experience.” That is precisely what the women on the Hudibras fought to accomplish.31

#### Afro-pessimism is inaccurate and is used to justify white supremacy

Patterson 98

The Ordeal Of Integration:

Progress And Resentment In America's "Racial" Crisis

Orlando Patterson is a Jamaican-born American historical and cultural sociologist known for his work regarding issues of race in the United States, as well as the sociology of development

In the attempt to understand and come to terms with the problems of Afro-Americans and of their interethnic relations, the country has been ill served by its intellectuals, policy advocates, and leaders in recent years. At present, dogmatic ethnic advocates and extremists appear to dominate discourse on the subject, drowning out both moderate and other dissenting voices. A strange convergence has emerged between these extremists. On the left, the nation is misled by an endless stream of tracts and studies that deny any meaningful change in America's "Two Nations," decry "The Myth of Black Progress," mourn "The Dream Deferred," dismiss AfroAmerican middle-class status as "Volunteer Slavery," pronounce AfroAmerican men an "Endangered Species," and apocalyptically announce "The Coming Race War." On the right is complete agreement with this dismal portrait in which we are fast "Losing Ground," except that the road to "racial" hell, according to conservatives, has been paved by the very pQlicies intended to help solve the problem, abetted by "The Dream and the Nightmare" of cultural changes in the sixties and by the overbreeding and educational integration of inferior Afro-Americans and very policies intended to help solve the problem, abetted by "The Dream and the Nightmare" of cultural changes in the sixties and by the overbreeding and educational integration of inferior Afro-Americans and lower-class Euro-Americans genetically situated on the wrong tail of the IQ "Bell Curve." If it is true that a "racial crisis" persists in America, this crisis is as much one of perception and interpretation as of actual socioeconomic and interethnic realities. By any measure, the record of the past half century has been one of great achievement, thanks in good part to the suecess of the government policies now being maligned by the left for not having gone far enough and by the right for having both failed and gone too far. At the same time, there is still no room for complacency: because our starting point half a century ago was so deplorably backward, we still have some way to go before approaching anything like a resolution.

### 2AC A2 whiteness

#### Whiteness overtheorizes and underexplains violence – best historical analysis goes aff

**Kolchin 2**, Professor of History at Delaware University, (Peter, “ Whiteness Studies: The New History of Race in America,” The Journal of American History, Vol. 89, No. 1 (Jun., 2002), pp. 154-173, JSTOR)

The central question one must confront in evaluating whiteness studies is the salience of whiteness as an explanation for exploitation, injustice, and, more gener- ally, the American past. In addressing that question, the matter of context becomes crucial. Simply put, in making whiteness omnipresent, whiteness studies authors risk losing sight of contextual variations and thereby undermining the very understand- ing of race and whiteness as socially constructed.

Nonhistorians are particularly prone to deprive whiteness of historical context. As Roediger notes in pointing to "tensions" within the field of whiteness studies, "much cultural studies work in the area lacks historical grounding and ignores or miscon- ceives the emphasis on class relations common among historians of whiteness." In Scenes of Subjection, for example, the literary scholar Saidiya V. Hartman portrays white racism as a constant unaffected by any change in the social order, including "the nonevent of emancipation," and sees virtually everything done to or for African Americans as an expression of that racism. A similar inattention to context underlies Brodkin's attribution of American prejudice against Jews (their "temporary darken- ing") to the desire to exploit them as industrial laborers, without bothering to place that prejudice in the framework of the long European history of anti-Semitism-an anti-Semitism that was not always rooted in economic interest and did not always require that Jews be seen as nonwhite. Writing as if racism were a uniquely American illness, the American studies scholar George Lipsitz muses that "it must be the con- tent of our character.'19 But inattention to context bedevils many of the historians as well. In White Women's Rights, for example, one of the few historical works to examine the way whiteness shaped the experiences and behavior of women, Louise Michele Newman too often strays from her intriguing exploration of the impact on feminism of a par- ticular form of evolutionary racism and generalizes about the views of "white women," who resisted patriarchy for themselves but sought to impose it on "inferior" races. Pushing far beyond the sensible observation that most white feminists shared the racial prejudices common among whites in the late nineteenth and early twenti- eth centuries, she understates the range and complexity of feminist thought and argues that racism was "an integral, constitutive element" of feminism itself, or as she puts it, "feminism developed . .. as a racialized theory of gender oppression."20 Such overgeneralization is especially prevalent among historians who rely heavily on image, representation, and literary depiction. Grace Elizabeth Hale's densely writ- ten but fascinating book, Making Whiteness, has the rare advantage among whiteness studies works of dealing with that part of the country where race has most pervasively shaped social relations: the South. But Hale loses much of that advantage by paying virtually no attention to social relations and confusing what is southern with what is more generally American until the reader is unsure whether she is describing south- ern whiteness or American whiteness, or whether she thinks that it does not make any difference. The South, she concludes, "lies not south of anywhere but inside us." Never really explaining what she means by "whiteness" (which at times she equates with segregation) or whose interests it served, she is on equally slippery ground in confronting chronological context. "Whites [all? most? some?] created the culture of segregation," she proclaims, "in large part to counter black success." This thesis is perfectly plausible, if undemonstrated. But in arguing that the myths of the happy slave and of criminal Reconstruction were products of the late-nineteenth-century imagination, Hale largely ignores earlier versions of those myths propounded by pro- tagonists in the struggles over slavery and Reconstruction; the arguments that she treats as new were appropriations and modifications of arguments previously forged in real social relations. Indiscriminately mixing fiction and nonfiction as documenta- tion, she confuses description (at which she is very good) with explanation and almost totally ignores interest and politics in her delineation of the "making" of whiteness .21 Although Jacobson pays more attention to contextual variation, he too can paint with a very broad brush, in the process placing a heavy explanatory burden-I believe too heavy-on whiteness. His focus on image and representation makes it difficult to judge the prevalence of particular ideas, because in quoting extensively from racist stereotypes, he makes no effort to give equal time to the opponents of such views. Brilliantly exploring racial depictions of diverse immigrant groups that Americans would later consider ethnic rather than racial and thereby showing the subjective character of race, he too often blurs a crucial distinction between "race" on the one hand and "nation," "nationality," and "ethnicity" on the other. For if both race and nation are constructed (imagined) communities, they are differently con- structed: whereas race implies inherent, immutable characteristics, national and eth- nic identity can be conceived of as inherent but need not be. Throughout much of American history, Americans have promiscuously combined racial and nonracial thinking in differentiating among groups; sometimes they assumed that differences were inherent, sometimes not, and often they failed to articulate clear positions on the question (no doubt because they had not formulated such positions). Jacobson himself notes in passing that discrimination was not always based on color or race- "The loudest voices in the organized nativism of the 1 840s and 1 850s harped upon matters of Catholicism and economics, not race"-but he tends to assume the bio- logical nature of arguments that could as easily be interpreted as cultural. (See, for example, his citation of the assertion in the 191 1 publication A Dictionary of Races or Peoples that "'the savage manners of the last century are still met with amongst some Serbo-Croatians of to-day"' as evidence for emphasis on the "physical properties" of race.)22

The role of whiteness in this process of distinguishing among groups remains murky. On one hand, Jacobson portrays the 1840s-1920s as a period of "variegated whiteness" in which white Americans saw some whites as whiter than others, warns us not to "reify a monolithic whiteness," and speaks of a "system of 'difference' by which one might be both white and racially distinct from other whites." On the other, he speaks of the "process by which Celts or Slavs became Caucasians." The unresolved issue here is the extent to which Americans conceived of whiteness (rather than other criteria such as religion, culture, ethnicity, and class) as the main ingredi- ent separating the civilized from the uncivilized.23 There can be no doubt, for example, that many antebellum Americans viewed the Irish as a degraded and savage people, but whether they saw lack of whiteness as the key source of this inferior status is dubious; to most Americans, for whom Protestant- ism went hand in hand with both republicanism and Americanism, the Irish immi- grants' Catholicism was far more alarming than their color. Indeed, some abolitionists managed to combine a passionate belief in the goodness and intellectual potential of black people with an equally passionate conviction of the unworthiness of the Irish, and in the 1850s many nativists saw little difficulty in moving from the anti-Irish Know-Nothing party into the antislavery Republican party, a trajectory that would have been truly remarkable had their dominant perception of the Irish been that they were nonwhite. And as Jacobson points out, the 1790 law that limited naturalization to "free white persons" "allowed Irish immigrants entrance as 'white persons"'; in what sense, then, should one speak of their subsequently "becoming" white? This can make sense if whiteness is to be understood metaphorically, meaning "acceptable," but Jacobson and other whiteness studies authors clearly intend the term to serve as more than a metaphor; indeed, if it is understood only metaphori- cally, much of their analysis collapses.24

The overworking of whiteness is especially noteworthy in the work of David Roe- diger, for he professes greater interest in specific social relations than many whiteness studies authors. Nevertheless, his argument too often depends on blurring important distinctions among whites, thereby belying the commonality of the "wages of white- ness" he outlines. His starting point is promising: living in a slaveholding republic, white workers in the (northern) United States increasingly defined themselves by what they were not blacks, slaves. But defining oneself as not-black and as not-slave are not at all the same, and Roediger's fudging on that crucial point is especially strik- ing coming from someone who usually pays such careful attention to language. The "not-slave" formulation led to the elaboration of a "free-labor" ideology that com- bined an emphasis on the dignity of labor with a condemnation of chattel slavery as the antithesis of free, republican (that is, American) values; the "not-black" variation led to a racist denigration of nonwhites and the insistence that the United States was a "white man's country." The two views could go together, but often they did not, and Roediger's argument that whiteness was an essential element of free-labor ideol- ogy is unpersuasive. If some labor radicals took what amounted to the proslavery position that slaves in the South were better off than "free" white workers in the North, others did not, and the argument in any case rested less on the degree of whiteness than on the degree of exploitation. Similarly, Roediger's thesis that in rejecting the term "servant" in favor of "hired hand" and "help," workingmen were "becoming" white conflates two very different forms of resistance to dependence that could be, but were not always, combined. The uppity domestics who tormented Frances Trollope in Cincinnati expressed little or no concern for whiteness as they asserted their American equality, and they contrasted their rights, not with black dependence, but with that stemming from English hierarchy. Responding disdain- fully to Trollope's expectation that she would eat in the kitchen, one servant typically "turned up her pretty lip, and said, 'I guess that's 'cause you don't think I'm good enough to eat with you. You'll find that won't do here."'25

The question is not whether white racism was pervasive in antebellum America- it was-but whether it explains as much as Roediger and others maintain. In an argu- ment further developed by Ignatiev, Roediger asserts that "it was by no means clear that the Irish were white." They present little evidence, however, that most Ameri- cans viewed the Irish as nonwhite. (To establish this point one would have to analyze the "racial" thought of Americans about the Irish, a task that neither Roediger nor Ignatiev undertakes.) Indeed, the whiteness studies authors often display a notable lack of precision in asserting the nonwhite status of despised groups. Roediger sug- gests that Irish whiteness was "by no means clear"; Ignatiev speaks of "strong tenden- cies . . . to consign the Irish, if not to the black race, then to an intermediate race located between white and black"; Neil Foley, in discussing prejudice against poor whites in central Texas, proclaims that "not all whites . . . were equally white" and suggests that landlords felt that their tenants "lacked certain qualities of whiteness"; Brodkin states that "for almost half a century, [Jews] were treated as racially not- quite-white." What is at issue is not the widespread hostility to and discrimination against the Irish, Jews, poor whites, and multiple other groups, but the salience of whiteness in either explaining or describing such hostility and discrimination. The status of southern poor whites is especially telling, for despite persistent "racial" stereotypes of them as shiftless, slovenly, and degraded, such stereotypes did not usu- ally include denials of their whiteness. Americans have had many ways of looking down on people without questioning their whiteness.26

A brief consideration of the ideology of four prominent nineteenth-century Amer- icans-the Confederate vice president Alexander H. Stephens, Illinois's Democratic senator Stephen A. Douglas, Abraham Lincoln, and Ohio's Republican senator Ben- jamin F. Wade-illustrates the risk of overemphasizing whiteness. Like most white Americans, all four were in some sense committed to whiteness. In his famous speech hailing the secession of the southern states, Stephens boldly identified as the "corner- stone" of the new government "the great truth that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery, subordination to the superior race, is his natural and moral condition." In the Lincoln-Douglas debates of 1858, Douglas mercilessly denounced his Republican challenger as a supporter of black equality and boasted that "this gov- ernment was made on the white basis.... It was made by white men, for the benefit of white men and their posterity for ever, and I am in favor of confining citizenship to white men." Lincoln responded that he did not favor "political and social equality between the white and black races"; noting the "physical difference" between the races, he proclaimed that "inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to which I belong, hav- ing the superior position." Upon his arrival in Washington, D.C., in 1851, Wade complained that "the Nigger smell I cannot bear," adding that the food was "all cooked by Niggers until I can smell and taste the Nigger."27

Yet any treatment of those four men that stopped at their common commitment to whiteness would be so incomplete as to be totally misleading. Stephens was an ardent Confederate whereas the other three were committed Unionists. Their differ- ences on slavery and black rights were even more notable. Stephens was a defender of slavery and black racial subordination. Douglas saw slavery as a minor issue whose fate should be left to local (white) control. Lincoln believed that slavery was morally wrong as well as socially degrading, eschewed the race-baiting that Douglas and many other white Americans took for granted, and in his debate with Douglas imme- diately qualified his support for white supremacy with the ringing assertion that whether or not "the negro" was equal in all respects, "in the right to eat the bread, without leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal ofJudge Douglas, and the equal of every living man." Wade was an ardent opponent of slavery, who became one of the most enthusiastic proponents of a radical Reconstruc- tion policy designed to remake the South and provide equal rights for the former slaves, as well as a sturdy champion of the rights of women and of labor. In short, what is most significant about the careers of the four men lies, not in their shared expressions of whiteness, but in the sharply divergent positions they took on the major issues of their era. Whiteness turns out to be a blunt instrument for dissecting the nuances-or even the major outlines-of their political ideology and behavior.28

### 2AC perm

Perm do the aff and engage in a paradigmatic analysis of the underlying antagonism's of the 1AC

#### Combining goals of alleviating energy poverty and climate change mitigation is essential to tip the balance and persuade policy elites of both agendas—either in isolation fails

Versatz and Herrero, 2012[SergioTiradoHerrero Center forClimateChangeandSustainableEnergyPolicy(3CSEP),DepartmentofEnvironmentalSciencesandPolicy,CentralEuropeanUniversity(CEU), “Building synergies between climate change mitigation and energy poverty alleviation” Energy Policy 49 (2012) 83–90]

This leads us to the crucial importance of policy integration. Because substantial investment costs and policy efforts are required for a large-scale implementation of deep efficiency in new and existing buildings, neither energy poverty eradication nor climate change mitigation goals alone may be enough to mobilise sufficient policy effort for making it happen. In contrast, if several of these policy goals are considered together, and the political and financial resources for several policy fields are merged, this might tip the expenditure-benefit[4](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421511009918#fn4) balance in favour of action. Following this approach, it is more likely that one of the most promising measures to fight climate change and energy poverty – deep efficiency – will take place if their synergy (and perhaps further synergies such as with energy security and net employment creation) is forged through strong policy integration. For such an integration to be effective, however, progress is also needed in research and methodologies. Today, cost-benefit assessments on which policy decisions are based typically consider direct costs and benefits only for single policy fields. In ideal policy-preparatory assessments, full costs and benefits, going beyond the single policy fields and just direct impacts, need to be considered. This requires a major advance in presently used methodologies to quantify and monetise co-benefits (e.g., for some key co-benefits like net employment creation and energy dependency reduction no economic valuation techniques are yet available) and co-costs (e.g., transaction costs, policy implementation costs, risks, etc.), as well as to their summation accounting for all synergies and trade-offs.

5. Conclusions

This paper has explored the functional and policy interactions between fighting climate change and alleviating energy poverty. For that, it has reviewed a number of selected mainstream scientific literature and policy-relevant literature in both domains in order to identify trends, key elements, synergies, trade-offs and potential conflicts, and to provide a taxonomy of these interactions. The conclusions reached refer primarily to residential energy users and buildings in developed and transition economies, where a considerably large potential for cost-effective mitigation lies, and where the inability of some households to afford an adequate level of energy services (energy poverty) has distinct public health and social welfare implications.

The most important trade-off identified in the paper is the potential increase in energy poverty levels as a result of strong climate change action increasing energy prices through carbon pricing, which points at an impending conflict between the welfare of present and future generations. If the internalisation of the external costs of carbon emissions is not offset by efficiency gains, the burden of mitigation will be disproportionately felt by those worse-off members of society who are still unable to provide enough energy services to their households. The rebound or takeback effect, another case of potential conflict between energy poverty and climate goals, is thought to be not as relevant and perhaps not even applicable to the case of energy poor households, where energy services needs are inadequately covered in the first place.

The most significant synergy is offered by the improved energy efficiency of buildings. As argued in Section 4, ensuring high efficiency standards is the only option for aligning strong energy poverty alleviation and climate change mitigation goals. In comparison, direct support measures implemented as fuel allowances or social tariffs do not provide a long term solution to the energy deprivation challenge – in fact, they may lock-in households in energy poverty if implemented on their own because they remove incentives to invest in energy efficiency at the household level – and do not reduce carbon emissions either.

This analytical review has explored in more detail the strongest synergy that is offered by these two areas of policy action: large reductions in GHG emissions and the elimination of energy poverty through deep energy efficiency. The paper suggests that in the developed and transition economics of North America, Eurasia and the Pacific this synergy is so strong that neither of the two problems is likely to be solved in such countries fully on their own merit; while the integration of these policy goals, with the potential addition of other key related policy goals such as energy security or employment, is likely to tip the cost-benefit balance and provide sufficient policy motivation to mobilise wide-scale resources and commitments. Thus, an essential message carried by this review is the importance of integrating seemingly unrelated policy goals and sharing the resources for their solution.

The paper has also identified critical gaps in knowledge and methodology that presently prevent such informed decisions to be integrated in policy-making, in order to forge this synergy on the ground. Only by ensuring that the various co-benefits are appropriately integrated into policy assessment methods and decision support tools, and thus making policy-makers aware of the synergistic economic and social benefits of reaching these various policy goals simultaneously through ambitious energy efficiency programmes, will the needed transformation be realised.

### Liberalism good – 2AC

#### Liberalism can affirm cultural difference and contingency – their critique is a totalizing portrayal of liberalism that destroys progressive change

Arslan, professor of government – Polis Akademisi Güvenlik Bilimleri Fakültesi, ‘99

(Zhutu, “Taking Rights Less Seriously,” Res Publica 5)

Incredulous of foundational truth claims, the postmodernists reject the idea that human beings have certain rights simply by virtue of being human. Foucault for instance claims that, like the individual, civil liberties are nothing but expressions of governance and disciplinary power.98 Gaete writes:

[A] Post-Modern perspective would assume that human rights are neither the expression of a universal truth nor a denial of it and regard their truth claims as only local moves in a game the subject enters when formulating his/her relationship to power in the language of fundamental rights.99

The postmodern hymn of relativity rules out the possibility of any universal claim to human rights. In the postmodern condition, it would be impossible to argue that individuals have some basic rights irrespective of their nationality or geography. The inevitable consequence of the relativisation of “truth-claims” is to undercut any universal, “principled, normative basis” for claiming that human rights simply exist.100 But without such a basis, we are left in a situation in which we lack any criteria to distinguish between right and wrong. This ethical vacuum may easily lead to the apparent legitimation and justification of almost any belief and practice in the realm of rights. This conservative support of the prevailing status quo is an obvious rejection of the “revolutionary” nature of universal human rights. At the end of the day, the notion of rights is forced to surrender its power as a legitimating factor of political regimes. With the demise of the subject and his/her rights, the postmodernists in fact undermine any possible resistance against oppressive orders. As Touraine asserts, “[T]he idea of the subject is a dissident idea which has always upheld the right to rebel against an unjust power.”101 Touraine also reminds the murderers of the subject what a subject-less world would look like:

[T]he day when the Subject is debased to meaning introspection, and the Self to meaning compulsory social roles, our social and personal life will lose all its creative power and will be no more than a post-modern museum in which multiple memories replace our inability to produce anything of lasting importance.102

The postmodern defence of “uncertainty” and “contingency” is equally problematic. The very idea of “uncertainty” itself implies the existence of a certainty, after all: “[I]f you tried to doubt everything, you would not get as far as doubting anything. The game of doubting itself presupposes certainty.”103 Human beings live with their values, and need to rank them. Their highest values, or what Charles Taylor calls “hypergoods”,104 play a central role in our lives. Individuals define and are defined by these hypergoods, be they a divine being, Brahma, Nirvana, Justice, Reason, Science, Progress, Cogito or Superman. To kill our hypergoods therefore means an attempt to kill the sources of the self, sources which confer meaning on the lives of human beings. The need for hypergoods points to the necessity of “an absolute truth”, to use Sartre’s phrase.105 This necessity is also the precondition of any critique. Thus Habermas claims that “Nietzsche’s critique consumes the critical impulse itself”; for “if thought can no longer operate in the realms of truth and validity claims, then analysis and critique lose their meaning”. 106 Oddly, perhaps, Derrida seems to agree with Habermas when he says that he “cannot conceive of a radical critique which would not be ultimately motivated by some sort of affirmation, acknowledged or not”.107

Postmodernity, despite its dream of a “godless” epoch,108 cannot escape the necessity we have explored. Such a dream itself anyway reflects, however implicitly and unintentionally, the belief in linear progress, one of the hypergoods of modernity.109 Postmodernism turns out to be a new grand narrative: “a grand narrative of postmodernity”.110 Even Lyotard comes close to acknowledging the existence of this new metanarrative. He states that “the great narratives are now barely credible. And it is therefore tempting to lend credence to the great narrative of the decline of great narratives.”111 As a new “totalising” project, postmodernism reproduces the very predicaments of modernity,112 and its rejection of metaphysics becomes a merely “rhetorical” claim.113

The real question now is how to establish a socio-political framework in which people’s hypergoods might peacefully live side by side without people trying to kill each other. This is the project of political liberalism: but it is also to certain extent the project of postmodernism itself, as we have earlier seen.114 In other words, pluralism is the common value which in fact pervades the writings of liberals and postmodernists alike,115 even though it is expressed in different terms, and on different epistemological grounds, amounting, ironically, to both the “ethical relativism” of John Keane116 and the “moral universalism” of Habermas.117 Keane writes:

[T]o defend relativism requires a social and political stance which is throughly modern. It implies the need for establishing or strengthening a democratic state and a civil society consisting of a plurality of public spheres, within which individuals and groups can openly express their solidarity with (or opposition to) others’ ideas.118

In an interview, Habermas explains what his “moral universalism” stands for:

[W]hat does universalism mean, after all? That one relativizes one’s own way of life with regard to the legitimate claims of other forms of life, that one grants the strangers and the others, with all their idiosyncrasies and incomprehensibilities, the same rights as oneself, that one does not insist on universalizing one’s own identity, that one does not simply exclude that which deviates from it, that the areas of tolerance must become infinitely broader than they are today – moral universalism means all these things.119

At the core of this pluralism required by “ethical relativism” and “moral universalism” alike lies the conception of autonomy.120 Indeed, as Raz puts it, pluralism is a necessary requirement of the value of autonomy.121 Autonomy, however, is inextricably connected with rights. An autonomous individual who is “the author of his own life” has certain rights.122 In Raz’s words “autonomy is constituted by rights and nothing else: the autonomous life is a life within unviolated rights”.123 Since it is an essential part and parcel of human being (or being human), autonomy constitutes a “sufficient ontological justification” for rights and thus gives an invaluable support to those who seek for a justificatory ground for them.124

Autonomy requires the existence of the Other(s).125 The Other is not simply external to me, but he or she at the same time constitutes my identity: I am in a way parasitic on the Other. My autonomy makes sense only insofar as there exist others. As Sartre puts it, “[T]he other is indispensable to my existence, and equally so to any knowledge I can have of myself.”126 And unless I in turn recognise others as autonomous beings I shall end up in the fundamental predicament of “absolute loneliness and terror”.127 This points to the absolute necessity of living with others,128 as a “zoon politikon” in Marx’s words.129

Thus autonomy is a key value not only for “I”, but also for others. The postmodernists must take into account autonomy, if they are to present an ethical/political project part of which involves rights, however “locally”. They can do so, furthermore, without having to abandon their conceptual tools. Difference and otherness, the magical terms of postmodern discourse, are in fact quite compatible with such conceptions as autonomy and universality. As Lyotard himself argues, a human being has rights only if she is also an other human being. Likewise, as Terry Eagleton emphasises, universalism and difference are not mutually exclusive. Difference may need universalism. The idea of difference is indeed likely to be undermined by “certain militant particularisms of our day”.130

V. CONCLUSION

Whatever the merits of the entirety of their arguments, the postmodernists emphasise the paramount importance of human rights: they are, after all, its starting-point. As Bauman points out, “[T]he great issues of ethics – like human rights . . . – have lost nothing of their topicality”,131 and he is well aware of the fact that “[m]oral issues tend to be increasingly compressed into the idea of ‘human rights’ ”.132 Lyotard himself likewise states that “[A] human being has rights only if he is other than a human being. And if he is to be other than a human being, he must in addition become an other human being.”133

More importantly, influenced by the communitarian and postmodern critique of metaphysical grounds for ethical and political claims, some liberal rights theorists such as Ronald Dworkin and John Rawls adopt a kind of “apologetic” attitude towards the theoretical foundation of rights, refusing to play the traditional role of moral magician by plucking ethical claims out of a metaphysical hat. In a recent essay, Rawls makes it clear that

[T]hese [human] rights do not depend on any particular comprehensive moral doctrine or philosophical conception of human nature, such as, for example that human beings are moral persons and have equal worth or that they have certain particular moral and intellectual powers that entitle them to these rights. To show this would require a quite deep philosophical theory that many if not most hierarchical societies might reject as liberal or democratic or else as in some way distinctive of Western political tradition and prejudicial to other countries.134

This passage implies that in fact the idea of human rights is a product of the western liberal tradition, but in order to make it universally applicable we must refrain from any theoretical attempt to reveal this fact. Let’s pretend that human rights are simply there. They do not need any moral or philosophical ground for justification.

But there need be no contradiction between the postmodernists and the liberals; nor need the latter apologize for “rights”. For, as we have seen, the postmodernists have never underestimated the importance of human rights. They argue that ethical issues such as human rights “only need to be seen, and dealt with, in a novel way”.135 Yet the postmodernists have not presented us with any postmodern “novel way” in which human rights might be seen. It seems to be difficult, if not impossible, for them to show this novel way without taking into account the conceptions of autonomous self and universality. Perhaps they need to begin taking rights more seriously.

## 1AR

### 1AR --- Ontology Defense

#### Slavery as inhumanity undermines a historical confrontation with different ideologies of slavery. Understanding how and why slaveholders distinguished between human slaves and animals is important for confronting that ideology.

Peter **KOLCHIN** History @ Delaware **‘7** Review Essay: Putting New World Slavery in Perspective *Slavery & Abolition* 28 (2) p. 278-279

Davis navigates carefully through these swirling eddies, accepting and rejecting strands of divergent definitions before adding a provocative new element of his own. On the one hand, he accepts the idea that the measure of a ‘genuine “slave society”’ is that society’s dependence on ‘slave labor’ (41); on the other, he follows Patterson in maintaining that ‘wholly apart from later economic functions, slaves from the very beginning were perceived as dehumanized humans’ (29). Sensibly insisting that Patterson erred in denying ‘the crucial element of chattel property’ in slavery, Davis extends Patterson’s concept of ‘natal alienation’ by suggesting that ‘the “animalization” or “bestialization” of slaves’ was central to the slave relationship (32). This extension is likely to be controversial. The main advantage of the concept of slave ‘animalization’ is the way in which it underlines the particular cruelty and degradation inherent in slavery: slaveowners, Davis suggests, saw their slaves as less than human – hence the title Inhuman Bondage. Whether this formulation advances our understanding of slavery is another matter. **Even granting** the figurative or **metaphorical nature** of the argument – clearly slaveowners did not actually believe that their slaves were (nonhuman) animals – the aptness of this particular metaphor seems debatable. The sexual attraction that so many slaveowners felt for their slaves should raise questions about the idea of seeing slaves as beasts, as should the widespread use by slaveholders of very different metaphors to describe the master–slave relationship, the most persistent of which was that of parent and child. Indeed, although undergraduate students often put forth the argument that slaveowners treated their slaves ‘like animals’, there is abundant evidence that – at least in the Southern United States and many other New World societies – slaveowners accepted the basic humanity of their slaves, sleeping with them, believing that they had immortal souls and passing legislation to prevent them from being treated ‘like animals’. (Needless to say, this legislation tells us more about evolving master class ideology than about actual slave treatment.) Although Davis’s concept of slavery as ‘inhuman’ may appear unobjectionable (and well-intentioned), I am uncomfortable with it because I think that it is likely to reinforce misconceptions about slavery that are already widespread, and to obscure the very real differences among the numerous variants of slavery. As Davis himself has previously shown, for millennia slavery (together with other forms of unfreedom) was not only widespread, but virtually unquestioned: the idea that slavery was incompatible with ‘human progress’ emerged only in the last third of the eighteenth century. Throughout history, humans have enslaved (as well as oppressed, tortured and killed) one another with depressing regularity. In short, a**lthough slavery was certainly not humane, it was all too human**.3 Yet if slavery has been ubiquitous for most of human history, the effort to define it or discover its universal meaning is fraught with difficulty because doing so inevitably runs the risk of reification – investing reality in the word ‘slavery’ (or in words sometimes translated as ‘slavery’) rather than in particular social relations that in fact varied enormously. That slaves in some times and places served as victims of human sacrifice cannot prove that slavery in the Southern United States (or, for that matter, Jamaica) did not operate primarily as a system of labour exploitation; indeed, in many ways, American slavery had more in common with other systems of forced labour than with some (non-labour-based) forms of human relations commonly termed ‘slavery’. By distilling only what was common in all systems of slavery, one can easily exclude what was most important about each.4

### 1AR --- Alternative Debate

#### We must reimagine – not abandon – the state

**Giroux 11** – Global Television Network Chair in Communication Studies @ McMaster University [Dr. [Henry A. Giroux](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/action/doSearch?action=runSearch&type=advanced&result=true&prevSearch=%2Bauthorsfield%3A%28Giroux%2C+Henry+A.%29) (Former professor of Education @ Miami & Penn State University) “Neoliberalism and the death of the social state: remembering Walter Benjamin's Angel of History,” Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture [Volume 17](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/loi/csid20?open=17#vol_17), [Issue 4](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/toc/csid20/17/4), 2011, pages 587-601

Under the reign of the punishing state, those experiencing poverty are seen as the problem and become an easy target for mobilizing middle-class fears about not just the poor, the disabled, immigrants, and others who may depend on social services, but also the social services themselves and the policies that make them possible. Even as inequality deepens and the ultra-rich wreak havoc on the globe, the dominant media focus on so called welfare cheaters, while right-wing politicians go out of their way to associate poverty and dependency with a culture of crime and immorality. The social state is portrayed as a ‘nanny’ and those who partake in its services are represented as childish, lazy, and lacking any sense of individual responsibility. One example of this discourse can be found in a statement by former Republican presidential candidate Mike Huckabee who compared people with pre-existing health conditions to burned out houses. In this instance, Huckabee was criticizing Obama’ s health care plan, which requires insurance companies to cover people with pre-existing conditions (Pitt, 2010). We also see the attack on the poor and welfare policies being magnified as part of the right-wing call for austerity. Punitive sanctions against the poor combine with a kind of class and racial cleansing as right-wing politicians block legislation for schools to provide free meals to thousands of hungry children; eliminate public transportation systems; lay off thousands of civil servants; cancel school programs that benefit the poor; and ask parents to pay for school¶ supplies (Cooper, 2010; Krugman, 2010). The politics of austerity is not about¶ rethinking priorities to benefit the public good. Instead, it has become part of a discourse of shame, one that has little to do with using indignation to imagine a better world. On the contrary, shame is now used to wage a war on the poor rather¶ than poverty, on young people rather than those economic and political forces that undermine their future, and on those considered other rather than on the underlying structures and ideologies of various forms of state and individual racism.

We need to return to Benjamin’ s Angel of History in order to reimagine what it means to reconstruct a social state that invests in people rather than in the rich, mega corporations, the prison-industrial complex, and a permanent war economy. We need to imagine how the state can be refigured along with the very nature of politics and economics in order to eliminate structural inequality, racism, and militarism. Once again, Americans must recognize that something is ‘ profoundly wrong with the way we live today’ and that the obsession with wealth, war, and violence is at odds with those democratic ideals often invoked in the name of freedom, justice, and equality (Judt, 2010, pp. 1\_ 2).

Just as we need a new language for talking about public values, shared responsibilities, and the common good, we also need a language for connecting the war at home with the war abroad. War is rarely about real defense or national honor, as the current wars in Iraq and Afghanistan demonstrate. Not only are these two wars draining the public treasury, they are also partly responsible for budget cuts at home that aim at balancing federal and state budgets on the backs of the poor, minority youth, working people, and the elderly. Robust war spending is matched by the massive cutting of school budgets at home. The United States spends $1.1 million per year to put a single soldier in Afghanistan, but refuses to bail out public schools, rescue universities that are suffering massive budget cuts, or reinvest in its crumbling national infrastructure. We offer paltry aid to support public libraries or to assist students who now absorb massive debts to finance their education, while potentially spending over $1.8 trillion to cover the wars in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other operations associated with the war on terror (Congressional Research Service Report, 2010). Instead of using these funds for crucial domestic programs that could develop jobs, public works programs, health initiatives, housing, and education, the punishing state with its permanent war machine spreads death and destruction through the organization and production of violence. The punishing state not only locks up more people than any other country in the world, but also, as Tom Englehardt (2010) states, ‘ puts more money into the funding of war, our armed forces and the weaponry of war than the next 25 countries combined. We garrison the planet in a way no empire or nation in history has ever done’. With such a war mentality, economy, and values ruling the United States, we see daily the destruction of human lives and the exacerbation of massive inequalities that now permeate every aspect of American life (Bacevich, 2010; Johnson, 2006). War has become a poison that legitimates the corporate state, on the one hand, and works in tandem with the punishing state on the other. At the same time, it feeds an inequality that rots American society from within as it turns over matters of democratic governance and rule to corporate swindlers, military leaders, and right-wing ideologues (Wilkinson & Pickett, 2009; Dollars & Sense & United for a Fair Economy, 2008). Tony Judt (2010) gets it right when he argues that:

Inequality, then, is not just unattractive in itself; it clearly corresponds to pathological social problems that we cannot hope to address unless we attend to their underlying cause. There is a reason why infant mortality, life expectancy, criminality, the prison population, mental illness, unemployment, obesity, malnutrition, teenage pregnancy, illegal drug use, economic insecurity, personal indebtedness and anxiety are so much more marked in the US and the UK than they are in continental Europe . . . Inequality is corrosive. It rots societies from within. The impact of material differences takes a while to show up: but in due course competition for status and goods increases; people feel a growing sense of superiority (or inferiority) based on their possessions; prejudice towards those on the lower ranks of the social ladder hardens; crime spikes and the pathologies of social disadvantage become ever more marked. The legacy of unregulated wealth creation is bitter indeed.

If we are to imagine another type of society than the one we have, we will have to once again put the social question on the political agenda in order to understand how ‘ the pathologies of inequality and poverty \_ crime, alcoholism, violence and mental illness \_ have all multiplied commensurately’ , and how we might take up the challenge of addressing the symptoms of social dysfunction through a concerted effort to embrace communal freedom, social investments, social rights, civic duties, and a vocabulary for translating private troubles into public issues (Judt, 2010, p. 175). The return of the social question necessitates invoking a public language and a new set of questions regarding ‘ What should be done to alleviate the suffering and¶ injustices to which the urban working masses [are] now exposed and how [is] the ruling elite of the day to be brought to see the need for change?’ (Judt, 2010, p. 174). The social question also demands that we make visible what C. Wright Mills (2008¶ [1944]) calls the forces of ‘ organized irresponsibility [that] prevail everywhere’ (p. 18), which functions to dissolve crucial social solidarities, undermine compassion, disparage mutual responsibility, and disband the bonds of social obligation itself (see also Terry, 1997). But if we are to put the social question back on the agenda, we will¶ first have to acknowledge, like Benjamin’ s Angel of History, the ‘ catastrophe that keeps piling wreckage upon wreckage’ (1968 [1950], p. 257). That catastrophe lies in a brutal and ruthless form of economic Darwinism that shreds the social fabric of the state, eviscerates the importance of the social question, and creates the conditions for a society resembling Thomas Hobbes’ war of all against all, a survival-of-the-fittest social order in which the flight from freedom and responsibility becomes the default mechanism for upholding a machinery of exploitation, cruelty, inequality, and militarism.

Not only has the American public lost its ability, perhaps even its will, to talk about public values such as sharing, caring, and preserving, but it can no longer distinguish between a market-driven society and a democratic society. As Sheldon Wolin (2008) has insisted, the supportive culture for a viable democracy \_ ‘ a complex of beliefs, values and practices that nurture equality, cooperation and freedom’ (pp. 260\_ 261) \_ is incompatible with the market-driven values of neoliberalism and their emphasis on a crude consumerism, over-the-top materialism, brutal competition, a culture of lying, a possessive individualistic ethic, and an aggressive battle to privatize, deregulate, and commodify everything.

The promise of democracy and economic justice and social rights necessitates a new language of public purpose, rationality and formative culture embedded in democratic public values, collective struggles, and a social movement willing to fight for a new kind of politics, democracy and future. We don’ t need privatized utopias, but models of a democratic society and social state in which public values and democratic interests are expressed in a range of economic, political, and cultural institutions. We need a new army of critical and passionate winged messengers alert to the need for progressive social solidarities, social agency, collective action, and a refusal to stare hopelessly at the rotting corpses, gated communities, and the walking dead that turn the promise of democracy into an advertisement for global destruction. Pg. 597-599

# Round 4 vs Wayne LM

## 1AC- Same as rd 1

## 2AC

### 2AC social death

#### The invocation of social death as ontologically inevitable inscribes a pessimism towards politics which makes agency impossible and oversimplifies the history of resistance [both]

Brown 9 Vincent, Prof. of History and African and African-American Studies @ Harvard Univ., December, "Social Death and Political Life in the Study of Slavery," American Historical Review, p. 1231-1249

Specters of the Atlantic is a compellingly sophisticated study of the relation be- tween the epistemologies underwriting both modern slavery and modern capitalism, but the book’s discussion of the politics of anti-slavery is fundamentally incomplete. While Baucom brilliantly traces the development of “melancholy realism” as an op- positional discourse that ran counter to the logic of slavery and finance capital, he has very little to say about the enslaved themselves. Social death, so well suited to the tragic perspective, stands in for the experience of enslavement. While this heightens the reader’s sense of the way Atlantic slavery haunts the present, Baucom largely fails to acknowledge that the enslaved performed melancholy acts of accounting not unlike those that he shows to be a fundamental component of abolitionist and human rights discourses, or that those acts could be a basic element of slaves’ oppositional activities. In many ways, the effectiveness of his text depends upon the silence of slaves—it is easier to describe the continuity of structures of power when one down- plays countervailing forces such as the political activity of the weak. So Baucom’s deep insights into the structural features of Atlantic slave trading and its afterlife come with a cost. Without engagement with the politics of the enslaved, slavery’s history serves as an effective charge leveled against modernity and capitalism, but not as an uneven and evolving process of human interaction, and certainly not as a locus of conflict in which the enslaved sometimes won small but important victories.11¶ Specters of the Atlantic is self-consciously a work of theory (despite Baucom’s prodigious archival research), and social death may be largely unproblematic as a matter of theory, or even law. In these arenas, as David Brion Davis has argued, “the slave has no legitimate, independent being, no place in the cosmos except as an instrument of her or his master’s will.”12 But the concept often becomes a general description of actual social life in slavery. Vincent Carretta, for example, in his au- thoritative biography of the abolitionist writer and former slave Olaudah Equiano, agrees with Patterson that because enslaved Africans and their descendants were “stripped of their personal identities and history, [they] were forced to suffer what has been aptly called ‘social death.’ ” The self-fashioning enabled by writing and print “allowed Equiano to resurrect himself publicly” from the condition that had been imposed by his enslavement.13 The living conditions of slavery in eighteenth-century Jamaica, one slave society with which Equiano had experience, are described in rich detail in Trevor Burnard’s unflinching examination of the career of Thomas Thistle- wood, an English migrant who became an overseer and landholder in Jamaica, and who kept a diary there from 1750 to 1786. Through Thistlewood’s descriptions of his life among slaves, Burnard glimpses a “world of uncertainty,” where the enslaved were always vulnerable to repeated depredations that actually led to “significant slave dehumanization as masters sought, with considerable success, to obliterate slaves’ personal histories.” Burnard consequently concurs with Patterson: “slavery completely stripped slaves of their cultural heritage, brutalized them, and rendered ordinary life and normal relationships extremely difficult.”14 This was slavery, after all, and much more than a transfer of migrants from Africa to America.15 Yet one wonders, after reading Burnard’s indispensable account, how slaves in Jamaica or- ganized some of British America’s greatest political events during Thistlewood’s time and after, including the Coromantee Wars of the 1760s, the 1776 Hanover conspiracy, and the Baptist War of 1831–1832. Surely they must have found some way to turn the “disorganization, instability, and chaos” of slavery into collective forms of belonging and striving, making connections when confronted with alien- ation and finding dignity in the face of dishonor. Rather than pathologizing slaves by allowing the condition of social death to stand for the experience of life in slavery, then, it might be more helpful to focus on what the enslaved actually made of their¶ situation.¶ Among the most insightful texts to explore the experiential meaning of Afro- Atlantic slavery (for both the slaves and their descendants) are two recent books by Saidiya Hartman and Stephanie Smallwood. Rather than eschewing the concept of social death, as might be expected from writing that begins by considering the per- spective of the enslaved, these two authors use the idea in penetrating ways. Hart- man’s Lose Your Mother: A Journey along the Atlantic Slave Route and Smallwood’s Saltwater Slavery: A Middle Passage from Africa to American Diaspora extend social death beyond a general description of slavery as a condition and imagine it as an experience of self. Here both the promise and the problem with the concept are most fully apparent.16¶ Both authors seek a deeper understanding of the experience of enslavement and its consequences for the past, present, and future of black life than we generally find in histories of slavery. In Hartman’s account especially, slavery is not only an object of study, but also the focus of a personal memoir. She travels along a slave route in Ghana, from its coastal forts to the backcountry hinterlands, symbolically reversing the first stage of the trek now commonly called the Middle Passage. In searching prose, she meditates on the history of slavery in Africa to explore the precarious nature of belonging to the social category “African American.” Rendering her re- markable facility with social theory in elegant and affective terms, Hartman asks the question that nags all identities, but especially those forged by the descendants of slaves: What identifications, imagined affinities, mythical narratives, and acts of re- membering and forgetting hold the category together? Confronting her own alienation from any story that would yield a knowable genealogy or a comfortable identity, Hartman wrestles with what it means to be a stranger in one’s putative motherland, to be denied country, kin, and identity, and to forget one’s past—to be an orphan.17 Ultimately, as the title suggests, Lose Your Mother is an injunction to accept dis- possession as the basis of black self-definition.¶ Such a judgment is warranted, in Hartman’s account, by the implications of social death both for the experience of enslavement and for slavery’s afterlife in the present. As Patterson delineated in sociological terms the death of social personhood and the reincorporation of individuals into slavery, Hartman sets out on a personal quest to “retrace the process by which lives were destroyed and slaves born.”18 When she contends with what it meant to be a slave, she frequently invokes Patterson’s idiom: “Seized from home, sold in the market, and severed from kin, the slave was for all intents and purposes dead, no less so than had he been killed in combat. No less so than had she never belonged to the world.” By making men, women, and children into commodities, enslavement destroyed lineages, tethering people to own- ers rather than families, and in this way it “annulled lives, transforming men and women into dead matter, and then resuscitated them for servitude.” Admittedly, the enslaved “lived and breathed, but they were dead in the social world of men.”19 As it turns out, this kind of alienation is also part of what it presently means to be African American. “The transience of the slave’s existence,” for example, still leaves its traces in how black people imagine and speak of home:¶ We never tire of dreaming of a place that we can call home, a place better than here, wherever here might be . . . We stay there, but we don’t live there . . . Staying is living in a country without exercising any claims on its resources. It is the perilous condition of existing in a world in which you have no investments. It is having never resided in a place that you can say is yours. It is being “of the house” but not having a stake in it. Staying implies transient quarters, a makeshift domicile, a temporary shelter, but no attachment or affiliation. This sense of not belonging and of being an extraneous element is at the heart of slavery.20¶ “We may have forgotten our country,” Hartman writes, “but we haven’t forgotten our dispossession.”21¶ Like Baucom, Hartman sees the history of slavery as a constituent part of a tragic present. Atlantic slavery continues to be manifested in black people’s skewed life chances, poor education and health, and high rates of incarceration, poverty, and premature death. Disregarding the commonplace temporalities of professional historians, whose literary conventions are generally predicated on a formal distinction between past, present, and future, Hartman addresses slavery as a problem that spans all three. The afterlife of slavery inhabits the nature of belonging, which in turn guides the “freedom dreams” that shape prospects for change. “If slavery persists as an issue in the political life of black America,” she writes, “it is not because of an antiquated obsession with bygone days or the burden of a too-long memory, but because black lives are still imperiled and devalued by a racial calculus and a political arithmetic that were entrenched centuries ago.”22¶ A professor of English and comparative literature, Hartman is in many respects in a better position than most historians to understand events such as the funeral aboard the Hudibras. This is because for all of her evident erudition, her scholarship is harnessed not so much to a performance of mastery over the facts of what hap- pened, which might substitute precision for understanding, as to an act of mourning, even yearning. She writes with a depth of introspection and personal anguish that is transgressive of professional boundaries but absolutely appropriate to the task. Reading Hartman, one wonders how a historian could ever write dispassionately about slavery without feeling complicit and ashamed. For dispassionate accounting—exemplified by the ledgers of slave traders—has been a great weapon of the powerful, an episteme that made the grossest violations of personhood acceptable, even necessary. This is the kind of bookkeeping that bore fruit upon the Zong. “It made it easier for a trader to countenance yet another dead black body or for a captain to dump a shipload of captives into the sea in order to collect the insurance, since it wasn’t possible to kill cargo or to murder a thing already denied life. Death was simply part of the workings of the trade.” The archive of slavery, then, is “a mortuary.” Not content to total up the body count, Hartman offers elegy, echoing in her own way the lamentations of the women aboard the Hudibras. Like them, she is concerned with the dead and what they mean to the living. “I was desperate to reclaim the dead,” she writes, “to reckon with the lives undone and obliterated in the making of human commodities.”23¶ It is this mournful quality of Lose Your Mother that elevates it above so many histories of slavery, but the same sense of lament seems to require that Hartman overlook small but significant political victories like the one described by Butter- worth. Even as Hartman seems to agree with Paul Gilroy on the “value of seeing the consciousness of the slave as involving an extended act of mourning,” she remains so focused on her own commemorations that her text makes little space for a consideration of how the enslaved struggled with alienation and the fragility of belonging, or of the mourning rites they used to confront their condition.24 All of the ques- tions she raises about the meaning of slavery in the present—both highly personal and insistently political—might as well be asked about the meaning of slavery to slaves themselves, that is, if one begins by closely examining their social and political lives rather than assuming their lack of social being. Here Hartman is undone by her reliance on Orlando Patterson’s totalizing definition of slavery. She asserts that “no solace can be found in the death of the slave, no higher ground can be located, no perspective can be found from which death serves a greater good or becomes any- thing other than what it is.”25 If she is correct, the events on the Hudibras were of negligible importance. And indeed, Hartman’s understandable emphasis on the personal damage wrought by slavery encourages her to disavow two generations of social history that have demonstrated slaves’ remarkable capacity to forge fragile com- munities, preserve cultural inheritance, and resist the predations of slaveholders. This in turn precludes her from describing the ways that violence, dislocation, and death actually generate culture, politics, and consequential action by the enslaved.26¶ This limitation is particularly evident in a stunning chapter that Hartman calls “The Dead Book.” Here she creatively reimagines the events that occurred on the voyage of the slave ship Recovery, bound, like the Hudibras, from the Bight of Biafra to Grenada, when Captain John Kimber hung an enslaved girl naked from the mizzen stay and beat her, ultimately to her death, for being “sulky”: she was sick and could not dance when so ordered. As Hartman notes, the event would have been unre- markable had not Captain Kimber been tried for murder on the testimony of the ship’s surgeon, a brief transcript of the trial been published, and the woman’s death been offered up as allegory by the abolitionist William Wilberforce and the graphic satirist Isaac Cruikshank. Hartman re-creates the murder and the surge of words it inspired, representing the perspectives of the captain, the surgeon, and the aboli tionist, for each of whom the girl was a cipher “outfitted in a different guise,” and then she puts herself in the position of the victim, substituting her own voice for the unknowable thoughts of the girl. Imagining the experience as her own and wistfully representing her demise as a suicide—a final act of agency—Hartman hopes, by this bold device, to save the girl from oblivion. Or perhaps her hope is to prove the impossibility of ever doing so, because by failing, she concedes that the girl cannot be put to rest. It is a compelling move, but there is something missing. Hartman discerns a convincing subject position for all of the participants in the events sur- rounding the death of the girl, except for the other slaves who watched the woman die and carried the memory with them to the Americas, presumably to tell others, plausibly even survivors of the Hudibras, who must have drawn from such stories a basic perspective on the history of the Atlantic world. For the enslaved spectators, Hartman imagines only a fatalistic detachment: “The women were assembled a few feet away, but it might well have been a thousand. They held back from the girl, steering clear of her bad luck, pestilence, and recklessness. Some said she had lost her mind. What could they do, anyway? The women danced and sang as she lay dying.”¶ Hartman ends her odyssey among the Gwolu, descendants of peoples who fled the slave raids and who, as communities of refugees, shared her sense of dispos- session. “Newcomers were welcome. It didn’t matter that they weren’t kin because genealogy didn’t matter”; rather, “building community did.” Lose Your Mother con- cludes with a moving description of a particular one of their songs, a lament for those who were lost, which resonated deeply with her sense of slavery’s meaning in the present. And yet Hartman has more difficulty hearing similar cries intoned in the past by slaves who managed to find themselves.27¶ Saltwater Slavery has much in common with Lose Your Mother. Smallwood’s study of the slave trade from the Gold Coast to the British Americas in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries likewise redeems the experience of the people traded like so many bolts of cloth, “who were represented merely as ciphers in the political arithmetic,” and therefore “feature in the documentary record not as subjects of a social history but as objects or quantities.”28 Each text offers a penetrating analysis of the market logic that turned people into goods. Both books work with the concept of social death. However, Smallwood examines the problem of social death for the enslaved even more closely than Hartman does.29¶ Like Hartman, Smallwood sees social death as a by-product of commodification. “If in the regime of the market Africans’ most socially relevant feature was their exchangeability,” she argues, “for Africans as immigrants the most socially relevant feature was their isolation, their desperate need to restore some measure of social life to counterbalance the alienation engendered by their social death.” But Small- wood’s approach is different in a subtle way. Whereas for Hartman, as for others, social death is an accomplished state of being, Smallwood veers between a notion of social death as an actual condition produced by violent dislocation and social death as a compelling threat. On the one hand, she argues, captivity on the Atlantic littoral was a social death. Exchangeable persons “inhabited a new category of mar- ginalization, one not of extreme alienation within the community, but rather of ab- solute exclusion from any community.” She seems to accept the idea of enslaved commodities as finished products for whom there could be no socially relevant relationships: “the slave cargo constituted the antithesis of community.” Yet elsewhere she contends that captives were only “menaced” with social death. “At every point along the passage from African to New World markets,” she writes, “we find a stark contest between slave traders and slaves, between the traders’ will to commodify people and the captives’ will to remain fully recognizable as human subjects.”30 Here, I think, Smallwood captures the truth of the idea: social death was a receding ho- rizon—the farther slaveholders moved toward the goal of complete mastery, the more they found that struggles with their human property would continue, even into the most elemental realms: birth, hunger, health, fellowship, sex, death, and time.¶ If social death did not define the slaves’ condition, it did frame their vision of apocalypse. In a harrowing chapter on the meaning of death (that is, physical death) during the Atlantic passage, Smallwood is clear that the captives could have no frame of reference for the experience aboard the slave ships, but she also shows how des- perate they were to make one. If they could not reassemble some meaningful way to map their social worlds, “slaves could foresee only further descent into an endless purgatory.” The women aboard the Hudibras were not in fact the living dead; they were the mothers of gasping new societies. Their view of the danger that confronted them made their mourning rites vitally important, putting these at the center of the women’s emerging lives as slaves—and as a result at the heart of the struggles that would define them. As Smallwood argues, this was first and foremost a battle over their presence in time, to define their place among ancestors, kin, friends, and future progeny. “The connection Africans needed was a narrative continuity between past and present—an epistemological means of connecting the dots between there and here, then and now, to craft a coherent story out of incoherent experience.” That is precisely what the women on the Hudibras fought to accomplish.31

#### Afro-pessimism is inaccurate and is used to justify white supremacy

Patterson 98

The Ordeal Of Integration:

Progress And Resentment In America's "Racial" Crisis

Orlando Patterson is a Jamaican-born American historical and cultural sociologist known for his work regarding issues of race in the United States, as well as the sociology of development

In the attempt to understand and come to terms with the problems of Afro-Americans and of their interethnic relations, the country has been ill served by its intellectuals, policy advocates, and leaders in recent years. At present, dogmatic ethnic advocates and extremists appear to dominate discourse on the subject, drowning out both moderate and other dissenting voices. A strange convergence has emerged between these extremists. On the left, the nation is misled by an endless stream of tracts and studies that deny any meaningful change in America's "Two Nations," decry "The Myth of Black Progress," mourn "The Dream Deferred," dismiss AfroAmerican middle-class status as "Volunteer Slavery," pronounce AfroAmerican men an "Endangered Species," and apocalyptically announce "The Coming Race War." On the right is complete agreement with this dismal portrait in which we are fast "Losing Ground," except that the road to "racial" hell, according to conservatives, has been paved by the very pQlicies intended to help solve the problem, abetted by "The Dream and the Nightmare" of cultural changes in the sixties and by the overbreeding and educational integration of inferior Afro-Americans and very policies intended to help solve the problem, abetted by "The Dream and the Nightmare" of cultural changes in the sixties and by the overbreeding and educational integration of inferior Afro-Americans and lower-class Euro-Americans genetically situated on the wrong tail of the IQ "Bell Curve." If it is true that a "racial crisis" persists in America, this crisis is as much one of perception and interpretation as of actual socioeconomic and interethnic realities. By any measure, the record of the past half century has been one of great achievement, thanks in good part to the suecess of the government policies now being maligned by the left for not having gone far enough and by the right for having both failed and gone too far. At the same time, there is still no room for complacency: because our starting point half a century ago was so deplorably backward, we still have some way to go before approaching anything like a resolution.

### Case o/w

#### Biological death outweighs social death

**Bernstein ‘2** (Richard J., Vera List Prof. Phil. – New School for Social Research, “Radical Evil: A Philosophical Interrogation”, p. 188-192)

This is precisely what Jonas does in The Phenomenon of Life, his rethinking of the meaning of organic life. He tealizes that his philosophical project goes against many of the deeply embedded prejudices and dogmas of contemporary philosophy. He challenges two well-entrenched dogmas: that there is no metaphysical truth, and that there is no path from the "is" to the "ought". To escape from ethical nihilism, we must show that there is a metaphysical ground of ethics, an objective basis for value and purpose in being itself. These are strong claims; and, needless to say, they are extremely controversial. In defense of Jonas, it should be said that he approaches this task with both boldness and intellectual modesty. He frequently acknowledges that he cannot "prove" his claims, but he certainly believes that his "premises" do "more justice to the total phenomenon of man and Being in general" than the prevailing dualist or reductionist alternatives. "But in the last analysis my argument can do no more than give a rational grounding to an option it presents as a choice for a thoughtful person — an option that of course has its own inner power of persuasion. Unfortunately I have nothing better to offer. Perhaps a future metaphysics will be able to do more." 8 To appreciate how Jonas's philosophical project unfolds, we need to examine his philosophical interpretation of life. This is the starting point of his grounding of a new imperative of responsibility. It also provides the context for his speculations concerning evil. In the foreword to The Phenomenon of Life, Jonas gives a succinct statement of his aim. Put at its briefest, this volume offers an "existential" interpretation of biological facts. Contemporary existentialism, obsessed with man alone, is in the habit of claiming as his unique privilege and predicament much of what is rooted in organic existence as such: in so doing, it withholds from the organic world the insights to be learned from the awareness of self. On its part, scientific biology, by its rules confined to the physical, outward facts, must ignore the dimension of inwardness that belongs to life: in so doing, it submerges the distinction of "animate" and "inanimate." A new reading of the biological record may recover the inner dimension — that which we know best -- for the understanding of things organic and so reclaim for psycho-physical unity of life that place in the theoretical scheme which it had lost through the divorce of the material and the mental since Descartes. p. ix) Jonas, in his existential interpretation of bios, pursues "this underlying theme of all of life in its development through the ascending order of organic powers and functions: metabolism, moving and desiring, sensing and perceiving, imagination, art, and mind — a progressive scale of freedom and peril, culminating in man, who may understand his uniqueness anew when he no longer sees himself in metaphysical isolation" (PL, p. ix). The way in which Jonas phrases this theme recalls the Aristotelian approach to bios, and it is clear that Aristotle is a major influence on Jonas. There is an even closer affinity with the philosophy of nature that Schelling sought to elaborate in the nineteenth century. Schelling (like many post- Kantian German thinkers) was troubled by the same fundamental dichotomy that underlies the problem for Jonas. The dichotomy that Kant introduced between the realm of "disenchanted" nature and the realm of freedom leads to untenable antinomies. Jonas differs from both Aristotle and Schelling in taking into account Darwin and contemporary scientific biology. A proper philosophical understanding of biology must always be compatible with the scientific facts. But at the same time, it must also root out misguided materialistic and reductionist interpretations of those biological facts. In this respect, Jonas's naturalism bears a strong affinity with the evolutionary naturalism of Peirce and Dewey. At the same time, Jonas is deeply skeptical of any theory of evolutionary biology that introduces mysterious "vital forces" or neglects the contingencies and perils of evolutionary development.' Jonas seeks to show "that it is in the dark stirrings of primeval organic substance that a principle of freedom shines forth for the first time within the vast necessity of the physical universe" (PL 3). Freedom, in this broad sense, is not identified exclusively with human freedom; it reaches down to the first glimmerings of organic life, and up to the type of freedom manifested by human beings. " 'Freedom' must denote an objectively discernible mode of being, i.e., a manner of executing existence, distinctive of the organic per se and thus shared by all members but by no nonmembers of the class: an ontologically descriptive term which can apply to mere physical evidence at first" (PL 3). This coming into being of freedom is not just a success story. "The privilege of freedom carries the burden of need and means precarious being" (PL 4). It is with biological metabolism that this principle of freedom first arises. Jonas goes "so far as to maintain that metabolism, the basic stratum of all organic existence, already displays freedom — indeed that it is the first form freedom takes." 1 ° With "metabolism — its power and its need — not-being made its appearance in the world as an alternative embodied in being itself; and thereby being itself first assumes an emphatic sense: intrinsically qualified by the threat of its negative it must affirm itself, and existence affirmed is existence as a concern" (PL 4). This broad, ontological understanding of freedom as a characteristic of all organic life serves Jonas as "an Ariadne's thread through the interpretation of Life" (PL 3). The way in which Jonas enlarges our understanding of freedom is indicative of his primary argumentative strategy. He expands and reinterprets categories that are normally applied exclusively to human beings so that we can see that they identify objectively discernible modes of being characteristic of everything animate. Even inwardness, and incipient forms of self; reach down to the simplest forms of organic life. 11 Now it may seem as if Jonas is guilty of anthropomorphism, of projecting what is distinctively human onto the entire domain of living beings. He is acutely aware of this sort of objection, but he argues that even the idea of anthropomorphism must be rethought. 12 We distort Jonas's philosophy of life if we think that he is projecting human characteristics onto the nonhuman animate world. Earlier I quoted the passage in which Jonas speaks of a "third way" — "one by which the dualistic rift can be avoided and yet enough of the dualistic insight saved to uphold the humanity of man" (GEN 234). We avoid the "dualistic rift" by showing that there is genuine continuity of organic life, and that such categories as freedom, inwardness, and selfhood apply to everything that is animate. These categories designate objective modes of being. But we preserve "enough dualistic insight" when we recognize that freedom, inwardness, and selfhood manifest themselves in human beings in a distinctive manner. I do not want to suggest that Jonas is successful in carrying out this ambitious program. He is aware of the tentativeness and fallibility of his claims, but he presents us with an understanding of animate beings such that we can discern both continuity and difference.' 3 It should now be clear that Jonas is not limiting himself to a regional philosophy of the organism or a new "existential" interpretation of biological facts. His goal is nothing less than to provide a new metaphysical understanding of being, a new ontology. And he is quite explicit about this. Our reflections [are] intended to show in what sense the problem of life, and with it that of the body, ought to stand in the center of ontology and, to some extent, also of epistemology. . . The central position of the problem of life means not only that it must be accorded a decisive voice in judging any given ontology but also that any treatment of itself must summon the whole of ontology. (PL 25) The philosophical divide between Levinas and Jonas appears to be enormous. For Levinas, as long as we restrict ourselves to the horizon of Being and to ontology (no matter how broadly these are conceived), there is no place for ethics, and no answer to ethical nihilism. For Jonas, by contrast, unless we can enlarge our understanding of ontology in such a manner as would provide an objective grounding for value and purpose within nature, there is no way to answer the challenge of ethical nihilism. But despite this initial appearance of extreme opposition, there is a way of interpreting Jonas and Levinas that lessens the gap between them. In Levinasian terminology, we can say that Jonas shows that there is a way of understanding ontology and the living body that does justice to the nonreducible alterity of the other (l'autrui). 14 Still, we might ask how Jonas's "existential" interpretation of biological facts and the new ontology he is proposing can provide a metaphysical grounding for a new ethics. Jonas criticizes the philosophical prejudice that there is no place in nature for values, purposes, and ends. Just as he maintains that freedom, inwardness, and selfhood are objective modes of being, so he argues that values and ends are objective modes of being. **There is a basic value inherent in organic being, a basic affirmation, "The Yes' of Life**" (IR 81). 15 "**The self-affirmation of being becomes emphatic in the opposition of life to death. Life is the explicit confrontation of being with not-being**. . . . The 'yes' of all striving is here sharpened by the active `no' to not-being" (IR 81-2). Furthermore — and this is the crucial point for Jonas — **this affirmation of life that is in all organic being has a binding obligatory force upon human beings**. This blindly self-enacting "yes" gains obligating force in the seeing freedom of man, who as the supreme outcome of nature's purposive labor is no longer its automatic executor but, with the power obtained from knowledge, can become its destroyer as well. He must adopt the "yes" into his will and impose the "no" to not-being on his power. But precisely this transition from willing to obligation is the critical point of moral theory at which attempts at laying a foundation for it come so easily to grief. Why does now, in man, that become a duty which hitherto "being" itself took care of through all individual willings? (IR 82). We discover here the transition from is to "ought" — from the self-affirmation of life to the binding obligation of human beings to preserve life not only for the present but also for the future. But why do we need a new ethics? The subtitle of The Imperative of Responsibility — In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age — indicates why we need a new ethics. Modern technology has transformed the nature and consequences of human ac-tion so radically that the underlying premises of traditional ethics are no longer valid. For the first time in history human beings possess the knowledge and the power to destroy life on this planet, including human life. Not only is there the new possibility of total nuclear disaster; there are the even more invidious and threatening possibilities that result from the unconstrained use of technologies that can destroy the environment required for life. The major transformation brought about by modern technology is that the consequences of our actions frequently exceed by far anything we can envision. Jonas was one of the first philosophers to warn us about the unprecedented ethical and political problems that arise with the rapid development of biotechnology. He claimed that this was happening at a time when there was an "ethical vacuum," when there did not seem to be any effective ethical principles to limit ot guide our ethical decisions. In the name of scientific and technological "progress," there is a relentless pressure to adopt a stance where virtually anything is permissible, includ-ing transforming the genetic structure of human beings, as long as it is "freely chosen." We need, Jonas argued, a new categorical imperative that might be formulated as follows: "Act so that the effects of your action are compatible with the permanence of genuine human life"; or expressed negatively: "Act so that the effects of your action are not destructive of the future possibility of such a life"; or simply: "**Do not compromise the conditions for an indefinite continuation of humanity on earth**"; or again turned positive: "In your present choices, include the future wholeness of Man among the objects of your will." (IR 11)

### A2 slave = ontological

#### The African slave was never purely the object of modernity – but also an agent in the construction of modern concepts of universal humanity.

Paul **MILLER** French & Italian @ Vanderbilt **’10** *Elusive Origins: The Enlightenment in the Modern Caribbean Imagination* p.75-76

Toussaint for James undoubtedly represented, as we have shown, the embodiment of the best ideals of the Enlightenment. David Scott’s *Conscripts of Modernity* bears the subtitle *The Tragedy of Colonial Enlightenment*, but his study favors the category of modernity over that of the Enlightenment and seems to conflate the two: “My point, in short, is simply this, that however many slaves preserved individual memories of nonmodern practices from their African homelands…the fact is that they were now obliged to conduct these remembered lives in conditions brought into being by the categories and institutions of the modern world.” It is not clear to me what is at stake in this emphasis on a widespread notion of institutional modernity, with its anti- or non-modern tribal antithesis, and the depiction of African slaves, whether docile or rebellious, as passive “conscripts.” This seems to me precisely the kind of **binary trap** prescribed by the logic of Enlightenment**.** A counterexample or alternative to this approach might be found in Nick Nesbitt’s discussion of the Chartre du Mandé, a 1222 oral declaration of the Mandé nation in what is today the Republic of Mali. The charter according to Nesbitt, “founded a society based upon the universal and unqualified rights of all human beings to be free from enslavement.” The 1222 charter, contemporaneous with the Magna Carta (1215) and centuries before the *Declarations of the Rights of Man* (1789) or the eighteenth-century constitutions, proclaims, “Every human life is a life.” Nesbitt hypothesizes that this proclamation of universal equality could have survived the Middle Passage and was known to Toussaint through the common Kreyol proverb (and title of Jean-Betrand Aristide’s autobriography) “Tout moun se moun.” Though this account relies on speculation to a certain degree, since it is based on an oral document that did not leave written traces, it is certainly plausible enough to allow us at least to imagine a scenario in which African slaves were not mere **passive enlistees in the game of modernit**y, but rather impacted and helped shape the unfolding of modern culture through a process that Fernando Ortiz calls transculturation, but rather the “consequent creation of new cultural phenomena.”

### A2 anti-blackness

#### We shouldn’t write the history of African slavery as anti-blackness. Their account assumes historical continuity between racial, geographic, and religious categorization between masters and slaves.

Eve **POWELL** History & Africana Studies @ Penn **‘6** in *Middle East Historiographies* eds. Gershoni et. al. p. 247-249

To his credit, Baer does turn to Ali Mubarak's A I-Kh ita t al-tawfiqiya fi masr al-jadida for information about the slave markets of Cairo and follows Mubarak's map of the journey African slaves took once they arrived in Cairo in the late nineteenth century. But when researching slave traders of the Cairo markets he resorts to the descriptions of Evliya Celebi, a seventeenthcentury Ottoman traveler: to Cairo came "dark-skinned people from the districts of the Oases, Aswan and Ibrim." This process went on for generations, Baer writes (which would explain why he used a seventeenthcentury source to describe a nineteenth-century phenomenon): "these people continued, apparently, to constitute the main element of slave dealers until the abolition of the slave trade late in the nineteenth century (emphasis added)."20 Any change in the patterns of acquiring slaves by different tribes or kingdoms over two centuries of the slave trade along the Nile Valley is effaced with the use of the word "apparently." Gabriel Baer was an Israeli historian researching Egyptian history in the late 1960S, so it is quite understandable that he was unable to gain access to the archives of Cairo. But his chapter demonstrates an even greater geographic distancing through its indifference, then common, to the demographics of the African slave trade. Baer exiled to other books the European officers hired by the Khedive Isma'il to abolish slavery in the Nile Valley, not only because a great deal had previously been written about them, but also because "their efforts and the results of their activities belong to the history of the Sudan rather than that of slavery in Egypt."21 This is an example of how historiography has kept the slaves hidden and mute. By divorcing Sudanese from Egyptian history, the geographic origins of the trade, and the majority of the slaves, are removed from the map of slavery. Unlike Baer, Bernard Lewis carefully asserts the prominence of relations between "black Africa [and] the Muslim lands."22 Lewis's work covers a much broader subject in both geography and historical time, and Race and Slavery in the Middle East certainly raised the important issue of constructions of race in the Islamic world when it was published. But as in Baer's, there is also a problematically defined geographic separation in Lewis's work on slavery, this time between the West and the East. Slavery in the "one" is the obverse of slavery in the "other," so what African slavery really meant is described only in the negative. Lewis first wrote the lectures that constitute Race and Slavery in the Middle East in 1969, and although the 1990 edition of the book was revised, Lewis's strong distinction between "black" and "white" in Arab societies bears many influences of debates about race that took place during the decade when Afro-American studies was only just coming into its own. Perhaps that is why Lewis never succumbed to the compulsion to define the terms black and white in either an African Or Middle-Eastern context. In Race and Slavery, the racial classifications that seem so firm to him are presented as unchanging over centuries, from preIslamic Arabia through the Ottoman Middle East in the late nineteenth century. Lewis's reach extends far: law, literature, Islamic art, and poetry. He offers important examples of Arab-, Persian-, and Turkish-Muslim biases against sub-Saharan Africans and even goes so far as to include graceful translations of "black" poets' laments, as in the following lines written by Nusayb ibn Rabah (d. 726): Blackness does not diminish me, as long as I have this tongue and this stout heart, Some are raised up by means of their lineage; the verses of my poems are my lineage! How much better a keen-minded, clear-spoken black than a mute white!23 As a historian, Lewis has often displayed formidable literary insight, and the pleasure he takes in poetry is clear. But his obvious enjoyment of the Arabic language leads him in two contradictory directions, both of which obscure the experiences of the slaves whose identities and histories he tries to uncover. He writes that "after the eighth century, there are few identifiable black poets in Arabic literature, and their blackness is not a significant poetic theme." Later African Muslims wrote poetry in their own languages, preferring to use ''Arabic for scholarship." Even though African slavery in the Middle East continued, "the school of self-consciously black poets came to an end." Few slaves had the education or the cultural fluency to compose Arabic poetry, "while the few Arabic poets of African or part-African ancestry were too assimilated to see themselves as black and therefore other."24 But his extensive footnotes offer no information about the poetry of black African Muslims writing in languages other than Arabic. The idea of blackness itself changes after the eighth century, no longer to be discussed by poets but by jurists, who argue, in Lewis's words, "that piety outweighs blackness and impiety outweighs whiteness."25 Yet he concluded this chapter by saying, "from the literature, it is clear that a new and sometimes vicious pattern of racial hostility and discrimination had emerged within the Islamic world."26 This is a difficult argument, because Lewis first asserts a change in racial thinking and then asserts an unchanging pattern from the eighth century through the Ottoman and Persian empires. The slaves themselves, so deserving of Lewis's sympathy, are frozen in Nusayb's images. The changes in identities to which Lewis briefly alludes are also simultaneously effaced. None of the documents discussed in the chapter about images and stereotypes was written after 1597, and yet Lewis asserts, "what is more important is that the black is almost entirely missing from the positions of wealth, power and privilege. Medieval authors sometimes attribute this want of achievement by black slaves and freedmen to lack of capacity. The modern observer will recognize the effect of lack of opportunity."27 Again, there is a leap across time here without what I would consider requisite information about how slavery enabled people in the Middle East to construct racial identities; instead, the reader is asked to fill in the blanks using material from his or her own experience. Nor does Lewis help the reader understand in what ways literary sources can inform modern observers about antiblack prejudice. The reader is again left up to his or her own devices to conjure up an image of the black slave from the pages of Lewis's book. Although cited by many scholars, Race and Slavery in the Middle East remains part of the tradition created by the British "men on the spot," whose descriptions of African slavery in the Muslim world left much to the imagination of their readers.

### 2AC perm

Perm do the aff and engage in a paradigmatic analysis of the underlying antagonism's of the 1AC

#### Combining goals of alleviating energy poverty and climate change mitigation is essential to tip the balance and persuade policy elites of both agendas—either in isolation fails

Versatz and Herrero, 2012[SergioTiradoHerrero Center forClimateChangeandSustainableEnergyPolicy(3CSEP),DepartmentofEnvironmentalSciencesandPolicy,CentralEuropeanUniversity(CEU), “Building synergies between climate change mitigation and energy poverty alleviation” Energy Policy 49 (2012) 83–90]

This leads us to the crucial importance of policy integration. Because substantial investment costs and policy efforts are required for a large-scale implementation of deep efficiency in new and existing buildings, neither energy poverty eradication nor climate change mitigation goals alone may be enough to mobilise sufficient policy effort for making it happen. In contrast, if several of these policy goals are considered together, and the political and financial resources for several policy fields are merged, this might tip the expenditure-benefit[4](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421511009918#fn4) balance in favour of action. Following this approach, it is more likely that one of the most promising measures to fight climate change and energy poverty – deep efficiency – will take place if their synergy (and perhaps further synergies such as with energy security and net employment creation) is forged through strong policy integration. For such an integration to be effective, however, progress is also needed in research and methodologies. Today, cost-benefit assessments on which policy decisions are based typically consider direct costs and benefits only for single policy fields. In ideal policy-preparatory assessments, full costs and benefits, going beyond the single policy fields and just direct impacts, need to be considered. This requires a major advance in presently used methodologies to quantify and monetise co-benefits (e.g., for some key co-benefits like net employment creation and energy dependency reduction no economic valuation techniques are yet available) and co-costs (e.g., transaction costs, policy implementation costs, risks, etc.), as well as to their summation accounting for all synergies and trade-offs.

5. Conclusions

This paper has explored the functional and policy interactions between fighting climate change and alleviating energy poverty. For that, it has reviewed a number of selected mainstream scientific literature and policy-relevant literature in both domains in order to identify trends, key elements, synergies, trade-offs and potential conflicts, and to provide a taxonomy of these interactions. The conclusions reached refer primarily to residential energy users and buildings in developed and transition economies, where a considerably large potential for cost-effective mitigation lies, and where the inability of some households to afford an adequate level of energy services (energy poverty) has distinct public health and social welfare implications.

The most important trade-off identified in the paper is the potential increase in energy poverty levels as a result of strong climate change action increasing energy prices through carbon pricing, which points at an impending conflict between the welfare of present and future generations. If the internalisation of the external costs of carbon emissions is not offset by efficiency gains, the burden of mitigation will be disproportionately felt by those worse-off members of society who are still unable to provide enough energy services to their households. The rebound or takeback effect, another case of potential conflict between energy poverty and climate goals, is thought to be not as relevant and perhaps not even applicable to the case of energy poor households, where energy services needs are inadequately covered in the first place.

The most significant synergy is offered by the improved energy efficiency of buildings. As argued in Section 4, ensuring high efficiency standards is the only option for aligning strong energy poverty alleviation and climate change mitigation goals. In comparison, direct support measures implemented as fuel allowances or social tariffs do not provide a long term solution to the energy deprivation challenge – in fact, they may lock-in households in energy poverty if implemented on their own because they remove incentives to invest in energy efficiency at the household level – and do not reduce carbon emissions either.

This analytical review has explored in more detail the strongest synergy that is offered by these two areas of policy action: large reductions in GHG emissions and the elimination of energy poverty through deep energy efficiency. The paper suggests that in the developed and transition economics of North America, Eurasia and the Pacific this synergy is so strong that neither of the two problems is likely to be solved in such countries fully on their own merit; while the integration of these policy goals, with the potential addition of other key related policy goals such as energy security or employment, is likely to tip the cost-benefit balance and provide sufficient policy motivation to mobilise wide-scale resources and commitments. Thus, an essential message carried by this review is the importance of integrating seemingly unrelated policy goals and sharing the resources for their solution.

The paper has also identified critical gaps in knowledge and methodology that presently prevent such informed decisions to be integrated in policy-making, in order to forge this synergy on the ground. Only by ensuring that the various co-benefits are appropriately integrated into policy assessment methods and decision support tools, and thus making policy-makers aware of the synergistic economic and social benefits of reaching these various policy goals simultaneously through ambitious energy efficiency programmes, will the needed transformation be realised.

### Liberalism good – 2AC

#### Liberalism can affirm cultural difference and contingency – their critique is a totalizing portrayal of liberalism that destroys progressive change

Arslan, professor of government – Polis Akademisi Güvenlik Bilimleri Fakültesi, ‘99

(Zhutu, “Taking Rights Less Seriously,” Res Publica 5)

Incredulous of foundational truth claims, the postmodernists reject the idea that human beings have certain rights simply by virtue of being human. Foucault for instance claims that, like the individual, civil liberties are nothing but expressions of governance and disciplinary power.98 Gaete writes:

[A] Post-Modern perspective would assume that human rights are neither the expression of a universal truth nor a denial of it and regard their truth claims as only local moves in a game the subject enters when formulating his/her relationship to power in the language of fundamental rights.99

The postmodern hymn of relativity rules out the possibility of any universal claim to human rights. In the postmodern condition, it would be impossible to argue that individuals have some basic rights irrespective of their nationality or geography. The inevitable consequence of the relativisation of “truth-claims” is to undercut any universal, “principled, normative basis” for claiming that human rights simply exist.100 But without such a basis, we are left in a situation in which we lack any criteria to distinguish between right and wrong. This ethical vacuum may easily lead to the apparent legitimation and justification of almost any belief and practice in the realm of rights. This conservative support of the prevailing status quo is an obvious rejection of the “revolutionary” nature of universal human rights. At the end of the day, the notion of rights is forced to surrender its power as a legitimating factor of political regimes. With the demise of the subject and his/her rights, the postmodernists in fact undermine any possible resistance against oppressive orders. As Touraine asserts, “[T]he idea of the subject is a dissident idea which has always upheld the right to rebel against an unjust power.”101 Touraine also reminds the murderers of the subject what a subject-less world would look like:

[T]he day when the Subject is debased to meaning introspection, and the Self to meaning compulsory social roles, our social and personal life will lose all its creative power and will be no more than a post-modern museum in which multiple memories replace our inability to produce anything of lasting importance.102

The postmodern defence of “uncertainty” and “contingency” is equally problematic. The very idea of “uncertainty” itself implies the existence of a certainty, after all: “[I]f you tried to doubt everything, you would not get as far as doubting anything. The game of doubting itself presupposes certainty.”103 Human beings live with their values, and need to rank them. Their highest values, or what Charles Taylor calls “hypergoods”,104 play a central role in our lives. Individuals define and are defined by these hypergoods, be they a divine being, Brahma, Nirvana, Justice, Reason, Science, Progress, Cogito or Superman. To kill our hypergoods therefore means an attempt to kill the sources of the self, sources which confer meaning on the lives of human beings. The need for hypergoods points to the necessity of “an absolute truth”, to use Sartre’s phrase.105 This necessity is also the precondition of any critique. Thus Habermas claims that “Nietzsche’s critique consumes the critical impulse itself”; for “if thought can no longer operate in the realms of truth and validity claims, then analysis and critique lose their meaning”. 106 Oddly, perhaps, Derrida seems to agree with Habermas when he says that he “cannot conceive of a radical critique which would not be ultimately motivated by some sort of affirmation, acknowledged or not”.107

Postmodernity, despite its dream of a “godless” epoch,108 cannot escape the necessity we have explored. Such a dream itself anyway reflects, however implicitly and unintentionally, the belief in linear progress, one of the hypergoods of modernity.109 Postmodernism turns out to be a new grand narrative: “a grand narrative of postmodernity”.110 Even Lyotard comes close to acknowledging the existence of this new metanarrative. He states that “the great narratives are now barely credible. And it is therefore tempting to lend credence to the great narrative of the decline of great narratives.”111 As a new “totalising” project, postmodernism reproduces the very predicaments of modernity,112 and its rejection of metaphysics becomes a merely “rhetorical” claim.113

The real question now is how to establish a socio-political framework in which people’s hypergoods might peacefully live side by side without people trying to kill each other. This is the project of political liberalism: but it is also to certain extent the project of postmodernism itself, as we have earlier seen.114 In other words, pluralism is the common value which in fact pervades the writings of liberals and postmodernists alike,115 even though it is expressed in different terms, and on different epistemological grounds, amounting, ironically, to both the “ethical relativism” of John Keane116 and the “moral universalism” of Habermas.117 Keane writes:

[T]o defend relativism requires a social and political stance which is throughly modern. It implies the need for establishing or strengthening a democratic state and a civil society consisting of a plurality of public spheres, within which individuals and groups can openly express their solidarity with (or opposition to) others’ ideas.118

In an interview, Habermas explains what his “moral universalism” stands for:

[W]hat does universalism mean, after all? That one relativizes one’s own way of life with regard to the legitimate claims of other forms of life, that one grants the strangers and the others, with all their idiosyncrasies and incomprehensibilities, the same rights as oneself, that one does not insist on universalizing one’s own identity, that one does not simply exclude that which deviates from it, that the areas of tolerance must become infinitely broader than they are today – moral universalism means all these things.119

At the core of this pluralism required by “ethical relativism” and “moral universalism” alike lies the conception of autonomy.120 Indeed, as Raz puts it, pluralism is a necessary requirement of the value of autonomy.121 Autonomy, however, is inextricably connected with rights. An autonomous individual who is “the author of his own life” has certain rights.122 In Raz’s words “autonomy is constituted by rights and nothing else: the autonomous life is a life within unviolated rights”.123 Since it is an essential part and parcel of human being (or being human), autonomy constitutes a “sufficient ontological justification” for rights and thus gives an invaluable support to those who seek for a justificatory ground for them.124

Autonomy requires the existence of the Other(s).125 The Other is not simply external to me, but he or she at the same time constitutes my identity: I am in a way parasitic on the Other. My autonomy makes sense only insofar as there exist others. As Sartre puts it, “[T]he other is indispensable to my existence, and equally so to any knowledge I can have of myself.”126 And unless I in turn recognise others as autonomous beings I shall end up in the fundamental predicament of “absolute loneliness and terror”.127 This points to the absolute necessity of living with others,128 as a “zoon politikon” in Marx’s words.129

Thus autonomy is a key value not only for “I”, but also for others. The postmodernists must take into account autonomy, if they are to present an ethical/political project part of which involves rights, however “locally”. They can do so, furthermore, without having to abandon their conceptual tools. Difference and otherness, the magical terms of postmodern discourse, are in fact quite compatible with such conceptions as autonomy and universality. As Lyotard himself argues, a human being has rights only if she is also an other human being. Likewise, as Terry Eagleton emphasises, universalism and difference are not mutually exclusive. Difference may need universalism. The idea of difference is indeed likely to be undermined by “certain militant particularisms of our day”.130

V. CONCLUSION

Whatever the merits of the entirety of their arguments, the postmodernists emphasise the paramount importance of human rights: they are, after all, its starting-point. As Bauman points out, “[T]he great issues of ethics – like human rights . . . – have lost nothing of their topicality”,131 and he is well aware of the fact that “[m]oral issues tend to be increasingly compressed into the idea of ‘human rights’ ”.132 Lyotard himself likewise states that “[A] human being has rights only if he is other than a human being. And if he is to be other than a human being, he must in addition become an other human being.”133

More importantly, influenced by the communitarian and postmodern critique of metaphysical grounds for ethical and political claims, some liberal rights theorists such as Ronald Dworkin and John Rawls adopt a kind of “apologetic” attitude towards the theoretical foundation of rights, refusing to play the traditional role of moral magician by plucking ethical claims out of a metaphysical hat. In a recent essay, Rawls makes it clear that

[T]hese [human] rights do not depend on any particular comprehensive moral doctrine or philosophical conception of human nature, such as, for example that human beings are moral persons and have equal worth or that they have certain particular moral and intellectual powers that entitle them to these rights. To show this would require a quite deep philosophical theory that many if not most hierarchical societies might reject as liberal or democratic or else as in some way distinctive of Western political tradition and prejudicial to other countries.134

This passage implies that in fact the idea of human rights is a product of the western liberal tradition, but in order to make it universally applicable we must refrain from any theoretical attempt to reveal this fact. Let’s pretend that human rights are simply there. They do not need any moral or philosophical ground for justification.

But there need be no contradiction between the postmodernists and the liberals; nor need the latter apologize for “rights”. For, as we have seen, the postmodernists have never underestimated the importance of human rights. They argue that ethical issues such as human rights “only need to be seen, and dealt with, in a novel way”.135 Yet the postmodernists have not presented us with any postmodern “novel way” in which human rights might be seen. It seems to be difficult, if not impossible, for them to show this novel way without taking into account the conceptions of autonomous self and universality. Perhaps they need to begin taking rights more seriously.

#### We should not abandon the category of universal humanity. Anti-slavery abolition and its intersections with critiques of gendered citizenship drew on universal humanity as a source of solidarity.

Paul **GILROY** Anthony Giddens Prf. of Social Theory @ London School of Economics **‘9** *Race and the Right to be Human* p. 6-11

At times, the movement against slavery was extended into a comprehensive assault on racial hierarchy which invoked an idea of **universal humanity** (by no means always religious in origin) as well as an idea of inalienable rights1. That alternative provides my point of departure this evening. It was articulated in distinctive accents which were **neither bourgeois nor liberal**. It requires us to follow a detour through colonial history which has come under revisionist pressure as a result of recent attempts to revive imperial relations. That dubious development has made it imperative to place the west’s avowal of modern, liberal, humanistic and humanitarian ideas in the context of the formative encounter with native peoples whose moral personality and humanity had long been placed in doubt. The approach I favour requires seeing not just how all-conquering liberal sensibilities evolved unevenly into considerations of human rights but how a range of disputes over and around the idea of universal humanity—its origins, its hierarchies and varying moral and juridical dispositions—were connected to struggles over race, slavery, colonial and imperial rule, and how they in turn produced positions which would later be narrated and claimed as liberal. This agonistic enterprise necessitates a **different genealogy** for human rights than is conventional. It begins with the history of conquest and European expansion and must be able to encompass the evolving debates over how colonies and slave plantation systems were to be administered4. At its most basic, it must incorporate the contending voices of Las Casas and Sepulveda. It should be able to analyze the contrapuntality of a text like Thomas Hobbes’ Leviathan with the introduction of England’s Navigation Acts and illuminate the relationship between John Locke’s insightful advocacy on behalf of an emergent bourgeoisie and his commitment to the colonial improvers’ doctrine of the vacuum domicilium. This counter-narrative would certainly include the Treaty of Utrecht and the Assiento. It could terminate uneasily in the contemporary debates about torture and rendition or in discussion about the institutionalisation of rightslessness which floods into my mind each time I navigate the halls of the Schiphol complex. Focusing on that **combination of progress and catastrophe** through a postcolonial lens yields a view of what would become the liberal tradition moving on from its seventeenth century origins in a style of thought that was partly formed by and readily adapted to colonial conditions5. This helps to explain how an obstinate attachment to raciology recurs. Struggles against racial hierarchy have contributed directly and consistently to challenging conceptions of the human. They valorized forms of humanity that were not amenable to colour-coded hierarchy and, in complicating approaches to human sameness, they refused the full, obvious force of natural differences even when they were articulated together with sex and gender. These struggles shaped philosophical perspectives on the fragile universals that had come into focus initially on the insurgent edges of colonial contact zones where the violence of racialized statecraft was repudiated and cosmopolitan varieties of care took shape unexpectedly across the boundaries of culture, civilization, language and technology6. One early critique of the humanitarian language and tacit racialization of the enlightenment ideal had been delivered by the militant abolitionist David Walker in his 1830 commentary on the US constitution: Appeal to the Coloured Citizens of the World, but in particular, and very expressly, to those of the United States of America. His famous text supplies a useful symbolic, starting point for generating the new genealogy we require. Erecting secular demands over the foundation of a revolutionary, Pauline Christianity, Walker made the problem of black humanity and related issues of rights—political and human—intrinsic to his insubordinate conception of world citizenship. His plea that blacks be recognized as belonging to “the human family” was combined with a view of their natural rights as being wrongfully confiscated in the condition of slavery which could, as a result of their exclusion, be justifiably overthrown7. His address was primarily offered to the coloured citizens of the world but the tactical reduction of that universalist argument to the parochial problem of joining the US as full citizens soon followed. The consequences of that change of scale can be readily seen in the humanistic abolitionism that followed. Frederick Douglass—particularly in his extraordinary 1852 speech on the meaning of the 4th of July to the slave8, spoke directly to the US **in the name of its polluted national citizenship**. His indictment of slavery was a cosmopolitan one in which the eloquent facts of plantation life were judged, just as Walker had suggested they should be, through global comparisons. They were compared with all the abuse to be found in “the monarchies and despotisms of the Old World (and in) South America”. Douglass concluded that “for revolting barbarity and shameless hypocrisy, America reigns without a rival”. He continued, again echoing Walker: “Must I undertake to prove that the slave is a man? That point is conceded already. Nobody doubts it. The slave-holders themselves acknowledge it in the enactment of laws for their government. They acknowledge it when they punish disobedience on the part of the slave. . . . . . How should I look to-day, in the presence of Americans, dividing, and subdividing a discourse, to show that men have a natural right to freedom? speaking of it relatively and positively, negatively and affirmatively. To do so, would be to make myself ridiculous, and to offer an insult to your understanding.”9 In demanding equality based on natural rights and exploring the relationship of debased citizenship and tainted law to racialized life, Douglass was drawing upon the thinking of an earlier cohort of abolitionist writers. Many of them had, like Walker and other anti-slavery radicals, practiced a chiliastic Christianity that built upon St. Paul with incendiary consequences which could not be limited by the heading of anti-slavery. Consider the way in which Angelina Grimké had articulated the concept of human rights in her 1836 Appeal To The Christian Women of The South: . . . man is never vested with . . . dominion over his fellow man; he was never told that any of the human species were put under his feet; it was only all things, and man, who was created in the image of his Maker, never can properly be termed a thing, though the laws of Slave States do call him ‘a chattel personal;’ Man then, I assert never was put under the feet of man, by that first charter of human rights which was given by God, to the Fathers of the Antediluvian and Postdiluvian worlds, therefore this doctrine of equality is based on the Bible10. Grimké elaborated upon this inspired refusal of the reduction of people to things in a memorable (1838) letter to her friend Catherine Beecher (the older sister of Harriet Beecher Stowe). There, she connected the notion of divinely instituted human rights to a growing sense of what it would mean for women to acquire political rights. Her insight was framed by a deep engagement with the problem of a gendered alienation from the humanity of “species being”: “The investigation of the rights of the slave has led me to better understanding of our own. I have found the Anti-slavery cause to be the high school of morals in our land—the school in which human rights are more fully investigated and better understood and taught, than in any other. Here a great fundamental principle is uplifted and illuminated, and from this central light rays innumerable stream all around. Human beings have rights, because they are moral beings: the rights of all men grown out of their moral nature, they have essentially the same rights. ”11 It is not easy to assimilate this variety of critical reflection to the political traditions inherited by modern liberalism from revolutionary France. The foregrounding of race is, for example, a fundamental and distinguishing feature as is the suggestion that reflecting upon the thwarted rights of slaves promotes a richer understanding of the rightslessness known by women. Here, slavery was not only a political metaphor. A different kind of connection was being proposed: whoever we are, **we can learn about our own situation from studying the suffering of others which instructively resembles it.** This approach makes the disinterest in abolitionism shown by today’s liberal chroniclers of human rights struggles all the more perplexing. The long battle to appropriate the language and political morality of human rights re-worked the assumptions which had led to **articulating the unthinkable prospects of black** **citizenship and black humanity in** the form of the ancient rhetorical questions immortalized in Wedgewood’s porcelain: “Am I not a Man and a brother?” “Am I not a Woman and a sister?”. The liberatory recognition solicited by those inquiries was pitched against the corrosive power of racial categories and mediated by the cosmopolitan power of human shame. It asked that the social divisions signified by phenotypical difference be set aside in favour of a more substantive human commonality. It promised an alternative conception of kinship that could deliver a world purged of injustice in general and racial hierarchy in particular.

### 2AC historical oppression

Political systems historically constituted by white supremacy are not inevitably oppressive

Sullivan 8 – Shannon Sullivan, Head of Philosophy and Professor of Philosophy, Women's Studies, and African and African American Studies at Pennsylvania State University, Spring 2008, “Whiteness as Wise Provincialism: Royce and the Rehabilitation of a Racial Category,” Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society: A Quarterly Journal in American Philosophy, Vol. 44, No. 2

It is commonly acknowledged today, at least in academic circles, that racial essences do not exist. Racial categories, including whiteness, are historical and political products of human activity, and for that reason the human racial landscape has changed [End Page 236] over time and likely will continue to change in the future. In the wake of this acknowledgement, critical race theorists and philosophers of race debatewhether whiteness must be eliminated or racial oppression to be ended. Given whiteness’s history as a category of violent racial exclusion, eliminativists and “new abolitionists” have argued that it must be abolished. If “whiteness is one pole of an unequal relationship, which can no more exist without oppression than slavery could exist without slaves,” then as long as whiteness endures, so does racial oppression.2 In contrast, critical conservationists have claimed even though it has an oppressive past, whiteness could entail something other than racism and oppression. Moreover, since lived existential categories like whiteness cannot be merely or quickly eliminated, white people should work to transform whiteness into an anti-racist category.

I count myself as a critical conservationist, but I also acknowledge the force of eliminativist arguments. If whiteness necessarily involves racist oppression, then attempting to transform whiteness into an anti-racist category would be a fool’s game at best, and a covert continuance of white supremacy at worst. My goal here is not to rehearse the disagreement between new abolitionists and critical conservationists; excellent work explaining the details of their positions already exists.3 I instead approach that disagreement by asking thepragmatic questionof whether a rehabilitated version of whiteness can be worked out concretely. What would a non-oppressive, anti-racist whiteness look like?What difference would or could it make to the lives of white and non-white people? If the question of how to transform whiteness cannot be answered in some practical detail—if it’s not a difference that makes a difference—then critical conservatism would amount to a hopeful, but ultimately harmful abstraction that makes no difference in lived experience and that damages anti-racist movements. In that case, abolitionism would appear to be the only alternative to ongoing white supremacy and privilege.

I propose turning to Josiah Royce for help with these issues, more specifically to his essay on “Provincialism.”4 This turn is not as surprising as it might initially seem given that Royce wrote explicitly about race in “Race Questions and Prejudices.”5 In that essay, Royce issued an anti-racist, anti-essentialist challenge to then-current scientific studies of race, especially anthropology and ethnology, which claim to prove the superiority of white people, and he even briefly but explicitly names whiteness a possible threat to the future of humanity. 6 I focus here on “Provincialism,” however, because even though the essay never explicitly discusses race, it can help explain the ongoing need for the category of whiteness and implicitly offers a wealth of useful suggestions for how to transform it. “Provincialism” is an exercise in critical conservation of the concept of provincialism, and while not identical, provincialism and whiteness share enough in common that “wise” provincialism can serve [End Page 237] as a model for developing “wise” whiteness.7 Royce’s essay thus can be of great help to critical philosophers of race wrestling with questions of whether and how to transformatively conserve whiteness. Exploring similarities and differences between wise provincialism and wise whiteness, I use Royce’s analyses of provincialism to shed light on why whiteness should be rehabilitated rather than discarded and how white people today might begin living whiteness as an anti-racist category.

### 2AC civil society

#### Revolutionary rejection of civil society increases white supremacy.

Francis Lee **ANSLEY** Law @ Tennessee **’89** STIRRING THE ASHES: RACE, CLASS AND THE FUTURE OF CIVIL RIGHTS SCHOLARSHIP 74 Cornell L. Rev. 993 L/N

Scholars sometimes present this methodology not as a matter of personal preference, or of temporal tactics, but rather as the only tenable or principled response to the current situation. John Calmore quotes Mark Tushnet as follows: "Despite the cost in claims to influence on public policy, then, the post-nihilist legal scholar must stand apart from the legal system and must attempt to work with legal materials in some other way." 250 Alan Freeman implies that any "claims to influence" asserted by those engaging in traditional doctrinal discourse are illusory, so there is no real cost in withdrawing from such activity: [\*1061] If I were content to stay within the structure of legal ideology and argument, I would write a brief in favor of the victim perspective as the appropriate form of judicial decision-making in racial-discrimination cases. But surely the law's refusal to incorporate the victim perspective has had little to do with either the logic or effectiveness of legal argument or the subjective wishes of the participants in the legal process. 251 In some instances, this stepping back for perspective has allowed great leaps forward in understanding. Freeman's own article on antidiscrimination law is a case in point. On the other hand, this detached stance faces increasing criticism. The stratospheric level of some CLS discourse, with its arcane vocabulary, high level of abstraction, cool distance from concrete social or litigational problems, and refusal to suggest solutions, has faced methodological criticism from several sympathetic quarters. Patricia Williams, for example, spins a fable that ends with a haunting image: At the bottom of the Deep Blue Sea, drowning mortals reached silently and desperately for drifting anchors dangling from short chains far, far overhead, which they thought were life-lines meant for them. . . . CLS . . . has failed to make its words and un-words tangible, reach-able and applicable to those in this society who need its powerful assistance most. 252 What are alternatives, or partners, to scholarship "far, far overhead"? One approach, of course, is business as usual. Plenty of cases and doctrinal arguments are published in reporters and law reviews every day, more than enough to keep scholars busy assimilating and commenting on them. A total renunciation of this system would impose costs. Moreover, thoughtful articles within this system, when informed by a desire to defeat racism, can and have been helpful: they may articulate certain themes running through a line [\*1062] of cases, 253 or contribute valuable insights about current debates, 254 or even directly address judges on the perils of judging about race. 255 Generally, however, bolder steps are required. Life is short. Two recent articles 256 epitomize another approach. They both do things that Alan Freeman repudiated; that is, they stay within the structure of legal ideology and argument, and essentially argue for actual judicial implementation of the victim perspective as the appropriate form of judicial decision-making in race-discrimination cases; 257 they seek to pry open space for women and people of color from "the interstices of depressing Supreme Court opinions." 258 Yet both of these articles do something deep and strong enough to be worth the cost. In The Id, the Ego and Equal Protection: Reckoning with Unconscious Racism, 259 Charles Lawrence undertakes the task of working within the disastrous rule of Washington v. Davis. 260 He proposes to create a new "test" for discriminatory intent in equal protection cases, a test that would recognize unconscious racism as the functional equivalent of discriminatory intent. In the course of spinning out how such a test would work, he also presents a helpful short-course on the psychology of racism. Lawrence takes pains to argue that his approach is in harmony with existing equal protection theories, and attempts a precise demonstration of how his proposed "cultural meaning test" for unconscious racism would work in specific cases. Despite the traditional form of the discussion, however, Lawrence asks the reader to examine material powerfully opposed to the crippled and blindered notion of intentional discrimination that now effectively impedes much meaningful racial remediation. Lawrence's article signifies infusion of racial consciousness-raising into traditional legal scholarly debate. [\*1063] Direct participation in constitutional conversations can be important. The Senate Judiciary Committee hearings on the nomination of Robert Bork to the Supreme Court were only one particularly strong illustration of the notion that when Americans fight out important questions about the good life and about public and private morality, we often do so on the stage of constitutional law. 261 Alan Freeman himself has noted that "civil rights law serves as much more than 'just law.' It serves also as the evolving statement of dominant moral consciousness . . . ." 262 Lawrence observes that blacks have a special interest in such public conversations, because the "and other historically stigmatized and excluded groups have no small stake in the promotion of an explicitly normative debate." 263 On the other hand, Lawrence is not naive about the likelihood that his argument will sweep today's Supreme Court off its feet: "I do not anticipate that either the Supreme Court or the academic establishment will rush to embrace and incorporate the approach this article proposes . . . . Rather, it is my hope that the preliminary thoughts expressed in the preceding pages will stimulate others to think about racism in a new way . . . ." 264 I agree with Lawrence that even properly steely-eyed survivors of the civil rights struggle, fully aware of the absorbing, legitimizing and profoundly resistant powers of the law, should sometimes contribute actual proposals to the doctrinal conversation, that they should not always "stand aside." 265 Alternative doctrinal formulations can be liberating, can remind us, sometimes groggy from the blows of the Reagan and now post-Reagan eras, that other possibilities exist. However, it takes some daring and imagination to pose a counter-doctrine that does more than nibble at the edges of distress. Ruth Colker's article is also within the genre of powerful alternatives. 266 Like Professor Lawrence, Professor Colker enters the standard equal protection arena and has her say, even though for feminists as well as for civil rights scholars the ironies and limits of [\*1064] equality-focused struggle have become too obvious to ignore. 267 She advocates replacing the dominant interpretation of anti-discrimination principle (an interpretation she calls the "anti-differentiation") with a different animating rationale for equal protection activity, the "anti-subordination principle": [C]ourts should analyze equal protection cases from an anti-subordination perspective. Under the anti-subordination perspective, it is inappropriate for certain groups in society to have subordinated status because of their lack of power in society as a whole. This approach seeks to eliminate the power disparities between men and women, and between whites and non-whites, through the development of laws and policies that directly redress those disparities. 268 Colker's redefinition of the harm to be avoided by equal protection parallels Randall Kennedy's insight. In an article published in the same year as Colker's, Kennedy observed: In the forties, fifties and early sixties, against the backdrop of laws that used racial distinctions to exclude Negroes from opportunities available to white citizens, it seemed that racial subjugation could be overcome by mandating the application of race-blind law. In retrospect, however, it appears that the concept of race-blindness was simply a proxy for the fundamental demand that racial subjugation be eradicated. This demand, which matured over time in the face of myriad sorts of opposition, focused upon the condition of racial subjugation . . . . Brown and its progeny do not stand for the abstract principle that governmental distinctions based on race are unconstitutional. Rather, [they] stand for the proposition that the Constitution prohibits any arrangements imposing racial subjugation -- whether such arrangements are ostensibly race-neutral or even ostensibly race-blind. This interpretation . . . articulates a principle of anti-subjugation rather than anti-discrimination . . . . 269 [\*1065] These two articulations are more than word play or whistling Dixie. They offer a welcome and lucid formulation that can radically help to correct the amnesiac world view underlying most notions of "reverse discrimination." They are simple and direct enough to help any woman in the street who finds herself in a yelling match over affirmative action. 270 They attempt to revive and launch the battered "victim perspective" unabashedly into the heart of equal protection discourse. One need not believe that the equal protection clause should remain so dominant in the work of civil rights scholars to believe that dramatic recastings like this are healthy for the public debate.

### A2 ethics/revolution

#### Focus on the ethics of revolutionary methodology destroys the chance for political success.

William **CHALOUPKA** Poli Sci @ Colorado State **‘2** “The Tragedy of the Ethical Commons” in *The Politics of Moralizing* eds. Bennett & Shapiro p. 124-125

Environmentalism's accidental and sedimentary way of accumulating a public strategy is not necessarily a problem in and of itself. We live in an apolitical culture, and many public concerns are handled as far away from politics as their advocates can manage. Political strategizing does not come easy for Americans, and it is thus avoided whenever possible. This is not necessarily a problem, in the grander scheme of things. But it does entail risks. And some of the risks hold special relevance for greens. While political culture depends on victories, for example, moralistic movements can learn to live quite well with defeat. Public setbacks are a matter of Concern for the political activist, but could be reassuring for the moralist, who could see each setback as confirming the martyred cause. Left unwatched, such setbacks can become a trend, slipping over from martyrdom to pathos. Losing is bad. Winning is perilous. Losing with a sense of moral justification is terribly perilous. It can become habit or neurosis, damaging any chance for ultimate success. There are other dangers inherent in the avoidance of the political when public concerns are at stake. If one always phrases one's political choices in terms of "the right thing," the risk is that political choices will be warped, at the same time that one is attempting to inoculate oneself from the worst of political culture. It is not an easy problem to avoid or solve. To put it another way, there is always the danger of learning to love the loss. Greens risk becoming comfortable with the arrangement in which any loss confirms one's purity and correctness, one's superiority to the political system that has delivered defeat. This is a durable problem. It reinforces itself, pushing the moralist out of politics or into failure. Even discussing the prob1em-recognizing its existence-requires a perspective at some distance from the ethical. At the same time, it remains true that moralizing opens potentially political space, creating a constituency for public action and personal learning and change. But moralizing can also close off political options, through inattention or open critique of the inevitably messy, contingent, and compromised (and compromising) event that politics routinely becomes. The political world is durably contingent. What happens today is contingent on what happened yesterday. This is not to say, "anything goes," that one is somehow free to impose just anything on the political world. Quite the opposite: each political response is constrained by its provocation, while at the same time it attempts to rechannel subsequent debate. Contingency also implies the multidimensional quality of politics. Moralizing, economics, identity, history, and many other elements-some overlapping, some exclusive-can enter the fray, often unpredictably. The contingency of politics is most troubling to those who are convinced that politics has an underlying sense, a structure-whether that sense derives from the oppression of labor, women, or racial minorities; the progress of humanity; the exploitation of nature; or the automatic harmony between private and public goals, to cite just a few examples. The paired and primary lessons of political contingency are that luck can often intervene in the best-laid plans, but that such plans nonetheless must be made, as we struggle to accomplish public goals in a contingent context. The existence of a political space for environmental issues cannot be assumed. Such space is not guaranteed by the merit of green claims, and the same is true for everyone else's claims, too. Environmental ethics can work against politics. From an ethical perspective, how could there be anything wrong with recycling? 'S It doesn't take much time, it provides a constant reminder of one's green commitments, and it provides the opportunity to educate children and friends about green goals. But from a political perspective, potential problems persist. Is there a danger that some citizens will come to believe that their civic responsibility has been discharged by recycling or green consumerism ?'9 If one carefully buys the green product every time it is available, is there still a need to go to those tedious evening meetings, much less to run for office yourself? If one can act " directly" on a problem by recycling, what reason is there to spend time on such "indirect" activities as building coalitions with other groups? This kind of psychological compensation, in which desires are balanced (in these cases, at the expense of politics), is normal. But some kinds of activity are better equipped to address this dynamic than are others. And moralists, who stake so much on their moral certainty, are seldom known for their flexibility. In extreme cases, the ethical (or ideological) denunciation has completely obscured or destroyed politics. Under the edict to only act in the interest of revolutionary change, twentieth -century Marxists insisted that" reformist" actions actually had an absolute and uniformly negative effect (a position, by the way, that Marx, a confirmed political enthusiast, likely would not have taken to such extremes). Only revolutionary politics was deemed to have any merit at all. Anything that could be described as reformist was removed from strategic consideration. Anything short of triumph is defeat. In other ways, the environmental movement has done remarkably well at distancing itself from Marxism, but in this case, the green habit tracks closely with the Marxist model. An excuse is provided, justifying the apolitical course that already has too much popular appeal. In short, the notion that ethics leads to politics is a dubious one. Sometimes this is true, but sometimes it isn't. And the strategic discussion about the effect of ethicizing public concerns is itself imperiled by excessive levels of ethical commitment, unless the ethicizers take precautions.

### 2AC Cap

### Perm

Perm do both

Revolt against modern civilization

#### Perm net-benefit – proposing alternative non-<capitalist> economics out of nowhere is of *zero value*. Environmental reform of <capitalism> is key.

John BARRY Reader in Politics @ Belfast ‘7 “Towards a model of green political economy: from ecological modernisation to economic security” Int. J. Green Economics, Vol. 1, Nos. 3/4, 2007 p. 447-448

Economic analysis has been one of the weakest and least developed areas of broadly green/sustainable development thinking. For example, whatever analysis there is within the green political canon is largely utopian – usually based on an argument for the complete transformation of modern society and economy as the only way to deal with ecological catastrophe, an often linked to a critique of the socioeconomic failings of capitalism that echoed a broadly radical Marxist/socialist or anarchist analysis; or underdeveloped – due, in part, to the need to outline and develop other aspects of green political theory. However, this gap within green thinking has recently been filled by a number of scholars, activists, think tanks, and environmental NGOs who have outlined various models of green political economy to underpin sustainable development political aims, principles and objectives. The aim of this article is to offer a draft of a realistic, but critical, version of green political economy to underpin the economic dimensions of radical views about sustainable development. It is written explicitly with a view to encouraging others to think through this aspect of sustainable development in a collaborative manner. Combined realism and radicalism marks this article, which starts with the point that we cannot build or seek to create a sustainable economy *ab nihlo*, but must begin from where we are, with the structures, institutions, modes of production, laws and regulations that we already have. Of course, this does not mean simply accepting these as immutable or set in stone; after all, some of the current institutions, principles and structures underpinning the dominant economic model are the very causes of unsustainable development. We do need to recognise, however, that we must work with (and ‘through’ – in the terms of the original German Green Party’s slogan of ‘marching through the institutions’) these existing structures, as well as change and reform and in some cases, abandon them as either unnecessary or positively harmful to the creation and maintenance of a sustainable economy and society. Equally, this article also recognises that an alternative economy and society must be based in the reality that most people (in the West) will not democratically vote for a completely different type of society and economy. That reality must also accept that a ‘green economy’ is one that is recognisable to most people and that indeed safeguards and guarantees not just their basic needs but also aspirations (within limits). The realistic character of the thinking behind this article accepts that consumption and materialistic lifestyles are here to stay (so long as they do not transgress any of the critical thresholds of the triple bottom line) and indeed there is little to be gained by proposing alternative economic systems, which start from a complete rejection of consumption and materialism. The appeal to realism is in part an attempt to correct the common misperception (and self-perception) of green politics and economics requiring an excessive degree of self-denial and a puritanical asceticism (Goodin, 1992, p.18; Allison, 1991, p.170–178). While rejecting the claim that green political theory calls for the complete disavowal of materialistic lifestyles, it is true that green politics does require the collective reassessment of such lifestyles, and does require a degree of shared sacrifice. It does not mean, however, that we necessarily require the complete and across-the-board rejection of materialistic lifestyles. There must be room and tolerance in a green economy for people to live ‘ungreen lives’ so long as they do not ‘harm’ others, threaten long-term ecological sustainability or create unjust levels of socioeconomic inequalities. Thus, realism in this context is in part another name for the acceptance of a broadly ‘liberal’ or ‘post-liberal’ (but certainly not anti-liberal) green perspective.1

#### Sustainability link turns

#### History proves the plan’s coalitional politics more successful than revolutionary withdrawl

Michael **KAZIN** History @ Georgetown **’11** “Has the US Left Made a Difference” *Dissent* Spring p. 52-54

But when political radicals made a big difference, they generally did so as decidedly **junior** **partners** in a **coalition** **driven by establishment reformers**. Abolitionists did not achieve their goal until midway through the Civil War, when Abraham Lincoln and his fellow Republicans realized that the promise of emancipation could speed victory for the North. Militant unionists were not able to gain a measure of power in mines, factories, and on the waterfront until Franklin Roosevelt needed **labor votes** during the New Deal. Only when Lyndon Johnson and other liberal Democrats conquered their fears of disorder and gave up on the white South could the black freedom movement celebrate passage of the civil rights and voting rights acts. **For a political movement to gain any major goal, it needs to win over a section of the governing elite** (it doesn’t hurt to gain support from some wealthy philanthropists as well). Only on a handful of occasions has the Left achieved such a victory, and never under its own name. The divergence between political marginality and cultural influence stems, in part, from the kinds of people who have been the mainstays of the American Left. During just one period of about four decades—from the late 1870s to the end of the First World War— could radicals authentically claim to represent more than a tiny number of Americans who belonged to what was, and remains, the majority of the population: white Christians from the working and lower-middle class. At the time, this group included Americans from various trades and regions who condemned growing corporations for controlling the marketplace, corrupting politicians, and degrading civic morality. But this period ended after the First World War—due partly to the epochal split in the international socialist movement. Radicals lost most of the constituency they had gained among ordinary white Christians and have never been able to regain it. Thus, the wageearning masses who voted for Socialist, Communist, and Labor parties elsewhere in the industrial world were almost entirely lost to the American Left—and deeply skeptical about the vision of solidarity that inspired the great welfare states of Europe. Both before and after this period, the public face and voice of the Left emanated from an uneasy alliance: between men and women from elite backgrounds and those from such groups as Jewish immigrant workers and plebeian blacks whom most Americans viewed as dangerous outsiders. This was true in the abolitionist movement—when such New England brahmins as Wendell Phillips and Maria Weston Chapman fought alongside Frederick Douglass and Sojourner Truth. And it was also the case in the New Left of the 1960s, an unsustainable alliance of white students from elite colleges and black people like Fannie Lou Hamer and Huey Newton from the ranks of the working poor. It has always been difficult for these top and- bottom insurgencies to present themselves as plausible alternatives to the major parties, to convince more than a small minority of voters to embrace their program for sweeping change. Radicals did help to catalyze mass movements. But furious internal conflicts, a penchant for dogmatism, and hostility toward both nationalism and organized religion helped make the political Left a taste few Americans cared to acquire. However, some of the same qualities that alienated leftists from the electorate made them pioneers in generating an alluringly rebellious culture. Talented orators, writers, artists, and academics associated with the Left put forth new ideas and lifestyles that stirred the imagination of many Americans, particularly young ones, who felt stifled by orthodox values and social hierarchies. These ideological pioneers also influenced forces around the world that adapted the culture of the U.S. Left to their own purposes—from the early sprouts of socialism and feminism in the1830s to the subcultures of black power, radical feminism, and gay liberation in the 1960s and 1970s. Radical ideas about race, gender, sexuality, and social justice did not need to win votes to become popular. They just required an audience. And leftists who were able to articulate or represent their views in creative ways often found one. Arts created to serve political ends are always vulnerable to criticism. Indeed, some radicals deliberately gave up their search for the sublime to concentrate on the merely persuasive. But as George Orwell, no aesthetic slouch, observed, “the opinion that art should have nothing to do with politics is itself a political attitude.” In a sense, the radicals who made the most difference in U.S. history were not that radical at all. What most demanded, in essence, was the fulfillment of two ideals their fellow Americans already cherished: individual freedom and communal responsibility. In 1875, Robert Schilling, a German immigrant who was an official in the coopers, or caskmakers, union, reflected on why socialists were making so little headway among the hard-working citizenry: ….everything that smacks in the least of a curtailment of personal or individual liberty is most obnoxious to [Americans]. They believe that every individual should be permitted to do what and how it pleases, as long as the rights and liberties of others are not injured or infringed upon. [But] this personal liberty must be surrendered and placed under the control of the State, under a government such as proposed by the social Democracy. Most American radicals grasped this simple truth. They demanded that the promise of individual rights be realized in everyday life and encouraged suspicion of the words and power of all manner of authorities—political, economic, and religious. Abolitionists, feminists, savvy Marxists all quoted the words of the Declaration of Independence, the most popular document in the national canon. Of course, leftists did not champion self-reliance, the notion that an individual is entirely responsible for his or her own fortunes. But they did uphold the modernist vision that Americans should be free to pursue happiness unfettered by inherited hierarchies and identities. At the same time, the U.S. Left—like its counterparts around the world—struggled to establish a new order animated by a desire for social fraternity. The labor motto “An injury to one is an injury to all” rippled far beyond picket lines and marches of the unemployed. But American leftists who articulated this credo successfully did so in a patriotic and often religious key, rather than by preaching the grim inevitability of class struggle. Such radical social gospelers as Harriet Beecher Stowe, Edward Bellamy, and Martin Luther King, Jr., gained more influence than did those organizers who espoused secular, Marxian views. Particularly during times of economic hardship and war, radicals promoted collectivist ends by appealing to the wisdom of “the people” at large. To gain a sympathetic hearing, the Left always had to demand that the national faith apply equally to everyone and oppose those who wanted to reserve its use for privileged groups and undemocratic causes. But it was not always possible to wrap a movement’s destiny in the flag. “America is a trap,” writes the critic Greil Marcus, “its promises and dreams…are too much to live up to and too much to escape.” In a political culture that valued liberty above all, the Left had more difficulty arguing for the collective good than for an expansion of individual rights. Advocates of the former could slide into apologizing for totalitarian rule in the Soviet Union and elsewhere. But to give primacy to individual freedom could deprive the Left of its very reason to exist. In trying to advance both ideals, radicals confronted a yawning contradiction: in life as opposed to rhetoric, the desire for individual liberty routinely conflicts with the yearning for social equality and altruistic justice. The right of property holders and corporations to do what they wish with their assets clashes with environmentalists’ desire to preserve the natural habitat, with the desire of labor unionists to restrict an employer’s right to hire and fire, and with the freedom of consumers of any race to buy any house they can affordLeftists who claimed to favor both liberty and equality could not resolve such conflicts. Neither could major-party politicians. But Whigs, Republicans, and Democrats basked in the glow of legitimacy, which often shielded them from charges of hypocrisy that bedeviled the Left.

### AT: Incentives K

#### The plan fixes capitalism – changes the political and economic balances of power to create greener corporations – that’s Bailey

The aff is not working within the system- the aff is a strike at reducing consumption

#### Incentives that create economic winners solve the environment – crisis or revolution fails.

Peter **NEWELL** IR @ Sussex **AND** Matthew **PATTERSON** Political Studies @ Ottawa **’10** *Climate Capitalism* p. 8-10

But if one premise for this book is that climate change entails an enormous transformation of how capitalism operates, then our other premise is that despite resistance, in fact an embryonic form of climate capitalism is already emerging. The chapters that follow elaborate how the ways that governments, corporations and non-governmental actors have responded to climate change are best understood as an effort to decarbonise the global economy. Of course this development is patchy - some governments are more active than others, some businesses much more entrepreneurial and far-sig~ted than others - but the foundations of such an economy are nevertheless in the process of being built. These foundations can be characterised as different types of carbon markets, which put a price on carbon, and thus create incentives to reduce emissions. These sorts of response to climate change are also highly problematic of course. Many readers will already have prejudices against, or at least worries about, treating the atmosphere like a commodity to be bought and sold, or about buying carbon offsets to enable the rich to continue their high-consuming lifestyles with a clear conscience. We share these worries. But there is something about climate change that makes it unique amongst environmental problems. The origins of climate change are deeply rooted in the development of the global capitalist economy. The ways the world has responded to climate change have been conditioned by the sort of free-market capitalism which has prevailed since the early 1980s. To respond to climate change successfully entails decarbonising that economy, to re-structure or dismantle huge economic sectors on which the whole of global development has been based. This is in sharp contrast to efforts to deal with ozone depletion, which involved the elimination of a relatively small batch of chemicals with specific uses by a handful of leading companies. Likewise, we can deal with most forms of water pollution by banning certain applications offertilisers, dealing with human and animal wastes, and controls on what chemical industries can discharge into rivers and lakes. To ban these practices, while often inconvenient for the companies involved, is hardly a challenge to the whole edifice of global capitalism. In contrast, to propose to ban all further coal and oil use, as some have done, is both unrealistic and deeply problematic. The use of these fuels is currently so widespread that simply to ban them would cause economic growth to collapse. And a lack of growth is something that the capitalist system in which we live simply cannot tolerate - it would collapse as a system. So the challenge of climate change means, in effect, either abandoning capitalism, or seeking to find a way for it to grow while gradually replacing coal, oil and gas. Assuming the former is unlikely in the short term, the questions to be asked are, what can growth be based on? What are the energy sources to power a decarbonised economy? Which powerful actors might be brought on board to overcome resistance from the oil and coal companies? And for those worried (including us) about the image of unbridled free-market capitalism as managing the climate for us, then we are forced to address the questions: What type of climate capitalism do we want? Can it be made to serve desirable social, as well as environmental, ends? And what might it take to bring it about? 9In this context, a response that focuses on creating markets, where money can be made for trading carbon allowances within limits set by governments, is rather appealing. Against the backdrop of the problems of recalcitrant industries and reluctant consumers, it creates the possibility of economic winners from decarbonisation. What's more, those winners - financiers - are rather powerful, and can support you as you build the policies which might produce decarbonisation overall. Trading on its own clearly won't be enough, but it does provide a powerful constituency that benefits from climate-change policy, which is crucial politically. Turning this into a successful project for decarbonisation requires constructing altogether different models of growth that do not depend on abundant and cheap fossil fuels, one that may actually reward reductions in energy use and its more efficient use. This means decoupling emissions growth from economic growth. The key question is whether capitalists can find ways of doing new business in a way that helps to achieve decarbonisation. They need to be able to do this in a way which brings on board those that will be doing less business in a low-carbon economy, or at least to provide enough growth overall for policymakers to be able to override their resistance.

#### Incentivizing market changes are better than non-capitalist relations at communicating information needed for environmental solutions. Their methodology and epistemology inevitably result in information defecits—non-market planning can’t solve.

Mark PENNINGTON Politics @ University of London ‘1 Environmental Markets vs. Environmental Deliberation: A Hayekian Critique of Green Political Economy *New Political Economy* 6 (2) p. 181-184

Similar problems are evident in the unresolvable contradictions besetting the eco-anarchist44 and eco-socialist45 literatures, which for all their emphasis on ‘local participation’ favour some form of ‘strategic planning’ (usually in the guise of ‘democratic inter-community federations’) to ‘coordinate’ what might otherwise be a disparate and inconsistent set of local agendas. If complex inter-community relations are not to be coordinated through impersonal market forces then at some point recourse must be made to some central ‘coordinating’ authority—a position that would seem radically at odds with the supposed goal of ‘empowering’ local communities. It is, however, precisely this sort of central planning, which the Hayekian account and the actual experience of attempts at ‘integrated environmental policies’ suggest are prone to the severe epistemological difficulties discussed above. In markets, by contrast, the constant process of positive and negative feedback embodied in the structure of relative prices facilitates a process of mutual self-adjustment between people who never actually meet and cannot know in sufé cient detail the precise circumstances of others. None of the above is to suggest that no information can successfully be communicated via public discourse and debate. As Hayek repeatedly emphasised, language and discourse are also a form of spontaneous order and evolve without conscious social control.46 Moreover, deliberative democrats are surely right when they emphasise the coordinative signié cance of dialogue in many economic relationships .47 Gossip, for example, is often an important source of knowledge about new techniques, prices and production processes, as well as about the plans of competitors. As one Hayekian puts it, Market institution s are not the result of atomistic individuals responding to a given array of prices, but the result of individuals already involved in truly dialogical relationships . Trade journals, industry studies, marketing agreements, business lunches, conference calls, higgling and haggling, the interpretation of accounts and so forth are all part of the grand conversation of the market place.48 One might also add membership of environmental and religious groupings, the purchase of ‘lifestyle’ magazines, books and other spontaneous public fora, all of which transmit information verbally and provide a cultural/dialogical backdrop within which the market economy operates. Whilst recognising the signié cance of dialogical processes, what is fundamentally at issue from a Hayekian perspective is that there are important limits to the amount and type of information that can successfully be communicated in this way. Verbal knowledge communication in contexts such as business networks or the process of academic debate is effective in so far as it is focussed on a relatively narrow and circumscribed set of issues. In academia, for example, discursive knowledge transmission is possible because the terms of debate tend to be coné ned within what are fairly tight theoretical and disciplinary boundaries.49 Severe problems arise, however, when attempts to communicate knowledge and to coordinate decision making through discursive means are extended more widely to embrace more complex sets of issues. This is, however, precisely what Green deliberativists wish to pursue through the development of ‘holistic’ or ‘integrated’ environmental policies. Habermasian Greens such as Dryzek tend to see markets as abstract systems, which ‘get in the way’ or ‘subvert’ dialogical processes in some fundamental sense.50 From a Hayekian perspective, by contrast, market prices act as important ‘aids to the mind’, conveying otherwise inarticulable knowledge about economic relations in ways which allow for much wider, more complex communicative social relations than would be possible through purely discursive means. This very point appears to be accepted by Habermas himself, when he suggests that the complexity of modern systems would have to be sacrié ced if a completely democratic, dialogical model of social democracy were actually to be instituted. 51 For Habermas, a shift to an all-encompassing model of democratic participation at every level of decision making is incompatible with a complexly interrelated economic system—hence the call for social democrats to limit discursive decision procedures to the central ‘steering mechanisms’ of the political economy. It is far from clear, therefore, why markets should be regarded so sceptically by Greens and participatory socialists. If it is conceded that markets allow the development of much richer, more complex sets of social relations which extend the scope for communicative rationality beyond discursive means, then why should they not be utilised to facilitate the development of this rationality to the fullest possible degree? As Prychitko puts it, ‘why should a restricted dialogue, one which is not allowed the full play to yield market prices, be thought of as the more rational mechanism with which to conduct economic activity?’52 It is this propensity for the institution s advocated by Green theorists actually to reduce information è ows and hence thwart the desired process of intersubjective learning, which provides the critical element in the Hayekian case against an over-reliance on deliberative democracy. At the core of Hayek’s critique of government planning is his emphasis on the signié cance of tacit knowledge. This refers to time-and place-specié c information that cannot be articulated in verbal form. Much of this information is inherently private in character—knowledge of the phenomenal pictures that exist within the individual mind and which no one else discerns. Tacit knowledge of this species is epitomised in a person or group of persons ‘being in the right place at the right time’, exhibiting ‘è air and intuition’ or ‘knowing a particular market’ and constitutes the essence of creative entrepreneurship.53 Faced with the same set of ‘facts’ some individuals will perceive creative opportunities , where others see nothing. According to Hayek, individuals are best able to deploy tacit knowledge for social good, when they are the least constrained by collective/majoritarian decision procedures in which this knowledge is likely to be diluted or lost. Of course, collective forms of decision abound in all aspects of life—in company boardrooms, for example. What is crucial, however, is that there are clear lines of responsibility linking decisions and the relevant knowledge to specié c individuals /groups, so that people have a clear feedback mechanism to learn about the quality of their own decisions and knowledge. Private property rights and the account of proé t and loss provide such a link and hence facilitate social learning. In addition, property rights afford space to try out eccentric and innovative ideas, the merits/demerits of which people occupying other phenomenal spaces cannot discern. Knowledge of this sort cannot be communicated by verbal means, but is only revealed through action. It is only when private projects are put into practice that the relevant information is revealed. A learning process may then be set in motion as previously indiscernible successes are imitated and previously indiscernible errors can be avoided.54 The detrimental environmental effects which can follow from the inability of collectivist institution s to communicate knowledge effectively are well illustrated by the often, perverse results which have resulted from the introduction of environmental controls on ‘moral’ grounds. Consider regulations, often favoured by Greens, which mandate a specié ed proportion of recycled materials in various products. In many instances such controls have actually led to worse environmental outcomes, because the é nished products have turned out to be of a poorer quality (inadequate strength, for example). As a consequence, producers have responded by raising inputs (though not the proportion) of non-recycled elements in order to maintain product standards. The result has been the production of goods which use more total inputs than might otherwise have been the case.55 References to the signié cance of tacit knowledge by deliberative democrats are particularly surprising, since by deé nition much of the relevant information cannot be communicated linguistically . If people are consistently allowed to veto the exercise of private property rights through majoritarian democracy and an ‘extension of the public sphere’, then the relevant discovery process may be thwarted as the range of possible plans that may be implemented is reduced. Equally, the extension of third party decision rights to actors who are not themselves held é nancially responsible for their actions blurs the lines of responsibility linking the use of knowledge to outcomes and hence may inhibit social learning. The greater the extension of social democratic controls over property rights, the more difé cult it becomes to judge which particular bits of knowledge are appropriate to the tasks in hand. In general, it is much easier to generate clear feedback signals and to assess cause/effect relationships in a market context, such as the link between product quality and a particular producer, than to link the quality of complex social outcomes to public policy decisions. The repeated emphasis on the importance of ‘consensus building’ by the Habermasian Greens is also problematic from a Hayekian point of view.56 If no new actions are to be allowed to proceed until there is a majoritarian consensus (a major feat in itself given the difé culties of securing consensus even in small group settings such as the running of academic departments or company boardrooms), then innovation and entrepreneurship are likely to be thwarted. The essence of creative entrepreneurship in the economy and other contexts such as science is to break with the consensus position. For all the emphasis on the importance of diversity and localism by deliberativists , it is hard to see how such diversity would be possible if majoritarian consensus is the primary decision rule. There comes a point, therefore, where the use of the ‘voice’ mechanisms that characterise collective decision procedures need to be backed up by the ‘exit’ mechanisms that are more evident in private markets.57 It is the epistemological significance of exit and competition that is completely missed by most Green theorists, who equate the case for markets with a worldview that posits selfish egoists ruthlessly seeking to destroy the opposition in a Hobbesian jungle.58 Seen from this perspective, competition is the antithesis of the other regarding, cooperative values considered essential for the advancement of a more ecologically sensitive age. From a Hayekian perspective, by contrast, competition is not antithetical to cooperative endeavour

—even in a world of perfect altruism, market competition would be necessary on purely epistemologica l grounds. One might even argue that markets would work more effectively if people actually were altruistic—no need to worry about free-riders!59 In a world of uncertainty and diffuse, imperfect knowledge, what the market process involves is competition between different types of cooperation, allowing social experimentation and a discovery process to unfold that can reveal which particular ways of organising production and consumption work best. It is precisely this process of entrepreneurial experimentation and discovery which is thwarted by attempts to force supposedly ‘cooperative’ endeavours into a single plan. From a Hayekian perspective, the market economy does not act to maximise or optimise anything or to fulé l a single hierarchy of ends.60 Rather, it facilitates an open-ended process of experimentation to discover both ends and means in an uncertain world, where it is difé cult enough for people to comprehend their own interests, let alone the ‘public interest’. Market competition (i.e. competition in persuasion) provides a forum for experimentation, fosters mutual awareness between individuals who may never actually meet—through the generation of prices—and hence enables a degree of coordination between people with disparate and perhaps inconsisten t plans. The market process, therefore, acts as a form of ‘surrogate debate’ that, for the epistemologica l reasons discussed earlier, facilitates a wider range of options to be tried and tested than might ever be achieved through the processes of formal political communication.61 In the light of the above, the traditional concerns of both Greens and the left over excessive inequality and unequal ‘power relations’ may be better addressed through redistributive taxation, rather than attempts to restrict private property rights and transform the process of decision making itself along social democratic lines. In this way, greater equality in material resources would allow the subjective values of those individual s with previously low incomes to be given greater weight in an otherwise unregulated market.

### A2 cap unsustainable

#### The plan retools capitalism – makes it sustainable

Jonathan PORRIT Programme Director of Forum for the Future and Chairman of the UK Sustainable Development Commission formerly Director of Friends of the Earth (1984-90); co-chair of the Green Party (UK) Interviewed by James PORTEOUS ‘6http://www.ecosmagazine.com/?act=view\_file&file\_id=EC130p32.pdf

Contributing to the evolving discussion on sustainable development, his book articulates how capitalism, and our current economic framework, can and should be ‘retooled’ to avert approaching planetary limits. He constructively describes a ‘new capitalism’ that delivers human progress and wealth beyond the current economic bottom line. It’s an inspiring and seemingly achievable vision, laid out in a readable text that will reward anyone who’s wrestling with development ideas. During the author’s recent Australian visit, *Ecos* asked him about his hopes for the book. **What intended audience sector do you hope your book hits the mark with most? Where do you want your message to go deepest?** Business leaders and wealth creators – and those politicians who are just waking up to the fact that capitalism as we know it today is a busted flush. Here’s their choice: transition to a genuinely sustainable form of capitalism, or watch from the sidelines as we slide inexorably into some kind of ecological abyss. **How do you expect the practical measures laid out in the book to be realistically taken forward now? Who/what should lead and by what first step(s)?** Governments have to take the lead here: they have the mandate to frame markets in such a way as to make the sustainable choices the easier choices – both for people and for companies. There’s only so much that can be achieved by conscientious green consumers acting on their own, or indeed by companies voluntarily incurring additional costs by stretching way out beyond the regulatory minimum asked of them by governments. It’s the collective failure of governments that must first be addressed. **What is your idea of the timeline for these changes, given the current 10-year horizons for, say, critical greenhouse gas reductions?** Who knows the answer to that one? We’re either very close to the tipping point (the point at which emissions of greenhouse gases raise average temperatures to the level where further changes become irreversible), or we’ve already gone beyond it! Actually, it makes no difference. The faster we can reduce emissions of greenhouse gases (primarily by investing in energy efficiency, renewables and cleaner ways of using fossil fuels), the better our prospects are for securing some kind of ‘soft landing’ as climate change accelerates. If we carry on as we are today, then all we have to look forward to is a very hard landing indeed.

### 2AC self-correcting

#### Corporations are revolutionizing towards socially conscious innovation – solves their impact

Hollender and Breen 10 – \* Founder of the American Sustainable Business Council, a progressive alternative to the Chamber of Commerce, \*\*Editorial Director of the Fast Company

Jeffrey Hollender, Bill Breen, “The Responsibility Revolution: How the Next Generation of Businesses will Win,” pg. 2-3

To the conventional-minded, putting values before profit is an upside-down way to build strategy—and an all-downside way to spur sales. It sounds extreme, even anarchic. Perhaps Triodos Bank’s resilience and results might give skeptics cause to reset their think- ing. For this Dutch bank signals that ‘‘corporate responsibility’’3 (CR) may well be undergoing a period of unprecedented ‘‘punctuated equilibrium’’—the controversial theory promulgated by the renowned paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould.4 He posited that evolution proceeds mostly slowly, but not always steadily—that it is sometimes inter- rupted by sudden, rapid transitions, in which species decline and are supplanted by entirely new forms. Triodos Bank’s consistently positive performance, which grows out of its mission-first approach to investing, is but one more prominent piece of evidence that corporate responsibility is entering a period of dramatic, accelerated change in its own evolution. What new shapes CR is about to take on, we are just now beginning to understand. But we know this much—corporate responsibility is undergoing a change that’s as revolutionary as it is evolutionary. Consider the evidence: An emerging breed of values-driven companies—some new, some well established—is building a better form of capitalism. A new generation of values-driven leaders has kicked over the alpha capitalists’ argument that ‘‘the only business of business is business.’’ Old-guard notions about ‘‘culpability’’ and ‘‘accountability’’ are being subsumed by the vanguard’s requirement to act authentically and transparently. Bloodless buzzwords like ‘‘corporate responsibility’’ and ‘‘eco- efficiency’’ are being supplanted by a new vocabulary—‘‘corporate consciousness,’’ ‘‘resource intelligence,’’ ‘‘social innovation’’ — that aspires to capture our real-world experiences. Above all, tomorrow’s bellwether organizations are moving beyond the moralist’s dictum to be less polluting, less wasteful, ‘‘less bad.’’ They are striving to meet the innovator’s imposing imperative to be all nourishing, all replenishing, ‘‘all good.’’ This moment of punctuated, accelerated change affects all of us in business. It will determine how tomorrow’s companies organize, strategize, and compete. It will reveal new leaders and expose the phonies and purveyors of greenwash. It will redefine business’s obligations to society and reconfigure the sources of growth and competitive advantage. And it will require us not only to anticipate the end of corporate responsibility as we’ve known it, but also to imagine the whole new models that will replace it.

### 2AC equality / war

**Capitalism prevents war and has historically caused the largest reductions in poverty and inequality – any other argument ignores empirics and robust economic models**

**Weede 08** [Erich, professor at the Institute for Political Science and Sociology, “Globalization and Inequality” Comparative Sociology 7, p. 415-433]

Globalization refers to an increasing international division of labor and more trade between economies, to cross-border investment and rapid transfers of technology between nations, to global capital ﬂows and, to a lesser degree, to increasing labor mobility. Th ere is as yet no global labor market. Globalization also implies better opportunities to learn from foreigners or strangers. Th e more similar you are to others, the less likely it is that you can learn from them.1 Unfortunately, many people prefer to rely on established routines and resent the challenge of having to learn from others. Globalization is another word for a worldwide expansion of capitalism. It results in international tax competition (Edwards and de Rugy 2002; Mitchell 2005). Globalization is based on some technological and political prerequisites. These include ever cheaper and faster means of communication and transportation as well as an adequate political environment. The global expansion of capitalism requires political fragmentation: markets should be larger than political units.2 This provides an exit option from oppressive government for capital and, to a lesser degree, for qualiﬁed labor. Such an exit option protects economic freedom from ever-increasing state interference and tax burdens. If one state should be much more powerful than all others, as the US currently is, then globalization requires a deeper commitment to capitalism and economic freedom by the hegemon than by other states. Th ese political requirements of globalization are fulﬁlled. Globalization maximizes the size of the market. Since Adam Smith (1776/1976) we know that the size of the market determines the degree of division of labor which promotes productivity. Thus, globalization is beneﬁcial because it increases productivity. This is not only a theoretical claim, but also an empirical statement. For instance, based on data from the US Bureau of Labor Statistics, yearly economic gains from globalization have been estimated to be somewhere between $1,650 for Americans (Scheve and Slaughter 2007:36–37). Real compensation per hour (including beneﬁts and wages) has also gone up in the past decade, by 22 percent (Griswold 2007:1).3 Since Deng Xiaoping opened China in the late 1970s by introducing reforms which imply creeping capitalism, Chinese agricultural production grew rapidly. Later, China attracted a lot of foreign direct investment. Today China is a major base for manufacturing. By 2005 it was already the third largest exporter, still behind Germany and the US but already ahead of Japan (Th e Economist 2005). By 2008 China is likely to become the biggest exporter in the world. In the early 1980s (but no longer thereafter) even the disparity between urban and rural incomes in China decreased (Lin, Cai, and Li 2003:145). Hundreds of millions of Chinese were taken out of abject poverty. In the ﬁrst two decades of reform, per capita incomes grew fourfold (Bhalla 2002:218). Later, less radical reforms in India led to nearly doubling per capita incomes in a similar period of time and pulled about two hundred million Indians out of abject poverty (Das 2002:360). Since China and India together account for nearly forty percent of mankind and about half of the population living in less developed countries, economic growth in China and India and other Asian countries contributes to the equalization of the global distributions of income between individuals and households. If we are interested in individuals rather than states, then the **empirical indicators are clear**. Globalization or **the global expansion of capitalism has contributed to**, or at least been compatible with, **an equalization of** the size distribution **of income between human beings**. Since cross-national differences between average incomes are still a more important component of inequality between human beings than intra-national differences in income, it is possible – and currently true – to have the following two trajectories at the same time: growing inequality within many or even most countries amidst some movement towards equality among individuals worldwide (Bhalla 2002; Firebaugh 1999; Goesling 2001; Sala-i-Martin 2007; World Bank 2005). Admittedly, many economies, including the US and China, suffered some deterioration in their domestic income distributions. This is why the legitimacy of capitalism and globalization comes under attack, even in the American citadel of capitalism. This is also why calls for protectionism become louder and louder (Scheve and Slaughter 2007). But critics of globalization tend to forget a basic truth about free trade (Griswold 2007:3): “If workers, capital, and resources can shift within the domestic economy, jobs eliminated by import competition will quickly be replaced by jobs created elsewhere.”4 One should not blame the consequences of institutional sclerosis, or of an unwillingness to adjust, on globalization. Globalization has led to a significant reduction in mass poverty. Although the Chinese distribution of income has become much less equal since the reform process began in the late 1970s, the strong growth performance of China has pulled hundreds of millions out of abject poverty. In India growth has been less spectacular than in China such that the distribution of income has changed less, and yet again hundreds of millions have been pulled out of abject poverty. Although Latin America and Africa have benefitted much less from globalization than Asia has, these continents also cannot match the demographic weight of Asia. Therefore, their comparative lack of success cannot neutralize Asian progress in global perspective. Moreover, one has to keep in mind that winning in the process of globalization presupposes participating in it, not abstaining from it. One may illustrate global change with data provided by Indian economist Surjit Bhalla (2002:187). He deﬁnes people with a daily income between $10–$40 USD as members of the global middle class. In 1960 this class consisted largely of whites; only six percent were Asians. By 2000, however, 52 percent was Asian. Th e era of globalization is one in which Asia is now recovering, after falling for about two centuries further behind the West. Except for Africa abject poverty worldwide is likely to become signiﬁcantly reduced within one or two decades. Th e African share of abject poverty in the world is expected to rise until 2015 from 36 percent to about 90 percent (Bhalla 2002:S. 172).5 Why did so many people in Asia beneﬁt from globalization, whereas Africans did not? A plausible explanation has been oﬀered by Collier (2007:79).6 He points out that about three quarters of the bottom billion7 live in countries which have suﬀered from civil war or long periods of bad governance and poor economic policies. According to Collier (2007:27), “civil war is development in reverse. It damages both the country itself and its neighbors.” Bad governance and poor economic policies distort incentives and misallocate the meager resources of poor countries. Africa has suﬀered from these development traps to a greater degree than other continents. Moreover, one may argue that a focus on income and income distributions is biased towards understating the beneﬁts of globalization. As Goklany (2007:chaps. 2–3) has pointed out, the same income per capita today (in terms of purchasing power) implies higher life expectancies, lower infant mortalities, less malnutrition, healthier lives, and less child labor than it did decades or centuries earlier. Less developed, still poor countries do benefit from the technological progress achieved by developed and rich countries. Thus, even if one disputes the widely held and well-supported view regarding some equalization of individual or house-hold incomes worldwide in recent decades, one should still accept Goklany’s contention (2007:72): “In the aspects of human well-being that are truly critical – life expectancy, infant mortality, hunger, literacy, and child labor – the world is far more equal today than it was a century ago, in large part because of globalization.”8 Another advantage of globalization is that it contributes to preventing war (Russett and Oneal 2001; Weede 2005). Quantitative research demonstrates that the risk of war between nations is reduced if they trade a lot with each other. There is something like a commercial peace or peace by trade. Moreover, economic freedom reduces involvement in military conﬂict and ﬁnancial market openness also reduces the risk of war (Gartzke 2005, 2007). In particular, I want to underline that economic cooperation paciﬁes the geopolitical relationship between rising China and the West.9 Moreover, there is also something like a democratic peace. The risk of war between democracies is extremely small. In my view, one should conceptualize this as a component of a capitalist peace because democracies prosper best in wealthy countries10 and because capitalism or economic freedom and thereby globalization contribute to prosperity (Weede 2005, 2006). Since rising powers tend to challenge the political status quo, it is fortunate that the two demographic giants of this world seem to prosper under global capitalism.

### A2 environment

#### Capitalism isn’t the root cause of environmental destruction. empirical studies prove ecological capitalism can create *structural change* and net declines in resource use.

Arthur MOL Environmental Sociology @ Wageningen ‘2K “The Environmental Movement in an Era of Ecological Modernisation” *Geoforum* 31 p. EBSCO

In the 1980s increasing numbers of environmental sociologists, and other social scientists who had environmental deterioration and reform as their central object of study, started to observe that some significant changes were taking place in both the environmental discourse and the social practices and institutions that actually dealt with environmental problems. Out of the sometimes vigorous debates concerning the interpretation of these transformations, their structural or incidental character, their geographical reach and their normative valuation, the theory of ecological modernisation emerged. For example, some empirical studies showed that from the mid to late 1980s onwards, in countries such as Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, the USA, Sweden and Denmark, a discontinuity could be identified in the tendency of enhanced economic growth to be paralleled by increased environmental disruption – a process referred to as the decoupling or delinking of material flows from economic flows. In a number of cases (countries and/or specific industrial sectors and/or specific environmental issues) it was actually claimed that environmental reform resulted in an absolute decline of emissions and use of natural resources, regardless of growth in financial or material terms (cf. recently for the Netherlands RIVM, 1998). However, although these – sometimes controversial – empirical studies lie behind the idea of ecological modernisation, they do not form the core. Central stage in ecological modernisation is given to the associated social practices and institutional transformations, which are often believed to be at the foundations of these physical changes. In the debate on the changing character of the social practices and institutions since the 1980s, adherents to the theory of ecological modernisation positioned themselves by claiming that these transformations in institutions and social practices could not be explained away as mere window-dressing or rhetoric, but should indeed be seen as structural transformations in industrial society’s institutional order, as far as these concerned the preservation of its sustenance base.

#### Eco-marxist methdology is flawed—environmental problems can’t be reduced to class conflict or economic models.

Arthur MOL Environmental Sociology @ Wageningen ‘2K “The Environmental Movement in an Era of Ecological Modernisation” *Geoforum* 31 p. EBSCO

At the same time – and this is the concluding point I want to make – the relation between environmental victims and economic classes is far from one-sided and this should give us a cautious attitude towards generalising environmental justice ideas (both in an American and a European context). Arguing in a similar line ecological modernisation theory claims that, in contrast to earlier neo-Marxist analyses, environmental conflicts can no longer be interpreted as following predictable paths with static opposing parties and interests, and class or race biased distributional effects. Environmental struggles cross traditional (economic and other) interest lines and divisions in society and should be analysed increasingly as an independent – that is non-reducible – category. In that sense the neo-Marxist schemes claiming rather fixed parallels between conventional class inequalities and struggles and more recent environmental inequalities and struggles, might prove fruitful in individual empirical cases (such as the environmental justice movement shows us), but have increasingly lost their overall theoretical and analytical value. This is in fact the outcome of a growing number of empirical studies on environmental inequality: although on the average the poor and minorities are confronted with disproportionately high levels of local environmental risks (and even more so in the USA where segregation of class and race is more far reaching and thus the spreading of local environmental problems potentially more ‘unjust’), there exists no one-to-one relation between high environmental risks and economic categories.

#### Cap root cause arguments ask the wrong question—the only issue is *greater* sustainability, not absolute.

Nicholas LOWArchitecture @ Melbourne ‘2 “Ecosocialisation and environmental planning” *Environment and Planning A:* 34 p. 57-58

Sustainability is a global, urban project. The question `is capitalism sustainable?' is the wrong question. Capitalism can take many forms, including some that would not today be recognised by capitalists as `capitalist' but which yet incorporate some form of market system.Would the committed liberal of the mid-19th century have recognised the economic structures created after the Second World War as a `free market society'? Schumpeter is no doubt right when he says that capitalism is in constant evolution. But that evolution takes place in a society which is itself in evolution under its own political dynamics whose framework shapes the nature of the economy. Both society and economy are subject to ecological conditions. It is doubtful if there can be widespread prosperity in the world without a free market trading globally. Equally, prosperity will not be widely shared not ecological conservation achieved without strong positive intervention by governments. In order to allow nation-states to intervene effectively, the legitimacy of global governance in laying down a structure of rules for the operation of markets will have to be strengthened through cosmopolitical democracy.

### A2 Rejection

#### Specific progress within existing economic and political institutions builds hope. Rejection and alternatives to economic opportunity lock the left into pessimism and social isolation.

Daniel **INNERARITY** Social and Political Philosophy @ Basque Country University **’12** *The Future and its Enemies* p. 114-123

Escaping Pessimism One of the characters from Goethe's Torquato Tasso has given us a maxim that is probably the paradigm of all excuses: whatever one is/other people are to blame. This conviction does not clarify anything, but it provides a good deal of relief; its purpose is to reconfirm us as opposed to them. It explains in simple terms the tension between the global and the local, and it provides the basic outline for the relationship between right and left-wing forces. We can be certain that this approach encourages continued political confrontation when our entire view is filled with rhetoric designed to show that other people are worse than we are. This approach reveals very little confidence in our own project, ideas, and convictions. This is, with few exceptions, how the current antagonism between the right and the left functions. That is why the many outstanding analyses about the problems of the New Right fail to mention the weaknesses of the left. What if we inverted the maxim spouted by Goethe's character and considered the ways in which the left is to blame for the right's successes? This type of analysis tends to be more productive because it would not have to buy into the prejudicial assumption that if our competitors are bad, then our ideas must necessarily be right. I believe that one of the main difficulties faced by the left in many countries of the world is that it limits itself to being the anti-right, which-although it may seem otherwise has nothing to do with offering a true alternative. It has been said that the left has trouble mobilizing its electorate, and some believe that success would flow, not by reviving collective hope, but by fanning the flames of concern so that voters would be forced to support the left, however reluctantly, as the lesser evil. To summarize, the right nowadays is optimistic and the left pessimistic. It may be the case that political enmity is currently articulated more as an emotional disposition than an ideological position. The truth of the matter is that emotions and ideas are more closely related than we tend to assume. If we look at things this way, we will perceive the ideological displacement that is taking place. Traditionally, the difference between progressives and conservatives corresponded with pessimism and optimism, both anthropologically and socially. While progressivism formed a part of a historic movement toward betterment, conservatism, as Ernst Bloch suggested, has always been prepared to accept the inevitability of a certain amount of injustice or suffering. But to a large extent, this is no longer the case. The general mood of the right, whose best representative is Nico\_ las Sarkozy, is the complete opposite of resignation: decisive and activ complex-free, trusting in the future, and firmly resolved not to let anyonee, else take control of the vanguard. This attitude is making things difficult for a left that, even when it has good reasons to object, cannot seem to rally when the time comes for proposing something better. Whether defending the causes of marginalized peoples or becoming the advocate of pluralism , the left does not do so in order to construct an alternative conception of power; this is evidenced by the guilty conscience of those who realize they are merely preaching to the choir. The left is, fundamentally, melancholic and critical. It sees the contemporary world as a machine that needs to be stopped, not as a source of opportunities and instruments susceptible to being placed at the service of its own values: justice and equality**. Socialism is now perceived as the means to redress the inequalities of a liberal society. Its sole legitimacy stems from its goal of fixing things that were destroyed by the right or protecting things from the right's threats. It attempts to preserve that which is at risk of being destroyed but does not offer any alternative structure. Its** restorative mentality is constructed at the expense of innovative and predictive thought. **For this reason,** it does not offer a coherent interpretation of the world that awaits us because that world is seen only as a potential threat. This suspicion of the future is basically the end result of perceiving the market and globalization as the principal agents of economic chaos and social inequalities and failing to note the possibilities that they encompass and that could be exploited. It is not enough to simply marshal good feelings and continuously invoke ethical values; it is also important to understand social change and recognize the ways in which the values one holds can be achieved under new circumstances. The left's primary difficulty in positioning itself as a promising alternative comes from its "heroism in the face of the market" (Grunberg and Laldi 2007, 9) that prevents it from understanding the market's true nature and causes it to view the marketplace as nothing more than a fomenter of inequality, an antisocial reality. For much of the left, economic reasoning is a type of social conspiracy. They believe that social benefits are always in conflict with economic considerations. The ritual condemnation of neoliberalism and global commercialization stems from an intellectual tradition that sets social interests against economic interests and tends to privilege determinism and existing structures over the opportunities offered by social change. From this starting point, it is difficult to comprehend that competition, rather than public or private monopolies, is one of the left's (rue values, especially when government monopolies have stopped guaranteeing the provision of a common good in economically efficient and socially advantageous terms. Indeed, some government monopolies falsity the rules of the game. At this point, we are perfectly aware that both the marketplace and the government produce certain inequalities, but government inequalities are met with extraordinary indulgence by many. There are times, for example, when we must balance the value of guaranteeing employment at any cost with the price this protection represents for the people who are thus prevented from entering the workforce. This creates a new inequality. Masked as a defense of social progress, critiques of contemporary society can in fact be conservative and inequitable, which explains why the left is currently closely identified with maintaining the status quo. This conservative attitude could be redefined in terms of political innovation, modifying procedures in order to achieve the same objectives: it is a question of putting the marketplace at the service of the public good and the fight against inequalities. Nostalgia paralyzes and does not help us understand the new terms under which an old battle is being waged. It is not accurate that an era of solidarity has been supplanted by a burst of individualism, yet we must learn to express solidarity more formally. If we want to address social problems more effectively, we must replace the mechanical tendency to automatically intensity state interventions with more flexible forms of collaboration between the government and the marketplace, making use of indirect forms of government and promoting a culture that encourages the evaluation of public policies. The other reason the left currently projects a pessimistic attitude is its wholly negative assessment of globalization. This worldview prevents it from understanding the positive effects globalization can have on the redistribution of wealth, the emergence of new actors, or the change in the rules of the game in power relationships. When it insists on deregulations related to globalization, the left runs the risk of appearing to protect the privileged few while rejecting everyone else's possibilities for development. It is true that the forces at work in the world have never been so powerful but also so promising for so many people. Or are we meant to believe that there is not a hopeful correspondence between the process of globalization and the emergence of a multipolar world? For that reason, the left of the twenty-first century must be careful to distinguish itself from alter-globalization. This does not mean that there are no serious problems in need of solution or that the left should abandon its critical stance. But it must not yield to the litany of protests over OUr loss ofinBuence on the general course of the world. Instead of proclaiming that "another world is possible," it would better serve the left to imagine other ways of conceiving of and acting in this world. The idea that nothing can be done in the face of globalization is an excuse for political laziness. What the left cannot do is choose to act as if nothing had changed. The left will not be free from the grip of pessimism until it makes an effort to take advantage of the possibilities generated by globalization and tries to guide social change in a more just and egalitarian direction. The Political Configuration of the Future Politics is the attempt to civilize the future (Willke 2002, 208), to reject the colonization of the future by a determinant past, to impede its ideological monopoly or its abandonment to simple administrative inertia. The goal of politics is to shape a common backdrop of meaning in which individual expectations are linked with collective progress. For some time now, politics has been hard-pressed to configure that future, as its resolve to constitute, renew, and transform the social order has Bagged. Three factors, in my opinion, contribute to the political system's loss of relevance: the privatization of personal fulfillment; the barriers st

emming from other areas of public life such as the economy, law, or communications that prefer to see politics as superBuous; and in a correlative fashion, the weakness of politics itself when it comes to generating social change. The polls say that young people are imbued with "individual optimism and collective pessimism." They are interested in the "public good" but not "collective action." They tend to think of the future as an exclusively individual matter, not the responsibility of politics. We are seeing evidence of what Claus Offe has called the "privatization of utopias" (2004, 37): the future is privatized, pluralized, and fragmented. We consider happiness something private, no longer associating it with collective projects or seeing it as something made possible by a social context. We find the public space irrelevant to our happiness; it merely supports private affairs, but does not allow an expansion of them. Our destiny seems to be of the save yourself if you can variety as we are surrounded by impersonal forces that stem from globalization, bureaucracy, and technology in a society without politics, without collective hope, incapable of imagining and promoting an alternative common future. The only thing we expect from politics is the protection of our own projects of personal development. Devoid of the power for social transformation, politics is subordinated to society, understood as an amalgamation of private individuals, consumers, stockholders, and clients whose only relationship with politics is their occasional appearance in voting booths, at protest marches, or in public opinion research data. At the same time, politics is besieged by other types of human activity that shrink the scope of its operations. Politics disappears in the face of the influence of the media and the economy, the markets and the courts. Politics is too weak to withstand the rule of cash Bow and media power. The space for politics is lost within the new reality of globalization and in confrontation with the specific demands raised by the processes of individualization. These are forces that are attempting to turn politics into something we can do without. While the world is unified along economic and communicative fronts, we have not yet achieved the political objectives of multilateralism or global governance. The agility and synchronization of the markets contrasts with the political illiteracy of global society. Our principal challenge is how to react before the new hallmarks of the future, which are no longer tradition, law and order, or subjugation, but rather a type of leveling agitation that forces us to adapt to an unstoppable planetary shift. Because, if it were true that politics is now over, what would that mean for us? It would mean the end of the limited control that human societies achieve over the future when we decide collective matters among ourselves, without entrusting them to the knowledge of experts, the fury of fanatics, or administrative bureaucracy. But the principle threat against politics stems from its own weakness, which prevents the type of future that allows for political action in the transforming, reforming, or establishing of alternatives. Profound social reform, understood as the result of planning processes carried out by effective, conscientious actors, is improbable in present-day societies. "In rapid and dynamic systems, which have extremely short-lived present tenses, one can\_ not and perhaps should not want to significantly change the conditions of future action" (Luhmann 1989, 8). The belief that social complexity cannOt be politically modified has prevailed. This pessimism affects even the very idea of government and planning (Braun 1995, 612), which is increasingly obsolete and infused with a sense of "muddling through" or, in the best of cases, intelligent improvisation. We have moved from the euphoria of planning to the pessimism of governance. In contrast with "government," what we have is actually "evolution without a plan," "social self-regulation," "a self-referential closure of social subsystems," the reign of "side effects," and even "ungovernability." The government is in a state of transformation from its previous incarnation as a power center to a coordinating institution that must turn its attention to "managing social interdependencies" (Mayntz 2001, 23). Decisions and initiatives have been replaced by interactivity. In any case, patterns and dynamics end up being more important than people's intentions. There is, however, one positive aspect to the crisis of governability: it can be understood as an opportunity to transform politics along lines that are more democratic and respectful of civil sOciety's leading role. The political system's ability to configure is not realized in spite of its limitations but because of them. We could say that the resistance that societies and objects have against being governed constitutes a source oflearning for politics and a guarantee against irrefutable leadership. Our previous faith in the omnipotent nature of politics was probably as illusory as our current belief that it is powerless or irrelevant. The fact is that authoritarian management is not the only way of acting upon society. Politics must pursue an alternative method of intervention that is no longer hierarchical and domineering, but horizontally inclined, meaning it can successfully engage social, economic, and cultural agents. Since politics is a configuration of the future, it wages an unusual battle against destiny, against the seemingly unassailable world of facts. Politics attempts to transform fate into responsibility. One of the parts of our democratic tradition that is most deserving of protection is precisely the rejection of destiny. Living without destiny is manifested in a will to discover, comprehend, and transform. The future depends more on our decisions and commitments than was understood by those who devised the modern idea of progress as an irresistible force to which we could confidently relinquish control, or by the cynics when they view the present as inevitable. The future does not need to be guessed, but imagined and constructed. The big question, therefore, is not what awaits us, but what we are going to do; how we will replace our oversized ideological excuses with concrete projects. Let us suppose that we in effect no longer possess any of the overarching stories that used to construct and order our experience. This could be more liberating than limiting, given that those narratives also entailed a degree of fatalist thinking. Perhaps a new possibility will be inaugurated in that vacant space. Politics cannot completely eliminate destiny since it is impossible to imagine a world without limits. But the very idea of politics offers a different vision of personal and collective destiny. Politics is a small rebellion against the preconceived notion that everything is already determined and immutable. Politics is a unique combination of vision and passion, perspective and determination. It does not make us stop perceiving reality as it is, but at the same time, we are able to project ourselves beyond that which simply exists. It is an awareness of limits as well as the determination to get beyond them. Politics without vision is lost in the daily hustle and bustle, and we end up on a path to a place we did not really want to go. But if it is lacking in passion, politics cannot tackle the ill-fated resistance presupposed by reality; instead, it simply adjusts to the way things are without arriving at the place it meant to go. We may find that within a few years the content and style of politics will be unrecognizably different from today. But the need for politics will not disappear. In fact, politics has never been as necessary, given the magnitude of the problems that await us and require collective action. If we cannot resolve these problems through politics, we will be unable to resolve them at all. A Reasonable Hope I have the impression that political problems do not arise from rashly yielding to realism or from renouncing utopia, as people tend to say, but from something previous. The origin of the weakness of politics is its acceptance of a territorial division where reality and efficiency are managed by the right wing, while the left is free to enjoy the monopoly of unreality, where it is able to move about unchallenged amidst values, utopias, and dreams. In this way, there are those who are afforded reality without hope and others, hope without reality. This comfortable demarcation of territory is at the heart of the general political crisis: once we accept the divide between the principle of pleasure and the principle of reality, between objectivity and possibilities, the right wing can dedicate itself to heedless modernization, without worrying that the left will trouble it with its generic, confused utopianism. The right can allow itself the luxury of having some difficulties with values while the left continues its struggle with reality. This division barely interests voters, who would almost certainly prefer to be able to make a different type of choice. Understood in this way, political realism in this day and age confirms our powerlessness when we attempt to configure social space. What if, deep down, politics were nothing more than a discussion about our understanding of the meaning of "reality"? Because reality is not simply that which is real, nor can we reduce it to that which is currently possible. Reality also encompasses possibilities and provisional impossibilities, indeterminism and other alternatives. The reality of human life, the reality of all of society, is a combination of possibilities and impossibilities that are partially open and partially closed to action. As Sartre affirmed in his diaries, every present has a future that it illuminates and with which it disappears. The fact that everything is possible in another shape does not mean that everything is possible, but it is also true that "realists" tend to have a very narrow conception of reality, lacking awareness of other lateral possibilities. Perhaps the fundamental political question is not so much about ideals and imagery as about our conception of what is real. Tocqueville taught us that utopianism and empiricism are inseparable ways of leaving reality intact. Utopianism does not accelerate its movement except in an illusory way: the return to reality is eventually imposed. Empiricism does not halt reality except in an equally illusory manner; in the end, society's internal drive prevails. In both cases, reality is abandoned to its fate. So if that is the way things are, the best that can be done in the face of a conservative conception of politics is to tackle it in the sphere of reality, to argue against the right's conception of reality. That would be the only way to avoid repeating the left's perennial error of playing in a field where the right has a decided advantage. The right should be confronted not with fantasy but with a different description of reality, a superior description of reality. The battle will not be won through a generic appeal to another world but through the struggle to describe reality in another way. The left will never be persuasive if it seems to be quarreling with reality itself; it scores points when it is capable of convincing us that the description of reality wielded by the right is faulty. It would be catastrophic to give up for lost the definition of the playing field, accepting one of the two proffered choices: competing in the struggle to manage current reality better or fighting from a position of innocuous moralism. Faced with the official administrators of realism, we must defend the idea that politics is not simple management or simple adaptation, but configuration, a proposed framework for action, foresight into the future. It has to do with the new and unusual, dimensions that do not appear in other professions that, while effective in their areas, are distanced from the concerns provoked by excessive uncertainty. The types of activities that make up political action do not operate solely with simple rules of experience, with the comfortably accumulated teachings of the well-known. People who are able to perceive the opportunity offered by uncertainty will see how the erosion of some traditional concepts once again makes politics possible as a force of innovation and transformation. It is urgent to redefine the meaning and objectives of political action from the starting point that through politics we know, or rather discover, aspects of reality and possibilities for action that cannot be perceived when we remain within routine practices and preconceived debates. We would not be human without our capacity for "futurizing," projecting ourselves toward the future and anticipating it in terms of imagination, expectations, planning, and determination. The uneasiness that makes us hope, desire, and fear is what allows us to relate to the future in all its diverse forms. If it is not trained, this anticipation works destructively: it atrophies, turns us into fanatics, into people who are unnecessarily fearful or excessively credulous. Our relationship with the future must be cultivated, just as we cultivate other human capabilities. Although we do not tend to express it as such and no academic curriculum would label it in this way, one of the principal objectives of all education, and the task of institutions and our socialization in general, is to shape within each of us a proper relationship with the future, one that can also be preached in society as a whole. Some societies have an unhealthy relationship with their own future, while others deal with the future in a reasonable and beneficial manner.

### A2 Rev

#### Revolutionary politics generates atrocities. History of 20th century revolutions proves we should choose liberal reformism.

Fred **HALLIDAY** IR @ London School of Economics **‘3** “Finding the Revolutionary in Revolution” in *The Future of Revolutions* ed. John Foran p 306-309

A second issue central to discussion of revolution today is that of the historic legacy of revolutions. Writers on revolution like to invoke Marx's observation about the weight of past generations lying on the minds of the present; it has been often stated that all revolutions invoke symbols and claims derived from the past, real or imagined. The revolutionaries of the twentieth century all looked, in some degree, backwards: Lenin and Trotsky to 1789, Mao and Ho to I9I7, Castro to the 1890s, Khomeini to the seventh century. The present discussion of revolution seems, at first sight, not to do this. Political sociologists do look at earlier revolutions, but this is without practical import. Discussion of the possibility of change, particularly that linked to the anti-globalization movement, seems to be curiously ahistorical. The price of this is, however, that not only is inspiration from the past muted but, equally, lessons are not learnt. Here something curious seems to have happened since the collapse of communism: the amnesia of neoliberal discussion, which consigns all that was associated with the communist experiment to the dustbin, seems to be replicated in the case of the radical movements of today. But to do this is questionable. In this latter respect, there are dangers, of an amnesia that is **long on enthusiasm but short on responsibility and realism**. For the fact is that the history of revolution in modern times is one not only of resistance, heroism and idealism, but also of terrible suffering and human disaster, of chaos and incompetence under the guise of revolutionary transformation, of the distortion of the finest ideals by corrupt and murderous leaders, and of the creation of societies that are far more oppressive and inefficient than those they seek to overthrow. The anti-globalization movement makes much of revolutionary internationalism: tills is not some benign panacea, but a complex, often abused, transnational practice (Halliday I999). All of this entails confronting something that revolutionaries have always assumed but too often failed to discuss: the **ethics** of revolution. **Denunciation of the given and invocations of an ideal other are not enough** (Geras 1989). To grasp this involves a shift beyond the political sociology of revolutions, an academic pursuit that focuses in large measure on the incidence of revolutions, to an analysis of the **consequences** and **longerterm records of revolutionary states**. In the course of recent years, in writing my own work on revolutions, I have had reason to visit a number of cities that had served as the centers of world revolution and, if not revolution, anti-imperialist radicalism: Beijing, Havana, Tripoli, Tehran. These were the culminations of upheavals that had produced revolutionary regimes by some strange numerical consistency in, respectively, I949, I959, I969, I979· In every case, one could still discern the outlines of the original revolutionary project: a rejection of exploitation, foreign and domestic, a comnlitment to the transformation of society, internationalist support in rhetoric and deed for those resisting oppression elsewhere. But in the 1990S this had all **faded**: these were not the wave of the future. Whatever else, it could not be said that the initial revolutionary project was in good shape: few in these countries now believed in the ideological project that had initiated the revolution; corruption and inefficiency were widespread; there was a **pervasive desire for** change, towards a more open, **liberal, society**; the initial internationalist appeals had faded. Revolution had, in effect, become tired. It was indeed capitalism, not revolutionary socialism and third-worldism, which in the 1990S formed the global vision of the future. This haphazard and impressionistic response has, however, to be compounded by a reflection on the overall legacy of the century of revolutions: neither form of amnesia - counterrevolutionary or revolutionary - is acceptable. Indeed, amnesia invites the repetition of another common saying with regard to revolutions, that those who ignore history are doomed to repeat it. Here perhaps is one of the most worrying aspects of the contemporary radical movement, be it in its national or internationalist forms: the failure to reflect, critically, on the past record of revolutionary movements. This pertains to models of alternative political and social orders. It pertains to the dangers inherent in any utopian, radicalized, mass movement that **lacks clear forms of authority and decision-making**. It also involves the espousal, spirited but onlinous, of alternative social orders that could work only if imposed by an **authoritarian state.** A pertinent contemporary example is that of radical environmentalism: the program of de-industrialization, and restricted consumption and travel, entailed by such ideas could only be established, and maintained, by a coercive state. In the international sphere, the simple invocation of solidarity may too often conceal interests of power, and manipulation. In the days of authoritarian Communist Parties, but equally in that of national and communal movements today, unconditional solidarity with repressive organizations may be at odds with any commitment to emancipatory values. Such a critical reflection has to apply, too, to the individuals often invoked for contemporary purposes: Lenin was a visionary, but also a cruel, pompous bigot; Che was a man of heroism and solidarity, but his econonlic programs were a disaster and his austere romanticism at times led to cruelty; Mao freed a quarter of mankind from imperialism, but also repeatedly plunged his society into barbarous conflict and social experimentation; Khomeini overthrew the Shah, but his social and political program was reactionary and repressive. A similar pause in romanticization might be applicable to some of the supposed components of the anti-globalization front today: few might defend Saddam Hussein, Kim Jong-il or Ayatollah Khamenei, but there is perhaps too little questioning of the commitment to emancipatory values of the PKK in Turkey, Sendero Luminoso, the FARC in Colombia, the Chechen rebels, to name but some. The Zapatista movement has become for many an icon of hope: but, as contributors to this volume make clear, it is not always itself a model of democratic practice. More importantly, one has to ask if this is the most important experience in the Latin America of the I990S to study: it is part of, but only one part of, a broader crisis of the authoritarian PRI regime that beset Mexico and resulted in the rise on the one hand of the PRD and on the other of the election of Fox in 2000. An open assessment of challenges to authoritarian, and neoliberal, policies in Latin America in the I990S would also examine **democratization in Brazil and Chile**, and the experience of social movements, be they of women, workers or indigenous peoples, who engaged with **reformist states**. This need for a critical retrospective on the historical legacy of revolutions is, however, linked to another, perhaps even more pressing, issue, one that pervades the pages of this book, namely the relation of revolution to liberal democracy as a whole. Several contributors point out that where liberal democracy is established revolution is off the agenda. But this reflection may be taken further to ask the question of whether, faced with the alternative, one or other outcome is preferable. The implication of much 'revolutionary' writing over the past century has been that liberal democracy is to be denounced, and those who engage with and in it are reformists, dupes, or, in older language, 'class traitors'. Such a view lives on, in some of the contributions to this book, as in parts of the left. Yet this contrast of reform with revolution is not some eternal polarity. It too needs to be set in historical context, and seen for what it is, a product of the particular context of the twentieth century, starting with the split between the moderate and revolutionary factions of the socialist movement in I9I4. The costs of this division are evident enough, and it would be desirable, in the aftermath of the collapse of the revolutionary socialist models, to re-examine it (Therborn I989). Part of this re-examination would involve a questioning of the automatic antinomy of reform and revolution present in much contemporary and recent writing, and of the assumed contradictory relation of revolutionary ideas to those of another critical, and internationalist, trend produced by modernity: liberalism. This has immediate implications for the discussion in this book. In particular, it relates to an issue that is widely present in contemporary academic and political discussion, but that writers on revolution tend to avoid, namely the question of rights. The language of rights was long denounced by the left, and its revolutionary part, as a bourgeois myth, except where it was for tactical reasons deemed pertinent to use it, as with regard to workers' rights, or the right of nations to selfdetermination. The record of the revolutionary tradition, once it came to power, is a very mixed one: a strong commitment to certain social and economic rights, whose abolition by neoliberal policies many in the former Communist states regret; and a sustained, cruel and dogmatic denial of political rights, collective and individual. Yet the program of rights embodied in national, regional and international codes is, as much as any flamboyant radicalism, both a critique and a program that confronts the contemporary world. Faced with the record of the Communist tradition on rights on the one hand, and the aspirations of liberalism on the other, this disdain for rights, and the related adherence to a denunciation of reformism and liberalism, should be questioned. Invocations of a romanticized I968, of the nicer cases of armed struggle, or of Seattle may be fine for mobilization: they are not a serious answer to the problems of the contemporary world.

### Civ Good

#### 1. Civilization doesn't cause war

#### Taylor in ‘2

(Steve, Teaches Personal Development @ U. Manchester, Journal of Consciousness Studies, “Where Did It All Go Wrong? James DeMeo's Saharasia Thesis and the Origins of War”, 9:8, Ingenta)

In other words, archaeological evidence shows that, far from being ‘as old as history’ and common throughout our species, war emerged amongst certain human groups at a particular time and a particular place. Obviously, neither the physicalist nor the sociobiological theories can account for this. Perhaps one could suggest that the Indo-Europeans, the Semites and other war-like peoples had higher levels of testosterone (or lower levels of serotonin) than the human beings who came before them, or that their genes were even more ‘selfish’ than usual, but both of these options seem very unlikely. Scholars who accept that war is a relatively late historical development have suggested social and environmental causes. Some historians have suggested that war was linked to the beginnings of civilization. This makes some sense, since both arose at roughly the same time (the ancient civilizations of Egypt and Sumer emerged during the fourth millennium BCE), but the problem here is that peoples such as the early Indo-Europeans and Semites did not have any kind of civilization— or even lead a ‘settled’ lifestyle—and yet were extremely war-like. And even more significantly, there were many earlier peoples who were clearly ‘civilized’, with a reasonably high level of technological development and large living communities (such as the ancient Cretans or the citizens of Catal Huyuk), who were extremely peaceful. Similarly, some scholars have suggested that the eruption of war was linked to a growth of population and a resultant scarcity of new land for horticulture. But according to R. Bryan Ferguson (2000), ‘the data just does not support a direct association of increasing density and increasing war.’ Others have suggested that the beginnings of war were related to the decline of hunting, that as the opportunity to hunt faded with the horticultural way of life, men began to wage war as a kind of substitute, an alternative way of exercising their bravery and skill. But again, the fact that human groups lived a peaceful, sedentary life for as long as three thousand years following the transition to horticulture invalidates this view.

#### 2. War was MORE likely in the past ---- hunter-gatherer societies fought bloody conflicts every generation

#### LeBlanc in ‘7

(Steven, Dir. Collections @ Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology @ Harvard U., Daedalus, “Why warfare? Lessons from the past”, 136:1, Winter)

Quite a bit is known about warfare in the deep past, and about warfare in nonstate societies that have not been affected by nation-states. One obvious conclusion is that warfare was frequent long before complex societies developed. This generalization is clearly established by Lawrence Keeley in War Before Civilization, and was also discussed recently by Richard Wrangham and Raymond C. Kelly.1 Such warfare was chronic, virtually annual. Few societies experienced even one generation without significant warfare. Regardless of its frequency, almost all societies lived in fear of attack. Great efforts, often at considerable costs, were made to live in protected places - such as on the tops of windswept hills and on the faces of cliffs far from water supplies - and to build fortifications. Some groups lived in settlements that were larger or more compact than optimum, simply for defense. The deadliness of war made these measures inevitable. Estimates of around 25 percent of males dying from warfare are derived for virtually all continents, for foragers and egalitarian farmers alike. The probability of dying as a result of warfare was, in fact, much higher in the past than it is today.

#### 3. Environmental destruction is not a product of civilization or western culture ---- pre-civilization cultures were incredibly environmentally destructive

#### Penn in ‘3

(Dustin, Dir. And Senior Scientist @ Konrad Lorenz Institute of Comparative Ethology and former Visiting Prof. Zoology @ U. Vienna, Quarterly Review of Biology, “The Evolutionary Roots of our Environmental Problems: Toward a Darwinian Ecology”, 78:3, September, EBSCO)

We have never quite outgrown the idea that, somewhere, there are people living in perfect harmony with nature and one another, and that we might do the same were it not for the corrupting influences of Western culture (Konner 1990). When attempting to explain why humans are ecologically destructive, environmental scholars have long attributed the problem to “Western” culture, especially the anthropocentric and scientific worldviews (White 1967). Subsequently, many argue that addressing our ecological problems requires a rejection of the materialism of science, and an embrace of the animistic and spiritual beliefs of non-Western religions and traditional cultures. Aboriginal peoples, such as Native American Indians, have been represented as the major role model for the modern environmental movement because they are widely thought to have lived in harmony with nature before Western contact. Environmentalists often quote a famous speech by Chief Seattle of the Susquamish tribe who reportedly stated that “Every part of this earth is sacred to my people . . . the earth does not belong to man, man belongs to the earth” (Gore 1992:259). Just as Jean-Jacques Rousseau thought that people in traditional cultures live as “noble savages,” environmentalists often assume that humans lived in harmony with nature as “ecological noble savages” until they became corrupted by Western culture (Redford 1991). The idea that our modern environmental problems are due to Western science and culture is central to modern environmental movements and philosophies such as Deep Ecology (Devall and Sessions 1985; Sessions 1995) and ecofeminism (Merchant 1980). Evolutionary researchers have been uncovering a very different picture of the conservation behavior in traditional and other non- Western cultures (Smith and Wishnie 2000). Increasing evidence indicates that pre- Columbian American Indians and other traditional societies are not the conservationists often assumed (Edgerton 1992; Ridley 1996; Krech 1999). The low ecological impact of people in traditional cultures does not appear to be due to conservation practices per se, but simply their low population densities and inefficient technologies (Hames 1987; Alvard 1993, 1995; Kay 1994; Stearman 1994; Vickers 1994; Low 1996a; Alvard 1998; Miller et al. 1999; Ruttan and Borgerhoff Mulder 1999). Among the Piro Indians in Ecuador, hunters do not pay the opportunity costs of passing up prey for conservation; instead their hunting behavior follows optimal foraging principles (Alvard 1993, 1995, 1999). Nor is there is any association between societies that hold beliefs about the sacredness of nature and having a low ecological impact (Low 1996a). It turns out that the widely quoted speech by Chief Seattle is just a myth, a story created for television, that has been perpetuated by uncritical and wishfulthinking environmentalists (Ridley 1996). Furthermore, increasing evidence indicates that our species has a long history of causing ecological destruction (Diamond 1988, 1992, 1995; Redman 1999). As humans have moved around the planet, they have caused massive extinctions in various ecosystems. For example, the megafaunal extinction in the Americas during the Pleistocene (in which 57 species of large mammals went extinct, including mammoths and mastodons, in a sudden ecological collapse) is usually attributed to climate change. Alfred Russell Wallace suggested otherwise: “I am convinced that the rapidity of . . . the extinction of so many large Mammalia is actually due to man’s agency” (cited in Leakey and Lewin 1995:172). Much evidence now indicates that the Pleistocene extinctions in North America correspond to the time of arrival of human migrations from Asia (Martin 1978; Martin and Klein 1984). This major extinction event does not appear to have been due to climate change; other places experienced climate change at this time, but did not have similar extinctions. Instead, it appears that it was due to the vulnerability of North American fauna to a newly introduced and highly effective predator, Homo sapiens (Alroy 2001). This “Pleistocene overkill” hypothesis is somewhat controversial; it is still debated whether the Pleistocene extinctions in North American were due to human hunting alone, climate change, or some combination of these factors. Yet, the major extinctions that occurred on many South Pacific islands (Steadman and Olson 1985; Steadman et al. 2002), such as the disappearance of elephant birds in New Zealand, cannot be attributed to climate change and they coincide precisely with the arrival of humans who hunted them extensively (Anderson 1989; Diamond 2000; Holdaway and Jacomb 2000; Roberts et al. 2001). Once humans began to settle down and organize into larger and more complex societies, entire civilizations appear to have collapsed due to the overexploitation of their resource base (Diamond 1988; Ponting 1992). After arriving to Easter Island, the Polynesians turned a lush forested island into a treeless landscape, exhausted their resources, and their population and society collapsed (Diamond 1995). The sudden disappearance of the Anasazi Indians in North America, the Maya in Central America, and other non-Western civilizations may have been due to an ecological collapse (Culbert 1973; Deevey et al. 1979; Diamond 1992; Redman 1999; Stuart 2000). The precise causes for the demise of the Maya and Anasazi and other ancient civilizations are still unclear and controversial. Their downfall is still usually attributed to internal social turmoil or hostile invading groups (except Easter Island), though such events may have just provided the final coup de grace after resource depletion already undermined economic and political stability, as we are seeing today in many societies (Homer-Dixon 1999). Thus, humans did not live in harmony with nature until the spread of “Western” culture, and these findings about our species’ actual conservation behavior offer several extremely important implications. First, they indicate that environmentalists are not merely overreacting “alarmists”; we have very good reasons to be concerned about our species’ potential for causing ecological destruction. Second, they indicate that achieving ecological sustainability may be more difficult than is often assumed and that we cannot simply abandon “Western” secularism and science for mysticism. Third, they show that we must be wary of romantic myths and wishful thinking about human nature. Becoming more critical, though, does not imply that we should not be open to new possibilities or try to learn from other cultures. Many societies have successfully managed their resources (Smith and Wishnie 2000), so there is room for optimism. What is needed is more research into how people in various societies have successfully managed their natural resources, and to determine how to apply this knowledge toward designing adaptive strategies for dealing with ecological problems (e.g., Ostrom et al. 1999).

# Round 5 vs Wake BM

## 1AC

### Plan

United States Department of Agriculture should create a set-aside of Rural Energy for America Program financial incentives for wind power for Central Appalachia.

### Adv – Sustainability

#### ADVANTAGE one: Sustainability

#### Wind power paves the way for it - Central Appalachia will be the model for the transition

**Haltom 10** - Co-director of Coal River Muntain Watch [Vernon Haltom, “Can a Wind Farm Transform Appalachia's Energy Future?,” Solutions Journal, Volume 1 | Issue 4 | Page 71-77 | Jul 2010, pg. http://tinyurl.com/9e3fyr8

The communities of the Coal River Valley suffered a heartbreaking catastrophe on April 5, 2010, when Massey Energy's Upper Big Branch longwall mine exploded, killing 29 miners in the worst U.S. mine disaster in 40 years. The disaster at Upper Big Branch should remind the nation that with our current dependence on coal for electricity generation comes a responsibility to ensure that miners and the surrounding communities are protected from the negligence of company executives. At Coal River Mountain Watch, we want to take the debate a step further by offering an alternative vision for the community, one that has the potential to transform Coal River Valley and offer a powerful symbol of a viable energy future for the nation.

In March 2008, local residents banded together to fight for a wind farm instead of a mountaintop removal coal mining site operated by Massey. Generations of residents around Coal River Mountain have seen the detrimental effects of reliance on one industry. The boom-and-bust cycles of coal have caused bustling communities to become ghost towns. With the current reliance on technology such as longwall mining and mountaintop removal, miners have largely been replaced with machines and explosives. In 1980, 55,500 miners in West Virginia extracted over 121 million tons of coal, while in 2008, only about 21,000 miners extracted nearly 166 million tons. Comparing a map of the counties that have yielded the most coal to the Appalachian Regional Commission's map of distressed counties illustrates a clear correlation. Contrary to industry claims that coal provides prosperity, economic facts indicate that it provides poverty. Presently the state has a 9.5 percent unemployment rate, while less than 4 percent of the workforce is employed by mining and logging.

The plan for Coal River Mountain would destroy over 6,000 acres of the mountain, bury streams with 18 valley fills, destroy water supplies, and eliminate sustainable resources, including the commercial wind potential. The mountaintop removal operation would provide coal and temporary mining jobs for only 17 years. In contrast, a wind farm would preserve the abundant timber and non-timber forest products, protect the water, allow traditional and new sustainable economic opportunities, and provide clean energy and green jobs forever.

As we call on our leaders to reduce carbon emissions and to invest in the development of clean energy sources, we must also call on them to invest in the future of the miners and the communities that have provided the energy upon which our nation was built and continues to be fueled today. This means asking the federal government to reinvigorate the original intent of the Appalachian Regional Development Initiative, strengthen the capacity and purview of the Appalachian Regional Commission, and invest in the health, education, training, entrepreneurship, and environment of Appalachian communities and residents. It means addressing the root causes of persistent poverty and unemployment in the region and not being afraid to anger the coal industry and the local and state politicians who uphold it to the detriment of the citizens and the miners. But most of all, it calls for making a commitment to a sustainable economic transition for the coalfields and supporting every means possible to achieve it.

Building a Positive Vision

Coal River Mountain lies at the western end of Raleigh County, in the heart of the Coal River watershed, and is bounded by the two major tributaries of the Big Coal River: Marsh Fork on the south and west of the mountain and Clear Fork on the north and east. Kayford Mountain, where thousands of acres of mountaintop have been removed, lies across the Clear Fork to the north, and Cherry Pond Mountain, likewise devastated by mountaintop removal, lies across the Marsh Fork to the southwest. Several small, unincorporated towns—Rock Creek, Naoma, Sundial, Birchton, and Pettus—lie along the Marsh Fork, and the towns of Artie, Colcord, and Dorothy are situated along the Clear Fork. Whitesville, at the eastern edge of Boone County, sits just below the convergence of the two tributaries at the western edge of the mountain. Coal River Mountain itself has long been home to underground mines, a few small, old strip mines, and, since 1995, the Brushy Fork slurry impoundment. However, most of the mountain remains relatively unspoiled and has provided generations of residents with lumber, firewood, berries, ginseng and other valuable medicinal herbs, wild game, and fish. From the air, the Coal River Mountain stands in lush contrast to its barren, dusty neighbors.

The Upper Big Branch mine, the site of the recent disaster, lies beneath the expansive Twilight surface mine complex on Cherry Pond Mountain, just across from Coal River Mountain. In 2006, Massey Energy quietly received approval for the Bee Tree surface mine on Coal River Mountain. In the latter months of 2006, David Orr, a professor at Oberlin College in Ohio and a prominent environmental advocate and writer, worked with CRMW's North Carolina–based ally Appalachian Voices to commission a study of the wind potential on Coal River Mountain. WindLogics, a nationally recognized wind modeling and development firm, conducted the study and found that the ridges along Coal River Mountain exhibited strong Class 4 to Class 7 average annual wind speeds. Class 4 winds serve as a minimum threshold for industrial-scale wind development. When Massey applied for the Eagle 2 Surface Mine, the second of four planned permits on the mountain, Coal River Mountain Watch requested and was granted an informal conference in August 2007 for citizens to voice their opposition to the proposal. Nearly 100 residents attended the hearing, and over 30 spoke out against the permit. None spoke in favor of it. In 1997 and 2001, several Clear Fork residents had endured heavy flooding, exacerbated by runoff from mountaintop removal and valley fills on the opposite side of the Clear Fork. They feared the destruction of their community if both sides of the valley were dominated by streams buried under valley fills. Several citizens voiced support for a wind farm as an alternative to mountaintop removal. Dr. Matt Wasson of Appalachian Voices described the WindLogics study and provided copies to decision makers at the Department of Environmental Protection.

Seizing the opportunity offered by the mountain's wind resources, members of Coal River Mountain Watch, with the support of the Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition, Appalachian Voices, the Sierra Club, and the Student Energy Action Coalition, came together in March 2008 to make plans for a wind farm. Using the WindLogics wind map of the mountain, and with technical advice provided by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory and the American Wind Energy Association, CRMW's wind project coordinator, Rory McIlmoil, constructed a model wind farm utilizing ArcGIS and Google Earth software. The model suggested that Coal River Mountain had enough wind potential and land area to accommodate 220 two-megawatt wind turbines, resulting in a total generation capability of 440 megawatts. Meanwhile, CRMW's community organizer, Lorelei Scarbro, provided information about the project and hosted community meetings that generated substantial local support. The two, along with supportive community members, made presentations to elected and appointed leaders, from the city level to the governor's office, and held a rally at the state capitol that resulted in more than 10,000 signatures on a petition. The project received Co-op America's 2008 Building Economic Alternatives award. CNN reported on the project and interviewed CRMW organizer Lorelei Scarbro at her home and at the adjacent family cemetery on Coal River Mountain.

To determine what was at stake, Coal River Mountain Watch commissioned Downstream Strategies, an environmental consulting firm from Morgantown, West Virginia, to conduct a comparative economic analysis of the costs and benefits of mountaintop removal and wind development on Coal River Mountain.

That study concluded that a 328-megawatt wind farm, enough to power 70,000 homes, would generate more long-term jobs and significantly greater local tax revenues than the proposed mining would, while imposing far fewer costs on human health and the environment. In fact, the study estimated that the externalized costs of the proposed mining, which would be drained from the local economy, would amount to $600 million over the life of the mining and beyond. According to the Downstream Strategies executive summary,

"For each scenario, the local economic benefits are quantified based on increased jobs, earnings, and economic output. In addition to these economic benefits, costs due to excess deaths and illnesses from coal production and local environmental problems are quantified and added to earnings to demonstrate how each scenario impacts the citizens of Raleigh County.

Other externalities—including global environmental costs; forestry; tourism; property values; and gathering, hunting, and heritage—are not quantified in this report. However, quantification of these additional externalities would tend to favor the development of a wind farm over mountaintop removal mines."

The wind farm would provide nearly 50 times the tax revenue to the county that a mountaintop removal site would: $1.74 million per year from the wind farm's property tax revenues, compared to $36,000 per year for 17 years from the mountaintop removal operation. And the wind farm would provide at least 277 temporary construction jobs and 39 permanent jobs, while the jobs provided by the Massey surface mine would fluctuate in number from 79 to 248 and continue for only 17 years. The wind farm would also allow underground mining to continue.

The study also illustrated the root of the social and economic problems that have plagued coalfield communities ever since the coal industry moved in: the only beneficiaries of the mountaintop removal option would be Massey Energy and the two private land companies that own over 90 percent of the land and coal, whereas the wind farm would benefit the people—the residents of the entire county.

When the wind farm project organizers presented the study results to the Raleigh County Commission, they brought as visual aids two giant checks: one for $1.74 million per year forever from a wind farm, and one for $36,000 per year for 17 years from a mountaintop removal operation. The commission refused to take a position that would pit another energy source against coal. Commissioner John Aliff said, "To be quite honest, the coal industry has been good for the commission."

In the 2009 West Virginia legislative session, 41 of the state's 100 delegates co-sponsored a resolution in support of the wind project. This included four of the five delegates representing Raleigh County, where the wind farm is proposed. Again, coal lobbyist pressure and coal-friendly legislators ensured that the resolution died in committee.

However, local, national, and international support rose to new levels. As the threat to the mountain increased, community members lobbied for the wind resolution and joined with other national allies like Rainforest Action Network and Citizens Lead for Energy Action Now (CLEAN) in an e-mail campaign to West Virginia's governor, Joe Manchin, the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection (WVDEP), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the White House to halt mountaintop removal and valley fill permits on the mountain. The EPA has responded to the groups' concerns and is currently investigating operations on Coal River Mountain. In February 2009, NASA climate scientist James Hansen posted a short paper entitled "Tell President Obama about Coal River Mountain." He and actress/activist Daryl Hannah spoke at a June 23, 2009, rally for clean energy at the base of the mountain. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., headlined a December 7, 2009, rally where hundreds gathered to defend Coal River Mountain. Coal River Wind put a public service announcement on hulu.com, where it can be seen by millions, and collaborated with Appalachian Voices and Google Earth to create a virtual flyover tour and description of the Coal River Wind project. The virtual flyover was shown to delegates at the 2009 international climate conference in Copenhagen and is part of a series of Google Earth "tours" that illustrate climate change issues and solutions. The series includes only a couple of projects per continent. The online petition presently has over 17,000 signatures.

Citizen activists have also taken action to shut down the blasting where federal and state officials did not. For nine days in January 2010, two activists associated with the Mountain Justice movement and Climate Ground Zero campaign lived on platforms 60 feet high in trees near the blasting area. In spite of continuous air horn harassment, the two remained until voluntarily coming down in advance of an imminent winter storm. Activists engaged in dozens of other acts of nonviolent civil disobedience in 2009 and 2010 in the Coal River Valley, resulting in over 120 arrests. In addition to the tree-sit, seven actions took place on Coal River Mountain, ranging from simple trespass to activists chaining themselves to equipment.

The Next Steps in the Campaign

Surface mining has now begun on a small portion of Coal River Mountain. But there is still a chance to preserve the mountain for wind power. So far, the CRMW campaign's biggest problem has been the intransigence of Massey Energy. If the cloud created by the Upper Big Branch disaster has any silver lining, it is the national scrutiny brought to bear on mine safety and the belated return of government regulation. As we are finding out, loopholes in mining regulations and lax enforcement allowed Massey Energy to avoid strengthened oversight and inspection, which could have prevented that tragedy.

But federal regulators in the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA), and our elected politicians in Congress and the White House, allowed those loopholes to remain. For example, MSHA regulators ordered Massey to withdraw miners 61 times since the beginning of 2009. In 2009, more than 10 percent of MSHA's enforcement actions at this mine were for "unwarrantable failure" to comply with safety regulations—five times the national average of about 2 percent. In its preliminary briefing to President Obama, MSHA said, "In what is perhaps the most troubling statistic, in 2009, MSHA issued 48 withdrawal orders at the Upper Big Branch Mine for repeated significant and substantial violations that the mine operator either knew, or should have known, constituted a hazard. Massey failed to address these violations over and over again until a federal mine inspector ordered it done. The mine's rate for these kinds of violations is nearly 19 times the national rate." Massey CEO Don Blankenship tried to downplay the severity of the violations, saying that "violations are unfortunately a normal part of the mining process."

A buildup of methane, and possibly coal dust, stands out as a likely cause of the explosion, and the Wall Street Journal reported that the investigation will consider the effects of mountaintop removal blasting above the mine, which may have affected seals. Politicians such as Senator Robert C. Byrd have weighed in, and New York State Comptroller Thomas DiNapoli has called for Blankenship to resign.

In 2008, Massey Energy sought and received permission from the WVDEP to revise a permit on Coal River Mountain. The revision allows coal extraction on a small portion of the mountain without the need for a valley fill. However, the WVDEP did not consider the revision significant enough to allow public comment or a public hearing, and ignored the revision's effects on the remainder of the permit.

On April 1, 2010, the EPA delivered the best news yet for the campaign, issuing strict guidance for limiting water pollution from valley fills. The guidance focused on conductivity, a measure of dissolved pollutants in the water. The limit is so strict that EPA Secretary Lisa Jackson said, "You're talking about no, or very few, valley fills that are going to meet standards like this…. The intent here is to tell people what the science is telling us, which is it would be untrue to say that you can have numbers of valley fills, anything more than, say, very minimal valley fills, and not expect to see irreversible damage to stream health."

In addition to the impacts on stream chemistry, the guidelines consider environmental justice impacts to human communities. While they are still open for public comment, including comment from pro-coal politicians, and have not been finalized, the guidelines took effect immediately and apply to new permits and renewal permits. Along with the new guidelines, the EPA provided scientific documentation of the impacts mountaintop removal has on stream health, echoing a January 2010 study published in the journal Science by several renowned scientists that calls for a ban on mountaintop removal.

This news greatly improves the odds for Coal River Mountain's survival. Massey's original proposed permits included at least 18 valley fills that would fill a total of nine miles of headwater streams with mining waste laden with toxic heavy metals. If Massey were prohibited from filling the valleys, the scale of surface mining would be drastically reduced, preserving most of the mountain for a wind farm. The new requirements could lead Massey and the land companies to renegotiate their contracts, preserving the surface for a profitable wind farm while still allowing underground mining.

While citizens find encouragement in the EPA's new guidance, they also recognize the fact that mountaintop removal is still allowed and that a new administration could rescind this guidance. To make curtailment of mountaintop removal last, CRMW and other citizen groups are still pushing the Clean Water Protection Act (CWPA) in the U.S. House of Representatives and the Appalachia Restoration Act (ARA) in the Senate, which would curtail mountaintop removal.. The CWPA presently has 170 cosponsors and the ARA has 11. This progress is largely due to citizen lobby days sponsored by the Alliance for Appalachia, a 13-group regional coalition of which Coal River Mountain Watch is a core member. The Alliance conducts an annual lobby week, providing training and congressional meetings for approximately 200 citizens, and several mini-lobby events throughout the year. The Alliance also arranges meetings with government agencies, such as the EPA and the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.

Appalachian Transition

We still need your help to ensure that the changes taking place through EPA regulation stick. Anyone can take action and sign our petition at [www.coalriverwind.org](http://www.coalriverwind.org). Citizens all over the country can ask the EPA to deny any valley fill permits on Coal River Mountain that may be submitted, and everyone can contact their U.S. representatives and senators and ask them to support the Clean Water Protection Act and the Appalachia Restoration Act.

Coalfield communities need options for employment and livelihood beyond coal. The focus should be on giving them a choice and providing measures and incentives to support the development of those choices. It is time to turn our eyes toward Appalachia as an engine of transition and a model of sustainability, rather than a source of sorrow. If that means that the rest of the country has to pay a higher price for electricity due to a strengthening of oversight and enforcement of coal mine regulations, and if it means having more of our tax dollars go toward supporting economic transition in the coalfields, then for the sake of the miners and the future of Central Appalachian communities, that is a price we should be willing and honored to pay.

Eventually, more likely sooner than the rosy estimates of the coal industry, the coal is going to run out. According to the federal Energy Information Administration, coal production in Central Appalachia is expected to decline by nearly half within the next 10 years due to the depletion of the most accessible, lowest-cost coal seams. Another report by Downstream Strategies, titled "The Decline of Central Appalachian Coal and the Need for Economic Diversification," notes that "should substantial declines occur as projected, coal‐producing counties will face significant losses in employment and tax revenue, and state governments will collect fewer taxes from the coal industry." Without a strong focus on supporting economic transition in Central Appalachia, local economies will rapidly decline along with coal production.

Because of this, the report suggests that "state policymakers across the Central Appalachian region should…take the necessary steps to ensure that new jobs and sources of revenue will be available in the counties likely to experience the greatest impact from the decline. While there are numerous options available, the development of the region's renewable energy resources and a strong focus on energy efficiency offer immediate and significant opportunities to begin diversifying the economy."

The decisions we make now in the region will determine whether we make the best use of those renewable resources or squander the opportunity, whether we provide for long-term sustainability for communities or ravage them, and whether we preserve a planet that can support our civilization or plummet headlong into climate catastrophe. Coal River Mountain still stands as a majestic, tangible symbol of these clear choices, but it requires the decision of more citizens to make that phone call, write that letter, make that donation, and turn off that light in order to remain standing.

#### Appalachia is key to a global transition

**Flaccavento 10** - Founder of Appalachian Sustainable Development (ASD) and SCxALE, Inc [[Anthony Flaccavento](http://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/user/4896), “The Transition of Appalachia,” Solutions Journal, Volume 1 | Issue 4 | Page 34-44 | Aug 2010, pg. http://tinyurl.com/39kwh4h

Thirdly, the approach of the “environmental movement”, while helping to mitigate some of the worst abuses, has created its own form of estrangement: preservation rather than sustainable livelihoods. Largely urban and suburban environmentalists have focused on protection of the ecosystem from human degradation, often alienating farmers, loggers, fisherman and rural communities for whom “the environment” represents their livelihood, or a substantial part of it. As Wendell Berry has pointed out, this focus on protecting parts of the environment from people instead of developing the means to live within the ecosystem stems from the same hyper-specialized mindset that created many ecological and social problems in the first place.

Fortunately there is a different culture and mindset emerging in Appalachia and the nation, one that seeks to restore connections between farm and table, rural and urban; that recognizes that consumption choices have consequences for which we must begin to take responsibility; that “responsible consumption”, though essential, is inadequate without civic and political engagement; and that diverse, relatively self-reliant regional economies will do much less harm to other places and other people while making our own communities more just, resilient, perhaps even more satisfying in the years ahead.

Appalachia can and must play a pivotal role in this global economic and social transformation, both for the sake of its own people and because of its critical national role in energy and environmental choices. If a region known primarily for coal mining, tobacco farming and clear cut logging can come to exemplify sustainable development, it will be difficult to ignore.

#### Global collapse and extinction coming – We must establish a model for sustainability.

**Gowdy 07** - Professor of Economics @ Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute [John Gowdy, “Avoiding Self-Organized Extinction: Toward a Co-Evolutionary Economics of Sustainability,” Red Orbit, April 26, 2007, pg. http://tinyurl.com/apnknbt

A current line of research addressing the question of sustainability is analyzing in detail the history of entire cultures. The study of whole societies is, of course, a long- established tradition in anthropology. Especially influential today in cultural resource-institutional evolution is the pioneering work of Leslie White (1949) and Julian Steward (1955). Archaeological data and historical documents can provide the centuries-long time scales needed to examine the conditions for sustainability or collapse. Particularly revealing are studies of the long-term consequences of substituting technology for increasing resource scarcity (Erickson and Gowdy 2000; Tainter 1988). A striking fact is the sheer number of post-hunter-gatherer cultures that followed the pattern of overshoot and collapse. These include all the major Mesopotamian civilizations, the Mayans, the Anasazi of the US southwest, and the Indus valley. They all experienced a period of rapid resource use, rapid population growth then a relatively sudden economic, social and biological collapse (Diamond 2005).

Many cultures exploited their environments to a point at which they were so vulnerable they were unable to maintain the cultures they had so painstakingly established (Tainter 2000). Probably the best-known example is Easter Island. Over the course of about 500 years Polynesian settlers so eroded the resource base that the peak population of about 10,000 people was reduced to a few hundred living in a state of con\stant warfare and deprivation (Bahn and Flenley 1992; Erickson and Gowdy 2000; van Tilberg 1994). The burning question in the Easter Island case is why the population could not correctly assess their situation and change their socially destructive behaviour. It is a very small island – from the highest vantage point it is possible to see the whole island – and the destruction caused by deforestation should have been obvious. A similar pattern of overshoot and collapse also occurred on the islands of Mangaia (Kirch et al. 1992), Mangareva, Pitcairn and Henderson (Diamond 1997).

Some past societies, like Easter Island, have moved rapidly along the overshoot-and-collapse curve. Others took much longer to make the transition from a stable state to instability and collapse. But some post-hunter-gatherer societies managed to avoid the trap altogether. One society that apparently escaped the fate of so many others is the South Pacific island culture of Tikopia. Archaeological data indicate that Tikopia was headed down and had rapid population growth – but somehow managed to achieve a stable existence. Archaeological and ethnographic evidence indicates that the South Pacific Island of Tikopia is one of only a few cases of a successful transition from nonsustainability to sustainability (Erickson and Gowdy 2000). The island was settled about 3,000 BP and the first inhabitants quickly transformed the landscape through forest clearing and slash and burn agriculture. Many species of native birds were hunted to extinction and it appeared that the island was headed down the same overshoot and collapse path as in Easter Island. But somehow the people of Tikopia were apparently able to assess the precarious situation they were in and take corrective measures to prevent collapse. Sometime around AD 1700 archaeological evidence shows that pigs and dogs were eliminated from the island (Kirch and Yen 1982:353). Slash and burn agriculture was replaced with a ‘complex system of fruit and nut trees forming an upper canopy, with aroids, yams, and other shade tolerant crops under these.’ Some varieties of fish that once formed a significant portion of the diet were no longer eaten and from the ethnographic record considered tapu. The Tikopians also adopted a variety of customs to insure sustainable resource use and zero population growth (Firth 1967).

Something fairly unique about Tikopia allowed this culture to overcome institutional sunk costs and move to a sustainable way of living. This had something to do with the interaction between the characteristics of the resource base and the selection mechanisms for institutional change and institutional lock-in. The critical question then, in addressing the environmental and social stability of human cultures, is how disparate patterns of individual behaviour are selected and propagated by specific cultures. Rewards and punishments are used in human cultures to pass on traits that may be culturally desirable in the short run but may be disastrous in the end. In the cases of social collapse, sustainable patterns of behaviour are filtered out by cultural selection mechanisms and unsustainable patterns are reinforced. Understanding how this process works is critical to formulating effective sustainable social and environmental policies.

THE SUSTAINABttITY OF GLOBAL CAPITALISM: A CAUTIOUSLY PESSIMISTIC VIEW

The word collapse is widely used to describe the fall of past civilizations (Diamond 2005; Tainter 1988) but the demise of most of these societies was not sudden or final. Remnant populations survived and they were usually able to migrate to other areas, sometimes without a dramatic decline in material well-being. But past societies collapsed local ecosystems and now humans are in danger collapsing global systems. Still it would be foolish to predict the imminent collapse of global capitalism. Such predictions have been made many times before and yet the system rolls on apparently unaffected by any of the potential calamities listed above. Yet if we ask not ‘when’ but ‘whether’ the current world system will collapse, the answer would seem to be a clear ‘yes.’ That answer comes not only from an examination of the current consensus on twenty-first century scenarios on climate change, fossil fuel exhaustion and the diffusion of Weapons of Mass Destruction technology, but also on a growing body of research on past societies that have exhibited the same general pattern as our own.

So what can be done, if anything, to make the radical changes needed to avoid social collapse? Are current suggestions for sustainability policies feasible? The answer has to be a cautious ‘no’. But there is a glimmer of hope if the neo-liberal worldview driving public policy catches up with contemporary economic theory.

Sustainability and incremental policies – A well established theory in economics is the theory of the second best (Lipsey and Lancaster 1956). Basically this theorem states that if the conditions for efficiency are violated in several markets, correcting the conditions in one market alone will likely move the economy further away from an efficient solution. Applied to sustainability it means that changing one thing alone will not move us closer to sustainability and may move us further away. For example, greatly improving energy efficiency would have the effect of reducing demand and lowering energy prices, so that more energy would be used (this is the rebound or Jevons effect).

Sustainable consumption – It is argued above that, because of demonstration effects and habituation, higher incomes do not make people happier. However, just because economic growth does not make us happier this does not mean that stopping growth will not affect our happiness. Many of us have become habituated to a steady stream of new products. Like any addiction we need more and more of the fix just to keep us in the same place. Moving to no-growth or steady state economy requires policies to address the psychological dependence on consumption being fostered by the global marketplace. A first step would be to strictly control advertising designed to foster a culture of consumption.

Sustainability and the illusion of the steady state- In the current context of globalization and economic ‘rationalization’, for one country to slow or stop economic growth would amount to unilateral disarmament. When economic growth slows, so does capital formation, meaning that a nongrowing country’s capital stock would quickly become outdated and non-competitive. Neither should the link between military power and economic growth be ignored. The world is now a single socio-economic system and as long as nations compete with each other for markets and military power it may not be desirable for one country or even one large region to move to a steady state economy. Added to this is the growth imperative of empires, including contemporary Western capitalism. When past empires ceased to grow, a variety of related destructive forces came into play.

Do cultures have free will? A dominant pattern of cultural evolution since the advent of agriculture is overshoot and collapse. Cultures seem to become locked into patterns of behaviour that were successful in early stages of development but dysfunctional in later stages. Over time cultures build up a complex superstructure of material capital, learned patterns of behaviour, and ethical systems. ‘Sunk costs’ include not only capital and technology but also social systems of beliefs justifying the established way of doing things. These social systems reinforce the power elites that invariably control complex societies. Those who have the most to lose by dramatic changes have the power to reward those who accept the status quo and punish those who do not.

Those few cultures, such as Tikopia, that were able to change course did so because they were apparently able to modify behavioural incentives to reward sustainable behaviour. Two kinds of societies that were able to do this are egalitarian societies with small populations that worked by bottom up consensus and top-down hierarchical societies like Tokugawa, Japan that could impose sustainability by decree (Diamond 2005). Neither of these models is feasible in today’s global market economy of competing nations.

These concluding comments may seem pessimistic but the history of the collapse of past societies – and the mounting evidence of our own unsustainability-strongly suggests that piecemeal change will not be enough. It is better to face the future realistically from where we are rather than to pretend that limited measures within a businesses-usual framework will get us through the population and resource bottleneck of the current century.

#### A recent study by 22 scientists concurs. It improves on previous models and concludes that we are causing rapid and irreversible critical transitions

**Barnosky et al 12** - Professor of Integrative Biology @ UC Berkeley [Dr. Anthony D. Barnosky (Professor of Paleontology @ UC Berkeley), Dr. Elizabeth A. Hadly (Professor of Biology @ Stanford University, Jordi Bascompte (Integrative Ecology Group @ Estación Biológica de Doñana) Eric L. Berlow (TRU NORTH Labs), James H. Brown (Professor of Biology @ The University of New Mexico), Mikael Fortelius (Professor of Geosciences and Geography @ University of Helsinki), Wayne M. Getz (Professor of Environmental Science@ UC Berkeley), John Harte (Professor of Environmental Science@ UC Berkeley) Alan Hastings (Professor of Environmental Science@ UC Davis) Pablo A. Marquet (Departamento de Ecología, Facultad de Ciencias Biológicas, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile) Neo D. Martinez (Pacific Ecoinformatics and Computational Ecology Lab) Arne Mooers (Professor of Biological Sciences @ Simon Fraser University, Peter Roopnarine (California Academy of Sciences), Geerat Vermeij (Professor of Geology @ UC Davis) John W. Williams (Professor of Geography @ University of Wisconsin), Rosemary Gillespie (Professor of Environmental Science@ UC Berkeley) Justin Kitzes (Professor of Environmental Science@ UC Berkeley), Charles Marshall (Department of Integrative Biology, UC Berkeley), Nicholas Matzke(Department of Integrative Biology, UC Berkeley), David P. Mindell (Department of Biophysics and Biochemistry @ UC San Francisco), Eloy Revilla (Department of Conservation Biology, Estación Biológica de Doñana) & Adam B. Smith (Center for Conservation and Sustainable Development, Missouri Botanical Garden) “Approaching a state shift in Earth’s biosphere,” Nature 486, (07 June 2012) pg. 52–58

Humans now dominate Earth, changing it in ways that threaten its ability to sustain us and other species[1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref1), [2](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref2), [3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3). This realization has led to a growing interest in forecasting biological responses on all scales from local to global[4](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref4), [5](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref5), [6](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref6), [7](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref7).

However, most biological forecasting now depends on projecting recent trends into the future assuming various environmental pressures[5](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref5), or on using species distribution models to predict how climatic changes may alter presently observed geographic ranges[8](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref8), [9](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref9). Present work recognizes that relying solely on such approaches will be insufficient to characterize fully the range of likely biological changes in the future, especially because complex interactions, feedbacks and their hard-to-predict effects are not taken into account[6](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref6), [8](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref8), [9](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref9), [10](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref10), [11](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref11).

Particularly important are recent demonstrations that ‘critical transitions’ caused by threshold effects are likely[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12). Critical transitions lead to state shifts, which abruptly override trends and produce unanticipated biotic effects. Although most previous work on threshold-induced state shifts has been theoretical or concerned with critical transitions in localized ecological systems over short time spans[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [13](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref13), [14](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref14), planetary-scale critical transitions that operate over centuries or millennia have also been postulated[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), [12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [15](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref15), [16](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref16), [17](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref17), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18). Here we summarize evidence that such planetary-scale critical transitions have occurred previously in the biosphere, albeit rarely, and that humans are now forcing another such transition, with the potential to transform Earth rapidly and irreversibly into a state unknown in human experience.

Two conclusions emerge. First, to minimize biological surprises that would adversely impact humanity, it is essential to improve biological forecasting by anticipating critical transitions that can emerge on a planetary scale and understanding how such global forcings cause local changes. Second, as was also concluded in previous work, to prevent a global-scale state shift, or at least to guide it as best we can, it will be necessary to address the root causes of human-driven global change and to improve our management of biodiversity and ecosystem services[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), [15](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref15), [16](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref16), [17](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref17), [19](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref19).

It is now well documented that biological systems on many scales can shift rapidly from an existing state to a radically different state[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12). Biological ‘states’ are neither steady nor in equilibrium; rather, they are characterized by a defined range of deviations from a mean condition over a prescribed period of time. The shift from one state to another can be caused by either a ‘threshold’ or ‘sledgehammer’ effect. State shifts resulting from threshold effects can be difficult to anticipate, because the critical threshold is reached as incremental changes accumulate and the threshold value generally is not known in advance. By contrast, a state shift caused by a sledgehammer effect—for example the clearing of a forest using a bulldozer—comes as no surprise. In both cases, the state shift is relatively abrupt and leads to new mean conditions outside the range of fluctuation evident in the previous state.

Threshold-induced state shifts, or critical transitions, can result from ‘fold bifurcations’ and can show hysteresis[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12). The net effect is that once a critical transition occurs, it is extremely difficult or even impossible for the system to return to its previous state. Critical transitions can also result from more complex bifurcations, which have a different character from fold bifurcations but which also lead to irreversible changes[20](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref20).

Recent theoretical work suggests that state shifts due to fold bifurcations are probably preceded by general phenomena that can be characterized mathematically: a deceleration in recovery from perturbations (‘critical slowing down’), an increase in variance in the pattern of within-state fluctuations, an increase in autocorrelation between fluctuations, an increase in asymmetry of fluctuations and rapid back-and-forth shifts (‘flickering’) between states[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [14](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref14), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18). These phenomena can theoretically be assessed within any temporally and spatially bounded system. Although such assessment is not yet straightforward[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18), [20](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref20), critical transitions and in some cases their warning signs have become evident in diverse biological investigations[21](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref21), for example in assessing the dynamics of disease outbreaks[22](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref22), [23](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref23), populations[14](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref14) and lake ecosystems[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [13](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref13). Impending state shifts can also sometimes be determined by parameterizing relatively simple models[20](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref20), [21](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref21).

In the context of forecasting biological change, the realization that critical transitions and state shifts can occur on the global scale[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), [12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [15](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref15), [16](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref16), [17](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref17), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18), as well as on smaller scales, is of great importance. One key question is how to recognize a global-scale state shift. Another is whether global-scale state shifts are the cumulative result of many smaller-scale events that originate in local systems or instead require global-level forcings that emerge on the planetary scale and then percolate downwards to cause changes in local systems. Examining past global-scale state shifts provides useful insights into both of these issues.

Earth’s biosphere has undergone state shifts in the past, over various (usually very long) timescales, and therefore can do so in the future ([Box 1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#bx1)). One of the fastest planetary state shifts, and the most recent, was the transition from the last glacial into the present interglacial condition[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18), which occurred over millennia[24](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref24). Glacial conditions had prevailed for ~100,000 yr. Then, within ~3,300 yr, punctuated by episodes of abrupt, decadal-scale climatic oscillations, full interglacial conditions were attained. Most of the biotic change—which included extinctions, altered diversity patterns and new community compositions—occurred within a period of 1,600 yr beginning ~12,900 yr ago. The ensuing interglacial state that we live in now has prevailed for the past ~11,000 yr.

Occurring on longer timescales are events such as at least four of the ‘Big Five’ mass extinctions[25](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref25), each of which represents a critical transition that spanned several tens of thousands to 2,000,000 yr and changed the course of life’s evolution with respect to what had been normal for the previous tens of millions of years. Planetary state shifts can also substantially increase biodiversity, as occurred for example at the ‘Cambrian explosion’[26](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref26), but such transitions require tens of millions of years, timescales that are not meaningful for forecasting biological changes that may occur over the next few human generations ([Box 1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#bx1)).

Despite their different timescales, past critical transitions occur very quickly relative to their bracketing states: for the examples discussed here, the transitions took less than ~5% of the time the previous state had lasted ([Box 1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#bx1)). The biotic hallmark for each state change was, during the critical transition, pronounced change in global, regional and local assemblages of species. Previously dominant species diminished or went extinct, new consumers became important both locally and globally, formerly rare organisms proliferated, food webs were modified, geographic ranges reconfigured and resulted in new biological communities, and evolution was initiated in new directions. For example, at the Cambrian explosion large, mobile predators became part of the food chain for the first time. Following the K/T extinction, mammalian herbivores replaced large archosaur herbivores. And at the last glacial–interglacial transition, megafaunal biomass switched from being dominated by many species to being dominated by Homo sapiens and our domesticated species[27](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref27).

All of the global-scale state shifts noted above coincided with global-scale forcings that modified the atmosphere, oceans and climate ([Box 1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#bx1)). These examples suggest that past global-scale state shifts required global-scale forcings, which in turn initiated lower-level state changes that local controls do not override. Thus, critical aspects of biological forecasting are to understand whether present global forcings are of a magnitude sufficient to trigger a global-scale critical transition, and to ascertain the extent of lower-level state changes that these global forcings have already caused or are likely to cause.

Global-scale forcing mechanisms today are human population growth with attendant resource consumption[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), habitat transformation and fragmentation[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), energy production and consumption[28](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref28), [29](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref29), and climate change[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18). All of these far exceed, in both rate and magnitude, the forcings evident at the most recent global-scale state shift, the last glacial–interglacial transition ([Box 1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#bx1)), which is a particularly relevant benchmark for comparison given that the two global-scale forcings at that time—climate change and human population growth[27](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref27), [30](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref30)—are also primary forcings today. During the last glacial–interglacial transition, however, these were probably separate, yet coincidental, forcings. Today conditions are very different because global-scale forcings including (but not limited to) climate change have emerged as a direct result of human activities.

#### Only wind solves – It provides a viable alternative to mountaintop removal and pave the way for sustainable development

**Haegele 08** [Greg Haegele, “An Alternative to Mountaintop Removal Coal Mining in West Virginia,” Tree Hugger, July 18, 2008, pg. http://www.treehugger.com/renewable-energy/an-alternative-to-mountaintop-removal-coal-mining-in-west-virginia.html

Lorelei Scarbro lives in a place most of us would envy - on 10 acres of lush, green southern West Virginia mountain, where deer, turkeys and other wildlife make regular appearances.

Now Scarbro's land is threatened by mountaintop removal coal mining. If you're not familiar with this practice – it is the most destructive kind of coal mining out there. Companies literally blow up the tops of mountains to reach the coal beneath - leaving a barren, rocky landscape. The companies fill nearby valleys and streams with the waste rock - ruining entire watersheds and frequently the water supplies of nearby communities as well. (You can learn more about this type of mining by visiting our [coal website](http://www.sierraclub.org/mtr).)In Scarbro's case, Marfork Coal Company, a subsidiary of Massey Energy, has applied for four permits (two have been approved) to mine 6,600 acres of Coal River Mountain, including land bordering Scarbro's. The permits would also allow for the construction of at least 19 valley fills, which means mining waste would be desposited in nearly every headwater stream originating from the mountain.

Scarbro and a coalition of environmental and community organizations aren't taking this news from Massey lying down. [Coal River Mountain Watch](http://www.crmw.net) (CRMW) and these groups have an alternative they say the state coal association claims coal opponents never have: [The Coal River Wind Project.](http://www.coalriverwind.org)

The Coal River Wind Project is a proposed 440-Megawatt wind farm consisting of 220 wind turbines to be constructed on the land slated to be blown away for coal mining, and the coalition has done extensive studies on the area to show just how viable an alternative this wind farm would be. According to the project's study, the wind farm would:

• Create 440 megawatts of power, enough to power more than 150,000 homes in West Virginia. • Create more than 200 local employment opportunities during the construction phase, and 40-50 permanent operations and maintenance jobs during the life of the wind farm. • Provide Raleigh County and West Virginia with a source of clean, renewable energy, as well as a sustained tax income that could be used for the construction of new schools for the county. • Allow for concurrent uses of the mountain that could revitalize the local economy and bring sustainable economic development for the surrounding communities.

Adding that the jobs would be longer lasting than the proposed mining jobs, Scarbro said, "This is the viable alternative."

For Rory McIlmoil, who works for CRMW with Scarbro, if the mountain must be developed to meet the growing energy needs of the state, then why wouldn't you choose the option that's less destructive, much cleaner, and creates a more viable economy in the long run?

"This is definitely a 'much lesser of two evils' in terms of environmental impact," said McIlmoil. "The strip-mines will lead to the clearing of over 6,000 acres of native hardwood forest, whereas our maximum estimate for the clearing that would be related to the wind farm is 200 acres."

McIlmoil can get even more detailed in the numbers for turbine siting, just ask him. He's also tallied the wildlife impact.

"And when you talk about the birds and the bats, the loss of 6,600 acres of natural habitat is likely to have a much greater impact on populations than the wind farm would, especially considering the fact that a 10,000-plus acre mountaintop removal site (Kayford Mountain) sits to the north of Coal River Mountain and another 8,000-plus acre site sit to the southwest (the Twilight Mining Complex). So Coal River Mountain is basically a habitat buffer zone between two existing mountaintop removal sites."

Scarbro and other Coal River Wind Project supporters have met with officials from just about every city, state and private agency and organization you can imagine to garner support for the plan - and many like the idea. They also have nationwide support from a number of organizations (including the Sierra Club national and local groups).

McIlmoil added the wind farm isn't just an idea - they even have developers highly interested in it.

Now McIlmoil, Scarbro and the coalition want to meet with Massey Energy and the company that owns the Coal River Mountain property to see if this wind farm plan can become a reality.

"We're hoping (the meeting) happens soon so we can sit down and try to work out possibilities here," said Scarbro.

The coalition behind this wind project has covered all the bases - even answering the question about whether post mountaintop removal land can be used for wind turbines: Scarbro said studies show that post-mountaintop removal land is too unstable for turbines, and trying to stabilize the land would make the building costs exceptionally higher. And because the mountain would be significantly lower than before, building turbines makes no sense due to the dramatic loss of wind power potential.

McIlmoil and Scarbro need all the support they can get, so we urge you to [check out their website](http://www.coalriverwind.org) and help them build a wind farm instead of watching yet another Appalachian mountain get blown away.

"This is not just about green jobs, even though we desperately need those,"said Scarbro. "It's not just about renewable energy, even though we desperately need that. This is about saving the mountain and keeping it intact. We want to save vegetation, wildlife, and continue the Appalachian way of life - hunting, fishing, gathering herbs, and more. These are things we can't do if Massey comes in and destroys everything in its path."

### Adv – Progressivism

#### Advantage two: progressivism

**Tea party influence is increasing**

**AP, 2/8** [“Reports of tea party’s demise are exaggerated”, http://www.vindy.com/news/2013/feb/08/reports-of-tea-partys-demise-are-exagger/?newswatch]

Once again, punditocracy reports of the tea party’s demise are premature.

If you want evidence, look at Sen. John Cornyn’s joining with fellow Texas Republican Sen. Ted Cruz in voting against Secretary of State John Kerry’s confirmation, South Carolina Rep. Lindsey Graham’s vehement battle against the Obama administration on the Benghazi deaths and Defense secretary nominee Chuck Hagel, or Georgia Sen. Saxby Chambliss’ retirement.

In the House, Speaker John Boehner seems to have retaken temporary control of his fractious Republican caucus from the tea party activists who forced the 2011 battle against raising the legal limit on the debt.

But most have solidified their hold on their seats. And the tea party continues to cast a shadow over many Senate Republicans, where its success in GOP primaries during the last two elections probably cost the party its chance to regain the majority.

Aggressive effort

With Republicans needing to gain six seats next year to win Senate control, the tea party’s aggressive effort to expand its Senate membership has prompted onetime George W. Bush political “architect” Karl Rove to form yet another fundraising group to steer big bucks to mainstream alternatives.

Already, the tea party folks have driven Chambliss into retirement by threatening to oppose him because he worked with Democrats to craft a bipartisan deficit reduction package.

The resulting GOP candidate will almost certainly be more conservative than Chambliss, though it’s too soon to know if that will jeopardize the GOP’s hold on the seat. First in: Rep. Paul Broun, President Obama’s most fervent critic in Georgia’s delegation.

In generally moderate Iowa, tea party activists are among those behind outspoken GOP conservative Rep. Steve King’s bid to replace retiring liberal Democrat Tom Harkin. But a new Public Policy Polling poll shows the more mainstream Rep. Tom Latham would be a stronger candidate against potential Democratic standard bearers.

Meanwhile, both Cornyn and Graham face re-election next year in states with highly conservative Republican parties, prompting them to act and vote with one eye on potential Republican opponents.

So too is the Senate’s GOP leader, Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, in a state where tea party activists helped elect Sen. Rand Paul in 2010 over a mainstream candidate. Though McConnell opposed Paul then, he has since embraced him and recently appeared jointly with him.

Graham looks in excellent shape for re-election, and polls show his rightward swerve over the last two years has diminished the likelihood of a tea party challenger.

But recent PPP polling, a Democratic-leaning firm with an excellent 2012 record, indicates both McConnell and Cornyn have potential weakness as they approach their re-election years.

The Texas poll showed voters gave Cornyn a slightly negative job performance, within the margin of error, but led several potential rivals with from 45 percent to 48 percent of the vote. Despite criticism from some tea party groups, it’s too early to know if the new No. 2 Senate Republican will face a significant challenge from his right.

But Cruz’s victory in last year’s Senate election underscored again how conservative the Texas GOP is.

Kentucky’s senator

In Kentucky, PPP said McConnell’s 55-37 negative job rating made him the country’s most unpopular senator. But because Kentucky tilts Republican in federal elections, he polled 46 percent to 48 percent against potential Democratic rivals and led by from 4 (against actress Ashley Judd) to 11 points.

Neither he nor Graham seems currently vulnerable in a primary, thanks to their more aggressive anti-Obama positions, such as Graham’s laser-like focus on the death of four Americans last September in Benghazi, Libya, and his sharp questioning last week of Hagel.

Interestingly, stories about Rove’s new organization seem to have fired up his conservative targets, ensuring more internal GOP warfare. But Rove was more successful in raising money in 2012 than in producing the desired results, and his targets are unlikely to be deterred.

#### Wind incentives will short-circuit the conservative rebellion against Obama and empower progressives

**Elk 09** - Union organizer and labor journalist who writes for Harper's Magazine, the American Prospect, the Huffington Post and In These Times. He has appeared as a comme­ntator on CNN, Fox News, and NPR. [[Mike Elk](http://www.ourfuture.org/users/new-4013), “Stop The Teabaggers, Give Them Green Jobs: Lessons From the Coalfields of West Virginia,” Campaign for America’s Future, August 27, 2009 - 4:40pm ET, pg. http://tinyurl.com/mq62jx

West Virginia shows us how we could easily win over this key segment of society, working class whites, with a New Deal-style industrial policy. Currently, [81,000](http://www.ourfuture.org/blog-entry/2009083525/a%20href=) in the United States working as coal miners.

On election night 2000, the biggest shocker for me wasn't Florida, but that West Virginia had voted for a conservative Republican presidential candidate for the first time in nearly 70 years.

For decades, West Virginia, with one of the highest rates of unionization in the country, regularly voted for progressive candidates, even being one of only nine other states in 1988 to vote for the epitome of a Massachusetts liberal - Michael Dukakis. To know the story of West Virginia is to know why the progressive movement is failing to win over white working class voters. Because of their primary concern: jobs.

Driving around West Virginia as a young union organizer with Marshall University labor historian Gordon Simmons, I quickly learned that underneath its beautiful mountain lay a history of exploitation, broken promises and economic degradation. Despite being "the Saudi Arabia of Coal," West Virginia is engaged in a yearly neck and neck race with Mississippi for being [the poorest state in the country](http://money.cnn.com/2007/08/28/real_estate/wealthiest_state).

As a result of coal mining, West Virginia has a cancer rate that is [nearly 70% higher than the national average](http://www.grist.org/article/green-theatre-taking-off-broadway-off-coal/). Every day more than [three million pounds of ammonium nitrate explosives (a highly carcinogenic substance)](http://itsgettinghotinhere.org/2009/02/23/from-west-virginia-to-obama-stop-mountaintop-removal) are exploded in mountaintop removal. This is the equivalent of a Hiroshima bomb worth of explosives being dropped on West Virginia every month. Over [100 billion gallons of toxic sludge](http://news.newamericamedia.org/news/view_article.html?article_id=1bbe4b5f450365c1084c27172d95db6d) are contained in poorly regulated, coal sludge reservoirs from mountaintop mining contaminating local water supplies, leading to mind boggling rates of cancer.

A fact that is equally startling as the destruction of the mountains, is the destruction of jobs in West Virginia. Coal mining jobs have gone [down by 75%](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/daryl-hannah/why-i-was-arrested-in-coa_b_224531.html) with the shift to the highly mechanized, mountaintop removal. In the early 1950’s, there were [145,000 miners employed](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/daryl-hannah/why-i-was-arrested-in-coa_b_224531.html) in West Virginia; in 2004 there were just over [16,000 miners employed](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/daryl-hannah/why-i-was-arrested-in-coa_b_224531.html). While employment has decreased in coal mining, [coal production has actually increased dramatically](http://www.ilovemountains.org/resources/#mtreconomy) as a result of the environmentally destructive procedures of mountaintop removal.

Clearly, West Virginians would prefer jobs that didn't destroy their communities and health, but are forced into coal mining because few other jobs exist. As a result, West Virginians desperately fear losing these jobs. The fossil fuel lobby exploits this fear to kill investments in clean energy jobs. The industry uses events like the upcoming free concert called ["Friends of America"](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dave-cooper/rocker-ted-nugent-to-emce_b_258696.html) hosted by Sean Hannity, which has press materials implicitly attacking clean energy legislation, hysterically warning, [“we must keep these [coal mining] jobs from being regulated out of existence](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dave-cooper/rocker-ted-nugent-to-emce_b_258696.html)”.

These industries always say that regulating them will cost jobs - even when it is proven that jobs will be created. This is because they have created a situation where people are hanging on by a thread, paid so little that they desperately cling to what they have and other people are starving in front of them.

The ability of these AstroTurf groups to mobilize people fearing the loss of their jobs led to the dramatic weakening of the Waxman-Markey climate bill and quite possibly health care. We often make fun of teabaggers showing up at town halls, but fail to realize that the reason they are motivated to rebel against change because all change has ever meant to them is job loss and the destruction of their communities.

West Virginia shows us how we could easily win over these key segments of society with a New Deal-style industrial policy. Racial tensions and prejudices in West Virginia have long been as severe as in other places in the South. However as a result of heavy unionization, West Virginians learned to look beyond race to take on the true oppressors - big corporations. West Virginians also remembered the importance that the New Deal played in transforming their lives. It gave them jobs, electricity, roads, and helped to bring the region into the 20th Century.

As result, West Virginians stuck firmly with FDR’s Democratic Party and voted consistently for Democrats for the following five decades. While the once solid Democratic South became the Republican South after passage of Civil Rights legislation, West Virginia -- despite its strong racial tensions -- remained an island of Democratic support, until 2000.

In the 1990s, the generations that had survived the Great Depression, the New Deal, and World War Two began to die out, and a Democratic president forged the job-killing NAFTA trade deal. Support for Democrats in West Virginia suddenly began to weaken. All the new generation knew was rising unemployment and broken promises at the hand of liberal politicians promising them jobs, but instead taking what jobs they had away.

The failure of the progressive movement to advocate for the improvement of the economic conditions of the white working class created a vacuum that allowed right-wing demagoguery to flourish. West Virginians turned to conservative Republicans who promised to protect their country, their most cherished recreational activity - hunting, and the churches at the center of their communities because no one else seemed to be protecting their communities.

In 2000, Republicans in West Virginia portrayed environmentalist Al Gore, who played a key role in passing NAFTA, as a job-killer who would destroy West Virginia's coal-based economy. Ever since then, West Virginia has voted consistently Republican in presidential elections, while at the same time continuing to elect Democratic Senators and Congressman who promised to protect coal producing jobs and fight to keep manufacturing in West Virginia.

In response to the shifting winds against progressives in West Virginia, local activists have called for New Deal-style projects like the [Coal River Wind Project](http://www.coalriverwind.org/) which seeks to create a sustainable, green economy not based on the boom and bust cycles of coal. Recent studies show that Appalachia will be mined out of coal in [20-30 years](http://www.coalriverwind.org). In contrast the wind energy is sustainable industry that is here to stay and could create far more jobs.

It’s estimated that only a $30 billion investment through Senator Sherrod Brown's IMPACT Act [would create 2.5 million jobs](http://www.ourfuture.org/blog-entry/2009083525/%3Chttp://www.ourfuture.org/blog-entry/2009072808/building-clean-energy-economy-impact-act%3E) - many of them high, paying manufacturing jobs. The IMPACT Act could help replace the nearly [2 million manufacturing jobs that have been lost](http://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.nr0.htm) since the recession began in December 2007.

A New Deal-style industrial policy is crucial as well for winning over the politically elusive, white working class. The New Deal was successful in creating a lasting political coalition because it created lasting political constituencies. As a result of the wide range of people it helped: Social Security for seniors, labor unions for workers, subsidies for small farmers, and jobs for the unemployed, these groups were brought into the Democratic party and stayed there for nearly forty years.

However, a recent poll of non-college educated white males, showed that [only 35% approved of Obama’s performance](http://www.ourfuture.org/blog-entry/2009083525/%3Chttp://politics.theatlantic.com/2009/08/where_obama_is_losing_ground.php%3E) . Some liberal commentators like Ron Brownstein of the Atlantic Magazine claim that [we don't need the white working class](http://www.ourfuture.org/blog-entry/2009083525/%3Chttp://politics.theatlantic.com/2009/08/where_obama_is_losing_ground.php%3E) to build a lasting progressive movement. Some argue that we shouldn't waste our effort to reach out to them because we can build majority built simply based upon minorities, women, college educated professionals, and youth.

To that I simply say is if the progressive movement wants to have a lasting impact we should include everyone as the New Deal coalition did. By advocating for New Deal - style industrial policies we can bring in the white working class as part of our movement, help with efforts at racial healing, and could create a lasting political movement that could last for another forty years. Such tactics were successful in the past in bringing the white working class into the party and will be successful in the future.

If the progressive movement put as much energy into advocating for a New Deal-style industrial policy as they have attacking and debunking the teabaggers, there wouldn't be teabaggers at these town hall meetings.

Yes, New Deal-style industrial policy will bring people into the progressive movement. But the real reason we why we need an industrial policy is similar to the one we had under the New Deal: it was the right thing to do. The New Deal helped people. made their lives better, created the middle class, set up regulations that protected people ,and created the solid foundations for the economic revival and amazing growth that followed.

It's time that we again as a progressive movement, embrace an aggressive New Deal-style industrial policy. It's important to just to our growth as a movement, but to our economic growth, our efforts at racial reconciliation, and our betterment as a nation. These are the lessons that West Virginia has to offer us.

#### The tea party mindset of ideological rigidity has infused Republican politics – its grip has tightened since the election

Kornacki 12/27 (Steve, senior political writer, has been published in several newspapers, including the NYT and WSJ. “Triumph of the Tea Party mindset.” Salon, December 27, 2012. <http://www.salon.com/2012/12/27/triumph_of_the_tea_party_mindset/>.)

Two stories that might seem to contradict each other ran in the New York Times this week. One declared the Tea Party movement “significantly weakened” in the wake of November’s elections and on its way to becoming “just another political faction.” The other noted that Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell might be concerned about a potential 2014 primary challenge – enough to filibuster any fiscal cliff plan that President Obama and Democrats draw up, no matter how modest.

The problem, of course, is that the Tea Party’s power resides in Republican primaries, where conservative purists wreaked considerable havoc in the past two election cycles. This included, famously, McConnell’s home state of Kentucky, where the minority leader’s protégé was crushed in a 2010 GOP Senate primary by Rand Paul. Now McConnell has to worry about suffering a similar fate in two years, especially if his handling of the current fiscal impasse evokes cries of treason from the base. How could this square with claims of fading clout for the Tea Party?

Actually, there’s a way. It just depends on how you understand the Tea Party.

Defined as a literal movement, with an active membership pressing a specific set of demands, the Tea Party absolutely is in decline. Tea Party events have become less crowded, less visible and less relevant to the national political conversation. As the Times story notes, the movement’s die-hards are embracing increasingly niche pet issues. The term “Tea Party” has come to feel very 2010.

But if you think of the Tea Party less as a movement and more as a mindset, it’s as strong and relevant as ever. As I wrote back in ’10, the Tea Party essentially gave a name to a phenomenon we’ve seen before in American politics – fierce, over-the-top resentment of and resistance to Democratic presidents by the right. It happened when Bill Clinton was president, it happened when Lyndon Johnson was president, it happened when John F. Kennedy was president. When a Democrat claims the White House, conservatives invariably convince themselves that he is a dangerous radical intent on destroying the country they know and love and mobilize to thwart him.

The twist in the Obama-era is that some of the conservative backlash has been directed inward. This is because the right needed a way to explain how a far-left anti-American ideologue like Obama could have won 53 percent of the popular vote and 365 electoral votes in 2008. What they settled on was an indictment of George W. Bush’s big government conservatism; the idea, basically, was that Bush had given their movement a bad name with his big spending and massive deficits, angering the masses and rendering them vulnerable to Obama’s deceptive charms. And the problem hadn’t just been Bush – it had been every Republican in office who’d abided his expansion of government, his deals with Democrats, his Wall Street bailout and all the rest.

Thus did the Tea Party movement represent a two-front war – one a conventional one against the Democratic president, and the other a new one against any “impure” Republicans. Besides a far-right ideology, the trait shared by most of the Tea Party candidates who have won high-profile primaries these past few years has been distance from what is perceived as the GOP establishment. Whether they identify with the Tea Party or not, conservative leaders, activists and voters have placed a real premium on ideological rigidity and outsider status; there’s no bigger sin than going to Washington and giving ground, even just an inch, to the Democrats.

It’s hard to look around right now and not conclude that the Republican Party is still largely in the grip of this mindset. Yes, since the election, there have been GOP voices – some of them genuinely surprising – speaking out in favor of giving President Obama the income tax rate hike that he’s looking for. But the January 1 deadline is now just days after and, crucially, there’s been no action. And it’s looking more and more like there won’t be.

This is the case even though Obama apparently indicated that he’d settle for only raising rates on income over $400,000, that he’d dial back his new revenue request by $400 billion, that he’d be OK with not extending the payroll tax holiday, and that he’d sign on a form of chained-CPI for Social Security benefits. Oh, and despite the fact that if nothing happens, all of the Bush tax rates will expire on January 1, with no changes triggered for Social Security or any safety net program. Despite all of this, Republicans in the House still said no to Obama last week, and then wouldn’t even allow Speaker John Boehner to bring a bill to the floor to simply extend the Bush rates for income under $1 million. And McConnell and the Senate GOP still seem unwilling to go any farther than their House counterparts.

This is exactly what the Tea Party mindset produces. For one thing, the House GOP conference (and to a lesser extent, the Senate GOP) contains no shortage of Tea Party true-believers – men and women who embody the spirit of the movement and have no qualms about going to war with party leadership if they believe their principles are at risk. And they are backed by a conservative information complex – media outlets and personalities, commentators, activists and interest group leaders – ready to cast them as heroes in any fight with “the establishment.”

All of this is more than enough to instill real fear in Republicans on Capitol Hill who aren’t true believers – but who do like their jobs and want to keep them. McConnell falls in this category. Boehner evidently does too. And so do many, many other Republicans who don’t want to look back and regret the day they cast a vote that ended their careers. The fact that the Tea Party, as a literal entity, seems to be dying is actually a sign of how successful it’s been. Its spirit now rules the Republican Party.

#### Tea Party influence erodes liberal internationalism, causes protectionism, and risks strikes on Iran

**Mead 11** – Professor of Foreign Affairs and the Humanities @ Bard College [Walter Russell Mead, “The Tea Party and American Foreign Policy: What Populism Means for Globalism,” Foreign Affairs, March/April 2011Volume 9o • Number 2

Any increase in Jacksonian political strength makes a military response to the Iranian nuclear program more likely. Although the public’s reaction to the progress of North Korea’s nuclear program has been relatively mild, recent polls show that up to 64 percent of the U.S. public favors military strikes to end the Iranian nuclear program. Deep public concerns over oil and Israel, combined with memories of the 1979 Iranian hostage crisis among older Americans, put Iran’s nuclear program in Jacksonians’ cross hairs. Polls show that more than 50 percent of the public believes the United States should defend Israel against Iran—even if Israel sets off hostilities by launching the first strike. Many U.S. presidents have been dragged into war reluctantly by aroused public opinion; to the degree that Congress and the public are influenced by Jacksonian ideas, a president who allows Iran to get nuclear weapons without using military action to try to prevent it would face political trouble. (Future presidents should, however, take care. Military engagements undertakenwithout a clear strategy for victory can backfire disastrously. Lyndon Johnson committed himself to war in Southeast Asia because he believed, probably correctly, that Jacksonian fury at a communist victory in Vietnam would undermine his domestic goals. The story did not end well.)

On other issues, Paulites and Palinites are united in their dislike for liberal internationalism —the attempt to conduct international relations through multilateral institutions under an ever-tightening web of international laws and treaties. From climate change to the International Criminal Court to the treatment of enemy combatants captured in unconventional conflicts, both wings of the Tea Party reject liberal internationalist ideas and will continue to do so. The U.S. Senate, in which each state is allotted two senators regardless of the state’s population, heavily favors the less populated states, where Jacksonian sentiment is often strongest. The United States is unlikely to ratify many new treaties written in the spirit of liberal internationalism for some time to come.

The new era in U.S. politics could see foreign policy elites struggling to receive a hearing for their ideas from a skeptical public. “The Council on Foreign Relations,” the pundit Beck said in January 2010, “was a progressive idea of, let’s take media and eggheads and figure out what the idea is, what the solution is, then teach it to the media, and they’ll let the masses know what should be done.” Tea Partiers intend to be vigilant to insure that elites with what the movement calls their “one-world government” ideas and bureaucratic agendas of class privilege do not dominate foreign policy debates. The United States may return to a time when prominent political leaders found it helpful to avoid too public an association with institutions and ideas perceived as distant from, and even hostile to, the interests and values of Jacksonian America.

Concern about China has been growing for some time in American opinion, and the Jacksonian surge makes it more likely that the simmering anger and resentment will come to a boil. Free trade is an issue that has historically divided populists in the United States (agrarians have tended to like it; manufacturing workers have not); even though Jacksonians like to buy cheap goods at Walmart, common sense largely leads them to believe that the first job of trade negotiators ought to be to preserve U.S. jobs rather than embrace visionary “win-win” global schemes. Pg. 42-43

#### Iran war causes extinction

Giribets 12 [Miguel Giribets, “If US Attacks Iran, Human Survival May Be at Risk (Part III),” Argen Press, 10 January 2012, pg. http://watchingamerica.com/News/141596/if-us-attacks-iran-human-survival-may-be-at-risk-part-iii/]

The dangers of global war are clear. On one side, hundreds of Russian technicians would die working on Iranian nuclear facilities, to which Russia could not stand idly by. According to Chossudovsky: "Were Iran to be the object of a "pre-emptive" aerial attack by allied forces, the entire region, from the Eastern Mediterranean to China's Western frontier with Afghanistan and Pakistan, would flare up, leading us potentially into a World War III scenario. The war would also extend into Lebanon and Syria. It is highly unlikely that the bombings, if they were to be implemented, would be circumscribed to Iran's nuclear facilities as claimed by US-NATO official statements. What is more probable is an all out air attack on both military and civilian infrastructure, transport systems, factories, public buildings.

"The issue of radioactive fallout and contamination, while casually dismissed by US-NATO military analysts, would be devastating, potentially affecting a large area of the broader Middle East (including Israel) and Central Asian region." As an example, a few years ago Burma moved its capital Rangoon to Pyinmana, because it believed that the effects of nuclear radiation caused by an attack on Iran would be less there. Radiation and nuclear winter could have uncontrollable consequences for humans. Put plainly, the survival of the human race would be put at stake if the U.S. attacks Iran.

#### Protectionism causes extinction

PANZNER 08 Faculty – New York Institute of Finance. Specializes in Global Capital Markets. MA Columbia [Michael J. Panzner, Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse, Revised and Updated Edition [Paperback], p. 137-138]

Continuing calls for curbs on the flow of finance and trade will inspire the United States and other nations to spew forth protectionist legislation like the notorious Smoot-Hawley bill. Introduced at the start of the Great Depression, it triggered a series of tit-for-tat economic responses, which many commentators believe helped turn a serious economic downturn into a prolonged and devastating global disaster. But if history is any guide, those lessons will have been long forgotten during the next collapse. Eventually, fed by a mood of desperation and growing public anger restrictions on trade, finance, investment, and immigration will almost certainly intensify.

Authorities and ordinary citizens will likely scrutinize the cross—border movement of Americans and outsiders alike, and lawmakers may even call for a general crackdown on nonessential travel. Meanwhile, many nations will make transporting or sending funds to other countries exceedingly difficult. As desperate officials try to limit the fallout from decades of ill-conceived, corrupt and reckless policies, they will introduce controls on foreign exchange. Foreign individuals and companies seeking to acquire certain American infrastructure assets, or trying to buy property and other assets on the cheap thanks to a rapidly depreciating dollar, will be stymied by limits on investment by noncitizens. Those efforts will cause spasms to ripple across economies and markets, disrupting global payment, settlement, and clearing mechanisms. All of this will, of course, continue to undermine business confidence and consumer spending.

In a world of lockouts and lockdowns, any link that transmits systemic financial pressures across markets through arbitrage or portfolio-based risk management, or that allows diseases to be easily spread from one country to the next by tourists and wildlife, or that otherwise facilitates unwelcome exchanges of any kind will be viewed with suspicion and dealt with accordingly.

The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity be acquired from less-than-friendly nations, whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to fullscale military encounters, often with minimal provocation.

In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level.

Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part. may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation" between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point.

More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

#### Progressives must be in control to promote an inclusive world order that integrates rising powers and fosters multilateral cooperation

Kupchan, ’12 - Charles Kupchan, Professor of International Affairs at Georgetown, Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations [“Grand Strategy: The Four Pillars of the Future”. Democracy, Issue #23, Winter 2012. http://tinyurl.com/ccd6y5n]

Making Room for the Rising Rest

As emerging powers continue their ascent, dampening rivalries and fashioning a new rules-based order will require strategic vision and purposeful U.S. engagement. Rising powers, whether democratic or not, will not obediently take their place within the liberal order erected during the West’s watch. The rising rest differ with the West on fundamental issues, including the sources of domestic legitimacy, when and under what conditions violations of sovereignty are warranted, and the relationship between states and markets. Accordingly, they will want to recast the international system in ways that advantage their interests and ideological preferences.

Russia and China do not equate legitimacy with Western standards of liberal democracy, and both powers were critical of NATO’s intervention in Libya and vetoed a UN resolution condemning Syria’s crackdown on protestors. For decades, Turkey aligned itself with Europe and the United States, but Ankara is now charting its own path, flexing its muscles in the Middle East, and adopting a confrontational stance toward Israel. India is ostensibly America’s new strategic partner, but it votes with the United States in the UN General Assembly only about 25 percent of the time.

The task ahead for the West is not corralling emerging powers into the existing international order—a futile undertaking—but instead working together with them to arrive at a new set of global rules. Because progressives appreciate the merits of pluralism, they are well suited to help negotiate a bargain among states that embrace quite diverse conceptions of domestic and international governance. As Adam Mount and I argued in these pages in 2009 (“The Autonomy Rule,” Issue #12), equating legitimacy with responsible rule rather than only liberal democracy, fashioning a more equitable brand of capitalism, and strengthening the capacity and authority of regional institutions are the types of compromises around which a new order is likely to take shape. Progressives understand that pluralism and tolerance help resolve some of the most difficult challenges of domestic governance, and that these values can do the same for international politics.

Progressives should apply the logic of constructive engagement not just to those powers headed for the top ranks. As civil societies in many parts of the Arab world clamor for political freedom and economic opportunity, Washington should encourage and assist democratic movements even as it acknowledges that incremental liberalization is preferable to chaotic change and that more democracy in the Middle East may well mean more political Islam. Progressives should also support patient engagement when dealing with dangerous or unfriendly regimes. The reset with Russia has led to military cooperation on Afghanistan, diplomatic coordination on Iran, and a new pact limiting the size of nuclear arsenals. Obama’s outreach to Cuba has admittedly proceeded in fits and starts, but Havana has introduced a program of economic privatization and released dozens of political prisoners. Washington has been cautiously improving ties with Myanmar as its government relaxes its grip on power. And even if engagement with the likes of Iran and North Korea ultimately leads nowhere, Washington’s prior diplomatic efforts would help provide a political foundation for a more hard-line approach should that prove necessary.

Among Republicans, the ascent of illiberal powers promises to reinforce neoconservative and isolationist tendencies. Neoconservatives recoil at the prospect of working with autocracies like China, Russia, and Saudi Arabia; such regimes, they argue, should be brought to heel and transformed into liberal polities, not treated as stakeholders. Engagement is even less justifiable when dealing with pariahs like Iran and North Korea.

While perhaps emotionally satisfying, the neoconservative preference for regime change is a recipe for self-defeating adventurism; America’s recent forays into nation-building have produced scant benefits at enormous costs. The assumption that illiberal regimes yield only when forced into submission also flies in the face of history. The most notable geopolitical breakthroughs of the twentieth century came not through coercion, but bold diplomacy—Anwar Sadat and Menachem Begin in Jerusalem, Richard Nixon and Mao Zedong in Beijing, Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev in Reykjavik. Moreover, stabilizing the global economy, ensuring energy supplies, combating nuclear proliferation and terrorism—these and many other international challenges require working with, not isolating, non-democracies.

The Republican Party’s neo-isolationist wing, rather than seeking to turn illiberal regimes into democracies, would simply shun them. The Tea Party would want to avoid the domestic exertions and diplomatic constraints entailed in engaging rising powers not created in America’s image. Such isolation would, however, not only mean missing opportunities for pragmatic cooperation, but also ceding too much ground to non-democratic regimes. Even as the United States works with illiberal powers to forge a new rules-based order, it must actively promote democracy and liberal values globally. Pluralism, tolerance, and the power of persuasion are as important to advancing liberty and equality abroad as they are at home—something that progressives fully understand.

#### Failure to satisfy rising powers causes nuclear war

Kugler 06 – Professor of world politics @ Claremont Graduate University [Jacek Kugler (Consultant to the IMF, the World Bank, State Department, and Department of Defense. His publications on the causes and consequences of war use formal modeling and empirical analysis), “The Asian Ascent: Opportunity for Peace or Precondition for War?,” [International Studies Perspectives](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/journal/118516737/home), [Volume 7, Issue 1](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/journal/118606983/issue), Pages 36-42

Given the fundamental importance of demographic and economic forces in establishing the roster of states capable of fundamentally affecting the structure of world politics, whatever resolution there might be to the Global War on Terror will not alter the major challenge faced by the United States. In the long run, China’s demographic and hence economic power cannot be denied. By the same reasoning, the Middle East has no long-run demographic or economic power. The U.S. courts long-term peril by being obsessively distracted by short-term objectives. To ensure real peace, the U.S. would be much better advised to preserve strong links with the EU, maintain and improve cordial relations with Russia, and most importantly, open a sincere dialogue with India and China designed to maximize their support for the existing status quo. To be sure, positive, but limited, steps have been taken by the United States. American support for China’s entry into the World Trade Organization was important because it helps integrate China’s growing economy more fully into the capitalist world economy. Similar recognition for India, not to mention support for Indian membership on the United Nations Security Council, would also be beneficial. Because Taiwan and Korea have replaced the Cold War’s Berlin as focal points for potential Great Power conflict, finding an accommodation that meets the desires of the main parties with respect to them is central to the preservation of long-term peace. The economic, demographic, and political science research summarized above suggests that American foreign policy attention must center on China and India as the major future contenders for global leadership. Although China retains a political ideology inconsistent with democracy, there are good reasons to expect and thus to work toward change to a participatory system based on increasing prosperity (Feng 2003; Feng and Zak 2003). India is the largest democracy in the world, but like China it is still not a major partner of the Western world. While these relationships may develop and prosper on their own, the relative amount of attention paid to these rising giants compared with the Global War on Terror is simply insupportable.Neither convergence arguments nor power transition theory suggests that future Great Power war between Asia and the West is inevitable. The research described here offers evidence about probabilistic relationships between parity and status quo evaluations on the one hand, and war on the other. Thus, while China's overtaking of the U.S. may be relatively certain, the result of that overtaking is not. Power transition research supports claims that overtakings are dangerous when policy makers fail to accommodate them. A conflict between China or India and the United States as the Asian giants emerge from the shadows of underdevelopment is not inevitable. Rather, the political negotiations among contenders determine whether potential challengers can be made satisfied with the rules and norms governing world politics. If the declining dominant state is able to engineer a satisfactory compromise between the demands of the rising state and its own requirements (as Britain and the U.S. did when peacefully passing the mantle of international leadership), war is not expected. If the two sides remain intransigent, war is expected. It is clear that such a war in the twenty-first century would have a very high probabilityof involving nuclear weapons. A clear counter expectation can be drawn from classical nuclear deterrence arguments. They involve a fundamental assumption that as the costs of war increase, the probability of war decreases. Nuclear weapons are then alleged to alter calculations substantially because they raise the expected costs of war so high that war becomes unthinkable. According to this logic, a global war between a newly predominant China and a declining U.S. will never occur thanks to the pacifying influence of the balance of terror. A new Cold War is anticipated by this nuclear deterrence argument. Consistent with this theory, various scholars have advocated the proliferation of nuclear weapons as one method to prevent wars ([Intriligator and Brito 1981; Waltz 1981; Bueno de Mesquita and Riker 1982](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/cgi-bin/fulltext/118606987/main.html,ftx_abs#b5)). An odd paradox is raised by the fact that many world leaders accept nuclear deterrence claims, such as that about the stability of mutual assured destruction (MAD), while rejecting the logical concomitant that proliferation of nuclear weapons to more and more states is desirable. What follows logically has stubbornly resisted practical implementation. Thus, using some other logic, leaders of nuclear nations seem to agree that deterrence is stable under MAD but nevertheless also agree that nuclear proliferation must be prevented in order to preserve peace. If decision makers really believed MAD is stable, it is impossible to understand why they would oppose nuclear proliferation to Iran, thereby creating stable nuclear parity in the Middle East. This inconsistency was noted years ago by [Rosen (1977)](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/cgi-bin/fulltext/118606987/main.html,ftx_abs#b13), but subsequently conveniently overlooked. Theory and policy may frequently be at odds, but seldom when the costs of such logical inconsistency are so high. Power transition theorists are inherently suspicious of MAD arguments about nuclear stability because they essentially resurrect traditional balance of power arguments. Rather than focusing on conventional balance as a pacifying influence, nuclear deterrence proponents of MAD suggest that a nuclear balance will maintain the peace. Given a fortuitous absence of wars among nuclear states thus far, it is impossible to test arguments such as that about MAD. But what we can observe is not promising. It is not only policy makers who doubt the veracity of MAD when they deny the logical consequence of "beneficial" proliferation. Recent formal presentations of deterrence arguments strongly suggest that a preponderance of nuclear capabilities—specifically in the possession of satisfied states—is more amenable to peace than is MAD ([Zagare and Kilgour 2000](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/cgi-bin/fulltext/118606987/main.html,ftx_abs#b19)). Power transition theorists, informed by their own as well as by decades of demographic and economic research, strongly doubt that nuclear parity between the U.S. and a risen but dissatisfied China could preserve the peace. Conclusions It is entirely reasonable to anticipate that Asia will dominate world politics by the end of the century. The most important issue facing American decision makers is how to handle the anticipated overtaking. The research summarized here indicates that the one element of Asia's ascent that Western decision makers can manipulate is Asia's relative acceptance of the international system's existing norms and values. War is not an inevitable certainty. The opportunity for peace is at hand. If Western decision makers can persuade Chinese and Indian leaders through word and deed to join with the current global status quo, peace and prosperity should endure. If**,** on the other hand, China and India cannot be persuaded to join the existing structure of relations, then the chances for conflict increase around mid-century. The research summarized here suggests this is true even in the face of the enormous costs that reasonably would be anticipated from a nuclear war**.**

#### Only the plan solves - Obama must target Appalachia to encourage them to leave the Tea Party

**Eller 08** - Professor of history @ University of Kentucky [Ron Eller, “Obama's 'Appalachian Problem'? It's Not So Easy,” Daily Yonder, 05/16/2008, pg. http://tinyurl.com/5elfq7  
  
Popular stereotypes and misreading of Appalachian history have long provided a convenient excuse to ignore Appalachia or to justify public and private attempts to bring the region into the cultural mainstream. Thus, the argument is offered that Clinton's appeal in Appalachia should not be taken too seriously since mountain voters represent those "other whites" whose heritage has led them to be suspicious, pugnacious, and a little less civilized than the Anglo-Puritan whites of the Northeast.  
Sen. Barack Obama could not possibly succeed among these highly individualistic, uneducated, and unrefined mountain whites whose ancestors resisted slavery and Southern nationalism during the Civil War. This independent spirit, suggest the pundits, will lead the hillbillies to vote for Scotch-Irish Appalachian John McCain, born in Appalachian Mississippi.  
Such characterizations of Appalachia not only obscure the historical diversity of the region and project a static view of human culture but also ignore most of the recent scholarship on Appalachia that contradicts the idea of Appalachian "otherness" and attributes its history and economic problems to political struggles that have shaped the rest of the nation.  
Far from being the repository of Scotch-Irish culture, ignorance born of geographic isolation, or backwardness nurtured by anti-modernism, contemporary Appalachia is a much more diverse and historically complex place. Appalachian poverty, education, health care, and environmental problems are much more a product of the history of development patterns in the region than of any common Appalachian culture, and Appalachian voting patterns are much more a reflection of fundamental class, racial, and gender differences in America than they are of any ethnic heritage within the region.  
Racism does continue to influence the voting patterns of some whites in Appalachia, and the lower levels of formal education in the region do continue to fuel bigotry and prejudice, not only toward blacks but toward Muslims and ethnic immigrants as well. But prejudice is by no means unique to whites in Appalachia, and it is often a reflection of more deeply seated insecurities that are rooted in gender and class.  
For blue collar voters in Appalachia, economic concerns, not Appalachian identity, shaped their decisions at the polls. Job insecurity, rising food and gas prices, and uncertain access to health care and education turned Appalachian voters toward the more working class message of Hillary Clinton, especially among women who occupy the center of the modern mountain economy. Perhaps because of the race issue, Obama conceded West Virginia to Clinton, who was able to use the local Democratic political machinery to her advantage.  
Unlike John Kennedy, who came to Appalachia during the 1960 primary season to confront anti-Catholicism directly, the Obama strategy of side-stepping the race issue (so recently raised by the Reverend Wright controversy) left the playing field to the opposition. Kennedy quickly learned that economic distress was of greater concern to mountain voters than religious difference, and by appealing to those concerns, he carried the state.  
Obama has yet to learn this basic truth about Appalachia. The cultural conservatism that has often fueled a misunderstanding of the region's history and problems is grounded in economic conditions, hopes, and values that reflect those of the larger society. Appalachia is only the "other America" if we want to ignore the contradictions and challenges of our time. We do so at our own peril.

#### An Obama jobs project is key – His timidity emboldens Republicans and gives them media legitimacy

[**Skocpol**](http://www.politico.com/arena/bio/theda_skocpol.html) **10** - Professor of Government and Sociology @ Harvard University [Theda Skocpol, “Obama and the Democrats Need a Jobs and Taxes Argument for National Recovery,” Politico’s The Arena, Sep. 20, 2010, pg. http://www.politico.com/arena/perm/Theda\_Skocpol\_E8BD76F7-7169-44FC-B779-3993550FC1E6.html

Polls and all kinds of measures of the concerns of most ordinary Americans show very little concern about the federal deficit and spending. Americans want jobs and economic growth - and that is what they want D.C. to focus on. The tea Party and its sympathizers are colorful for TV, but they are only about a quarter of Americans at the most. Activists are about 12-15%. Their biggest impact is on frightened Republican officeholders and nominees, but in policy terms they stand for nothing clear besides deep generational and racial anxieties.

Rank-and-file tea partiers are not even opposed to the core of federal spending for defense, Medicare, and Social Security - many of them are living on these programs and believe they are entitled to them after lifetimes of work (as indeed they are)! Tea partiers may think the federal government is spending a lot on other things, but that is just ignorance (deliberately fed by Fox misinformation campaigns). Many of the grass roots tea partiers are going to be plenty surprised after Republicans take over again and hand out more tax breaks and subsidies to millionaires while gutting Social Security and Medicare.  
The timidity of Democrats and the White House is killing them. All we have heard for months are articles about what they are "considering" or fighting about. Pollsters who have told them they should avoid nationalizing this election have given disastrously bad advice. Events in a country determine whether an election is nationalized or not - and the country is in a deep economic crisis that cuts to the heart of home equity and employment, the core of family security. Obama and the Democrats have long ago needed a national message - about jobs and national recovery, what they are fighting to do, and what right-wingers are obstructing.

Instead, they have tried to engage in preemptive concessions (Orszag, Emanuel) and run and hide - which only emboldens crazy right-wingers all the more - and leaves the media free to focus on colorful extremists and side issues.

History will record this as one of the most tragic moments for Democrats - and above all for this White House. In a severe and ongoing national economic crisis, for the President to hide and cower and dither is amazing. Obama needs new advisors, and he needs to find a backbone. He needs a national narrative, not just fingerpoint at scary tea partiers.   
We are facing a turning point for effective democratic governance in the USA - and the tax cut decisions are really all that matters right now. The wealthy interests trying to knock out this White House understand that. Incredibly, Democrats seem to be on the verge of caving - or punting, which is the same - on tax cut extensions for millionaires and billionaires - giveaways of public resources that will ensure deep cuts  in Social Security and all kinds of vital endeavors going forward.

Massive victories for rabidly pro-rich and government-hating Republicans will lead to years more of deadlock and further deterioration of governmental capacities - just as the United States faces intense competition on the international stage. It is a recipe for permanent national decline.   
If Obama dithers through this, he will be a one term president - and much of what he seems already to have accomplished will be undone, including Affordable Care, which will not be repealed but will be eviscerated. He should be making it clear that he wants a vote now on tax cut extensions for the vast majority of Americans - because this will help recovery and do something for hard-hit millions - and at the same time he should tell the House and Senate that if they want to vote separately on tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires, they can do it, but if that passes, he will veto it.

Democrats still have the ability to bring two separate bills to the floor - and they should do it. Obama should not accept the cuts for millionaires and billionaires and he should tell all Americans why, loud and clear. This is both popular and the right thing to do for the country. If Obama made this declaration up front, it would support those in the House and Senate who are willing to oppose tax giveaways for the super-rich.   
Democrats on taxes are trying to use a national interest issue as an ambiguous political wedge, trying to pretend to favor tax cuts for the middle class up until the November election, while quietly preparing to extend tax cuts for the rich, too (or in effect allow that by turning things over to Republicans). It will not work. It never works for a political party to seem to be playing politics rather than focusing on America's needs. And if they extend millionaire/billionaire tax cuts even temporarily, this is a sure sign that they have betrayed the national interest and do not deserve to hold office. That is hard thing for someone with my political sympathies to say, but it is the truth.   
If Democrats are blown out in this election after this kind of cowardly performance, Americans who want a stronger nation need to create an alternative vehicle for a muscular liberalism focused on national greatness - with a prime focus on jobs for all Americans as the first goal. Tea Partiers have shown that they can dismantle and redirect the Republican Party. Meanwhile, soliciters for the DNC, DSCC, and DCCC keep asking for money for - what? Beyond "reelect us," they never say. They fudge - while offering a constant media spectacle of indecision and retreat.

### Solvency

#### USDA special category solves development and modeling

**MACED 10** [Mountain Association for Community Economic Development, “Economic Transition in Central Appalachia: Ideas for the Appalachian Regional Development Initiative” April 8, 2010

2. Expand local renewable energy production

Central Appalachia’s historic reliance on coal has also meant little progress in diversifying into renewable energy sources. However, the region possesses real potential for renewable energy from a number of sources. Wind power is possible at a distributed scale and at utility scale on ridgetops in Central Appalachia. At least 3,830 MW of wind potential exists on private land in West Virginia.8 The best wind potential in all of Kentucky is in the counties in the southeastern coalfields.9 A recent National Renewable Energy Laboratory study indicated that at the higher hub heights of modern wind turbines, the wind potential in the region’s states is greater than was often previously assumed.10

Leaders of Kentuckians For The Commonwealth in the towns of Benham and Lynch have launched the Benham and Lynch Community Energy Initiative to address the need for renewable power and energy efficiency in these small former company towns in the heart of the coalfields. The Initiative has partnered with the Massachusetts Institute o Technology and MACED to conduct initial research on the potential of local wind generation. The nearby mountains have the highest wind potential in all of Kentucky. The communities are also pursuing energy efficiency projects, as the town of Benham uses the highest amount of electricity per residential customer of any utility in the state.11 See more about the Benham and Lynch proposal in the appendix. In southern West Virginia, the leaders of Coal River Wind have developed a model and a proposal for a 328 MW wind farm on Coal River Mountain as an alternative to mountaintop removal mining in the same location.12 An economic impact analysis suggests greater long-term jobs and economic impact from the wind farm than from mining--particularly if local production of turbine components can be incorporated.13

Community-scale woody biomass for energy is also a significant opportunity. The ARC estimates that the total annual biomass resources for the Appalachian states at over 108 million tons.14 Solar potential exists in Central Appalachia particularly in distributed applications for solar thermal and solar PV. Small and micro-hydroelectric power has a significant potential. The Idaho National Laboratory has estimated 518 MWa of potential in Kentucky and 484 MWa in West Virginia.15

The region is also a potential site for the manufacturing of components for solar, wind and other energy sources. An ARC report found that counties in Appalachia as a whole currently possess almost 200,000 jobs in parts manufacturing industries that could be modified to produce renewable energy components. Those jobs represent 3,000 manufacturers within the region with the potential to be retooled to become part of the renewable energy industry. 28,000 of those jobs are in counties currently categorized as economically distressed or at risk of becoming distressed.16 Also, non-profits like¶ MACED and the Kentucky Highlands Investment Corporation (KHIC) are providing training, financing and technical assistance for renewable energy entrepreneurs in solar, biofuels and other areas such as through KHIC’s recent Energy Boot Camp program.17

Recommendations:

Provide grant funding and financing for community-scale renewable energy demonstrations in the areas of wind, solar, low-impact woody biomass and low impact hydro.

Community-scale renewable energy production that is locally owned has the potential to maximize the economic benefits of energy production for local communities. In addition, community-scale projects can be high-efficiency, reusing waste heat in the case of biomass projects and minimizing line loss. A program to create local demonstrations across the region, including at public buildings and institutions like hospitals, in small town main street areas, and at a county scale could go a long way in leveraging new beneficial energy activity. A proposal from East Kentucky Biodiesel to create a pilot pyrolysis/gasification facility utilizing biomass grown on former surface mine land, explained on page 19, has the potential to be the first stage of a regional network of community-scale bioenergy production. A wide range of USDA and DOE programs promoting renewable energy and energy efficiency projects could be set aside or repurposed for efforts of this kind.

Expand USDA Rural Utility Service (RUS) financing for renewable energy production (and energy efficiency) to utilities located in Central Appalachia.

President Obama’s 2011 budget proposes additional funds to USDA “to help transition fossil fuel-dependent utilities to renewable energy.”18 Central Appalachian utilities are among the most fossil fuel dependent in the country, reliant on coal in aging power plants for well over 90 percent of their electricity. A 2009 study by the Ochs Center for Metropolitan Studies showed that East Kentucky Power Cooperative, a major provider of electricity in the Appalachian Kentucky, could create 8,750 jobs and inject $1.7 billion into the regional economy through a program of energy efficiency investments and expanded renewable energy capacity.19 A combination of grants and loans through RUS (and similar USDA programs like REDLG) to Central Appalachian utilities could help them begin to make this transition and create new jobs and economic opportunities in the process. One potential step forward in this direction is the new Rural Energy Savings Program legislation filed by in the House by Rep. James Clyburn and in the Senate by Sen. Jeff Merkley.20 It would create a pool of RUS funds for rural electric coops to create on-bill financing programs.

Create a special category and set-aside of USDA Rural Energy for America (REAP) grants and guaranteed loans for renewable energy and energy efficiency projects in Central Appalachia.

The USDA REAP program provides valuable, much needed funds for small businesses, farmers and others to pursue renewable energy projects and energy efficiency improvements. Even with expanded funding for this program, however, valuable projects including ones MACED has helped support are being denied funding. Those projects that are receiving REAP grants are creating important models in the region. Organizations like MACED and the Natural Capital Investment Fund in West Virginia can also provide financing to small businesses that can be packaged with REAP grants, which will help leverage federal dollars and increase impact.

Fund community-based wind monitoring efforts to help communities assess the feasibility of wind power.

Wind power along the ridgelines of Central Appalachia is widely recognized as an important regional opportunity. However, there is a lack of site-specific data for communities to understand the actual opportunities for wind development in the region, holding back project development. A program of grants and equipment loans could help communities better assess these opportunities. Support the establishment of renewable energy component manufacturing in the coalfields of Central Appalachia.

Manufacturing of component parts for the wind and solar supply chain offer some of the greatest economic opportunities for the nation as a whole. However, the lack of manufacturing infrastructure in the heart of Central Appalachia threatens to leave the region out of these opportunities. An initiative should be developed with the goal of establishing at least one significant supply chain manufacturer in the coalfields of Central Appalachia. This initiative should include research to identify if there are any opportunities with existing manufacturers in the region. If no such opportunities arise, the focus should be on the feasibility of establishing a new facility. New approaches like the Cleveland model of community-based, worker-owned companies in new green industries are promising ways to create jobs that help low-income workers accrue long-term wealth.21 A project to establish a model facility in a coalfield community could go a long way in creating good opportunities and promoting a needed discussion about the region’s energy future.

Provide competitive grants for school-based renewable energy projects eligible for schools in Central Appalachia.

A number of potential models exist for renewable energy production at the school level, which can save schools money and create important opportunities for student and community learning. The model of Russell High School in Greenup County, Kentucky, is one example of the use of wind and solar demonstrations to save money and provide training for vocational students. Opportunities also exist to fund fuels-for-schools initiatives (like those in the western U. S.) utilizing local, sustainably harvested woody biomass as a building heat source. Support workforce training and enterprise development in the new renewable energy industries.

MACED and other entrepreneurial development organizations like the Natural Capital Investment Fund have worked with a number of entrepreneurs in the region interested in starting new companies in wind, biomass, or solar. These folks lack access to training that would deepen their understanding of the technologies, and often lack the business management skills to make their fledgling enterprises survive. In Kentucky, for example, state tax credits were recently enacted for renewable energy installations like solar panels, but included requirements that installers be North American Board of Certified Energy Practitioner (NABCEP) certified. Only a handful of people in the entirestate have that certification. Federal workforce and business services dollars could support targeted scholarship, training, and technical assistance programs that could help more renewable energy businesses get off the ground. As mentioned in the energy efficiency section above, the Department of Labor green jobs training programs such as the Green Capacity Building program, Energy Training Partnerships, and Pathways out of Poverty program could be allocated for such investments. Pg. 8-11

#### Disads non unique – wind PTC extension

GARDNER 12 – 31 – 12 Roll Call Staff [Lauren Gardner, Obama Suggests Cliff Deal Would Extend Wind Tax Credit, <http://www.rollcall.com/news/obama_suggests_cliff_deal_would_extend_wind_tax_credit-220432-1.html?pos=hln>]

President Barack Obama signaled Monday that a tentative agreement to avoid the fiscal cliff would also extend a critical tax benefit for the wind power industry.

In an apparent reference to the production tax credit set to expire at midnight, the president said White House and Senate negotiators have agreed to “extend tax credits for clean-energy companies that are creating jobs and reducing our dependence on foreign oil.”

The extension would be part of an agreement to avoid automatic across-the-board income tax increases slated to kick in on New Year’s Day if Congress does not act. The agreement would wrap in a package of tax credit extensions already approved by the Senate Finance Committee, including the production tax credit.

Obama said Monday afternoon that a fiscal cliff agreement between the White House and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., was close but had not been finalized. McConnell said later on the Senate floor that there had been agreement on tax issues but that other matters had not yet been resolved.

Preserving the tax credit would be a major triumph for the wind power industry. Congressional critics have argued that the industry is now mature enough to survive without the tax benefit. The industry has said the tax break remains critical, though even lobbyists for wind producers have proposed a phase-out over the next few years.

#### Central Appalachia is the key battleground – Federal investment in wind will facilitate a national political and economic transition

**Bailey 10** – Research and Policy Director @ Mountain Association for Community Economic Development [[Jason Bailey](http://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/user/4907), “Start Appalachian Transition through Green Jobs Investments,” Solutions Journal, Volume 1 | Issue 4 | Aug 2010, pg. http://tinyurl.com/9gxb8bm

Most communities around the world aren’t yet aware of how climate change will drastically impact their land, economy, and way of life. But the downsides of a fossil fuel–based economy are already well known in the coalfields of central Appalachia, a region including southern West Virginia, eastern Kentucky, southwest Virginia, and east Tennessee. Central Appalachia’s coal economy has severely altered the landscape and created communities made up of "haves and have-nots."1 But by creating jobs in ways that improve the land, air, and water, a green jobs strategy can set a new course for a needed economic transition.

Coal mining currently employs around 38,000 people in central Appalachia, and miners make good salaries. But due largely to mechanization, those jobs now make up only about 10 percent of employment in the coal counties, which suffer from high and persistent poverty.2 Most of the benefits of coal extraction have bypassed the region. While more than 20 billion tons of coal have been mined in central Appalachia over the last 100 years, the region contains 23 of the poorest 100 counties in the country, measured by median household income.3,4,5 There has been too little economic diversification beyond retail and social services in central Appalachia, and unemployed and discouraged workers make up a significant share of the working-age population.2 Decreasing coal reserves, the rising competitiveness of energy alternatives, and needed environmental and health restrictions will mean continued decline in central Appalachian coal production and employment over the next few decades.6,7

Green jobs are critical in central Appalachia for a number of reasons. First, an economy based on a different relationship to the land and to energy is essential to avoid the destruction from abusive mining practices that, if allowed to continue, would limit any long-term possibilities. Second, the region’s ancient mountains and diverse forests are among its main assets, and they present numerous income-generating opportunities that do not compromise the integrity of the land. And third, addressing the region’s existing environmental degradation presents immediate green job opportunities. That work is huge and labor intensive, and requires some of the skills and experience of the region’s existing workforce, including those who have worked in coal.

Public investment could advance a green jobs strategy, and the region’s transition could start today in five overlapping green jobs areas:

1. Increase Energy Efficiency in Homes, Buildings, and Businesses

Central Appalachia has high energy usage, related to a historic neglect of energy efficiency. Kentucky’s residential sector, for example, uses 24 percent more energy on average than the nation, and a recent Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) report projected that energy usage in Appalachia will grow at a rate 50 percent higher than the national rate between now and 2030.8,9 High energy usage and inattention to energy efficiency have been fed by low electricity prices from coal-fired power. But those prices are rising dramatically (up 40 percent in Kentucky in the last five years alone) and will increase further in future years.

High energy usage has a lot to do with substandard housing and lack of investment in the existing building infrastructure. More than 100,000 families in central Appalachia lack access to quality housing. Central Appalachian homes are three to four times more likely to be substandard in comparison to homes elsewhere in the nation. Approximately 25 percent of the housing stock consists of manufactured homes, most of which are highly inefficient, a share that rises to 40 percent in some counties.

A number of regional efforts are emerging to deal with these challenges, and they could be accelerated through greater federal financial support. Frontier Housing, a regional nonprofit, has developed a program to replace the estimated 300,000 highly inefficient mobile homes built before the 1976 HUD mobile home code with ENERGY STAR homes. The Mountain Association for Community Economic Development (MACED) is working with a number of rural electric co-ops in eastern Kentucky to create a pilot on-bill financing program for energy efficiency improvements that would be open to residents, commercial businesses, and institutions. And the Federation of Appalachian Housing Enterprises is working to double the number of highly energy efficient green homes built for low-income families through its member organizations. An ARC report found that a set of modeled energy efficiency policies in the region would save Appalachian consumers almost $10 billion annually on their energy bills by 2020 and create over 37,000 jobs.

2. Expand Local Renewable Energy Production

Central Appalachia’s historic reliance on coal has also meant little progress in diversifying into renewable energy sources. However, the region possesses real renewable energy potential. Wind power is possible at distributed and at utility scale, particularly on ridgetops in central Appalachia. With the higher hub heights of modern wind turbines, West Virginia has at least 2,772 megawatts (MW) of wind potential, and the best wind potential in Kentucky is in the counties in the southeastern coalfields.10,11

Community-scale energy from woody biomass is also a significant opportunity. The ARC estimates the total annual biomass resources for the Appalachian states at over 108 million tons.12 Solar potential exists in central Appalachia, particularly for distributed applications of solar thermal and solar photovoltaic (PV). Small, low-power hydro and micro-hydro are also an opportunity; the Idaho National Laboratory has estimated 518 MW of potential in Kentucky and 484 MW in West Virginia.13

Local efforts to develop renewable energy are emerging. Leaders of Kentuckians For The Commonwealth in the former company towns of Benham and Lynch have launched a local initiative to address the need for renewable energy and energy efficiency in the area. The nearby mountains have the greatest wind potential in all of Kentucky, and the rate of residential electricity usage in Benham is one of the highest in the state, in part due to poorly insulated housing stock.14 In southern West Virginia, the leaders of Coal River Wind developed a model and a proposal for a 328-MW wind farm on Coal River Mountain as an alternative to mountaintop removal mining in the same location.15 An economic impact analysis suggests that the wind farm would create more long-term jobs and have a greater economic impact than coal mining—particularly if local production of turbine components could be incorporated.16

Federal investment could support existing efforts and create new models. The USDA's Rural Utilities Service financing for renewable energy production and energy efficiency efforts could assist regional electric utilities in beginning to transition. Setting aside funds for central Appalachia through such sources as the USDA Rural Energy for America Program and the Department of Energy (DOE) Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant could support local planning and establish needed demonstrations of community-scale renewable energy projects.

3. Increase Sustainable Management of Forestland and Build a Sustainable Forest Economy

About 70 percent of the land in central Appalachia is forested, and the region possesses a diverse hardwood forest mix. But the forests have suffered from high-grading—the removal of only high quality trees, which degrades forest quality—and the prevalence of predatory or irresponsible logging practices. Over 90 percent of the forestland is privately owned, most often by families who have small tracts or by absentee landholding companies. There are few incentives or resources for private landowners to pursue sustainable forestland management and few opportunities for local communities to have a say in the use of forestland owned by outside corporate interests.

In this same context, the market for wood products is shifting to sustainably certified wood, a practice supported by government procurement policies. Many of the region’s existing wood processors are obtaining chain-of-custody certification to access these markets, but they lack a local supply of certified wood; in Kentucky, for example, only about 1,000 acres are certified by the Forest Stewardship Council. Other markets for the region’s forests either exist or are emerging, including ecosystem services (for which MACED is now operating a program to broker the sale of working forest carbon credits), woody biomass for energy, and non-timber forest products.

Federal assistance could help establish a certification support center that would help small landowners and wood-products businesses obtain certification. A wood-products competitiveness corporation could help primary and secondary manufacturers grow, modernize, and cooperate. Expanded support for management planning and cost-share programs could increase private forestland management and fill the gap left by federal government budget cuts. To make woody biomass a sustainable opportunity would require more research in order to create harvesting guidelines, understand the relationship between biomass supply and potential demand, and identify which technologies are most beneficial economically and ecologically. And a land bank for community financing and purchase of pre- and post-mine land for sustainable forestry activities could expand local control of land currently owned by outside interests.

4. Support Expansion of a Sustainable Local Foods System

The growing demand for local, healthy, and sustainably produced foods in the region’s urban fringe is juxtaposed with a fairly widespread lack of access to good foods (due to distance, income, and market hurdles), especially for lower income people. Health problems linked to poor diet are a major issue in the region, and efforts to increase access to good local food are a critical part of the solution. In addition, there is significant economic and job creation potential in the food and farming sector. Economist Ken Meter found in 2007 that $2.2 billion in annual income could be created for farmers in Virginia if all of the state’s residents bought local farm products just one day a week.

A number of important models exist in the region. About 60 farmers participate in Appalachian Harvest, a program of Appalachian Sustainable Development (ASD) based in southwest Virginia. Appalachian Harvest farmers grow organic produce and free-range eggs, which ASD then sorts in a packinghouse and sells to about 600 supermarkets and other institutions at a premium under its Appalachian Harvest brand. The Appalachian Center for Economic Networks (ACENet) in Appalachian Ohio has created a commercial kitchen and thermal processing facility for local food entrepreneurs to develop value-added products with the assistance of a food scientist and a business counselor. The Jubilee Project in northeast Tennessee operates a community kitchen, manages a co-op of 30 local farmers, and is accessing markets in the local school system. Other organizations, like Rural Action, are demonstrating success with farmers’ markets and produce auctions.

Federal investment could build upon these local efforts by, for example, creating a grants pool administered by ARC and USDA that would expand these initiatives and launch new ones. Other new USDA financing and assistance efforts supportive of local food enterprises and initiatives could include set-asides for central Appalachia, such as the Rural Microentrepreneur Assistance Program.

5. Invest in Environmental Remediation and Restoration of Land[

Communities in central Appalachia face serious challenges: how to remediate surface-mined land and how to deal with the impacts of acid mine drainage, slurry ponds, and other mine-related issues. While proper remediation methods can never restore land to its pre-mining condition and should not be an excuse for allowing continued destructive practices, there is a need for strategies to address the damage that has already been done. While the 1977 Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA) sought to address the reclamation of land that was mined both before and after passage of the act, numerous problems with the design and implementation of the law have meant inadequate progress.

Problems with current reclamation laws include the historic use of poor reclamation methods that create little or no regeneration; the failure to pay out the full funds in the Abandoned Mine Land (AML) fund and the continuing appropriation of AML monies to western states with no abandoned mine lands left; the lack of a federal commitment to fully address all of the region’s remediation and restoration challenges; and the lack of community visioning and planning processes for what could be done with formerly mined sites.

The federal government should direct more resources to environmental remediation in central Appalachia by changing the formulas in the AML and other programs. It should increase support for innovative and improved efforts at reclamation, including the Appalachian Regional Reforestation Initiative and local efforts like those of East Kentucky Biodiesel, which has plans for “ecological remediation plantations” on formerly mined land that use native species to produce high efficiency bioenergy for local use. Decisions about the best use of these lands should be driven by citizen involvement and local planning.

What’s at Stake

Twenty or thirty years from now, central Appalachia will be a different place than it is today. In one scenario, the land will be decimated by increasingly radical mining practices used to haul out the last tons of coal in the cheapest way possible, leaving the region’s communities further depopulated and demoralized. In a second scenario, it will be a region in the midst of transition. There will be a greater sense of hope, new local businesses and projects forming, more democratic public decision making, and a land that is beginning to heal. Which scenario plays out has implications not just for central Appalachia, but for the rest of the country and beyond. The powerful corporations that are influencing climate, energy, and other policies in this country derive their wealth and political power from places like central Appalachia. Federal investment now in green jobs can start us on the course of transition, and transition here can help make bigger transitions possible elsewhere.

#### Criticisms of wind are ideologically biased and ignore flaws in the current system.

**Sovacool 8** (Benjamin K., Assistant Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, part of the National University of Singapore. He is also a Research Fellow in the Energy Governance Program at the Centre on Asia and Globalization. He has worked in advisory and research capacities at the U.S. National Science Foundation’s Electric Power Networks Efficiency and Security Program, Virginia Tech Consortium on Energy Restructuring, Virginia Center for Coal and Energy Research, New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Semiconductor Materials and Equipment International, and U.S. Department of Energy’s Climate Change Technology Program. He is the co-editor with Marilyn A. Brown of Energy and American Society: Thirteen Myths (2007) and the author of The Dirty Energy Dilemma: What’s Blocking Clean Power in the United States (2008). He is also a frequent contributor to such journals as Electricity Journal, Energy & Environment, and Energy Policy, The intermittency of wind, solar, and renewable electricity generators: Technical barrier or rhetorical excuse?, ScienceDire, Utilities Policy 17 (2009) 288–296)

3. Assessing the reliability of conventional power plants

To penalize renewables for their variability, however, **may obscure** **equal** amounts of variability inherent in conventional fossil-fueled and nuclear resources. All electricity systems must respond to the complex interplay of constantly changing supply and demand. They are subject to unexpected failures and outages, and influenced by a large number of planned and unplanned events. While it is certainly true that the output from conventional power plants can be measured quite accurately, researchers from the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy noted that virtually ‘‘every other aspect of planning for and implementing that resource is **riddled with uncertainty**’’ (Vine et al, 2007). Three types of uncertainty are most common: unexpected outages, variance in construction costs, and variance in demand forecasts.

3.1. Unplanned outages

Conventional outage rates typically vary from 5 to 20 percent, meaning that units are only available 80–95 percent of the time. Looking at coal generation performance in the United States from 2000 to 2004, the North American Electric Reliability Corporation found that coal plants shut-down for scheduled maintenance 6.5 percent of the year and require unscheduled maintenance or experience forced outages another 6 percent of the year. Their study noted that coal-output is guaranteed on average only 87.5 percent of the time in the United States, with a range of 79–92 percent (NERC, 2005). Amory Lovins from the Rocky Mountain Institute adds that an ordinary nuclear plant, even if it runs perfectly, still shuts down completely for refueling an average of 37 days every 17 months (Lovins, 2007, p. 249). The reliability of nuclear power plants thus rarely exceeds 93 percent. Hydroelectric facilities are prone to alterations in output based on changes in the water cycle such as seasonal rain and runoff from snowpack. Biomass is subject to the seasonal rotation and harvesting of plants and energy crops. Wave and ocean energy technologies, if they ever become viable, will vary their output according to tidal movements (every 12 h and 15 min) and the changing gravitational fields of the moon and sun.

According to a study looking at the British electricity sector conducted by the Imperial College of London, for traditional generators as a whole, ‘‘there is, approximately, a one-in-ten chance that unexpected failures (or forced outages) in power plant or electricity transmission networks will cause any individual conventional generating unit not to be available to generate power’’ (Gross et al., 2006, p. iv). In other words, there is a 10 percent risk that a given future hour of capacity from conventional units will be unavailable or limited in capability due to forced outages and mechanical failures.

Electric generating plants are complex machines after all, and accidents do happen. While some of these risks can be reduced in a purchased power scenario through contractual provisions, those extra provisions increase the cost of the resource and, in any case, cannot eliminate all risk. As Meridium (2007), a utility consulting company, put it:

In today’s competitive market, forced or unplanned outages can be devastating to power producers, who can be exposed to the risk of losing a generating unit during peak demand time. Such a loss could necessitate the immediate purchase of backup power at a replacement cost that could be several hundred times the normal price of power.

For newer technologies such as clean coal systems, the study esti- mates that reliability problems can cost as much as an additional $13 million/year for each plant. When a few nuclear plants in Ohio went unexpectedly down in 1998 as the result of scheduled outages and water shortages, wholesale power prices jumped to $3500/ MWh (Murkowski, 2001, p. 82). The August 2003 blackout also stopped 20 Canadian and American reactors instantly and without warning.

**3**.2. Construction cost variance

Conventional baseload generators are ‘‘lumpy systems’’ in the sense that additions to capacity are made in primarily large lumps (gargantuan power plants, new transmission lines that must connect to them). These plants, unlike smaller and more decen- tralized generators, have long lead times and uncertainties, making planning and construction difficult, especially when the balance of supply and demand can change rapidly within a short period of time. They can also be extremely capital-intensive: a typical 1100 MW light water reactor can cost as much as $3 billion when licensing and construction expenses are included (Fertel, 2004).

Large variance exists between the projected costs and actual costs of conventional power plant construction. Experience has shown that there can be project delays and other unforeseen problems that can lead to considerable cost over-runs and even project cancellations. Generally, the larger the project (in terms of installed capacity and thus cost), the longer it takes to complete and the more it is at risk to unforeseen changes (such as interest rates, labor costs, environmental regulations, etc.). The very fact that large power plants take many years to construct and complete dates are imprecise adds uncertainty to the electric system (Vine et al., 2007).

Nuclear plants provide an excellent illustration. While the industry reports average costs of around $2000 per installed kilo- watt, construction costs have varied extensively from about $1000 per installed kilowatt to six times as much. In Argentina, the 698 MW Attucha II reactor cost $6017 per installed kilowatt, but in Brazil the 626 MW Angra I reactor cost $2874. Reactors projects started, but never finished, in Egypt and Iran have cost about $4000 per installed kilowatt, while at the other end of the spectrum in France and Sweden reactors cost about $1200 (Keepin and Kats, 1988). Keeping in mind that the Nuclear Energy Agency reports that close to 60 percent of the investment needed for a new nuclear project goes towards initial construction (Echavarri, 2007), and construction cost variance becomes a huge issue for investors, utilities, and ratepayers.

3.3. Variance in demand forecasts

Larger, conventional baseload generators, because they take longer to build, are also at greater risk of unexpected changes in electricity demand over long periods of time. We have a hard enough time predicting the weather or the outcome of political elections; imagine the difficulty of projecting how an entire society will demand electricity five, ten, or even twenty years from now. Consider the historical record.

In the 1970s and 1980s, excessively high forecasts of growth in demand for electricity led to overbuilding of generating plants and massive electric system cost over-runs in many states. One infa- mous example was in Washington State, where the Washington Public Power System (WPPS) began a construction program for as many as seven new nuclear power plants in the early 1970s. WPPS believed that regional electricity requirements would grow by 5.2 percent each year well into the 1990s and starting building to meet their projections.

At the same time, the massive flood of nuclear power plant orders flowing in after the 1973 oil crisis caused a massive shortage of skilled nuclear engineers and architects (69 plants were ordered in 1973 and 1974). Problems of plant design, poor craftsmanship, and strikes caused even longer delays. Five-year construction estimates lengthened to ten- and twelve-year periods. One WPPS project started in 1970 did not finish until 1984, and the WPPS annual report in 1981 projected that $23.7 billion was needed to complete one of its plants after $5 billion had already been expended, all the while electricity growth dropped 65.4 percent below original projections (Salsbury, 1991).

WPPS faced financial disaster and all but one of the plants was cancelled, leading to the country’s largest municipal bond default at the time. The entire experience came to be called the ‘‘WHOOPS’’ fiasco (as a play on the WPPS acronym) and is an enduring lesson of the risk associated with investing in large power plants. Consumers across the Northwest are still paying for WHOOPS in their monthly electricity bills.

While WHOOPS is perhaps the most spectacular example, similar ‘‘boom and bust’’ cycles in power plant construction and cost-over-runs occurred in many states during the 1980s, and directly produced the high electricity rates that spurred the ‘‘elec- tric restructuring’’ movement of the mid-1990s. In 1983 Cincinnati Gas & Electric announced that it planned to convert the 97 percent finished William H. Zimmer nuclear plant into a coal-burning facility to cut down cost, and managers converted the nearly completed Midland nuclear plant in Michigan to fossil fuels at the last minute. Between 1972 and 1984, more than $20 billion in construction payments flowed into 115 nuclear power plants that were subsequently abandoned by their sponsors (Cavanagh, 1986).

Nor are cost over-runs limited to nuclear reactors or the 1980s. In November 2006, Duke Energy announced that the price tag for the company’s proposed coal-fired power plants near Charlotte, North Carolina had soared to $3 billion. Just two months prior, the company had reported to state utility regulators that the two plants would cost only $2 billion. Charlotte’s daily newspaper speculated that such a substantial cost discrepancy raised the possibility that the total expense for the plants could continue ballooning during the five years that the utility estimated it would take to build the facilities.

Once large projects get built, their output is often subject to rapidly changing patterns in consumer demand (and thus required load). Weather events such as sudden thunderstorms can persuade customers to switch on lights, just as unexpected hours of sunshine can convince them to turn them off. Millions of people are constantly switching on and off equipmentdtelevisions, lights, computersdthat demand instant power (Murawski, 2006). Thus the entire electric utility system is already built to address variability, just of a different type.

4. Assessing the reliability of renewable power plants

The intermittency of renewable resources does have to be managed, but there are many strong reasons why it is **not a justification** to exclude them from power portfolios. As this section notes, operating experience in the United States shows that solar panels displace peaking units and wind turbines displace base load units. Wind and solar often do so more quickly and with shorter construction lead times that minimize the risks associated with unexpected changes in electricity demand. The rising capacity factors for wind and solar generators have drastically improved their output in the past ten years, meaning that most renewable generators have less unplanned outages compared to conventional units, often exceeding the **97 percent** reliability mark.

4.1. Operating experience

Renewable power generators already displace a significant share of baseload generation, contrary to the beliefs of many within the American electricity industry. The U.S. EIA (2002) has deter- mined that ‘‘the imposition of [a national] renewable portfolio standard [a law mandating the use of renewable generators] would lead to lower generation from natural gas and coal facilities.’’ Examinations of fuel generation in several states confirm this finding. The New York State Energy and Research Development Authority (NYSERDA, 2005) looked at load profiles for 2001 and concluded that 65 percent of the energy displaced by wind turbines in New York would have otherwise come from natural gas facilities, 15 percent from coal-fired plants, 10 percent from oil-based generation, and 10 percent from out of state imports of electricity. Alden Hathaway, Director of Green Power Programs at the Envi- ronmental Resources Trust, found that every new kWh of renew- able generation in Virginia would displace a portfolio of coal, natural gas, and oil facilities (Hathaway, 2006). In Texas, the Union of Concerned Scientists noted that renewable energy technologies primarily displace natural gas and coal facilities (UCS, 2005).

Equally important, but often overlooked, is how renewable generation can offset nuclear power in several regions of the United States. A study sponsored by the North Carolina Utilities Commis- sion determined that renewables would displace facilities relying on nuclear fuels and minimize the environmental impacts associ- ated with the extraction of uranium used to fuel nuclear reactors (Winer et al., 2007). In Oregon, the Governor’s Renewable Energy Working Group (2006) projected that every 50 MW of renewable energy would displace approximately 20MW of baseload resources, including nuclear power. Environment Michigan esti- mates that a 20 percent renewable generator penetration would displace the need for more than 640 MW of power that would have otherwise come from both nuclear and coal facilities (Shriberg, 2006). Utilities in Ontario, Canada, are deploying renewable energy systems in an attempt to displace all coal electricity generation in the region entirely. And in Europe, researchers estimate that a network of wind farms over parts of Europe and Northern Africa could displace about 70 percent of the entire generation portfolio (Czisch and Ernst, 2001).

4.2. Construction lead times

The quicker lead times for solar and wind projects enable a more accurate response to load growth, and minimize the financial risk associated with borrowing hundreds of millions of dollars to finance plants for 10 or more years before they start producing a single kW of electricity. Florida Power & Light says it can take as little as 3–6 months from groundbreaking to commercial operation for new wind farms (Flavin et al., 2006, p. 16). In 2005, Puget Sound Energy proved that FPL’s boast was achievable in practice when it brought eighty-three 1.8 MW wind turbines to its Hopkins Ridge Wind Project from groundbreaking to commercial operation in exactly 6 months and 9 days (Garratt, 2005).

Solar panels can be built in various sizes, placed in arrays ranging from watts to megawatts, and used in a wide variety of applications, including centralized plants, distributed sub-station plants, grid connected systems for home and business use, and off- grid systems for remote power use. PV systems have long been used to power remote data relaying stations critical to the operation of supervisory control and data acquisition systems used by electric and gas utilities and government agencies. Solar installations may require even less construction time than wind or geothermal facilities since the materials are pre-fabricated and modular. Ravis (2007), a project finance manager for TD BankNorth, recently told industry analysts that utility-level PV systems can come online in as little as two months if the panels are available.

Utilities and investors can cancel wind and solar plants easier, so abandoning a project is not a complete loss (and recoverable value exists should the technologies need to be resold as commodities in a secondary market). Smaller units with shorter lead times reduce the risk of purchasing a technology that becomes obsolete before it is installed, and quick installations can better exploit rapid learning, as many generations of product development can be compressed into the time it would take to build one giant power plant. In addition, outage durations tend to be shorter than those from larger plants and repairs for reciprocating gas and diesel engines take less money, time, and skill. As Lovins et al., (2002) concluded, ‘‘tech- nologies that deploy like cell phones and personal computers are faster than those that build like cathedrals. Options that can be mass produced and adopted by millions of customers will save more carbon and money sooner than those that need specialized institutions, arcane skills, and suppression of dissent.’’

4.3. Improved capacity factors

A capacity factor is the ratio of a generating facilities’ actual output over time compared to its theoretical output if it were operating at maximum efficiency. The U.S. EIA (2000) estimated that the average capacity factor for all power plants in the United States was approximately 55 percent. That is, over a long period of time, an average power plant actually contributes to the electricity grid only 55 percent of its theoretical maximum output. Nuclear and hydroelectric generators have boasted the highest capacity factors, occasionally exceeding 90 percent. Coal ranks near the middle, with a capacity factor of about 60 percent. Less reliable natural gas generators have much lower capacity factors of 29 percent, in part, because gas-fired plants are often ‘‘peaking’’ units (i.e., they are designed to have a low capacity factor).

Historically, all forms of electricity generation have followed the same general trend: the more the technologies get deployed, the higher their capacity factor (and the lower their costs). The inter- relationship between rising capacity factors and installed capacity suggests that deploying more clean energy technologies will significantly improve their capacity factors, except with renewables, the ‘‘fuel’’ is free for the taking. Recent experience with wind energy seems to confirm this rule. In 2000, wind turbines reported capacity factors in the low teens. But by 2006, when installed wind energy had more than tripled in the United States, wind turbines registered capacity factors in the high 30 percent range and even the low 40 percent range. Newer wind projects in Oahu, Hawaii, and San Gorgonio, California, have even achieved capacity factors of 36 and 38 percent. In a 2006 analysis, the EIA observed that wind turbine capacity factors appeared to be improving over time and concluded that ‘‘capacity factor grows as a function of capacity growth’’ (Namovicz, 2006).

Solar energy appears to follow this same pattern. In the early 1980s, with 10 MW of solar panels installed globally, the average capacity factor was around 9 percent. By 1995, however, after more than 70 MW had been installed, the average efficiency of panels jumped to almost 15 percent, and in the past five years has sur- passed 21 percent (Kammen, 2004). The central lesson seems to be the more wind and solar technologies get physically deployed, the more efficient they become.

4.4. Less unplanned outages

Closely connected to the improving capacity factor of renewables is their high technical reliability. Modern wind turbines and solar panels have less unplanned outages, operating reliably more than **97.5 percent** of the time (IEA, 2005). Moreover, such high reliability is for one wind turbine, so any amount of significant wind power in an electricity system would never see all (hundreds of thousands of turbines) down at the same time. In fact, the IEA (2005) recently concluded that:

Initially, it was believed that only a small amount of intermittent capacity was permissible on the grid without compromising

system stability. However, with practical experience gathering, for example, in the Western Danish region where over 20 percent of the yearly electricity load is covered with wind energy, this view has been refuted. Bigger units of power plants bring with them the need for both greater operational and capacity reserve since outages cause greater disturbances to the system. The higher the technical availability, the lower the probability of unexpected outages and thus the lower the requirements of short-term operational reserve. Wind power plants actually score favorable against both criteria, since they normally employ small individual units (currently up to 5 MW) and have a record of high technical availability (43–44).

Renewable energy technologies also improve overall system reliability because they tend to be dispersed and decentralized. It is considered a general principle in electrical and power systems engineering that the larger a system becomes, the less reserve capacity it needs. Demand variations between individual consumers are mitigated by grid interconnection in exactly this manner.

Just like consumers average out each other in electricity demand, individual wind farms average out each other in electricity supply. As the European Wind Energy

Association concluded:

Wind power is variable in output but the variability can be predicted to a great extent . variations in wind energy are smoother, because there are hundreds or thousands of units rather than a few large power stations, making it easier for the system operator to predict and manage changes in supply as they appear within the overall system. The system will not notice the shut-down of a 2 MW wind turbine. It will have to respond to the shut-down of a 500 MW coal-fired plant or a 1000 MW nuclear plant instantly (EWEA, 2005, pp. 7–9).

In other words, the modular and dispersed nature of technologies such as wind and solar improves overall system reliability because outages, when they rarely to occur, can be better managed.

One study, conducted by the nonpartisan Midwest ISO, pro- jected the operation of 152 wind sites (nominally 40 MW each) in the state of Minnesota, and calculated their operation every 5 min as the simulation progressed through three years. The study found that the additional cost of reserves required to manage the overall system were about one tenth of a cent/kWh. As the study noted:

Wind generation does make a calculable contribution to system reliability in spite of the fact that it cannot be dispatched like most conventional resources . The addition of wind generation to supply 20 percent of Minnesota retail electric power can be reliably accommodated by the electric power system (EnerNex and MISO, 2006, p. xiii, xxi).

A similar assessment performed by General Electric for the New York ISO investigated a 10 percent wind penetration scenario in New York State, or the addition of about 3300 MW of nameplate wind capacity on a 33,000 MW peak-load system. Researchers also assumed that wind capacity was located across 30 different sites. The study found ‘‘no credible single contingency’’ that led to a significant loss of generation, and that since the system was already designed to handle a loss of 1200 MW due to the unreli- bility of conventional generators, it had more than enough resil- iency to enable the incorporation of wind (Piwko et al., 2005). This could be why even though the United States has more than 12,000 MW of installed wind capacity, not a single conventional unit has been installed as a backup generator (DeMeo et al., 2005).

4.5. Effective load carrying capability

Not all electricity is created equal. A better metric for deter- mining the availability of electricity resources in any given region is the ‘‘effective load carrying capability,’’ or ELCC. The ELCC refers to the difference between the amount of energy a generating unit produces and the amount of energy that can actually be used by consumers at any given time (Perez, 1996). For example, nuclear and hydropower units have relatively low ELCCs because they are producing about the same amount of electricity 24 h a day. In times of low demand, these units are throttled back or shut-down.

Photovoltaics have great value as a reliable source of power during extreme peak-loads. Substantial evidence from many peer- reviewed studies demonstrates an excellent correlation between available solar resources and periods of peak demand. Because solar generators tend to produce the greatest amount of energy during the same times consumer demand is highest, solar has an amazingly high ELCC relative to other technologies (Perez, 1996). In many parts of the country, solar PV has an ELCC above 70 percent. In many parts of the Southeast, solar’s ELCC exceeds 60 percent (Silcker, 2004). Researchers in Sacramento, California, estimated that the ELCC for solar PV within the city was so high that the actual value of solar energy was more than $6000/kW (Robertson and Cliburn, 2006). That is, because solar PV generated electricity at periods of high demand, its value was greater than electricity generated by other units throughout the day.

NREL researchers compared the recorded ELCC of solar PV deployed by utilities in nearly every region of the country to earlier theoretical estimates of ELCC. Not only did NREL find that actual ELCC closely matched expectations, its analysis demonstrates that valuable amounts of solar PV are available in every region of the United States (Perez et al., 2006). In California, a PV array with a capacity of 5000 MW reduces the peak-load for that day by about 3000 MW, cutting in half the number of natural gas ‘‘peakers’’ needed to ensure reserve capacity (Herig, 2002).

4.6. Spatial diversification

Perhaps incongruously, no less than **nine studies show** that the variability of renewables becomes easier to manage the more they are deployed (not the other way around, as some utilities suggest). In one study conducted by the Imperial College of London, researchers assessed the impact that large penetration rates (i.e., above 20 percent) of renewable energy would have on the power system in the United Kingdom. The study found that the benefits of integrating renewables would far exceed their costs, and that ‘‘intermittent generation need not compromise electricity system reliability at any level of penetration foreseeable in Britain over the next 20 years.’’ Let me repeat this conclusion for emphasis: renewable energy technologies can be integrated at any level of foreseeable penetration without compromising grid stability or system reliability.

A second study noted that when done on a regional scale, renewables contribute to overall system reliability slightly more. Engineers in Ontario, Canada, assessed the impact of 20 percent wind penetration on its regional electricity grid (AWS, 2005). The study accounted for seasonal wind and load patterns, daily wind and load patterns, changing capacity value for delivering power during peak-load, and geographic diversity. It used wind and load data for May 2003 to April 2004, and concluded that the more wind that existed on the system and the more geographically dispersed it was, the more it reduced volatilitydin some cases by up to 70 percent.

A third study conducted a meta-analysis of utility experience with large wind farms in six locations: Xcel Energy North in Min- nesota; the California ISO in Northern California; We Energies in Wisconsin; PacifiCorp in Oregon and Wyoming; NYISO in New York; and Xcel Energy West in Colorado (DeMeo et al., 2005). The authors argue that modern wind plants help grid operators handle major outages and contingencies elsewhere in the system, since they generate power in smaller increments that are less damaging than unexpected outages from large plants.

A fourth study from the European Wind Energy Association assessed the wind portfolios of all major European power providers and concluded the same way, noting that:

A large contribution from wind energy . is technically and economically feasible, in the same order of magnitude as the individual contributions from the conventional technologies developed over the past century. These large shares can be realized while maintaining a high degree of system security (EWEA, 2005, p. 13).

In California, Kahn (1979) investigated the reliability and ELCC of arrays of different generators in California, varying from 2 to 13 connected sites. He found that most parameters, such as the availability of wind and capacity factor, improved as the size of the array increased.

Looking inversely at the risk of sudden reductions in wind availability, another study from Stanford University demonstrated that the frequency of zero- and low-wind events over a network of eight sites in the central US was less than 2 percent (Archer and Jacobson 2003). Seventh, the American Wind Energy Association compared wind power capacity factors from individual wind farms with an array of 28 interconnected sites in the central United States and concluded that interconnection reduced variability in energy production by a factor of 1.75–3.4 (Simonsen and Stevens, 2004). The authors also found that the combined energy output from interconnected sites had a smoother diurnal pattern and maximum output in the afternoon, during the peak time of electrical demand.

Eighth, Archer and Jacobson (again from Stanford University) looked at the benefits of interconnecting wind farms at 19 sites located in the Midwestern United States and found that an average of 33 percent and a maximum of 47 percent of yearly averaged wind power from interconnected farms can be used as reliable, baseload electric power. They concluded that almost all parameters from wind power showed substantial improvements as the number of interconnected sites increased, including standard deviations of array-average wind speed and wind power, reliability, and the need for energy storage or reserve capacity. They also found no satura- tion of benefits, meaning that positive marginal improvements always occurred as the number of interconnected farms increased (Archer and Jacobson, 2007).

Ninth, when interconnecting wind and solar farms is not prac- ticable or possible, such systems can be integrated with energy storage technologies to operate as baseload plants. Paul Denholm and his colleagues from NREL note that attaching wind turbines to compressed air energy storage technologies can improve their capacity factor above 70 percent, making them ‘‘functionally equivalent to a conventional baseload plant’’ (Denholm et al., 2005). Pumped hydro storage systems can also improve the potential of renewables to offset baseload generation. Bonneville Power Administration, a large federal utility in the Pacific North- west, uses its existing 7000 MW hydroelectric and pumped hydro storage network to do just that. Starting in 2005, Bonneville offered a new business service to ‘‘soak up’’ any amount of intermittent renewable output, and sell it as firm output from its hydropower network one week later. Such storage technologies can have greater than 1000 MW of capacity (depending on location), and operate according to fast response times and relatively low operating costs. Pumped hydro and compressed air storage systems are already commercially available and offer a combined 22.1 GW of installed capacity in the United States (University of Oregon, 2001).

Each of these studies suggest that significant benefits occur with the geographic dispersion of renewable energy technologies, espe- cially if winds, sunlight, and other renewable fuels vary considerably over large regions. Claiming that the variability of renewable energy technologies means that the costs of managing them are too great has **no factual basis** in light of the operating experience of renewables in Denmark, Germany, the United Kingdom, Canada, and a host of renewable energy sites in the United States.

5. Conclusions

Conventional power systems suffer variability and reliability problems, just to a different degree than renewables. Conventional power plants operating on coal, natural gas, and uranium are subject to an immense amount of variability related to construction costs, short-term supply and demand imbalances, long term supply and demand fluctuations, growing volatility in the price of fuels, and unplanned outages. Contrary to proclamations stating other- wise, the more renewables that get deployed, the more not less stable the system becomes. Wind- and solar-produced power is very effective when used in large numbers in geographically spaced locations (so the law of averages yields a relative constant supply). The issue, therefore, is not one of variability or intermit- tency per se, but how such variability and intermittency can best be managed, predicted, and mitigated.

Given the **preponderance of evidence** referenced here in favor of integrating renewable(s), utility and operator objections to them may **be less about tech**nical limitations and more about tradition, familiarity, and arranging social and political order. The work and culture of people employed in the electricity industry promote ‘‘business as usual’’ and tend to culminate in dedicated constitu- encies that may resist change. Managers of the system obviously prefer to maintain their domain and, while they may seek increased efficiencies and profits, they do not want to see the introduction of new and disruptive ‘‘radical’’ technologies that may reduce their control over the system. In essence, the current ‘‘technical’’ barriers to large-scale integration of wind, solar, and other renewables may not be technical at all, and more about the social, political, and practical inertia of the traditional electricity generation system.

## 2AC

### 2AC picking winners

**Picking a winner is inevitable and good --- better to pick correctly.**

**Banks 12** (Jenny and Keith Allott, Work for WWF UK, Why Governments Must Pick the Right Energy Policy ‘Winners’, originally published in the Guardian,

http://thebreakthrough.org/index.php/programs/energy-and-climate/why-governments-must-pick-the-right-energy-policy-winners/)

Ironically, those who are keenest on gas and nuclear tend to also promote the argument that governments should not seek to "pick winners" in energy policy. According to this worldview, technology choices should be left to the market – and the key to tackling climate change is sole, or very strong, reliance on a carbon price set by either taxation or an emissions trading scheme. Such views are gaining traction in debates on the UK energy bill and EU renewable energy targets.

So the title of a new WWF report, On Picking Winners: the need for targeted support for renewable energy, is deliberately provocative. The report is written by Rob Gross of Imperial College, one of the UK's leading authorities on energy policy. Gross concludes that the argument

"that carbon pricing is the only policy we need in order to save the planet … is so simplistic it is absurd. Renewable energy in particular needs policies that are **investment grade**. Only then will we get costs down and create a cleaner and more secure energy system."

Putting a price on carbon undoubtedly has an important role to play – but Gross concludes that in no way is it sufficient. One problem is that it is unlikely to be politically feasible to set a carbon price at a high enough level to encourage clean, emerging technologies.

Instead, a carbon price is much more likely to encourage gas. This may achieve modest emission reductions in the short term but simply switching all the UK's coal power stations for gas ones would leave power sector emissions at around six times the level that they need to be in 2030.

But is it sensible for governments to "pick winners" by supporting renewable energy technologies? The reality is that governments have **always picked winners** whether through research and development funding, repeated subsidies and cost write-offs for the nuclear industry, tax breaks for the North Sea oil and gas industry, or proposed tax breaks for shale gas. Fossil fuels and nuclear power have benefited from subsidies for decades.

So the reality is that governments pick winners all of the time. George Osborne's determination to turn UK into "gas hub" – and his efforts to undermine renewable energy – is one clear example.

The real question is not whether the government should be "picking winners". It is about whether it is **backing the right horses**. If the UK relies excessively on a carbon price, we will end up locked in to a gas-based energy system, which is bad news for the climate, the consumer and for security of supply. And the apparent faith that nuclear – now a very mature technology – will be cheap and reliable this time round flies in the face of historic experience in the UK and globally, and ignores the huge cost over-runs with new nuclear projects under way in Europe.

Government forecasts suggest that gas prices are going only one way: up. The UK is becoming increasingly dependent on gas imports, whatever happens with shale gas production. The dramatic increases in consumer bills over the past few years, and again this autumn, have been largely driven by rising wholesale gas prices.

Yet the alternative is clear and attractive. The UK has huge renewable energy resources and could be a world leader in the growing global markets for marine renewables, electric vehicles and even carbon capture and storage, bringing in jobs and investment at a time when they are sorely needed. These technologies do not just magically appear fully formed. They need clear policy frameworks to reach a level of maturity where they can compete easily with technologies like gas which, let us not forget, has reaped plenty of subsidies of its own in the past.

The cost of technologies such as solar and onshore wind is already falling rapidly, and costs for offshore wind are set to fall dramatically – provided investors can be confident that they have a clear market and that politicians won't pull the rug out from under them.

So our government has a choice. It can listen to the siren voices who speak the language of economic efficiency but who are really more interested in shoring up the future market for gas. Or it can provide stable policies to bring forward investment in renewables and energy efficiency.

The benefits? A power sector, which is not based on imported and increasingly expensive gas, a booming green economy and – not least – we could actually hit our carbon targets.

**Market is too slow to solve sustinabaility- even if they get there eventually, it will be too late**

#### Tons of subsidies for green energy now

**WSJ, 12** (The Energy Subsidy Tally, August 17th, 2012, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111903285704576559103573673300.html>)

The facts come in a 2011 report from Mr. Obama's own Department of Energy. The report—"Direct Federal Financial Interventions and Subsidies in Energy in Fiscal Year 2010"—identifies $37.16 billion in federal subsidies. These include special tax breaks, loans and loan guarantees, research and development, home heating assistance, conservation programs, and so on. The nearby chart shows the assistance that each form of energy for electricity production received in 2010. The natural gas and oil industry received $2.8 billion in total subsidies, not the $4 billion Mr. Obama claims on the campaign trail, and $654 million for electric power. The biggest winner was wind, with $5 billion. Between 2007 and 2010, total energy subsidies rose 108%, but solar's subsidies increased six-fold and wind's were up 10-fold.

### 2AC Neodymium (Wake)

This is not a disad- Wake is really good at putting things in tags that are not in the cards

-no war- China would not shut off exports

-no supply bottleneck

-their china war card is about cyberterrorism

#### Supply shortages coming now

**A. China reserves**

**Giacalone12’**

Joseph A. Giacalone, Ph.D., is Professor of Economics and Holder of the Henry George Chair in Economics, St. John’s University, USA. Dr. Giacalone earned his B.A. and Ph.D. at Columbia University and his MBA at St. John's University. He previously served fifteen years as Associate Dean and four years as Dean of the College of Business Administration. His publications are in the areas of health care economics, business and economic history, economic thought, industry studies, and collegiate business education. Journal of International Energy Policy – Spring 2012 Volume 1, Number 1 The Market For The “Not-So-Rare” Rare Earth Elements Joseph A. Giacalone, St. John’s University, USA

Many experts argue that there are sufficient world reserves to meet the forecasted increases in consumption for the foreseeable future (Hendrick & Cordier, 2010). However, the abundance of rare earth mineral reserves does not seem to be enough to mitigate the current state of crisis regarding an impending supply shortage. This is because no matter how abundant world reserves are, without the necessary resources to extract the raw materials from the ground and with continued reliance on a China as the dominant source of supply, production will neither be able to meet nor sustain anticipated future demand.

#### B. Cars

Field et all 12’

Elisa Alonso, Andrew M. Sherman, Timothy J. Wallington, Mark P. Everson, Frank R. Field, Richard Roth, and Randolph E. Kirchain. Massachusetts Institute of Technology comprehensive study. “Evaluating Rare Earth Element Availability: A Case with Revolutionary Demand from Clean Technologies.” February 13, 2012. http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es203518d

Finally, two interesting conclusions emerge from these projections. First, the projected demand for REs for wind energy is small compared to projected demand for vehicle applications. In other words, the automotive industry is expected to be a more significant driver of the change in RE demand than wind power generation over the next 25 years. Second, the increase in demand for magnets from these wind and automotive products, especially in the case of Scenario D, results in higher ratios of Nd, Pr, and most significantly, Dy (Figure 4).

#### REM resource conflicts will instead spur governments to increase long term supply capacity

Abraham 12’

David Former Visiting Scholar, RIETI. “The Battle for New Resources: Minor minerals in green technologies.” ABRAHAM, March 26, 2012

The lines for the battle over new resources and green technology are shaping up along national lines, between China and Japan over rare earths; between the US and China over subsidies to the solar industry; between Korea and Japan in developing lithium resources in Bolivia. Some of these disagreements, such as the rare earth conflict between Japan and China, are paradoxically positive for long-term natural resource security: the conflict highlighted the increasing shortage of certain rare earth elements and spurred investment in new projects that will increase long-term supply capacity. It also highlighted the increasing reliance on minor metals for products the world now relies upon and restarted the discussion on government’s role in natural resource security. 42

#### Plan causes domestic mining

**Johnson 12** [Keith, “Bill Passes to Boost Rare-Earth Elements Production,” 7-12, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303644004577523064235675688.html?mod=googlenews_wsj>]

Once self-sufficient in rare-earth minerals production, the U.S. ceded the market to China over the last two decades, partly because of environmental concerns over energy-intensive mining and partly because of falling global demand and prices.

However, the growth of the clean-energy sector, in particular, galvanized global demand for many rare-earth elements and has kick-started interest in revitalizing U.S. production in recent years.

#### Wind power now

**A. Globally**

**Sahu ‘13**

Bikash Kumar Sahu, Moonmoon Hiloidhari, D.C. Baruah, Energy Conservation Laboratory, Department of Energy, Tezpur University, Tezpur, Assam 784028, India, “Global trend in wind power with special focus on the top five wind power producing countries,” Renewable andSustainableEnergyReviews19(2013)348–359

In the last few decades the world has witnessed tremendous growth in wind industry sector. Today wind represents 36% of total renewable energy generated worldwide. By the end of 2011, globally more than 238 GW wind power is installed, 14 times greater than the cumulative installed capacity of the year 2000 as shown in Fig. 3. Almost **70%** of the global capacity is added alone in the last 5 years (2007–2011). Globally 41.24 GW of new wind power is installed alone in 2011. The World Wind Energy Association (WWEA) has projected that by the year 2015 and 2020, global wind power capacity will increase up to 600 and 1500 GW, respectively [18].

**B. PTC**

**Bloomberg 1/2**/13

Bloomberg news, “U.S. Credit Extension May Revive Stalled Wind Industry,” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-01-02/wind-tax-credit-extension-seen-driving-growth-trade-group-says.html>

The one-year extension of a U.S. tax credit for wind power includes modified terms that may revive an industry that’s expected to stall this year. The production tax credit was due to expire at the end of 2012 and the extension was part of yesterday’s passage of the bill to avert the so-called fiscal cliff that would have imposed income tax increases for most U.S. workers. Unlike past extensions, Congress is now allowing the credit to cover wind farms that begin construction in 2013, not just those that go into operation. Uncertainty last year over whether the policy would be renewed is a key reason the U.S. is expected to install 4,800 megawatts of turbines this year, down from an estimated 11,800 megawatts in 2012, Bloomberg New Energy Finance said in a November report. “This extension allows the industry to **reactivate development** that had been on hold since mid-year,” Tom Vinson, senior director of federal and regulatory affairs at the American Wind Energy Association, said today in an interview. “The start-construction language provides a longer period of certainty than prior extensions.” Delayed Recovery The full benefits of the extension may not be felt this year, Justin Wu, Hong Kong-based head of wind analysis at New Energy Finance, said by e-mail. “Though too late for this year, it will allow the U.S. market to see some recovery in 2014.” Spain’s Iberdrola SA (IBE), the second-largest builder of U.S. wind farms with more than 4,800 megawatts in operation, would have pursued few new wind developments this year without the revised language. Manufacturers and installers of wind turbines had sought the revision to allow for the 18 months to 24 months needed to develop new wind farms. “That was pretty critical to resuming development,” Paul Copleman, an Iberdrola spokesman, said today in an interview. “Without that, the extension might not have had any impact this year. **We’re in a good position to get some construction started.”**

PTC extension will massively increase US wind production

**Substitution Solves**

#### **Pool 12’**

RELEASING THE RARE EARTHS Engineering & Technology May 2012 Rebecca Pool

Projects aimed at replacing rare-earth materials in magnets for, say, wind turbines and electric vehicles in a bid to relieve an over-reliance on China’s supplies are also growing. Only late last year, the US Department of Energy awarded $4.5m to the Ames Laboratory at Iowa State University to research rare-earth alternatives. In its first project, the organisation will work with General Motors, NovaTorque and Molycorp to create a new powerful magnet with high temperature stability for electric vehicle motors. The high-strength magnet will be based on the rare-earth element cerium, which is four times more abundant than neodymium, the critical element used in today’s permanent magnets. In the second project, Ames Laboratory scientists will team with Pacific Northwest National Laboratory on research to develop a manganese-based magnet, as a rare-earth free alternative to rare-earth permanent magnets. These magnets hold the potential to double the magnetic strength relative to today’s magnets while using cheaper and readily available raw materials. These projects are just two examples of many more being carried out around the world. At the time of writing, Japanese government had just pledged $65m in subsidies for projects that reduce the need for magnets containing rare elarth elements dysprosium and neodymium.

### 2AC electricity prices

#### **Investor withdrawal from gas will cause price spikes**

Kobb, 2/18/13 [Kurt Cobb is an author, speaker, and columnist focusing on energy and the environment. Resilience (a project of the Post Carbon Institute). “Investors are subsidizing natural gas consumers. But it won't last.”. http://www.csmonitor.com/Environment/Energy-Voices/2013/0218/Investors-are-subsidizing-natural-gas-consumers.-But-it-won-t-last]

Investors have essentially subsidized natural gas through huge loss-making investments, creating an oversupply that has sent prices significantly below the average cost of new production. That means consumers get cheap natural gas while investors kick themselves for not realizing that they were buying into a flawed concept—one that oil and gas consultant Art Berman has called “an improbable business model that has no barriers to entry except access to capital, that provides a source of cheap and abundant gas, and that somehow also allows for great profit.”

The conventional wisdom is that prices are likely to stabilize between $3 and $4 per mcf and stay there for the rest of the decade as the natural gas drilling juggernaut continues. There just one problem with this outlook. The juggernaut has most definitely NOT continued.

Since the last week of August 2008 when the count of active U.S. natural gas drilling rigs peaked at 1606, the number of active rigs has plunged to just 425 for the week ending February 8.

Investors who helped to fuel the boom included hedge funds, wealthy individuals and institutional investors, all of whom chipped in a lot of money to finance the drilling of individual wells for what turned out to be meager payouts. None are eager to get burned that badly again.

In addition, the share prices of publicly traded drillers such as Chesapeake Energy, Devon Energy, Encana, and Southwestern Energy—who put an extraordinarily large proportion of their efforts and funds into finding natural gas (as opposed to oil)—have plummeted. That decline has for now made raising new capital through stock issuance a relatively rare event.

Furthermore, many drillers—who borrowed heavily to help finance their drilling efforts—now find themselves deeply in debt, groaning under the weight of interest charges and loan repayments. But, they’ve been unable to do much except sell assets to counter the devastating effects that low natural gas prices continue to have on their balance sheets.

It’s hard to imagine the same investors and banks deciding that for the rest of the decade, they’ll keep repeating what they’ve just done.

As for the drillers, they have moved on. They have already repositioned their rigs for drilling oil which is currently fetching a splendidly profitable price near $100 a barrel, that is, near the historically high levels seen since 2008. It turns out that even the natural gas drillers don’t believe the natural gas story any more if we judge by their actions. Indeed, even the biggest booster of the cheap (but somehow profitable) natural gas forever narrative, Chesapeake Energy, has given up and turned its focus to oil.

So, where does that leave the working stiffs who heat their homes with natural gas, the utilities who burn it to make electricity, and the chemical manufacturers who use it as a feedstock for many chemicals including nitrogen fertilizer? They all face an uncertain future in which natural gas prices are likely to rise significantly, perhaps even returning to the double-digit nosebleed levels of 2008 before gun-shy investors and drillers will dare to take the necessary steps to bring on significant new supply.

Which begs the question: What if drillers and investors wait that long to move back into the natural gas fields in force?

Petroleum geologist Jeffrey Brown of Export Land Model fame offered a startling response in a conversation at a recent conference I attended. The production decline rates of the shale gas wells that are providing the bulk of new U.S. supplies are so high—60 percent in the first year and up to 85 percent by the end of the second year—that we may never be able to return to today’s production level.

That would certainly put the nail in the coffin of the natural gas abundance narrative.

#### Wind power key to stabilize against price spikes.

Matthew Wald, 2/17/2013. “Could Wind Power Cool New England’s Price Fever?” New York Times, http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/02/17/could-wind-power-cool-new-englands-price-fever/.

[As I reported in Saturday’s paper](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/16/business/electricity-costs-up-in-gas-dependent-new-england.html), New England is experiencing a remarkable spike in electricity prices brought on by high heating demand and rising natural gas prices for electric generators.

What role, if any, could renewable energy play in solving this problem?

At the Union of Concerned Scientists, the senior energy analyst Michael B. Jacobs, who has a blog called the [Energy Roller Coaster](http://blog.mikejacobs-energy.com/), has been sounding the alarm about over-reliance on natural gas in New England and Texas. The solution, he said, would be to turn to more renewable energy sources like wind so that the demand for gas would be smaller at clinch times.  
“You don’t have nearly so much of a price spike if you have more renewables in your portfolio,’’ he said.

Wind advocates made a similar argument when the price of natural gas was high about five years ago: that even if wind energy was expensive, it could have a major impact on the price of gas by cutting demand slightly. In the commodity markets, small shortages or surpluses can result in huge price swings.

#### Economy resilient to high prices.

Lotterman, ’12 [Ed, professor of economics at Augsburg College. “High gas prices have been around before”. http://www.edlotterman.com/2012/03/18/high-gas-prices-have-been-around-before/#.USjl-6WyCds]

The U.S. economy, like other market economies, is more resilient than many people give it credit for. It can adjust to higher energy prices, just as it repeatedly has in the past. And, if history and economic theory are guides, sharp increases in the price of any resource usually are followed by long periods in which prices rise by less than average inflation.

Start by considering how gas prices have evolved in the past century. Ignoring inflation, a slow increase occurred from 1919 to 1973. Since then, an upward trend took hold that saw sharp spikes whenever there was trouble in the Mideast, usually followed by declines as tensions eased.

The first such spike came after the 1973 Arab-Israeli War when Arab-dominated OPEC first flexed its muscles and U.S. gas prices rose from 39 cents a gallon in 1973 to 57 cents a gallon in 1975. There were subsequent spikes as the regime of the Shah of Iran began to crumble in 1979, and from 2002 to 2008 with the Iraq War.

Prices fell from 2008 into 2009 but have since risen, particularly as the West’s confrontation with Iran over its nuclear program has become more acute.

Interestingly, the 1991 Gulf War was not accompanied by a dramatic increase in prices because Saudi Arabia and its Arab allies sharply increased oil output to counteract any shortfalls caused by the conflict.

If one adjusts for inflation, the picture looks much different, with a general downtrend from 1919 to 1972 followed by great volatility thereafter. The 17-year period from 1986 through 2003 had lower prices than at any time prior, including the 1950s and 1960s that many of my generation remember as the glory days of cheap gas and muscle cars.

Prices are high now and likely to get higher unless there is some miraculous easing of tension with Iran, but we are not in a markedly worse position than 30 years ago when mean household incomes were 29 percent lower than now, adjusted for inflation.

Higher crude oil and gasoline prices pose challenges for households and national economies in the short run because it takes time to adjust to changes. In the short run, if an individual has to pay more for gas, she may have substantially less to spend on other things. Higher diesel fuel means it costs more to till an acre of ground, construct a mile of road or deliver a ton of freight.

So prices of many goods rise, although the overall price level may be kept constant if the central bank clamps an iron hand on the money supply.

But in the longer run, both households and national economies adjust. In general, the growth of our gross domestic product since the mid-1970s has been somewhat slower than in the 30 years before, but we have seen good growth. Plus, the amount of all energy and of petroleum products needed to produce a dollar’s worth of output has fallen sharply. The U.S. now uses only half as much energy relative to GDP as we did 40 years ago.

Moreover, we can continue to improve. Countries including the United Kingdom, Germany and Japan produce 20 percent to 30 percent more GDP per unit of energy used than we do, with comparable median household incomes.

#### Grid parity solves the link

Randall, 3/14/12 - Tom Randall is a deputy sustainability editor for Bloomberg News [“Wind Innovations Drive Down Costs, Stock Prices”. Bloomberg. http://go.bloomberg.com/multimedia/wind-innovations-drive-down-costs-stock-prices/]

The world’s wind-power capacity increased 113-fold over the past 20 years. As installations increase, turbines become more efficient and electricity prices decline. For a growing number of countries, this means wind power is now cheaper than conventional energy sources, even without government subsidies.

Wind's ‘Learning Curve’

This chart shows how the cost of producing a wind turbine falls as more turbines are produced. The improved efficiencies of technology and scale -- the industry's learning curve -- reduce wind-power prices by 7 percent every time installed capacity doubles. The price for a megawatt of wind power dropped by almost half since 1991.

The global turbine price is currently lower than the industry's historic learning curve by about 60,000 euros ($78,000) per megawatt. Oversupply and competition from China have led manufacturers like Vestas, the world's largest turbine maker, to cut prices. The company's shares tumbled 68 percent in the last year.

Wind's Golden Goal

Wind electricity providers have begun to reach what energy experts call the "golden goal" of grid parity, when operating fields of wind turbines is as cheap as burning coal or natural gas. Falling natural gas prices makes it harder for wind to compete in the US, despite its good wind resources. However, rising natural gas prices in Europe are making wind more competitive

Countries with high power prices and strong winds are already past parity: Brazil, Italy, Argentina, Canada, the U.K. and Portugal. As time passes, the country bubbles expand to represent growing capacity and shift right to reflect increased turbine efficiency.

"The cost of producing wind energy needs to come down to reach parity," said Stefan Linder, an analyst at Bloomberg New Energy Finance. "However in the best locations onshore wind is already competitive with fossil fuel electricity, and most wind farms in fair resource areas will be at parity by 2016."

#### New regulations cause price spikes

Michael Bastasch 11/7 The Daily Caller News Foundation http://dailycaller.com/2012/11/07/energy-industry-could-be-hit-by-tougher-regulations-in-obama-second-term/2/

The energy industry could see itself under a renewed attack by regulators and environmental groups during President Barack Obama’s second term as the administration could tighten regulations on oil, gas, and coal. “It’s going to be a rougher second term for oil and gas given the way the environmental debate is going and the diminished incentive Obama has to protect oil and gas after his last election is behind him,” said Robert McNally, a former White House energy adviser under George W. Bush and current head of the Rapidan Group consulting firm. Reuters reports that Obama slowed fossil fuel regulations during the campaign as his challenger Mitt Romney championed expanding drilling and more state authority over oil and gas regulation while painting Obama as anti-fossil fuel. “Obama streamlined regulation on drilling for natural gas from shale and delayed finalizing rules on mercury emissions from power plants,” according to Reuters. “The light touch may have helped the president gain support from voters anxious about jobs in gas-rich Pennsylvania and Ohio.” Despite the regulatory slowdown, it has been reported that the Environmental Protection Agency has more than 50 staffers gearing up for a “November Surprise” to finish new greenhouse gas standards. “[I]t’s pretty clear that if President Obama secures a second term, the Obama-EPA will have a very busy next four years, moving full speed ahead to implement numerous major rules and regulations that he has delayed or punted due to the upcoming election,” reads a report by Inhofe on EPA actions during an Obama second term. The brunt of the environmental regulations have been felt by the coal industry and have contributed to the planned shutdown of more than 200 coal-fired generators across 25 states, reports the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity. Coal mining companies and miners also saw 9,000 mining jobs were lost in October, with mining employment decreasing by 17,000 jobs since May of this year. ‘We will see energy prices continue to go up as a result of these policies,” Thomas J. Pyle, president of the Institute for Energy Research told the Daily Caller News Foundation, adding that “coal is toast” in an Obama second term due to onerous EPA regulations. Coal company shares fell in pre-market trading on the news of President Obama’s re-election, including shares of Alpha Natural Resources which previously announced layoffs for 1,200 workers and the closing of eight coal mines partly due to “a regulatory environment that’s aggressively aimed at constraining the use of coal.” “(The drop is) 100 percent related to election results,” said Eric Green, senior managing partner at Penn Capital Management. The Obama administration could also revive some rules which were rejected by the courts, like the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR), which was recently struck down in federal court, and estimated to cost $853 million “I think under Obama [CASPR] would come back, probably reinstated in 2014,” Kevin Massy, associate director of the Brookings Institution’s Energy Security Initiative told the Daily Caller News Fondation. However, there are still other major regulations still in place, seven of which will cost 887,000 jobs per year, with annual costs as high as $16.7 billion per year according to a report by National Economic Research Associates (NERA). Fracking could also be in jeopardy as the Obama EPA is expected to release two reports on fracking which could set the tone for regulation in his second term. The shale oil and gas boom has almost exclusively taken place on private and state lands which means its largely out of federal hands, but that could change, says Pyle. “What Obama will certainly continue to do is try to regulate the technology that makes [fracking] possible,” Pyle said. “His EPA has been caught with their hand in the cookie jar on several occasions trying to claim that fracking has caused groundwater contamination, and it hasn’t.”

#### US not key

#### Empirics prove no war.

Miller 1—Morris Miller is an adjunct economics professor at the University of Ottawa [Jan.-Mar, 2001, “Poverty: A Cause of War?” *Peace Magazine*, http://peacemagazine.org/archive/v17n1p08.htm]

Economic Crises?

Some scholars have argued that it is not poverty, as such, that contributes to the support for armed conflict, but rather some catalyst, such as an economic crisis. However, a study by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik shows that this hypothesis lacks merit. After studying 93 episodes of economic crisis in 22 countries in Latin American and Asia since World War II, they concluded that much of the conventional thinking about the political impact of economic crisis is wrong:

"The severity of economic crisis—as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth—bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... or (in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence... In the cases of dictatorships and semi-democracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another)."

### 2AC A2 states

#### Conditionality is a voting issue

a) 2AC strategy – even potential shifts and contradictions deter us from making our best arguments because we don’t know what will be relevant – 2AC determines the debate

b) Argument responsibility – a “zero risk” model of advocacy discourages deep research and civic decisionmaking

\*\*\*c) Dispo solves – preserves neg flex but also aff strategic choice

\*\*\*c) x conditional world(s) is a better middle ground – minimum for \_\_ without overwhelming the aff

#### Perm do both.

#### \*\*\* Uniform implementation is a voting issue – shifts the focus from the topic mechanism. Lacks literature. Kills actual education about federalism because states exist as disuniform laboratories. Must be a voter to correct skewed research practices. Proves uniform guideline counterplans solve their offense.

#### \*\*\* 50 state fiat is a voting issue - shifts the focus from the topic mechanism. Even if lit exists it’s implemented as a contrivance. Proves the net benefit solves their offense.

#### Aff ground – teams fiat through differences between states and USFG. We lose the plan mechanism. Proves state modeling counterplans solve their offense.

#### \_ A USDA set aside is key –

#### a) Energy model – REAP grants signal commitment and feasibility– symbolic value matters – that’s Bailey and MACED

#### c) Certification – wind entrepreneurs lack credentials to access state incentives. Federal involvement results in job training. That’s MAECD.

#### \_ States will recruit large corporations – kills solvency

**Flaccavento 10** - Founder of Appalachian Sustainable Development (ASD) and SCALE, Inc [[Anthony Flaccavento](http://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/user/4896), “The Transition of Appalachia,” Solutions Journal, Volume 1 | Issue 4 | Page 34-44 | Aug 2010, pg. http://tinyurl.com/39kwh4h

Much of the current public debate on Appalachia focuses on the benefits and problems associated with coal mining, even though employment in the region’s two largest coal-producing states, West Virginia and Kentucky, has declined by more than 70 percent over the past three decades,5 primarily due to mechanization.

State resources intended to increase employment and diversify the economy still focus predominantly on the recruitment of companies from outside the region. As a 2008 study by the Mountain Association for Community Economic Development showed, Kentucky spent 80 percent of its total economic development dollars on recruitment incentives for outside corporations. And it’s not just Kentucky: economist Michael Shuman documents state and local government expenditure of $50 billion annually on such recruitment and other subsidies for large companies nationwide, while public resources devoted to homegrown businesses are minimal by comparison.6 Federal subsidies of large businesses are greater still; the Cato Institute estimates that they total $87 billion each year.6 It is likely that the majority of these federal funds subsidize ecologically extractive or damaging industries, according to a 2003 study by the Green Scissors Coalition.7

At the same time, a wide range of enterprises and initiatives designed to build a more sustainable economy and healthier, more resilient communities has begun to emerge in the region. They vary in scale and stage of development, but, in general, they are more ecologically sustainable because of the way they are produced and the greatly reduced transport distances to market. They use asset-based strategies, building and adding value to the ecological, cultural, and human strengths of the region. They cultivate self-reliance for producers and the broader community. And they build cooperative networks that help overcome isolation, estrangement, and problems of scale.

As these initiatives have grown in number and scale, elected leaders and local, state, and federal agencies have taken notice. The Appalachian Regional Commission, for instance, launched an "Asset Based Development" program several years ago, while the USDA more recently created a Community Facilities loan and grant program to spur local infrastructure development. Both of these programs were, in part, based upon successful initiatives in central Appalachia. In some cases, state and federal agencies have become active partners with these initiatives—for example, the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development supports locally based agricultural and cultural enterprises in a number of ways. More broadly, public policy has begun to shift toward greater support for "sustainable development" and locally led economic strategies, though it remains inconsistent and generally inadequate throughout the region.

#### c) REAP goes to small producers

**USDA 12** [United States Department of Agriculture, “Rural Development Energy Programs,” Last Modified:10/18/2012, pg. http://tinyurl.com/byzfwbl

The Rural Energy for America Program provides assistance to agricultural producers and rural small businesses to complete a variety of projects, including renewable energy systems, energy efficiency improvements, renewable energy development, energy audits, and feasibility studies. [Read more](http://www.rurdev.usda.gov/BCP_Reap.html)

#### \_ An Obama jobs policy is key – sends a signal of political strength necessary to mobilize voters – that’s Skocpol and Dreier.

#### \*\*\*b) Tea Party will get credit for the CP – They control the states

**Wessler 12** – Investigative reporter and researcher @ Colorlines.com and the Applied Research Center [Seth Freed Wessler, “The Tea Party Will Still Run the States, No Matter Who Wins the Presidency,” Colorlines, Thursday, November 1 2012, 10:26 AM EST, pg. http://tinyurl.com/ceqe6v6

|  |
| --- |
| The 2010 elections, in which Republicans seized 23 state legislative chambers from Democrats and secured 29 governor’s mansions, catapulted the GOP into a control seat over the shape of state-level policy. While President Obama and Republicans in Congress fought tooth and nail over nearly every aspect of the president’s agenda, Republicans in the states had remarkable leeway to make policy as they wished.  Over the past two years, Republican state legislators have introduced a round of tea party inspired bills to restrict reproductive health access, impose barriers on voting, undercut the safety net and healthcare access and make life unlivable for immigrants. The battles these bills spurred are certain to continue in the coming years, whatever happens at the federal level.  Recently, there seems to be a sense of relief among liberal and progressive commentators who observe that the swell of conservative populist rage is settling. Pundits have taken to noticing that not once has Mitt Romney publicly associated himself with the tea party, and few congressional candidates appear to be running on the tea party mantle. “Tea party thinking is dead,” declared the liberal [Washington Post opinion writer EJ Dion](http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/ej-dionne-the-tea-partys-drubbing-in-2012/2012/10/24/185416ea-1e0e-11e2-9cd5-b55c38388962_story.html) last week, referring to Romney’s move the center in recent debates.  Indeed, the tea party storm that hit the nation like Sandy two years ago seems to have retreated from view.  Yet despite a year’s worth of polling showing voters less attached to tea party symbolism, there’s no indication that the politics insurgent GOP candidates brought with them are going anywhere. The persistence of these conservative politics is nowhere more clear than at the state level.  Election watchers, including the National Council of State Legislatures, project the 2012 elections are unlikely to shift the composition of state legislative chambers. Election watchers say the current legislative field is more stable than it’s been in nearly a decade.  A review of the current state political map reveals that the make up of legislative chambers is unlikely to budge much at all after Nov. 6. That’s because Republicans who seized power in 2010 arrived just in time to redraw maps for their own benefit. The redistricting process following the 2010 Census thus left Republicans firmly in control of a majority of state legislative chambers. |

#### They will bust state budgets

**Ravitch 12** - Former Lieutenant Governor of New York [Richard Ravitch, “State Budget Crisis Must Be Addressed, Before It's Too Late,” Huffington Post, Posted: 07/17/2012 11:09 am, pg. http://tinyurl.com/9sa3nrh

Many of us have read about the bankruptcy issues facing cities such as Scranton, Stockton and Central Falls, but when we combine the totality of the problem and look at the ability of the states to meet their obligations to public employees, to creditors and most critically to the education and well-being of their citizens, we are a threatened nation.

Our states and local governments bear a heavy burden, given that the U.S. Constitution leaves to states the responsibility for most domestic governmental functions: States and their localities largely finance and build public infrastructure, educate our children, maintain public safety and serve as the social safety net. State and local governments spend $2.5 trillion annually and employ over 19 million workers -- 15 percent of the national total and six times as many workers as the federal government.

I am hopeful the substantial array of facts that our Task Force has assembled will motivate Washington, our states and localities to commit to breaking down the disconnect that seems to permeate more and more.

To summarize, certain large expenditures are growing at rates that exceed reasonable expectations for revenues, including Medicaid, pension funds and health care benefits. And, at the same time, the capacity to raise revenues is increasingly impaired because of declines in sales, gas and income taxes. In addition, there are the spillover effects of the federal budget crisis on state and local governments, and state actions will have spillover impact on local governments.

Going forward, business as usual will not work. The storm warnings are there. Only an informed public can demand that the political systems -- federal, state and local -- recognize these problems and take effective action. The costs, whether in service reductions or higher revenues -- will be large. Deferring action can only make the ultimate costs even greater.

#### Fed key – four reasons

**Kay, 2012** [ Energy Federalism: Who Decides? David Kay Cornell Community and Regional Development Institute (CaRDI) July 2012 http://devsoc.cals.cornell.edu/cals/devsoc/outreach/cardi/programs/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&PageID=1071714]

Centralized Federalism

Sovocool list four significant benefits of the centralized theory, a theory which has provided the legal support for a strong federal role throughout American history. The first benefit finds modern expression in the language of environmental economics by highlighting the economic efficiency of internalizing economic externalities such as transboundary pollution. The essential logic is that the decisions are most efficient and fair when decision makers represent all constituencies who will experience significant costs and benefits of the decision. Small, decentralized authorities have few incentives to attend to impacts on those outside their own jurisdiction.

The second benefit is derived from a regulatory theory that favors economic investment. From this perspective, the uniformity and consistency of regulation imposed by a single authority lowers the costs of regulation for manufacturers and investors, in particular if they are active in multiple jurisdictions. Of course, the efficiency of lowering investment costs is not perceived as a benefit by those who see the investments as detrimental.

The third benefit is also fundamentally about economic advantage and efficiency. It posits that uniformity in regulation across jurisdictions enables economies of scale in regulation itself. Larger scale enables greater efficiencies in regulatory administration and enforcement as well as in research that provides the scientific basis for the regulation itself. An additional complexity is involved in the scaling of influence and power. In particular, some argue that there is an inherent mismatch between local politicians and corporate interests. In particular,

the former have relatively meager financial, legal and technical capacities and are arguably more likely to be “captured” or even overwhelmed by the interests of a few key businesses. They may simply be more likely to make either unwarranted or unnecessary concessions to economic interests to the detriment of environmental ones.

The final benefit is categorically different: “it promotes distributive justice and a minimum standard of environmental quality, thus preventing a race to the bottom” among the states. The idea here is that a centralized authority is logically necessary to impose minimum standards and, in the face of competition for capital investment, practically more likely to guarantee a minimum standard of human health and environmental quality that applies to all. Of course, to be valid the aggregate minimum must indeed be higher than the minimum among the separate smaller governments.

### 2AC Politics

#### Lots of Thumpers

FOX NEWS 3 – 4 – 13 http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/03/04/recurring-budget-crises-could-put-squeeze-on-obama-second-term-priorities/

The automatic spending cuts that kicked in over the weekend effectively added another administrative headache for a White House and Congress that have struggled with even the most perfunctory tasks.

At a certain point, something's got to give.

The day-in, day-out debate and speechifying and crisis management are getting to a point where they could overshadow the other planks of President Obama's second-term agenda -- for now, anyway.

"He has a very ambitious agenda with both the sequester and his separate policy priorities, and there is a bandwidth issue at the end of the day," said John Ullyot, a longtime senior Senate aide and Republican strategist.

For starters, agencies must now figure out how to trim their fiscal waistlines, while the president tries anew to negotiate a more "balanced" deal out of Congress -- all while trying to avert a government shutdown and secure another debt-ceiling increase.

Still, all the items from the president's campaign and State of the Union address supposedly remain on the docket: immigration reform, gun control, policies to curb climate change, an increase in the minimum wage and expanded access to preschool.

Over the weekend, President Obama stressed his commitment to pursuing all those items. White House Press Secretary Jay Carney reiterated that message Monday from the briefing room.

But while administration officials have insisted that Washington can walk and chew gum, the president's first term stands as a cautionary tale. The president devoted his political capital and time to passing the health care overhaul, while other legislative items were pushed off.

Obama has revived some -- immigration reform -- and introduced others -- gun control -- at the start of his second term. But politics and a crowded agenda could already be tainting the Washington waters.

#### Controversial VAWA extension passed with funding on Thursday

US NEWS 3 – 7 – 13 <http://www.usnews.com/news/politics/articles/2013/03/07/obama-to-sign-expanded-violence-against-women-act>

President Barack Obama signed expanded protections for domestic violence victims into law Thursday, renewing a measure credited with curbing attacks against women a year and a half after it lapsed amid partisan bickering.

The revitalized Violence Against Women Act also marked an important win for gay rights advocates and Native Americans, who will see new protections under the law, and for Obama, whose attempts to push for a renewal failed last year after they became entangled in gender politics and the presidential election.

"This is your day. This is the day of the advocates, the day of the survivors. This is your victory," Obama said. "This victory shows that when the American people make their voices heard, Washington listens."

As Obama prepared to put his pen to the new law, new government data underscored both the progress that has been made and the enduring need to do more.

The rate of sexual violence against women and girls age 12 or older fell 64 percent in a decade and has remained stable for five years, the Justice Department said in a survey released Thursday. In 2010, women and girls nationwide experienced about 270,000 rapes or sexual assaults, compared with 556,000 in 1995.

The survey also showed that rapes and sexual assault rates involving women have plateaued while violent crime rates overall have declined. Women's advocacy groups called the report proof that the Violence Against Women Act and heightened awareness of the problem by police has had a positive effect.

Still, 1 in 5 women will be raped during their lifetime, said Obama, asserting a continued need for action nearly two decades after the bill's original passage in 1994.

"It didn't just change the rules, it changed our culture. It empowered people to start speaking out," Obama said.

The law authorizes some $659 million a year over five years for programs that strengthen the criminal justice system's response to crimes against women and some men, such as transitional housing, legal assistance, law enforcement training and hotlines. One element of this year's renewal focuses on ways to reduce sexual assault on college campuses. It also reauthorizes the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, adds stalking to the list of crimes that make immigrants eligible for protection and authorizes programs to reduce the backlog in rape investigations.

After twice being renewed with little resistance, it was something of a surprise in 2011 when lawmakers let the act expire. At the crux of the election-year clash were disagreements about expanded protections for gays and lesbians, Native Americans and illegal immigrants.

Sensing a political advantage, Senate Democrats offered an expanded law that specifically protects gays, lesbians, bisexuals and transgender Americans and gives tribal authorities the power to prosecute non-Indians for abuse committed on tribal lands. Republicans saw the move to load a popular bill with controversial elements as a provocation and objected to the Native American provisions on constitutional grounds. Democrats rejected a Republican alternative, arguing it didn't go far enough.

Continued resistance became less tenable for the GOP after its less-than-stellar performance among women voters in November's election. In February, House Republicans capitulated and allowed a vote on an almost identical version of the bill, which passed 286-138. It was the third time in two months that House Speaker John Boehner let a Democratic-supported bill reach the floor despite opposition from a majority of his own party — a clear sign that Republicans wanted to put the issue behind them.

#### Ignore the bipartisan talk – masking

REUTERS 3 – 6 – 13 [<http://www.trust.org/alertnet/news/hopes-for-a-political-thaw-sprout-in-wintry-washington>]

Now Obama appears to be looking for allies among a dozen or so rank-and-file Republican senators who have indicated they would be willing to work with the White House.

If he is successful, he could forge a bipartisan Senate majority on issues that could force the Republican-controlled House to act.

Senator Lindsey Graham of South Carolina, who says he would back a budget deal that includes up to $600 billion in new revenue in exchange for reforms to the Medicare and Medicaid health programs, was among those invited to the dinner at a hotel near the White House.

According to a source, Graham drew up the list of invitees to the dinner at a small expensive hotel, The Jefferson, near the White House.

Senator Pat Toomey of Pennsylvania, who also was invited, said any deal must include "long-term structural reforms" of Medicaid and Medicare - something Obama has indicated he is willing to discuss despite objections from some of his fellow Democrats.

"I am happy to work with the president if he is willing to work with us," Toomey said.

Julian Zelizer, a historian at Princeton University, said the accommodating talk from both sides masked the fact that neither party was budging much.

"There is a tension between the rhetoric and actually taking the votes," he said. "They might be speaking differently, but it's not clear they are willing to make a deal."

#### Sequester thumps immigration - bashing

KRAUSHAAR 2 – 28 – 13 Managing Editor, Politics for the National Journal [Josh Kraushaar, President Obama’s Losing Hand on the Sequester Fight, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/against-the-grain/president-obama-s-losing-hand-on-the-sequester-fight-20130228>]

President Obama’s Losing Hand on the Sequester Fight

By spending all his political capital over the budget cuts, the president risks losing it all on immigration reform and gun control.

To understand why the White House is aggressively contesting Bob Woodward’s account of who’s responsible for the sequester, you only have to take a look at how high the political stakes are for President Obama. Instead of tactically conceding on a short-term fix that would provide for smarter spending cuts -- as the Republicans did during the fiscal-cliff fight, when the White House held more leverage -- Obama has chosen to pick a fight over the fairness of deep spending cuts, at the expense of more significant items on his plate.

Now the White House’s entire agenda, from guns to immigration, is in jeopardy, and the president’s approval is taking a hit, with much more on the line in the coming month.

The headlines from the NBC/Wall Street Journal poll, released Wednesday, seemed like good news for the president, but there are plenty of warning signs embedded within the survey. President’s Obama’s job-approval rating dropped 3 points overall since last December, to 50 percent, and his economic job approval is a mediocre 44 percent, down 5 points in the past two months. Despite the GOP’s deep unpopularity, Democrats hold only a statistically insignificant 2-point edge, 32 percent to 30 percent, over which party was best able to handle the economy. Republicans hold a 16-point edge on which party is best-equipped to control spending, even higher than their pre-2010 midterm standing.

Most notably, on the sequester, the White House held only a narrow advantage when respondents were presented the arguments for and against it. A bare 50 percent majority agreed with the president’s argument that the cuts “are too severe,” while 46 percent argued it is “time for dramatic measures.” Asked what Congress should do, 53 percent supported either keeping the cuts or implementing more significant spending cuts, with 37 percent backing a plan with fewer cuts. It’s hardly the sign of a presidential mandate on the subject, and a reminder that there is widespread concern over spending and the federal debt.

The White House’s strategy to exaggerate the immediate impact of the cuts has backfired, at least to some degree. The Washington Post reported that Education Secretary Arne Duncan falsely claimed that public school teachers were already receiving pink slips. The Pew Research Center this week found that only 30 percent of voters thought the spending cuts would have an impact on their personal finances – much lower than the 43 percent who believed the fiscal cliff posed a danger on that front.

And even if you concede that the president holds the upper hand in the coming month as the cuts are implemented (a point that seems awfully tenuous), it’s worth remembering the cost he’s paying for putting all his focus on the sequester. As I pointed out in last week’s column, there’s a reason why presidents from both parties have angered their bases by promoting legislation to the middle – be it Bill Clinton’s welfare reform, George W. Bush’s education package or George H.W. Bush’s tax hike.

Obama has a lot more to gain politically on immigration and gun control -- winning long-term issues for Democrats -- and there’s plenty of evidence that congressional Democrats and Republicans are (gasp!) working together to forge bipartisan agreement. On gun control, liberal Sen. Chuck Schumer of New York and conservative Sen. Tom Coburn of Oklahoma are negotiating a possible deal that would expand background checks for gun sales, with signs that some of the Senate Republican Caucus would be on board. On immigration, Republican leaders are all but begging for a deal so they can improve their outreach with Hispanics well before the 2016 presidential election. Passing bipartisan immigration reform and some gun-control measures would provide Obama with a long-term legacy and provide Democrats with twin political victories of their own heading into the midterms.

But these issues also hang at the mercy of congressional Republicans, who don’t have much goodwill with this White House. Poisoning the well on a sequester fight focuses on the short game instead of the long. Picking fights with Bob Woodward underscores how much this White House has gambled on the issue, and how much it has to lose. Already, Democrats are concerned there’s no backup plan on gun control if the Schumer-Coburn negotiations break down. Reaching a deal on immigration, meanwhile, relies on winning over some skeptical House Republicans, whom the president has been relentlessly bashing in this sequester fight.

What’s ironic is that the much-maligned Congress is actually pretty close on crafting bipartisan legislation on long-intractable subjects of gun control and immigration. But it’s the White House, with the political attention span of a cable news cycle, that is risking losing it all for betting Obama will come out ahead in this messy fiscal fight.

#### It won’t pass – multiple reasons

**Witman 3/6/13** (Luke, The Examiner, “Talks on immigration reform progressing, but hurdles remain”, March 6, 2013, http://www.examiner.com/article/talks-on-immigration-reform-progressing-but-major-hurdles-remain)

However, despite the shared commitment from Republican and Democratic lawmakers to push forward a bipartisan immigration reform bill, **a number of major roadblocks still stand in the way of this actually happening.** Earlier today, Ariz. Sen. John McCain stated that **the single biggest hurdle** Senate Republicans have encountered thus far is working with labor unions on the establishment of viable visa programs both for highly skilled STEM workers and lower skilled agriculture workers. McCain admitted that coming to a compromise with unions could be impossible.¶ Last week, McCain made another potential hurdle to immigration reform clear, when he stated that potentially **allowing U.S. citizens in same sex partnerships with immigrants to petition for legal residency status for their spouses should not be a part of the debate**. According to McCain, **introducing what he calls “social issues” into the proceedings will certainly derail bipartisan cooperation.** Civil rights activists argue that it is vital that current immigration law be amended so that LGBT citizens are given the same rights as heterosexuals.¶ Finally, **it has also become clear that comprehensive immigration reform can not pass until lawmakers are sure the U.S.-Mexico border is properly secured.** Republicans are calling for an increased security presence at the nation’s southern border to ensure that individuals and contraband are not free to filter freely into this country. **If Democrats hope to get bipartisan support for an immigration reform bill**, they will have to prove to Republicans that the necessary infrastructure, technology and manpower are in place to keep the border effectively secure.

#### Plan empowers Obama in the short term – he use popular forces to exert electoral pressure and force the tea party to cave – that’s Dreier.

#### Winners win on controversial issues

Hirsh, National Journal, 2-7-13

(Michael, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital,” http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207?page=1, accessed 2-7-13)

Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger.¶ But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”¶ALL THE WAY WITH LBJ¶ Sometimes, a clever practitioner of power can get more done just because [they’re] he’s aggressive and knows the hallways of Congress well. Texas A&M’s Edwards is right to say that the outcome of the 1964 election, Lyndon Johnson’s landslide victory over Barry Goldwater, was one of the few that conveyed a mandate. But one of the main reasons for that mandate (in addition to Goldwater’s ineptitude as a candidate) was President Johnson’s masterful use of power leading up to that election, and his ability to get far more done than anyone thought possible, given his limited political capital. In the newest volume in his exhaustive study of LBJ, The Passage of Power, historian Robert Caro recalls Johnson getting cautionary advice after he assumed the presidency from the assassinated John F. Kennedy in late 1963. Don’t focus on a long-stalled civil-rights bill, advisers told him, because it might jeopardize Southern lawmakers’ support for a tax cut and appropriations bills the president needed. “One of the wise, practical people around the table [said that] the presidency has only a certain amount of coinage to expend, and you oughtn’t to expend it on this,” Caro writes. (Coinage, of course, was what political capital was called in those days.) Johnson replied, “Well, what the hell’s the presidency for?”¶ Johnson didn’t worry about coinage, and he got the Civil Rights Act enacted, along with much else: Medicare, a tax cut, antipoverty programs. He appeared to understand not just the ways of Congress but also the way to maximize the momentum he possessed in the lingering mood of national grief and determination by picking the right issues, as Caro records. “Momentum is not a mysterious mistress,” LBJ said. “It is a controllable fact of political life.” Johnson had the skill and wherewithal to realize that, at that moment of history, he could have unlimited coinage if he handled the politics right. He did. (At least until Vietnam, that is.)

#### Agency set-aside doesn’t link – not legislation and doesn’t require additional funding

#### Strong bipartisan support for the REAP

**Learner 12** - Executive Director of the Environmental Law & Policy Center [Howard A. Learner, “Clean-Energy Programs Key to Rural U.S.,” National Journal, May 14, 2012 7:11 AM, pg. http://tinyurl.com/b85fecc

The Senate Agriculture Committee wisely redirected funding to the Farm Bill’s Energy Title, which has strong bipartisan support. These clean energy programs provide a new source of income for farmers and rural small businesses, create rural jobs and enhance economic development, and produce environmental quality benefits for everyone.

The Rural Energy for America Program (REAP), in particular, is a success story. It crosses agricultural sectors and provides value in every state. REAP's competitive cost-share grants have helped support a broad range of 8,000 wind, solar, biogas and energy efficiency projects in rural communities. Since the 2008 Farm Bill, REAP grants have leveraged more than $1 billion in private investments, creating jobs during a historic economic crisis.

The Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP) spurs new opportunities for growing sustainable biomass crops. BCAP provides cost-sharing and risk-sharing for innovative farmers who plant sustainable “energy crops” such as perennial grasses. There’s a future for these energy crops that reduce erosion, improve water quality, promote conservation and expand agricultural opportunities.

Under the 2008 Farm Bill, REAP did not include corn ethanol. While USDA recently added ethanol blender pumps to REAP, only 8 percent of 2011 program funds were used for this purpose. By contrast, 38 percent of program funds were directed to energy efficiency programs and 25 percent for solar energy systems on farms and rural small businesses. These programs cut energy costs for farmers, create jobs, reduce pollution and help rural electric co-ops.

Since 2002, Farm Bill clean energy programs have enjoyed bipartisan support because they are achieving success in promoting homegrown, clean energy in rural America. Renewing core Energy Title programs with sufficient funding attracts private investment, creates jobs and increases clean energy production. This achieves the goals of agriculture, investors and environmentalists, and it enhances economic stability in rural communities.

#### Issues are compartmentalized

**LEE  05** The Rose Institute of State & Local Government – Claremont McKenna College – Presented at the Georgia Political Science Association 2005 Conference  
[Andrew, “Invest or Spend?:Political capital and Statements of Administration Policy in the First Term of the George W. Bush Presidency,” http://a-s.clayton.edu/trachtenberg/2005%20Proceedings%20Lee.pdf]  
Instead of investing political capital, the president may spend it on an initiative. When spending political capital, the president does not necessarily  expect higher approval ratings. President Clinton’s first term actions to balance the budget and normalize trade with China did not yield returns. In fact, balancing the budget in 1993 was a reason for the change of congressional control from the Democrats to the Republicans (Panetta 2002, 201-02). In President Bush’s first term, he accrued a large amount of capital from the September 11th attacks, and subsequently spent a substantial portion pursuing the Iraq war.  Political capital is not equal in all policy areas. Commenting on President Clinton’s term, President George W. Bush said, “I felt like he tried to spend capital on issues that he didn't have any capital on at first, like health care” (quoted in Suellentrop 2004). In spending political capital, the president diminishes his political strength by initiating or pushing a policy proposal with no intent on return. A president can spend capital for noble goals such as a balanced budget, the end of Saddam Hussein’s regime, or to veto legislation. The theory of political capital as it relates to SAPs is that presidents are more likely to spend political capital through a presidential veto because they have the power to do so. In times of increased political capital, the relative strength of SAP wording will also increase because the president has greater flexibility to take stands on particular issues. This analysis is a case study of the first Bush term’s adherence to this hypothesis.

#### Liberal internationalism solves – crises are inevitable but multilateralism prevents them from escalating – that’s Kupchan

#### Executive action solves

Lillis 2/16

[Mike, 2/16/13, “Dems: Obama can act unilaterally on immigration reform,” http://thehill.com/blogs/regwatch/administration/283583-dems-recognize-that-obama-can-act-unilaterally-on-immigration-reform]

President **Obama can** – and will – **take steps on immigration reform in the event Congress doesn't reach a comprehensive deal** this year, according to several House Democratic leaders. While the Democrats are hoping Congress will preclude any executive action by enacting reforms legislatively, they say **the administration has the tools to move unilaterally** if the bipartisan talks on Capitol Hill break down. Furthermore, they say, Obama stands poised to use them. "I don't think the president will be hands off on immigration for any moment in time," Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-Calif.), the head of the House Democratic Caucus, told reporters this week. "He's ready to move forward if we're not." Rep. Joseph Crowley (N.Y.), vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus, echoed that message, saying Obama is "not just beating the drum," for immigration reform, "he's actually the drum major." "There are limitations as to what he can do with executive order," Crowley said Wednesday, "but he did say that if Congress continued to fail to act that he would take steps and measures to enact common-sense executive orders to move this country forward." Rep. Raul Grijalva (D-Ariz.), who heads the Congressional Progressive Caucus, said there are "plenty" of executive steps Obama could take if Congress fails to pass a reform package. "The huge one," Grijalva said, is "the waiving of deportation" in order to keep families together. "Four million of the undocumented [immigrants] are people who overstayed their visas to stay with family," he said Friday. "So that would be, I think, an area in which … there's a great deal of executive authority that he could deal with." The administration could also waive visa caps, Grijalva said, to ensure that industries like agriculture have ample access to low-skilled labor. "Everybody's for getting the smart and the talented in, but there's also a labor flow issue," he said. To be sure, Obama and congressional Democrats would prefer the reforms to come through Congress – both because that route would solidify the changes into law and because it would require bipartisan buy-in. Still, **House Republicans have been loath to accept one of the central elements of Obama's strategy**: A pathway to citizenship for the estimated 11-12 million undocumented people currently living in the country – a move which many conservatives deem "amnesty." Indeed, when the House Judiciary Committee met earlier this month on immigration reform, much of the discussion focused on whether there is some middle ground between citizenship and mass deportation. “If we can find a solution that is … short of a pathway to citizenship, but better than just kicking 12 million people out, why is that not a good solution?” Rep. Raul Labrador (R-Idaho) asked during the hearing. Obama on Tuesday spent a good portion of his State of the Union address urging Congress to send him a comprehensive immigration reform bill this year. Central to that package, he said, should be provisions for "strong border security," for "establishing a responsible pathway to earned citizenship" and for "fixing the legal immigration system to cut waiting periods and attract the highly-skilled entrepreneurs and engineers that will help create jobs and grow our economy." "We know what needs to be done," Obama said. "So let’s get this done." Becerra said he and other immigration reformers have had two meetings with the White House on immigration this month, one with the executive team working on the issue and, more recently, with Obama himself. Becerra said administration officials "essentially" know what reforms they want – "and they have communicated that to both House and Senate members, bipartisanly" – but they also want Congress to take the lead. "They're giving Congress a chance to work its will to move this," Becerra said. "But … I don't think he's going to wait too long. "If you were to ask him would he be prepared to submit a bill if Congress isn't ready … he would tell you, I have no doubt, 'I can do it in a heartbeat,'" Becerra added. "The president will move forward where he can if Congress doesn't act." Indeed, **Obama has already shown a willingness to do just that.** Last summer, just months before November's elections, Obama shocked political observers when he launched a program through the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) allowing undocumented immigrants brought to the country as children to remain without threat of deportation. The two-year "deferred action" was modeled on the Dream Act legislation that has been unable to pass Congress. The change was not an executive order, but an extension of "prosecutorial discretion" on the part of the DHS. Although conservatives howled about administrative overreach, Obama's gamble paid off, as the president won more than 70 percent of the Hispanic vote at the polls – a margin that has fueled the drive for immigration reform this year, as GOP leaders are anxious to avoid a similar divide in 2016. Grijalva said the expansion of the deferred action program represents another opportunity for Obama to move immigration reform administratively. "Like the deferred action that was taken with the Dream Act, I think that can be done for family members," he said. Not all immigration-reform supporters think Obama has so much space to move on immigration without Congress. Rep. Henry Cuellar (Texas), vice-chairman of the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, said the president has some license to make border security moves and spending decisions. "But pretty much he's done what he can do right now," Cuellar said Friday, "and after that it's up to Congress to address the rest of the issues." "It'd be better for the president to wait for us," Cuellar said. "He can urge us [to act], but it'd be better for us to come up with our own proposal and let the legislative process work itself."

#### Now isn’t key – immigration bill in the future can resolve […] - the plan gives Obama the leverage to pursue it

#### Relations resilient under Obama – despite visa issues

Desai 12 Fellow, Truman National Security Project (Ronak. “US-India Relations under the 2nd obama administration.” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ronak-d-desai/usindia-relations-under-t\_b\_2115396.html)

What's ahead for US-India relations now that President Obama has won reelection? With ties between Washington and New Delhi continuing to flourish over the past four years, the US-India bilateral partnership will likely be characterized by continuity and growth during a second Obama term. The fundamental pillars underlying President Obama's foreign policy towards India--strengthening security and military cooperation, boosting trade, and encouraging New Delhi's collaboration on various regional and global issues--will remain largely intact.¶The US-India strategic partnership has thrived during Obama's first administration. Initial concerns from some Indian officials that the newly elected president would "re-hyphenate" relations with New Delhi, prioritize ties with China, insert the US in the Kashmir dispute, and view India exclusively through an Af/Pak lens proved unfounded. On the contrary, President Obama quickly established himself a reliable champion of the bilateral relationship which witnessed Washington and New Delhi expand their engagement in a number of substantive areas.¶ On the security front, cooperation reached unprecedented levels under Obama's first term. The United States now conducts more military exercises with India than with any other country in the world, while counter-terrorism and intelligence collaboration between the two has increased dramatically following the infamous November 2008 Mumbai terror attacks. President Obama has also taken significant steps to relax export-controls to India to allow New Delhi greater access to advanced US technology. Additionally, since 2008, the Obama Administration has approved the sale of more than $8 billion in military equipment from US defense suppliers to New Delhi. Administration officials have described India as the "linchpin" of its strategic rebalancing towards Asia and are relying on New Delhi to play a greater role stabilizing Afghanistan once the US begins its military withdrawal there.¶ Economically, trade with India is on track to cross the $100 billion mark for the first time, US investment in the country has skyrocketed compared to just a decade ago, and the two sides have worked to conclude a US-India Bilateral Investment Treaty that would further bolster their economic relationship.¶These positive trends will likely continue during a second Obama administration. Although the basic contours of US-India ties remain unchanged, reflecting the potent durability of the bilateral relationship, this is not to say that the two countries are in perfect harmony with one another on every issue.¶ As President Obama embarks on a second term, Washington will want New Delhi to continue reducing its dependence on Iranian oil, implement significant economic reforms that eliminate barriers to foreign investment, and modify liability legislation enacted by the Indian parliament that has precluded the United States and India from realizing the full benefits of the landmark US-India Civilian Nuclear Agreement. President George W. Bush signed the historic accord with Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh in 2005 and President Obama moved to quickly implement the deal by concluding a reprocessing agreement with India shortly after taking office.¶ New Delhi, for its part, will want Washington to resolve the Iran question exclusively through non-military means, resist entering into any formal security pact with the United States that would appear to compromise its inviolable strategic autonomy, and press Washington to make it easier for Indian tech workers to obtain visas to come to the United States.¶ Yet none of these issues--or any other differences that may remain between the two sides--is capable of arresting the overall upward trajectory of US-India relations. Areas of convergence far exceed areas of disagreement, indicating that earlier misgivings by some observers that bilateral ties had been oversold have been misguided.¶ President Obama has established himself as an able and effective custodian of the US-India strategic partnership. Although the bipartisan consensus that has emerged in Washington around the importance of deepening ties with India would suggest that US engagement with New Delhi would have continued regardless of whether he had won reelection, President Obama is uniquely well positioned to strengthen the US-India relationship during his second-term. His enduring popularity within India, close relationship with Manmohan Singh, and widespread support amongst the Indian-American community are just some of the distinctive factors that will help ensure ties with New Delhi remain robust and continue to grow over the next four years. If the past is any indicator of what's on the horizon, the future looks bright for US-India relations.

#### Innovation solves the impact

**Krikorian 4** [Mark, Executive Director of the Center for Immigration Studies, "Flawed Assumptions Underlying Guestworker Programs," February, http://www.cis.org/articles/2004/back204.html]

Another assumption that underlies a guestworker program is that the infusion of low-skilled foreign labor will not retard the process of technological innovation and increasing productivity. Unfortunately, elementary economics tells us that capital is likely to be substituted for labor only when the price of labor rises, something a guestworker program is specifically intended to prevent. A 2001 report by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston highlights this problem by warning that a new wave of low-skilled immigrants over the course of this century may slow growth in U.S. productivity.16 That this is so should not be a surprise. Julian Simon, in his 1981 classic, The Ultimate Resource, wrote about how scarcity leads to innovation: It is all-important to recognize that discoveries of improved methods and of substitute products are not just luck. They happen in response to scarcity a rise in cost. Even after a discovery is made, there is a good chance that it will not be put into operation until there is need for it due to rising cost. This point is important: Scarcity and technological advance are not two unrelated competitors in a Malthusian race; rather, each influences the other.17 As it is for copper or oil, this fact is true also for labor; as wages have risen over time, innovators have devised ways of substituting capital for labor, increasing productivity to the benefit of all. The converse, of course, is also true; the artificial superabundance of a resource will tend to remove much of the incentive for innovation. Stagnating innovation caused by excessive immigration is perhaps most apparent in the most immigrant-dependent activity the harvest of fresh fruit and vegetables.18 The period from 1960 to 1975 (roughly from the end of the "Bracero" program, which imported Mexican farmworkers, to the beginning of the mass illegal immigration we are still experiencing today) was a period of considerable agricultural mechanization. Although during hearings on the proposed termination of the Bracero Program in the early 1960s, California farmers claimed that "the use of braceros is absolutely essential to the survival of the tomato industry," the termination of the program prompted mechanization which caused a quintupling of production for tomatoes grown for processing, an 89 percent drop in demand for harvest labor, and a fall in real prices.19 But a continuing increase in the acreage and number of crops harvested mechanically did not materialize as expected, in large part because the supply of workers remained artificially large due to the growing illegal immigration we were politically unwilling to stop. An example of a productivity improvement that "will not be put into operation until there is need for it due to rising cost," as Simon said, is in raisin grapes.20 The production of raisins in California’s Central Valley is one of the most labor-intensive activities in North America. Conventional methods require bunches of grapes to be cut by hand, manually placed in a tray for drying, manually turned, manually collected. But starting in the 1950s in Australia (where there was no large supply of foreign farm labor), farmers were compelled by circumstances to develop a laborsaving method called "dried-on-the-vine" production. This involves growing the grapevines on trellises, then, when the grapes are ready, cutting the base of the vine instead of cutting each bunch of grapes individually. This new method radically reduces labor demand at harvest time and increases yield per acre by up to 200 percent. But this high-productivity, innovative method of production has spread very slowly in the United States because the mass availability of foreign workers has served as a disincentive to farmers to make the necessary capital investment.

**Water shortages are coming now- that will destroy the US agricultural base**

**Sovacool 9** (Benjamin K., Assistant Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, part of the National University of Singapore. He is also a Research Fellow in the Energy Governance Program at the Centre on Asia and Globalization. He has worked in advisory and research capacities at the U.S. National Science Foundation’s Electric Power Networks Efficiency and Security Program, Virginia Tech Consortium on Energy Restructuring, Virginia Center for Coal and Energy Research, New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Semiconductor Materials and Equipment International, and U.S. Department of Energy’s Climate Change Technology Program. He is the co-editor with Marilyn A. Brown of Energy and American Society: Thirteen Myths (2007) and the author of The Dirty Energy Dilemma: What’s Blocking Clean Power in the United States (2008). He is also a frequent contributor to such journals as Electricity Journal, Energy & Environment, and Energy Policy, Identifying future electricity–water tradeoffs in the United States, Energy Policy, Volume 37, Issue 7, July 2009, Pages 2763–2773)

If electric utilities build the thermoelectric capacity planned for by 2025, those new power plants would need about 14.6 billion gallons of water per day, potentially conflicting with the city's drinking water needs. The Natural Resources Defense Council has noted that Houston used to depend primarily on groundwater to provide 80% of its drinking water supply, but rapid depletion has lowered that amount to only 67% today, forcing the city to take more water from the Trinity, San Leon, and San Jacinto Rivers (along with the reservoirs they support) (Natural Resources Defense Council, 2003). These rivers, however, are precisely the ones where new power plants will likely be built, and where existing power plants, such as the 2211 MW P.H. Robinson coal facility and the 1498 MW Cedar Bayou natural gas facility, already draw their water from. With Houston water planners predicting rising demands for drinking water, there may not be enough water for both power plants and Houston residents.

Surface water upstream from Houston is also needed to irrigate agriculture. During the last serious water shortage caused by a prolonged drought in 1996, the **agricultural sector** was the **first to suffer** as water was diverted to supply power plants and drinking water systems. In June 1996, for instance, lack of water induced agricultural losses for cotton, wheat, feed grains, cattle, and corn at a cost of $2.4 billion for Texas, with an additional $4.1 billion in losses for agriculture-related industries such as harvesting, trucking, and food processing. Reduced irrigation also contributed to a drop in vegetable production, with concomitant losses in jobs and income and drastic increases in the price of foodstuffs (Wilhite, 2006).

4.2. Atlanta, Georgia

Georgia Power and Southern Company have reported to the EIA that they intend to build at least 3480 MW of new capacity between 2000 and 2025, power plants that would consume 13.7 billion gallons of water per year and withdraw an additional 672.2 billion gallons of water. Fed by the waters of the Chattahoochee and Chestatee rivers, Lake Sidney Lanier, a federally managed reservoir, provides most of Atlanta's drinking water. While Lake Lanier has the potential to hold almost 1.1 million acre feet of water, however, four years of a recent drought have taken their toll and the reservoir was at a historic 18 feet below its average level in late 2007. The drought was so serious that US Army Corps of Engineers is rewrote control manuals for vessel navigation on low river levels, and the federal government had to intervene in water discussions between Georgia, Tennessee, Alabama, and Florida.

Thermoelectric plants use slightly more than half of all surface water within Georgia, and those that consume and withdraw water in the northern part of the state reduce flows to Lake Lanier (Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, 2007). The most immediate consequence of increased thermoelectric water consumption in Atlanta could therefore be eventual tradeoffs with other major **industrial and commercial** water users in the region. These include Georgia-Pacific Corporation (one of the world's largest manufacturers of tissue, packaging, paper, pulp and building products), Mohawk Industries (the world's largest producer of flooring and carpets), and the city's water utility, as well as the Coca-Cola Corporation, Pepsi Cola Corporation, Lockheed Martin Corporation, and Edwards Baking Corporation. Together, these industries and corporations report billions of dollars of gross sales every year.

If Atlanta runs drastically short of water, a state-wide crisis could ensue as inter-basin water transfers across the 17-county metropolitan area increase, especially from the **Coosa River Basin** (Johnson et al., 2007). Greater water consumption for new power plants near Atlanta could contribute to the deterioration of ground water quality throughout Georgia, especially since aquifers in the middle of the state are already heavily tapped. A 2005 assessment of ground water conditions found that at least 16 groundwater sources were below the 25th percentile water level for the period on record (Leeth, 2005). State policymakers seem to recognize this, and a fierce legal battle has erupted. Georgia is fighting to hold back more water along its river basins and reservoirs, but Florida and Alabama have argued that Georgia has mismanaged water resources and that extra Georgian withdrawals would dry up river flows that support out of state power plants, farms, fisheries, and industrial users along the river (Evans, 2008). Alabama, for example, says that restrictions on water use in Georgia would impede electricity production at their Farley Nuclear Plant, also on the Chathoochee River, threatening power outages among 8,00,000 residents in three states. Tri-statewater negotiations have so far only precipitated in eight active lawsuits, and Georgia's state assembly passed a resolution calling on the governor to set up a commission looking into having the border redrawn through the middle of Chattanooga, Tennessee. Resolutions were later introduced in both the state House and Senate to annex part of Tennessee to increase Georgia's access to water (Sovacool, 2009).

4.3. Las Vegas, Nevada

Nevada Power Company and Sierra Pacific Power Company intend to add 20,148 MW of thermoelectric capacity between 2000 and 2025, power plants that would consume 78.8 billion gallons of water per year and withdraw an additional 3.86 trillion gallons of water. State demographers expect the addition of another 1.6 million residents, or an increase in population of more than 80%, to the Las Vegas area from 2008 to 2026 (Illis, 2007). Water is so important for the region that state Representative Jon Porter calls it “liquid gold” (Young, 2003, p. 2). Because of its arid climate, more than 90% of the water for Las Vegas comes from Lake Mead on the Colorado River. Lake Mead, one of the largest reservoirs in the world, was created by the Hoover Dam's blockage of the Colorado River (which receives most of its water from melting snowpack). It holds roughly the same amount of water flowing through that very river over a two-year period. During the past decade a shortage of precipitation has induced a widespread drought and a serious decline in water levels. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA, 2004) and the US Drought Monitor placed the Lake Mead region in “extreme hydrological drought,” only one category above the worst in their drought intensity scale. Researchers from the Federal Bureau of Land Reclamation estimate that the Lake Mead water system is losing 326 billion gallons of water per year (Madrigal, 2008). This water loss is so significant that it can easily be seen from satellite images from space.

An increase in the water needs for Nevada Power's generation portfolio could directly deplete more water from Lake Mead, which supplies cooling water for a majority of the power plants operating in the region. The Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection report that the thermoelectric capacity additions sought by Sierra Pacific and Nevada Power Company could need an additional 1.38 trillion gallons of water per year coming from Lake Mead by 2010 (Saunders, 2005).

If Lake Mead continues to be depleted, the result could be an agricultural crisis. Lake Mead, in addition to providing drinking water to the Las Vegas Valley Water District and cooling water for power plants, affects the availability of water for downstream withdrawals from the Colorado River. These downstream withdrawals directly irrigate about a million acres of farmland in southern California's Imperial Valley, and another half million acres in northern Mexico as part of an international water treaty. In addition, the water in Lake Mead powers the Hoover dam whose electricity feeds into 5,00,000 homes and pumps water over the Sierra Nevada Mountains to irrigate southern California (Allen and Simmon, 2003). If water continues to be depleted from Lake Mead faster than it can be replenished, **agricultural collapse** could strike the entire region and possibly **spread to Mexico**.

**Wind power expansion displaces water intensive power construction and generation.**

**Ridlington 12** (Elizabeth – Policy Analyst at Frontier Group, BA from Harvard, Rob Sargent – Energy Program Director at Environment America, Wind Power for a Cleaner America: Reducing Global Warming Pollution, Cutting Air Pollution and Saving Water, http://environmenttexas.org)

Wind Power for a Cleaner America

Wind Energy Reduces Pollution and Saves Water

Wind energy is delivering **substantial reductions** in global warming pollution and water consumption across the U.S. Maintaining and expanding America’s commitment to wind energy will produce even greater benefits.

Benefits from Existing Wind Facilities

Wind power is delivering environmental benefits across the nation by displacing generation from coal and gas plants. In 2011, the United States generated 120 million megawatt-hours (MWh) of electricity from wind power, or nearly 3 percent of electricity generated in the

U.S.26 (See Appendix A for a breakdown of wind power generation by state.)

Assuming that wind energy displaced generation from natural gas and coal- fired power plants, the environmental benefits of wind power in 2011 included: • Avoided emissions of 68 million metric tons of carbon dioxide—as much as would have been emitted by 13 million passenger vehicles in a year (see Appendix B). • Water savings of 26 billion gallons, more than enough to meet the annual domestic use needs of a city the size of Boston (see Appendix C). • Reductions in air pollution, includ- ing reductions of 137,000 pounds of nitrogen oxide emissions and 91,000 pounds of sulfur dioxide emissions (see Appendix D).

Texas reaps greater savings from wind than any other state, avoiding 17 million metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions annually, or nearly 8 percent of 2009 emissions from the state’s electric sector.27 (See Figure 3 and Table 1 on p. 15.) In addition, as the state recovers from the extreme drought in 2011 that caused major rivers to run dry, wind power is averting the consumption of 6.5 billion gallons of water per year, enough to supply all the residents of Waco.

Seven of the top ten wind power- producing states are also on the list of states suffering from areas of extreme or exceptional drought in 2012.28 Not including any new wind projects that were completed in 2012, wind power will have helped these seven states avoid consumption of 14.7 billion gallons of water at power plants, enough to serve more than 400,000 people.

The total benefits in 2012 will be greater as projects currently under construction are completed. Projects in progress could save an additional 17 million metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions per year, or as much as is emitted by 3.3 million passenger vehicles in a year. The nation can also expect to save an additional 6.5 billion gallons of water, enough for more than 175,000 people. (See appendices for full details.)

America Stands to Benefit Further if We Continue to Expand Wind Power

If construction of **new wind capacity** continues at a similar pace in coming years, environmental benefits **will add up quickly**.

Figure 3. Top 10 States for Carbon Dioxide Emission Reductions from Wind-Powered Generation in 2011

Assuming that the construction patterns observed in recent years continue, an additional 99 million MWh of electricity could be produced from wind in 2016. That would bring total generation from wind power to 249 million MWh in 2016, or 6 percent of all electricity generated in the U.S. in 2011.

Under this scenario, global warming pollution would be reduced by an additional 56 million metric tons. That is as much pollution as is released by 11 million passenger vehicles. Water savings would increase, too, with the addition of 21.6 billion gallons of savings, or enough for more than 600,000 people. This additional amount of water saved from wind energy would be almost enough to serve a city the size of Denver. Air pollution would decline by an additional 108,000 tons of nitrogen oxides and 79,000 tons of sulfur dioxide.

The U.S. has **vast untapped potential** wind energy. The U.S. Department of Energy estimates that 20 percent of the nation’s electricity could be supplied by wind power in 2030, up from 3 percent in 2011.29 That level of wind power could reduce electric sector water consumption by 17 percent in 2030 and cut global warming emissions by 825 million metric tons.

*Status quo solves – Obama has increased relations*

**Lamarque ’09** (Kevin, Reuters, 4-18, Time Magazine, “Signs of Spring: U.S.-Latin America Relations Thaw,” <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1892432,00.html>, jj)

If it's genuine, **it's hard to overestimate how important that promise is to Latin Americans**, who've experienced a lot more heavy-handed interventionism and condescending disregard than they have partnership from either Republicans or Democrats in Washington. **It not only heartened Latin leaders in Trinidad, it disarmed them**. The summit could have easily deteriorated into another *yanqui*-bashing fest over the U.S.'s role in the global economic crisis or its antiquated trade embargo against Cuba. But **Obama had even Chávez feeling "great optimism" that his nation's icy relations with the U.S. will thaw**, starting with the return of each other's ambassadors, expelled last year, to Washington and Caracas. That bonhomie was hardly assured beforehand. Obama and Chávez had been critical of each other in recent months, with Obama suggesting that Chávez supported Colombian guerrilla violence and Chávez suggesting, as a result, that Obama was an "ignoramus." To many observers it was a toss-up whether Chávez — who has pledged that he and his leftist allies in the region will not sign the gathering's final declaration, to protest the fact that communist Cuba is still not invited to these summits — would upbraid Obama in Port of Spain or, given Obama's international popularity, reach out to him. But **they shared a warm handshake** Friday night, during which Obama tried his Spanish (*mucho gusto,* or "pleased to meet you") and **Chávez insisted**, according to a Venezuela communiqué, "**I want to be your friend**." **So, it seems, does the rest of the region after this summit. To most Latin Americans, Obama could not present a starker contrast to his predecessor, George W. Bush, whom Chávez once called "the devil" and whose relations with the hemisphere were strained at best.** Even Bill Clinton as President didn't set foot south of the border until five months into his second term. Latin America, according to many experts, has the worst gap between rich and poor of any region in the world — a big reason why the U.S. has so many immigration-policy headaches. And **what Obama gave the region this weekend was a reason to think that it could finally set aside its 20th century resentments** — which, admittedly, have too often been exploited by Latin leaders as an excuse for their own epic failings and iron fists — and move on to 21st century development. To believe, that is, that the U.S. now appreciates what Brazilian President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva told TIME in a recent interview — that it's not smart policy for the U.S. to be such a rich country "surrounded by so many poor people."

#### Current violence is a nuisance but unlikely to escalate to large scale conflict or pose at threat to US security interests

#### Cárdenas, 3-17-11

[Mauricio, senior fellow and director of the Latin America Initiative at the Brookings Institution, was cabinet minister during the Gaviria and Pastrana administrations in Colombia. Think Again Latin America, Foreign Policy, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/03/17/think_again_latin_america?page=full>]

"Latin America is violent and dangerous." Yes, but not unstable. Latin American countries have among the world's highest rates of crime, murder, and kidnapping. Pockets of abnormal levels of violence have emerged in countries such as Colombia -- and more recently, in Mexico, Central America, and some large cities such as Caracas. With 140,000 homicides in 2010, it is understandable how Latin America got this reputation. Each of the countries in Central America's "Northern Triangle" (Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador) had more murders in 2010 than the entire European Union combined. Violence in Latin America is strongly related to poverty and inequality. When combined with the insatiable international appetite for the illegal drugs produced in the region, it's a noxious brew. As strongly argued by a number of prominent regional leaders -- including Brazil's former president, Fernando H. Cardoso, and Colombia's former president, Cesar Gaviria -- a strategy based on demand reduction, rather than supply, is the only way to reduce crime in Latin America. Although some fear the Mexican drug violence could spill over into the southern United States, Latin America poses little to no threat to international peace or stability. The major global security concerns today are the proliferation of nuclear weapons and terrorism. No country in the region is in possession of nuclear weapons -- nor has expressed an interest in having them. Latin American countries, on the whole, do not have much history of engaging in cross-border wars. Despite the recent tensions on the Venezuela-Colombia border, it should be pointed out that Venezuela has never taken part in an international armed conflict. Ethnic and religious conflicts are very uncommon in Latin America. Although the region has not been immune to radical jihadist attacks -- the 1994 attack on a Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, for instance -- they have been rare. Terrorist attacks on the civilian population have been limited to a large extent to the FARC organization in Colombia, a tactic which contributed in large part to the organization's loss of popular support.

### 2AC Oil

The PTC triggers their disads but doesn’t solve the aff- that’s the 1ac card

Offshore wind now

UPI 3/4/14 (U.S. inching closer to offshore wind¶ http://www.upi.com/Business\_News/Energy-Resources/2013/03/04/US-inching-closer-to-offshore-wind/UPI-50091362402077/)

BOSTON, March 4 (UPI) -- BOSTON, March 4 (UPI) -- The U.S. Interior Department said it was moving closer to issuing its first leases for offshore wind energy developments in the Atlantic Ocean.

Outgoing Interior Secretary Ken Salazar told an offshore wind conference in Boston that offshore wind energy was priority for his department.

"We have made impressive gains, approving dozens of utility-scale solar, wind and geothermal projects in the west and transitioning from planning to commercial leasing for offshore wind," he said.

U.S. President Barack Obama launched plans for a lease sale off the U.S. East Coast for wind energy development. The Energy Department said offshore wind has the potential to produce as much as 4,000 gigawatts of renewable electricity.

Salazar said his department has identified at least six areas off the East Coast that are suitable for wind energy development. The wind potential in those areas would eventually generate enough electricity to meet the annual electricity demands of 1.4 million households.

**US exports a lot of wind now**

**Zhang 3/8**/13 (Moran, US-China Trade: China Loves America’s Green Technology¶ Published on International Business Times (http://www.ibtimes.com)¶ http://www.ibtimes.com/print/us-china-trade-china-loves-americas-green-technology-1116313¶ )

As unlikely as it may sound, the U.S. actually has a trade surplus with China -- in the clean energy sector. The United States' strength in the advanced manufacturing of components and capital equipment to produce finished clean energy technologies has led to a $1.63 billion surplus in the clean energy trade over China, according to a new report .

More than half a trillion dollars’ worth of goods and services passed between the world’s two leading economies in 2011, the most recent year for which complete data is available, according to a study released by the Pew Charitable Trusts. The study is based on data gathered and analyzed by market research firm Bloomberg New Energy Finance.

The two countries are the largest and second-largest global electricity markets and greenhouse gas emitters and the leading recipients of clean energy investment. Nearly two of every five dollars invested in clean energy worldwide since 2004 has gone to one country or the other.

All told, the U.S. and China traded more than $8.5 billion worth of clean energy goods. U.S. firms enjoyed surpluses in all three major clean energy sectors: solar, wind and energy smart technologies, or products that use energy efficiently.

Solar energy product exports are the largest component of U.S.-China clean energy trade for both countries. Combined, firms based in the two nations traded more than $6.5 billion worth of products and services in 2011.

China used its manufacturing and labor edge to produce large numbers of cells and turbines. But the U.S. focused successfully on high-margin goods and services that ultimately raked in greater profits. On a net basis, the U.S. enjoyed a $913 million surplus in the solar sector in 2011.

In addition, many jobs associated with China’s high-volume manufacturing operations are low-skill, low-wage jobs. Over time, China’s advantage in low-cost labor is eroding because of the steady wage growth of its workers.

Photo: The Pew Charitable Trusts Many jobs associated with China’s high-volume manufacturing operations are low-skill, low-wage jobs.

As with solar, the U.S. wind industry -- the smallest component of the three main sectors of clean energy trade between the two countries -- excels in relatively high-margin specialty materials produced by large firms and in sensitive electronic and other control systems, with U.S. trade to China totaling $534.9 million.

China’s largest trade contributors are wind turbine towers -- a trade driven almost entirely by logistical concerns rather than pure cost advantages -- and turbine rotors manufactured under a U.S.-China joint venture. China’s wind energy exports to the U.S. totaled $388.7 million. Overall, U.S. firms had a net trade surplus of over $146 million.

#### The link is about natural gas vehicles –

#### a) Wind won’t displace nat gas

**Doty 10/23/12** - Energy market analyst @ Doty Scientific [Glen Doty, “Wind Power Will Blow Natural Gas Prices Much Higher,” Seeking Alpha, October 23, 2012, pg. http://tinyurl.com/9od9ac8

[My first article](http://seekingalpha.com/article/715911-winter-is-coming-natural-gas-prices-must-rise) demonstrated clearly that the crash in the natural gas market ([UNG](http://seekingalpha.com/symbol/ung), [GASZ](http://seekingalpha.com/symbol/gasz), [GAZ](http://seekingalpha.com/symbol/gaz), [UNL](http://seekingalpha.com/symbol/unl), [NAGS](http://seekingalpha.com/symbol/nags), [BOIL](http://seekingalpha.com/symbol/boil), etc...) experienced in the spring, summer, and fall of 2012 was certain to not be sustained. In the discussions following that article, it became clear that there is some confusion about the relationship between wind power ([FAN](http://seekingalpha.com/symbol/fan), [PWND](http://seekingalpha.com/symbol/pwnd)) and natural gas (NG) demand in the power sector. There seems to be a widespread belief that higher natural gas prices are good for wind power, and vice versa. Nothing could be further from the truth. The reality is that high wind penetration in some cases will result in higher natural gas prices. By spring of 2013, this is certain to be the case.

Natural Gas is crucial to have as the "balance power" (dispatchable backup) for wind power - which would otherwise be curtailed if there is too much reliance on baseload power (coal and nuclear). So the existence of low-cost natural gas ensures there is less integration problems, and therefore less risk for new wind farms or new expansions of wind farms. But the reverse is also true - as more wind power gets added to the grid, those same integration difficulties will change the price points for dispatch switching between baseload and natural gas (balance power).

#### b) LNG vehicles inevitable

Silverstein, 12/15/12 – Ken, Forbes contributor [“All Roads Lead to Natural Gas-Fueled Cars and Trucks”. Forbes. http://www.forbes.com/sites/kensilverstein/2012/12/15/all-roads-lead-to-natural-gas-fueled-cars-and-trucks/]

The tea leaves would tend to indicate that the transportation sector will increasingly fill up using natural gas: LNG is best with heavy duty trucks while compressed natural gas, or CNG, is used to power passenger vehicles and corporate fleets. The momentum, however, will be slow mainly because of a nascent infrastructure that would support such changes. But some high profile public and private players are working on that, and are expecting success.

“As global demand for transportation fuel increases, including LNG, Shell is well positioned to meet this demand,” says Marvin Odum, president of Shell Oil Company. “LNG will be a welcome addition to Shell’s portfolio of quality transportation fuels.”

What’s Shell up to? It is working with Wartsila North America to develop larger engines that could run on the fuel. It is also joining with Westport Innovations to co-market the need for new LNG-fueled trucks as well as partnering with GE’s transportation division to assist the rail industry in building locomotive engines that can function on both diesel and LNG.

As for Shell, this year marks the first time that its natural gas production exceeded that of its oil development. Shell says that it expects the global demand for LNG to double to 400 million tons by 2020 and to potentially as much as 500 million tons by 2025.

Meeting this demand will require an industry investment of $700 billion.   Right now, Shell has 22 million tons on stream today that is being manufactured in Australia, Indonesia and North America. It is also working with China, South Africa and Ukraine to help those nations maximize their natural gas potential.

The selling point is that natural gas used for transportation cost 25 percent less than petroleum. It’s also cleaner. Consider Weld County, Colorado: It says that it received its first LNG truck in July 2012 and that it has already realized a 22 percent reduction in fuel costs, or $25,000 a year in fuel savings per truck, according to a news story in the Northern Colorado Gazette.

“Right now, it is costing us 20 percent less per mile to run our LNG trucks versus our diesel trucks,” Jay McDonald, a country supervisor, told the paper.

Clean Energy Fuels is a champion of LNG, saying that it costs the equivalent of a $1.50 gallon. The company now has 75 LNG fueling stations but it is in the process of doubling that. As such, it is working with GE to achieve just that.

Clean Energy is buying two LNG plants from GE Oil and Gas., which will provide $200 million in financing. The facilities, which will supercool the natural gas so that it can be transported to the filling stations, are expected to be operational by 2015. They will supply 250,000 gallons per day, or enough to fill 28,000 trucks, says GE.

Both Clean Energy and GE say that the existing market provides a gauge. They point to Fed Ex and to UPS, which are using increasing amounts of compressed natural gas (CNG). They also note that Waste Management has announced that it will use CNG for 80 percent of its new trucks that haul trash. Once those entities start saving money, the partners argue that their competition would have no choice but to make similar business choices.

While CNG is primarily used in cars, buses and smaller trucks, the LNG that is getting rolled out at Clean Energy’s fueling stations is targeting long-haul, heavy-duty trucks, which will have the advantage of longer driving ranges while not impacting tractor weight and incremental costs, says the company’s release. In 2013, four major manufacturers will introduce a 12-liter LNG engine, which is the optimum size for heavy-duty 18-wheeler trucks.

“As the long-haul trucking industry begins its transition to natural gas, it will be critical to have a reliable supply of LNG,” says Andrew Littlefair, who spoke to this reporter via a conference call.

Cost, of course, is a major consideration. Here, the American Trucking Association is working with U.S. lawmakers to help subsidize this conversion. President Obama is in favor of using government’s levers to help make the transition to cleaner burning fuels but the fiscal hawks say that taxpayers cannot afford it.

#### Domestic oil production now links

Thomas 13 [Stefanie, reporter for the Observer, "US oil output continues to rise, but becoming world's top producer is an uphill battle," http://www.yourhoustonnews.com/kingwood/living/us-oil-output-continues-to-rise-but-becoming-world-s/article\_412ca322-6a56-11e2-96ce-001a4bcf887a.html]

HOUSTON -- Topping the list of the big oil and gas stories in 2012 was the dramatic surge is US oil production. In 2013, the US will remain the largest source of new oil growth worldwide aided by the shale boom, but surpassing Saudi Arabia as the globe's top oil producer by 2020 will be a challenge. According to the Ernst & Young Oil & Gas Center, the big turnaround of US oil production brought by new light tight oil developments was fully recognized in 2012, putting to rest the long-held notion that domestic oil production was in terminal decline. The rise in domestic oil output and the expectation that US oil development will continue to grow amid high oil prices prompted some market observers to predict the US could become the world's largest oil producer, upstaging Saudi Arabia, by 2020.

**2. US doesn’t effect oil prices**

**Borenstein, 12.** (Severin Borenstein is E.T. Grether Professor of Business Economics and Public Policy at U.C. Berkeley's Haas School of Business and co-director of the Energy Institute at Haas. He teaches course in microeconomics and energy markets and has published numerous papers on oil and gasoline markets. “US Can’t Control the World Oil Market.” March 2, 2012. <<http://www.usnews.com/debate-club/is-obama-to-blame-for-high-gas-prices/the-us-cant-control-the-world-oil-market>>)

Oil prices drive gasoline prices and current oil prices are high. But $125 per barrel oil today is no more the fault of President Obama than $147 oil was President Bush's fault in June 2008. There is very little the U.S. president can do to change oil prices over months or a few years. U.S. oil production was up 13 percent in 2011 over 2008, but still remains less than one-tenth of the world oil market.¶ Producing more oil domestically will enrich the U.S. economy, particularly U.S. oil companies and their workers. With oil so valuable, it may be a good idea, though the value must be weighed against environmental consequences. But it will have no discernible impact on gas prices, because it will change the world's supply/demand balance for oil by less than 2 or 3 percent over a decade or more.¶ In fact, the impact on gas prices would probably be about the same as the recent increase in U.S. fuel economy standards will have over the next 20 years: somewhere between very little and none. The advantage of doubling fuel economy is that it will halve the cost of driving even if it has no impact on gas prices.¶ Many on the left, and a few on the right, argue that misguided or nefarious speculation in oil futures markets has driven oil prices well above their true competitive level. The claim, however, is rejected by nearly all economists across a broad range of political perspectives, from Paul Krugman to the Heritage Foundation. Speculation can cause short-run increases in oil price—on the order of days or weeks—but eventually if the price doesn't equate real physical demand with real physical supply, a massive buildup of inventories puts downward pressure on prices.¶ So what does drive the price of oil and therefore gasoline? The real physical suppliers do, especially Saudi Arabia. The Saudis hold more spare capacity today than the U.S. could bring online in the next decade even if all federal lands were opened to drilling. Likewise, the factors that drive the physical demand for oil, particularly the growing demand from China, India, and other developing countries, push up U.S. gas prices.¶ Those factors aren't going to change anytime soon. Even with the new drilling technologies, most oil production and the vast majority of reserves will remain in the Middle East and Africa. And the growth of oil demand from the developing world is much more likely to accelerate than abate. We need to adapt to this changing world, hoping that new supplies keep prices under control, but preparing for a world with permanently higher gasoline prices. Nothing the politicians are going to say or do will change those hard realities.

#### Libyan instability does not affect the rest of the region.

Bandow, 11 (Doug, Senior Fellow @ the Cato Institute, War in Libya: Barack Obama Gets in Touch With His Inner Neocon, March 19th, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/doug-bandow/war-in-libya-barack-obama_b_838049.html>)

What happens if troops sent in by the Sunni monarchies of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates shoot down Shiite demonstrators in Bahrain? Will the Obama administration do anything more than clear its collective throat? Even more dubious is the claim that Washington must intervene since the Libyan conflict is destabilizing the region. The Libyan uprising was triggered by the revolutions in Tunisia and Egypt, not vice versa. Africa has suffered far worse conflicts for decades without affecting America or Europe. Continued U.S. support for Israel despite the latter's authoritarian rule over millions of Palestinians weighs far more heavily on the Arab Street than whether America is willing to push Gaddafi out of power. And Bahrain is today's most dangerous regional spark, with the potential of triggering a Gulf-wide conflict between Shia and Sunni. Anyway, getting involved in someone else's civil war is a curious way to promote stability. A simple no fly zone, especially at this stage, wouldn't likely alter the balance of power on the ground. Hence the more expansive resolution and French action against Libyan ground forces. But this means the allies are taking sides in a civil war, not protecting civilians. The ultimate objective is to take Tripoli, not safeguard Benghazi.

#### No risk of escalation in Libya

Greenblatt 11 (April 4th, Alan, “Can 'Limited' U.S. Engagement In Libya Stay Limited?”, http://www.npr.org/2011/04/04/135113364/can-limited-u-s-engagement-in-libya-stay-limited)

The United States has fought a number of "limited" conflicts since the end of the Cold War. Libya is unlikely to escalate into a broader war in the way that, say, Korea and Vietnam did, outside observers say. Gadhafi does not have the support of his neighbors, so they are unlikely to be drawn in. He also lacks a superpower patron who might send proxies to fight on his behalf.

#### Mexico will not collapse or become a failed state -- political will solves.

#### Bay, ‘9

[Austin, 1/20. “Machiavelli, Joint Forces Command and Mexico” http://www.strategypage.com/on\_point/2009012023470.aspx]

Mexico's foreign minister objects -- and she's right. "**Mexico is not a failed state**," Foreign Minister Patricia Espinosa said this week, responding to sensationalized headlines that suggested the "The Joint Operating Environment (JOE)" study (published in November 2008) by U.S. Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) was predicting Mexico's collapse. The study was not a prediction. JFCOM made that explicit: "This document is speculative in nature and does not suppose to predict what will happen ... " But fear sells. Sensationalists latched onto the comments in the document that cited Pakistan and Mexico worst-case "rapid collapse" scenarios, which -- if they occurred -- would damage U.S. interests. Fearmongers missed (or ignored) the scenarios, which were "what ifs?" designed to spur creative planning and policies that would avoid them altogether. JFCOM's planners were merely doing their job. "Worst-case scenarios" provide fodder for war-gaming and planning "excursions." This intellectual preparation may or may not have organizational and technological consequences, but the intellectual exploration has value. Classicists understand. In Chapter 14 of "The Prince," Machiavelli writes of "Philopoemen, the leader of the Achaeans" who was "praised by the historians for ... having in peacetime never thought of anything else except military strategy." As he traveled he would "invite discussion" from his friends -- likely the men who would be his subordinate commanders in wartime. They would speculate on how they might defend a hill they were passing, maneuver in the terrain for advantage or even retreat. Machiavelli writes: "Because of these continuous speculations," Philopoemen "knew how to cope with all and every emergency." Philopoemen, however, didn't have to deal with instantaneous, global selective quotation and hype. No doubt a Mexican collapse would have huge effects on the U.S.; so would a collapse of Canada, which has also been war-gamed. In the latest edition of "A Quick and Dirty Guide to War" (fourth edition, Paladin Press), James F. Dunnigan and I revisit a "Canadian collapse" scenario first war-gamed in 1990. It is an analytic exercise speculating on the consequences of Quebec separating from the rest of Canada. Any direct comparison between Mexico and Pakistan is a huge stretch. Pakistan is failing, and it isn't clear that the central government has the power or political will to address fundamental ethnic, economic, demographic and ideological challenges. Mexico is a threatened state, but **the country has political will to confront the threats posed by violent drug cartels and its own legacy of corrupt politics**. President Felipe Calderon made that quite evident when he launched The Cartel War in December 200Even accounting for Chiapas (Maya land) and numerous wannabe separatists, Mexico also has money, education and a comparative political-social coherence the entirety of South and Central Asia should envy. Gen. (retired) Barry McCaffrey's recent report to the West Point social sciences department on Mexico (memo dated Dec. 29, 2008) praises the Mexican government's will to act decisively and provides sound advice to U.S. policymakers: "Now is the time during the opening months of a new U.S. administration to jointly commit to a fully resourced major partnership as political equals of the Mexican government … Specifically, we must support the government of Mexico's efforts to confront the ultra violent drug cartels. We must do so in ways that are acceptable to the Mexican polity and that take into account Mexican sensitivities to sovereignty. The U.S. government cannot impose a solution. The political will is present in Mexico to make the tough decisions that are required to confront a severe menace to the rule of law and the authority of the Mexican state." McCaffrey's report also noted: "President Calderon has committed his government to the "Limpiemos Mexico" campaign to "clean up Mexico." This is not rhetoric. They have energized their departments of social development, public education and health to be integral parts of this campaign. Finally, there is a clear understanding that this is an eight-year campaign -- not a short-term surge." The Mexican people are fighting a war for modernity -- it is a long war, but it is a war they are winning.

## 1AR

### 1AR Heg Defense

**Hegemony doesn’t prevent war – its absence would have zero effect on international stability   
Friedman 10** [Ben, research fellow in defense and homeland security, Cato. PhD candidate in political science, MIT, Military Restraint and Defense Savings, 20 July 2010, <http://www.cato.org/testimony/ct-bf-07202010.html>]  
  
Another argument for high military spending is that U.S. military hegemony underlies global stability. Our forces and alliance commitments dampen conflict between potential rivals like China and Japan, we are told, preventing them from fighting wars that would disrupt trade and cost us more than the military spending that would have prevented war. The theoretical and empirical foundation for this claim is weak. It overestimates both the American military's contribution to international stability and the danger that instability abroad poses to Americans. In Western Europe, U.S. forces now contribute little to peace, at best making the tiny odds of war among states there slightly more so.7 Even in Asia, where there is more tension, the history of international relations suggests that without U.S. military deployments potential rivals, especially those separated by sea like Japan and China, will generally achieve a stable balance of power rather than fight. In other cases, as with our bases in Saudi Arabia between the Iraq wars, U.S. forces probably create more unrest than they prevent. Our force deployments can also generate instability by prompting states to develop nuclear weapons. Even when wars occur, their economic impact is likely to be limited here.8 By linking markets, globalization provides supply alternatives for the goods we consume, including oil. If political upheaval disrupts supply in one location, suppliers elsewhere will take our orders. Prices may increase, but markets adjust. That makes American consumers less dependent on any particular supply source, undermining the claim that we need to use force to prevent unrest in supplier nations or secure trade routes.9 Part of the confusion about the value of hegemony comes from misunderstanding the Cold War. People tend to assume, falsely, that our activist foreign policy, with troops forward supporting allies, not only caused the Soviet Union's collapse but is obviously a good thing even without such a rival. Forgotten is the sensible notion that alliances are a necessary evil occasionally tolerated to balance a particularly threatening enemy. The main justification for creating our Cold War alliances was the fear that Communist nations could conquer or capture by insurrection the industrial centers in Western Europe and Japan and then harness enough of that wealth to threaten us — either directly or by forcing us to become a garrison state at ruinous cost. We kept troops in South Korea after 1953 for fear that the North would otherwise overrun it. But these alliances outlasted the conditions that caused them. During the Cold War, Japan, Western Europe and South Korea grew wealthy enough to defend themselves. We should let them. These alliances heighten our force requirements and threaten to drag us into wars, while providing no obvious benefit.

**No transition wars**

**Buzan 11** [Barry, Professor of International Relations at the London School of Economics, "The Inaugural Kenneth N. Waltz Annual Lecture A World Order Without Superpowers Decentred Globalism," International Relations, 4-1, vol. 25 no. 1 3-25]

There are many reasons to think that a regionalized international order would work quite well. The generic worry about such an order stems from the experience of most of the 20th century, when imperial powers competed with each other either over their spheres of influence or over whether one of them could dominate the whole world, and the 1930s’ experience is often cited as a warning against going down this route. 45 For several reasons the danger of a struggle for global hegemony seems no longer very salient. First, the West is in relative decline, and other regions are mainly defensive in outlook, trying to maintain their political and cultural characteristics, and find their own route to modernization, against Western pressure. Nobody else obviously wants the job of global leader. Second any potential global hegemon will be constrained both by the breadth and depth of anti-hegemonism, and by the difficulty of acquiring the necessary material preponderance and social standing. Third, there are no deep ideological or racist differences to fuel conflict like those that dominated the 20th century. Fourth, all the great powers fear both war and economic breakdown, and have a commitment to maintaining world trade. Nobody wants to go back to the autarchic, empire-building days of the 1930s. In addition, a good case can be made that sufficient shared values exist to underpin a reasonable degree of global-level coexistence and cooperation even in a more regionalized international order. Logics additional to Waltz’s unit veto ideas about the proliferation of nuclear weapons 46 are in play: cultural, political and economic factors can also work to produce a stable international order. The world will certainly divide on whether the move towards such an order is a good thing or not. Liberals, both in the West and elsewhere, will lament the weakening of their universalist project, and fear the rise of various parochialisms, some possibly quite nasty. Whatever its merits, a more regionalized world order would mark a retreat from universalist liberal agendas of both a political and an economic sort. The loss of hegemonic leadership would probably mean a reduction in the overall management capacity of the system, though even that is not a given. One should not underestimate the possibilities for innovation on this front once the now in-built habit of dependence on US leadership is broken. On the economic side, regions would still provide a halfway house for economies of scale, and there would still be a lot of global trade and cooperation on many functional matters from big science to environmental management. It is not without significance that even during the depths of the Cold War, the Americans and the Soviets were able to negotiate on common survival issues such as nuclear testing, non-proliferation and arms control. However, there would no longer be an attempt to run a financially integrated global economy.

### 1AR - No Pass

#### A litany of barriers block reform – only progressivism solves

Hispanic Link News Service, 3/6 [President Obama and Congress are still far apart on immigration reform, http://www.voxxi.com/obama-congress-apart-immigration-reform/]

WASHINGTON, D.C. — President Barack Obama and Congress have yet to address seriously, let alone find much common ground, on major differences in shaping comprehensive immigration reform legislation this year. They remain ideologically and politically far apart on a myriad of issues, most prominently border enforcement, a path to citizenship and family reunification.

The latest move by the Administration is the probationary release of several hundred immigrants from detention centers over the country who are awaiting disposition of their deportation orders. White House press secretary Jay Carney says they are ”low-risk, non-criminal detainees” being shifted to a less-expensive form of monitoring to ensure detention levels stay within ICE’s overall budget.

More than 400,000 immigrants are held annually in 250 federal immigration prisons. House Judiciary Committee chairman Robert Goodlatte (R- Virginia) calls it “abhorrent that President Obama is releasing criminals into our communities.” He adds that achieving an overhaul of immigration laws would have better odds if Congress, rather than the President, takes the lead.

President Obama’s leaked immigration bill

The buoyancy from the president’s Feb. 12 State of the Union immigration reform message turned flat five days later, when USA Today obtained a copy and revealed it. The leaked proposal included his intended roadmap to citizenship for nearly 11 million undocumented immigrants who meet stringent requirements in order to qualify. Although the White House has not confirmed the report, qualifying immigrants would be granted renewable “lawful prospective immigrant” visas.

Much like the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival (DACA) program, the plan would allow currently undocumented immigrants to live and work here temporarily within a four-year timeframe. After that, the visa could be renewed. Immigrants would have to pass criminal background checks, submit biometrics and pay any back taxes and fees due. The current non-refundable fee is $685 to take the citizenship test is $685.

Applicants would then have a minimum eight-year wait before they could apply for a green card, which grants permanent residency. Some persons already in deportation proceedings would be allowed to apply. The New York Times reported that none of the 11 million undocumented immigrants currently in the country would be granted permanent resident status or a green card before the earlier of two dates: Either eight years after the bill is enacted or 30 days after visas have been awarded to everyone who applied legally before they did.

During the State of the Union address the President entreated, “Let’s get this done. Send me a comprehensive immigration reform bill in the next few months, and I will sign it right away.” The bipartisan exuberance that filled the House chamber has visibly retracted. Senator John McCain (R-Ariz.) told NBC’s Meet the Press that if the president proposes the leaked plan as legislation it would fail. “Leaks don’t happen in Washington by accident,” he added.

U.S. Rep. Paul Ryan (R-Wisc.,) who had earlier praised Obama’s State of the Union immigration rhetoric, said on ABC’s This Week that by leaking his proposal the president was “looking for a partisan advantage and not a bipartisan solution.” Meanwhile, U.S. Rep. Luis Gutierrez (D-Ill.) cautioned that when Washington perceives people as complacent, “Someone will come and steal our victory right before our very eyes…Nothing happens in Washington, D.C., without a consistent and persistent demand from outside.”

Compromises are imminent, he said. “We have to understand something very clearly. The majority in the House of Representatives are Republicans. Reform cannot be passed without their support.”

In a Feb. 20 statement, Gutierrez called the leak a nod in the “right direction,” stating there is no need for the president to introduce his bill at this time but he and the public must continue pressuring Congress to act quickly. “We can’t let inertia, politics, gridlock or fights on other issues to get in the way of an immigration bill this year.” Latinos didn’t vote in unprecedented numbers in the last election just to have their friends and family deported or relegated to second-class status, said Eliseo Medina, international secretary-treasurer of the 2.1 million-member Service Employees International Union (SEIU.) “We will make sure voters in 2014 know who championed reform and who stood in the way.”

Republicans are changing their mind about immigration reform

Many Republicans have heard that message loud and clear, including Congressman Mike Coffman (R- Colo.) a consistent hardliner on immigration who had supported a bill that would have revoked birthright citizenship for the children of undocumented immigrants. He has done a 180, reported Politico, which quoted him, “I think the whole country is changing…and the Republican Party is shifting.”

Civilities between some Republicans and the President have undoubtedly diminished. U.S. Senator Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) intoned, “President Obama’s leaked immigration proposal is disappointing to those of us working on a serious solution. It would be dead on arrival in Congress.”

#### No pass --- wont be introduced for another month

#### Davis 3-9 [Julie, Bloomberg reporter, "White House Said to Expect Immigration Plan in April," 3-9, http://www.businessweek.com/news/2013-03-08/white-house-said-to-expect-immigration-plan-in-april]

Senators have raised doubts in recent days that they would complete their work by the end of the month. “I don’t know the timing,” Republican Senator Marco Rubio of Florida said in a March 5 interview. “We’re working on it -- as soon as we have it ready.” Negotiators have been unable to resolve a dispute over a new guest-worker program for lower-skilled immigrants, and are divided over the criteria for admitting future legal immigrants into the U.S. Republican Senator Lindsey Graham of South Carolina told the Associated Press this week that it wouldn’t be a good idea to release the measure just before a two-week congressional break, thus giving opponents an opportunity to criticize it while lawmakers are home in their districts. “You don’t want to leave it hanging out for two weeks to get shot up,” he told the AP. The Senate recess is scheduled from March 25 to April 5.

#### Democratic opposition and piecemealing

Fung 3-7

DEMOCRATS' DILEMMA ON HIGH-SKILLED IMMIGRATION REFORM. March 7

http://www.nextgov.com/cio-briefing/2013/03/democrats-dilemma-high-skilled-immigration-reform/61731/?oref=ng-dropdown

In a world with no competing priorities, H-1B reform would pass easily. But for two political reasons, the change is being held up in Congress. Senate lawmakers who are most involved with immigration legislation--the so-called Gang of Eight--would prefer to see a comprehensive deal. That's also the position President Obama has taken. The trick lies in corralling enough Republicans to support a total-package process, as opposed to striking a set of smaller agreements. Carving out skilled immigration might lead to an easy bipartisan win, but it would give ammunition to piecemealers and risk fracturing the Gang of Eight. On the Democratic side, the issue is problematic for another reason: Addressing high-skilled immigration alone does nothing to help low-skilled immigrants. “If there's an attempt to just try and pass high-end, high-tech immigration, guess who will be furious? The Hispanic community,” Sen. Chuck Schumer of New York, a Democratic Gang of Eight member, told tech-industry advocates at a daylong event in Washington Tuesday. Addressing one type of immigration without the other would be counterproductive for Democrats, who--particularly after 2012’s electoral results showing a shift in minority voting patterns--benefit from the perception of Latinos as a natural constituency for their party. Another problem for Democrats is union opposition to lifting the cap on high-skilled workers. Organizations representing blue-collar workers, said Schumer, have successfully argued in the past that more high-skilled foreign workers would hurt U.S. citizens’ chances of finding jobs. (It’s not entirely clear how this logic works in the long run; if there were already an abundance of high-skilled U.S. workers, then the STEM deficit wouldn’t be a problem, and Washington wouldn’t be looking abroad to fill the gap. Someday the United States will start graduating more skilled workers, but that's little comfort to tech companies who need labor now.) The new focus on high-tech immigration therefore sets up a potential showdown between one group emblematic of the Democrats’ industrial legacy and two that are emblematic of its technological and demographic future--groups that are nevertheless themselves at odds.

### 1ar - Winners-Win

#### Controversial fights are key to the agenda.

Dickerson 13 (John, Chief Political Correspondent at the Slate, Political Director of CBS News, Covered Politics for Time Magazine for 12 Years, Previous White House Correspondent, Go for the Throat!, http://tinyurl.com/b7zvv4d)

On Monday, President Obama will preside over the grand reopening of his administration. It would be altogether fitting if he stepped to the microphone, looked down the mall, and let out a sigh: so many people expecting so much from a government that appears capable of so little. A second inaugural suggests new beginnings, but this one is being bookended by dead-end debates. Gridlock over the fiscal cliff preceded it and gridlock over the debt limit, sequester, and budget will follow. After the election, the same people are in power in all the branches of government and they don't get along. There's no indication that the president's clashes with House Republicans will end soon.

Inaugural speeches are supposed to be huge and stirring. Presidents haul our heroes onstage, from George Washington to Martin Luther King Jr. George W. Bush brought the Liberty Bell. They use history to make greatness and achievements seem like something you can just take down from the shelf. Americans are not stuck in the rut of the day.

But this might be too much for Obama’s second inaugural address: After the last four years, how do you call the nation and its elected representatives to common action while standing on the steps of a building where collective action goes to die? That **bipartisan** bag of tricks has been tried and it didn’t work. People don’t believe it. Congress' approval rating is 14 percent, the lowest in history. In a December Gallup poll, 77 percent of those asked said the way Washington works is doing “serious harm” to the country.

The challenge for President Obama’s speech is the challenge of his second term: how to be great when the **environment stinks**. Enhancing the president’s legacy requires something more than simply the clever application of predictable stratagems. Washington’s **partisan rancor**, the size of the problems facing government, and the limited amount of **time** before Obama is a lame duck all point to a single conclusion: The president who came into office speaking in lofty terms about **bipartisanship** and cooperation can only cement his legacy if he **destroys the GOP**. If he wants to transform American politics, he must **go for the throat**.

President Obama could, of course, resign himself to tending to the achievements of his first term. He'd make sure health care reform is implemented, nurse the economy back to health, and put the military on a new footing after two wars. But he's more ambitious than that. He ran for president as a one-term senator with no executive experience. In his first term, he pushed for the biggest overhaul of health care possible because, as he told his aides, he wanted to make history. He may already have made it. There's no question that he is already a president of consequence. But there's no sign he's content to ride out the second half of the game in the Barcalounger. He is approaching gun control, climate change, and immigration with wide and excited eyes. He's not going for caretaker.

How should the president proceed then, if he wants to be bold? The Barack Obama of the first administration might have approached the task by finding some Republicans to deal with and then start agreeing to some of their demands in hope that he would win some of their votes. It's the traditional approach. Perhaps he could add a good deal more schmoozing with lawmakers, too.

That's the old way. **He has abandoned that**. He doesn't think it will work and he doesn't have the time. As Obama explained in his last press conference, he thinks the Republicans are dead set on opposing him. They cannot be unchained by schmoozing. Even if Obama were wrong about Republican intransigence, other constraints will limit the chance for cooperation. Republican lawmakers worried about primary challenges in 2014 are not going to be willing partners. He probably has at most 18 months before people start dropping the lame-duck label in close proximity to his name.

Obama’s **only remaining option is to pulverize**. Whether he succeeds in passing legislation or not, given his ambitions, his goal should be to delegitimize his opponents. Through a series of **clarifying fights over controversial issues**, he can force Republicans to either side with their coalition's most extreme elements or cause a rift in the party that will leave it, at least temporarily, in disarray.

This theory of political transformation rests on the weaponization (and slight bastardization) of the work by Yale political scientist Stephen Skowronek. Skowronek has written extensively about what distinguishes transformational presidents from caretaker presidents. In order for a president to be transformational, the old order has to fall as the orthodoxies that kept it in power exhaust themselves. Obama's gambit in 2009 was to build a new post-partisan consensus. That didn't work, but by exploiting the weaknesses of today’s Republican Party, Obama has an opportunity to hasten the demise of the old order by increasing the political cost of having the GOP coalition defined by Second Amendment absolutists, **climate science deniers**, supporters of “self-deportation” and the pure no-tax wing.

#### Prefer our argument --- qualifications and empirics.

**Dickerson 13** (John, Chief Political Correspondent at the Slate, Political Director of CBS News, Covered Politics for Time Magazine for 12 Years, Previous White House Correspondent, Go for the Throat!, http://tinyurl.com/b7zvv4d)

Obama’s only remaining option is to pulverize. Whether he succeeds in passing legislation or not, given his ambitions, his goal should be to delegitimize his opponents. Through a series of clarifying fights over controversial issues, he can force Republicans to either side with their coalition's most extreme elements or cause a rift in the party that will leave it, at least temporarily, in disarray.

This theory of political transformation rests on the weaponization (and slight bastardization) of the work by **Yale political scientist** Stephen Skowronek. Skowronek has written extensively about what distinguishes transformational presidents from caretaker presidents. In order for a president to be transformational, the old order has to fall as the orthodoxies that kept it in power exhaust themselves. Obama's gambit in 2009 was to build a new post-partisan consensus. That didn't work, but by exploiting the weaknesses of today’s Republican Party, Obama has an opportunity to hasten the demise of the old order by increasing the political cost of having the GOP coalition defined by Second Amendment absolutists, climate science deniers, supporters of “self-deportation” and the pure no-tax wing.

The president has the ambition and has picked a second-term agenda that can lead to clarifying fights. The next necessary condition for this theory to work rests on the Republican response. Obama needs two things from the GOP: overreaction and charismatic dissenters. They’re not going to give this to him willingly, of course, but mounting pressures in the party and the personal ambitions of individual players may offer it to him anyway. Indeed, Republicans are serving him some of this recipe already on gun control, immigration, and the broader issue of fiscal policy.

On gun control, the National Rifle Association has overreached. Its Web video mentioning the president's children crossed a line.\* The group’s dissembling about the point of the video and its message compounds the error. (The video was also wrong). The NRA is whipping up its members, closing ranks, and lashing out. This solidifies its base, but is not a strategy for wooing those who are not already engaged in the gun rights debate. It only appeals to those who already think the worst of the president. Republicans who want to oppose the president on policy grounds now have to make a decision: Do they want to be associated with a group that opposes, in such impolitic ways, measures like universal background checks that 70 to 80 percent of the public supports? Polling also suggests that women are more open to gun control measures than men. The NRA, by close association, risks further defining the Republican Party as the party of angry, white Southern men.

The president is also getting help from Republicans who are calling out the most extreme members of the coalition. New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie called the NRA video "reprehensible." Others who have national ambitions are going to have to follow suit. The president can rail about and call the GOP bad names, but that doesn't mean people are going to listen. He needs members inside the Republican tent to ratify his positions—or at least to stop marching in lockstep with the most controversial members of the GOP club. When Republicans with national ambitions make public splits with their party, this helps the president.

(There is a corollary: The president can’t lose the support of Democratic senators facing tough races in 2014. Opposition from within his own ranks undermines his attempt to paint the GOP as beyond the pale.)

If the Republican Party finds itself destabilized right now, it is in part because the president has already **implemented a version** of this strategy. In the 2012 campaign, the president successfully transformed the most intense conservative positions into liabilities on immigration and the role of government. Mitt Romney won the GOP nomination on a platform of “self-deportation” for illegal immigrants—and the Obama team never let Hispanics forget it. The Obama campaign also branded Republicans with Romney's ill-chosen words about 47 percent of Americans as the party of uncaring millionaires.

Now Republican presidential hopefuls like Chris Christie, Marco Rubio, and Bobby Jindal are trying to fix the party's image. There is a general scramble going on as the GOP looks for a formula to move from a party that relies on older white voters to one that can attract minorities and younger voters.

Out of fear for the long-term prospects of the GOP, some Republicans may be willing to partner with the president. That would actually mean progress on important issues facing the country, which would enhance Obama’s legacy. If not, the president will stir up a fracas between those in the Republican Party who believe it must show evolution on issues like immigration, gun control, or climate change and those who accuse those people of betraying party principles.

That fight will be loud and in the open—and in the short term unproductive. The president can stir up these fights by poking the fear among Republicans that the party is becoming defined by its most extreme elements, which will in turn provoke fear among the most faithful conservatives that weak-willed conservatives are bending to the popular mood. That will lead to more tin-eared, dooming declarations of absolutism like those made by conservatives who sought to define the difference between legitimate and illegitimate rape—and handed control of the Senate to Democrats along the way. For the public watching from the sidelines, these intramural fights will look confused and disconnected from their daily lives. (Lip-smacking Democrats don’t get too excited: This internal battle is the necessary precondition for a GOP rebirth, and the Democratic Party has its own tensions.)

This approach is not a path of gentle engagement. It **requires confrontation** and bright lines and tactics that are more aggressive

than the president demonstrated in the first term. He can't turn into a snarling hack. The posture is probably one similar to his official second-term photograph: smiling, but with arms crossed.

The president already appears to be headed down this path. He has admitted he’s not going to spend much time improving his schmoozing skills; he's going to get outside of Washington to ratchet up public pressure on Republicans. He is transforming his successful political operation into a governing operation. It will have his legacy and agenda in mind—and it won’t be affiliated with the Democratic National Committee, so it will be able to accept essentially unlimited donations. The president tried to use his political arm this way after the 2008 election, but he was constrained by re-election and his early promises of bipartisanship. No more. Those days are done.

Presidents don’t usually sow discord in their inaugural addresses, though the challenge of writing a speech in which the call for compromise doesn’t evaporate faster than the air out of the president’s mouth might inspire him to shake things up a bit. If it doesn’t, and he tries to conjure our better angels or summon past American heroes, then it will be among the most forgettable speeches, because the next day he’s going to return to

#### Finite time and attention aren’t attributable to political capital – bigger national mood and interest issues

HIRSH 2 – 7 – 13 chief correspondent for National Journal, previously served as the senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek. Overseas Press Club award for best magazine reporting from abroad in 2001 and for Newsweek’s coverage of the war on terror, which also won a National Magazine Award [Michael Hirsh, There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207]

THE REAL LIMITS ON POWER

Presidents are limited in what they can do by time and attention span, of course, just as much as they are by electoral balances in the House and Senate. But this, too, has nothing to do with political capital. Another well-worn meme of recent years was that Obama used up too much political capital passing the health care law in his first term. But the real problem was that the plan was unpopular, the economy was bad, and the president didn’t realize that the national mood (yes, again, the national mood) was at a tipping point against big-government intervention, with the tea-party revolt about to burst on the scene. For Americans in 2009 and 2010—haunted by too many rounds of layoffs, appalled by the Wall Street bailout, aghast at the amount of federal spending that never seemed to find its way into their pockets—government-imposed health care coverage was simply an intervention too far. So was the idea of another economic stimulus. Cue the tea party and what ensued: two titanic fights over the debt ceiling. Obama, like Bush, had settled on pushing an issue that was out of sync with the country’s mood.

# Semis vs UGA LS

## 1AC

### Plan

United States Department of Agriculture should create a set-aside of Rural Energy for America Program financial incentives for wind power for Central Appalachia.

### Agroforestry

#### ADVANTAGE one: Agroforestry

#### Wind power paves the way for it - Central Appalachia will be the model for the transition

**Haltom 10** - Co-director of Coal River Muntain Watch [Vernon Haltom, “Can a Wind Farm Transform Appalachia's Energy Future?,” Solutions Journal, Volume 1 | Issue 4 | Page 71-77 | Jul 2010, pg. http://tinyurl.com/9e3fyr8

The communities of the Coal River Valley suffered a heartbreaking catastrophe on April 5, 2010, when Massey Energy's Upper Big Branch longwall mine exploded, killing 29 miners in the worst U.S. mine disaster in 40 years. The disaster at Upper Big Branch should remind the nation that with our current dependence on coal for electricity generation comes a responsibility to ensure that miners and the surrounding communities are protected from the negligence of company executives. At Coal River Mountain Watch, we want to take the debate a step further by offering an alternative vision for the community, one that has the potential to transform Coal River Valley and offer a powerful symbol of a viable energy future for the nation.

In March 2008, local residents banded together to fight for a wind farm instead of a mountaintop removal coal mining site operated by Massey. Generations of residents around Coal River Mountain have seen the detrimental effects of reliance on one industry. The boom-and-bust cycles of coal have caused bustling communities to become ghost towns. With the current reliance on technology such as longwall mining and mountaintop removal, miners have largely been replaced with machines and explosives. In 1980, 55,500 miners in West Virginia extracted over 121 million tons of coal, while in 2008, only about 21,000 miners extracted nearly 166 million tons. Comparing a map of the counties that have yielded the most coal to the Appalachian Regional Commission's map of distressed counties illustrates a clear correlation. Contrary to industry claims that coal provides prosperity, economic facts indicate that it provides poverty. Presently the state has a 9.5 percent unemployment rate, while less than 4 percent of the workforce is employed by mining and logging.

The plan for Coal River Mountain would destroy over 6,000 acres of the mountain, bury streams with 18 valley fills, destroy water supplies, and eliminate sustainable resources, including the commercial wind potential. The mountaintop removal operation would provide coal and temporary mining jobs for only 17 years. In contrast, a wind farm would preserve the abundant timber and non-timber forest products, protect the water, allow traditional and new sustainable economic opportunities, and provide clean energy and green jobs forever.

As we call on our leaders to reduce carbon emissions and to invest in the development of clean energy sources, we must also call on them to invest in the future of the miners and the communities that have provided the energy upon which our nation was built and continues to be fueled today. This means asking the federal government to reinvigorate the original intent of the Appalachian Regional Development Initiative, strengthen the capacity and purview of the Appalachian Regional Commission, and invest in the health, education, training, entrepreneurship, and environment of Appalachian communities and residents. It means addressing the root causes of persistent poverty and unemployment in the region and not being afraid to anger the coal industry and the local and state politicians who uphold it to the detriment of the citizens and the miners. But most of all, it calls for making a commitment to a sustainable economic transition for the coalfields and supporting every means possible to achieve it.

Building a Positive Vision

Coal River Mountain lies at the western end of Raleigh County, in the heart of the Coal River watershed, and is bounded by the two major tributaries of the Big Coal River: Marsh Fork on the south and west of the mountain and Clear Fork on the north and east. Kayford Mountain, where thousands of acres of mountaintop have been removed, lies across the Clear Fork to the north, and Cherry Pond Mountain, likewise devastated by mountaintop removal, lies across the Marsh Fork to the southwest. Several small, unincorporated towns—Rock Creek, Naoma, Sundial, Birchton, and Pettus—lie along the Marsh Fork, and the towns of Artie, Colcord, and Dorothy are situated along the Clear Fork. Whitesville, at the eastern edge of Boone County, sits just below the convergence of the two tributaries at the western edge of the mountain. Coal River Mountain itself has long been home to underground mines, a few small, old strip mines, and, since 1995, the Brushy Fork slurry impoundment. However, most of the mountain remains relatively unspoiled and has provided generations of residents with lumber, firewood, berries, ginseng and other valuable medicinal herbs, wild game, and fish. From the air, the Coal River Mountain stands in lush contrast to its barren, dusty neighbors.

The Upper Big Branch mine, the site of the recent disaster, lies beneath the expansive Twilight surface mine complex on Cherry Pond Mountain, just across from Coal River Mountain. In 2006, Massey Energy quietly received approval for the Bee Tree surface mine on Coal River Mountain. In the latter months of 2006, David Orr, a professor at Oberlin College in Ohio and a prominent environmental advocate and writer, worked with CRMW's North Carolina–based ally Appalachian Voices to commission a study of the wind potential on Coal River Mountain. WindLogics, a nationally recognized wind modeling and development firm, conducted the study and found that the ridges along Coal River Mountain exhibited strong Class 4 to Class 7 average annual wind speeds. Class 4 winds serve as a minimum threshold for industrial-scale wind development. When Massey applied for the Eagle 2 Surface Mine, the second of four planned permits on the mountain, Coal River Mountain Watch requested and was granted an informal conference in August 2007 for citizens to voice their opposition to the proposal. Nearly 100 residents attended the hearing, and over 30 spoke out against the permit. None spoke in favor of it. In 1997 and 2001, several Clear Fork residents had endured heavy flooding, exacerbated by runoff from mountaintop removal and valley fills on the opposite side of the Clear Fork. They feared the destruction of their community if both sides of the valley were dominated by streams buried under valley fills. Several citizens voiced support for a wind farm as an alternative to mountaintop removal. Dr. Matt Wasson of Appalachian Voices described the WindLogics study and provided copies to decision makers at the Department of Environmental Protection.

Seizing the opportunity offered by the mountain's wind resources, members of Coal River Mountain Watch, with the support of the Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition, Appalachian Voices, the Sierra Club, and the Student Energy Action Coalition, came together in March 2008 to make plans for a wind farm. Using the WindLogics wind map of the mountain, and with technical advice provided by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory and the American Wind Energy Association, CRMW's wind project coordinator, Rory McIlmoil, constructed a model wind farm utilizing ArcGIS and Google Earth software. The model suggested that Coal River Mountain had enough wind potential and land area to accommodate 220 two-megawatt wind turbines, resulting in a total generation capability of 440 megawatts. Meanwhile, CRMW's community organizer, Lorelei Scarbro, provided information about the project and hosted community meetings that generated substantial local support. The two, along with supportive community members, made presentations to elected and appointed leaders, from the city level to the governor's office, and held a rally at the state capitol that resulted in more than 10,000 signatures on a petition. The project received Co-op America's 2008 Building Economic Alternatives award. CNN reported on the project and interviewed CRMW organizer Lorelei Scarbro at her home and at the adjacent family cemetery on Coal River Mountain.

To determine what was at stake, Coal River Mountain Watch commissioned Downstream Strategies, an environmental consulting firm from Morgantown, West Virginia, to conduct a comparative economic analysis of the costs and benefits of mountaintop removal and wind development on Coal River Mountain.

That study concluded that a 328-megawatt wind farm, enough to power 70,000 homes, would generate more long-term jobs and significantly greater local tax revenues than the proposed mining would, while imposing far fewer costs on human health and the environment. In fact, the study estimated that the externalized costs of the proposed mining, which would be drained from the local economy, would amount to $600 million over the life of the mining and beyond. According to the Downstream Strategies executive summary,

"For each scenario, the local economic benefits are quantified based on increased jobs, earnings, and economic output. In addition to these economic benefits, costs due to excess deaths and illnesses from coal production and local environmental problems are quantified and added to earnings to demonstrate how each scenario impacts the citizens of Raleigh County.

Other externalities—including global environmental costs; forestry; tourism; property values; and gathering, hunting, and heritage—are not quantified in this report. However, quantification of these additional externalities would tend to favor the development of a wind farm over mountaintop removal mines."

The wind farm would provide nearly 50 times the tax revenue to the county that a mountaintop removal site would: $1.74 million per year from the wind farm's property tax revenues, compared to $36,000 per year for 17 years from the mountaintop removal operation. And the wind farm would provide at least 277 temporary construction jobs and 39 permanent jobs, while the jobs provided by the Massey surface mine would fluctuate in number from 79 to 248 and continue for only 17 years. The wind farm would also allow underground mining to continue.

The study also illustrated the root of the social and economic problems that have plagued coalfield communities ever since the coal industry moved in: the only beneficiaries of the mountaintop removal option would be Massey Energy and the two private land companies that own over 90 percent of the land and coal, whereas the wind farm would benefit the people—the residents of the entire county.

When the wind farm project organizers presented the study results to the Raleigh County Commission, they brought as visual aids two giant checks: one for $1.74 million per year forever from a wind farm, and one for $36,000 per year for 17 years from a mountaintop removal operation. The commission refused to take a position that would pit another energy source against coal. Commissioner John Aliff said, "To be quite honest, the coal industry has been good for the commission."

In the 2009 West Virginia legislative session, 41 of the state's 100 delegates co-sponsored a resolution in support of the wind project. This included four of the five delegates representing Raleigh County, where the wind farm is proposed. Again, coal lobbyist pressure and coal-friendly legislators ensured that the resolution died in committee.

However, local, national, and international support rose to new levels. As the threat to the mountain increased, community members lobbied for the wind resolution and joined with other national allies like Rainforest Action Network and Citizens Lead for Energy Action Now (CLEAN) in an e-mail campaign to West Virginia's governor, Joe Manchin, the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection (WVDEP), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the White House to halt mountaintop removal and valley fill permits on the mountain. The EPA has responded to the groups' concerns and is currently investigating operations on Coal River Mountain. In February 2009, NASA climate scientist James Hansen posted a short paper entitled "Tell President Obama about Coal River Mountain." He and actress/activist Daryl Hannah spoke at a June 23, 2009, rally for clean energy at the base of the mountain. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., headlined a December 7, 2009, rally where hundreds gathered to defend Coal River Mountain. Coal River Wind put a public service announcement on hulu.com, where it can be seen by millions, and collaborated with Appalachian Voices and Google Earth to create a virtual flyover tour and description of the Coal River Wind project. The virtual flyover was shown to delegates at the 2009 international climate conference in Copenhagen and is part of a series of Google Earth "tours" that illustrate climate change issues and solutions. The series includes only a couple of projects per continent. The online petition presently has over 17,000 signatures.

Citizen activists have also taken action to shut down the blasting where federal and state officials did not. For nine days in January 2010, two activists associated with the Mountain Justice movement and Climate Ground Zero campaign lived on platforms 60 feet high in trees near the blasting area. In spite of continuous air horn harassment, the two remained until voluntarily coming down in advance of an imminent winter storm. Activists engaged in dozens of other acts of nonviolent civil disobedience in 2009 and 2010 in the Coal River Valley, resulting in over 120 arrests. In addition to the tree-sit, seven actions took place on Coal River Mountain, ranging from simple trespass to activists chaining themselves to equipment.

The Next Steps in the Campaign

Surface mining has now begun on a small portion of Coal River Mountain. But there is still a chance to preserve the mountain for wind power. So far, the CRMW campaign's biggest problem has been the intransigence of Massey Energy. If the cloud created by the Upper Big Branch disaster has any silver lining, it is the national scrutiny brought to bear on mine safety and the belated return of government regulation. As we are finding out, loopholes in mining regulations and lax enforcement allowed Massey Energy to avoid strengthened oversight and inspection, which could have prevented that tragedy.

But federal regulators in the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA), and our elected politicians in Congress and the White House, allowed those loopholes to remain. For example, MSHA regulators ordered Massey to withdraw miners 61 times since the beginning of 2009. In 2009, more than 10 percent of MSHA's enforcement actions at this mine were for "unwarrantable failure" to comply with safety regulations—five times the national average of about 2 percent. In its preliminary briefing to President Obama, MSHA said, "In what is perhaps the most troubling statistic, in 2009, MSHA issued 48 withdrawal orders at the Upper Big Branch Mine for repeated significant and substantial violations that the mine operator either knew, or should have known, constituted a hazard. Massey failed to address these violations over and over again until a federal mine inspector ordered it done. The mine's rate for these kinds of violations is nearly 19 times the national rate." Massey CEO Don Blankenship tried to downplay the severity of the violations, saying that "violations are unfortunately a normal part of the mining process."

A buildup of methane, and possibly coal dust, stands out as a likely cause of the explosion, and the Wall Street Journal reported that the investigation will consider the effects of mountaintop removal blasting above the mine, which may have affected seals. Politicians such as Senator Robert C. Byrd have weighed in, and New York State Comptroller Thomas DiNapoli has called for Blankenship to resign.

In 2008, Massey Energy sought and received permission from the WVDEP to revise a permit on Coal River Mountain. The revision allows coal extraction on a small portion of the mountain without the need for a valley fill. However, the WVDEP did not consider the revision significant enough to allow public comment or a public hearing, and ignored the revision's effects on the remainder of the permit.

On April 1, 2010, the EPA delivered the best news yet for the campaign, issuing strict guidance for limiting water pollution from valley fills. The guidance focused on conductivity, a measure of dissolved pollutants in the water. The limit is so strict that EPA Secretary Lisa Jackson said, "You're talking about no, or very few, valley fills that are going to meet standards like this…. The intent here is to tell people what the science is telling us, which is it would be untrue to say that you can have numbers of valley fills, anything more than, say, very minimal valley fills, and not expect to see irreversible damage to stream health."

In addition to the impacts on stream chemistry, the guidelines consider environmental justice impacts to human communities. While they are still open for public comment, including comment from pro-coal politicians, and have not been finalized, the guidelines took effect immediately and apply to new permits and renewal permits. Along with the new guidelines, the EPA provided scientific documentation of the impacts mountaintop removal has on stream health, echoing a January 2010 study published in the journal Science by several renowned scientists that calls for a ban on mountaintop removal.

This news greatly improves the odds for Coal River Mountain's survival. Massey's original proposed permits included at least 18 valley fills that would fill a total of nine miles of headwater streams with mining waste laden with toxic heavy metals. If Massey were prohibited from filling the valleys, the scale of surface mining would be drastically reduced, preserving most of the mountain for a wind farm. The new requirements could lead Massey and the land companies to renegotiate their contracts, preserving the surface for a profitable wind farm while still allowing underground mining.

While citizens find encouragement in the EPA's new guidance, they also recognize the fact that mountaintop removal is still allowed and that a new administration could rescind this guidance. To make curtailment of mountaintop removal last, CRMW and other citizen groups are still pushing the Clean Water Protection Act (CWPA) in the U.S. House of Representatives and the Appalachia Restoration Act (ARA) in the Senate, which would curtail mountaintop removal.. The CWPA presently has 170 cosponsors and the ARA has 11. This progress is largely due to citizen lobby days sponsored by the Alliance for Appalachia, a 13-group regional coalition of which Coal River Mountain Watch is a core member. The Alliance conducts an annual lobby week, providing training and congressional meetings for approximately 200 citizens, and several mini-lobby events throughout the year. The Alliance also arranges meetings with government agencies, such as the EPA and the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.

Appalachian Transition

We still need your help to ensure that the changes taking place through EPA regulation stick. Anyone can take action and sign our petition at [www.coalriverwind.org](http://www.coalriverwind.org). Citizens all over the country can ask the EPA to deny any valley fill permits on Coal River Mountain that may be submitted, and everyone can contact their U.S. representatives and senators and ask them to support the Clean Water Protection Act and the Appalachia Restoration Act.

Coalfield communities need options for employment and livelihood beyond coal. The focus should be on giving them a choice and providing measures and incentives to support the development of those choices. It is time to turn our eyes toward Appalachia as an engine of transition and a model of sustainability, rather than a source of sorrow. If that means that the rest of the country has to pay a higher price for electricity due to a strengthening of oversight and enforcement of coal mine regulations, and if it means having more of our tax dollars go toward supporting economic transition in the coalfields, then for the sake of the miners and the future of Central Appalachian communities, that is a price we should be willing and honored to pay.

Eventually, more likely sooner than the rosy estimates of the coal industry, the coal is going to run out. According to the federal Energy Information Administration, coal production in Central Appalachia is expected to decline by nearly half within the next 10 years due to the depletion of the most accessible, lowest-cost coal seams. Another report by Downstream Strategies, titled "The Decline of Central Appalachian Coal and the Need for Economic Diversification," notes that "should substantial declines occur as projected, coal‐producing counties will face significant losses in employment and tax revenue, and state governments will collect fewer taxes from the coal industry." Without a strong focus on supporting economic transition in Central Appalachia, local economies will rapidly decline along with coal production.

Because of this, the report suggests that "state policymakers across the Central Appalachian region should…take the necessary steps to ensure that new jobs and sources of revenue will be available in the counties likely to experience the greatest impact from the decline. While there are numerous options available, the development of the region's renewable energy resources and a strong focus on energy efficiency offer immediate and significant opportunities to begin diversifying the economy."

The decisions we make now in the region will determine whether we make the best use of those renewable resources or squander the opportunity, whether we provide for long-term sustainability for communities or ravage them, and whether we preserve a planet that can support our civilization or plummet headlong into climate catastrophe. Coal River Mountain still stands as a majestic, tangible symbol of these clear choices, but it requires the decision of more citizens to make that phone call, write that letter, make that donation, and turn off that light in order to remain standing.

#### Appalachia is key to a global transition

**Flaccavento 10** - Founder of Appalachian Sustainable Development (ASD) and SCxALE, Inc [[Anthony Flaccavento](http://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/user/4896), “The Transition of Appalachia,” Solutions Journal, Volume 1 | Issue 4 | Page 34-44 | Aug 2010, pg. http://tinyurl.com/39kwh4h

Thirdly, the approach of the “environmental movement”, while helping to mitigate some of the worst abuses, has created its own form of estrangement: preservation rather than sustainable livelihoods. Largely urban and suburban environmentalists have focused on protection of the ecosystem from human degradation, often alienating farmers, loggers, fisherman and rural communities for whom “the environment” represents their livelihood, or a substantial part of it. As Wendell Berry has pointed out, this focus on protecting parts of the environment from people instead of developing the means to live within the ecosystem stems from the same hyper-specialized mindset that created many ecological and social problems in the first place.

Fortunately there is a different culture and mindset emerging in Appalachia and the nation, one that seeks to restore connections between farm and table, rural and urban; that recognizes that consumption choices have consequences for which we must begin to take responsibility; that “responsible consumption”, though essential, is inadequate without civic and political engagement; and that diverse, relatively self-reliant regional economies will do much less harm to other places and other people while making our own communities more just, resilient, perhaps even more satisfying in the years ahead.

Appalachia can and must play a pivotal role in this global economic and social transformation, both for the sake of its own people and because of its critical national role in energy and environmental choices. If a region known primarily for coal mining, tobacco farming and clear cut logging can come to exemplify sustainable development, it will be difficult to ignore.

#### Appalachia’s transition to wind power provides a workable model for Agroforestry

**Todd et al. 10** – Research Professor & Distinguished Lecturer of ecological design @ [University of Vermont](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_of_Vermont). [Dr. [John Todd](http://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/user/29) (PhD in oceanography from the University of Michigan), [Samir Doshi](http://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/user/4899) (Lecturer @ University of Vermont's Gund Institute for Ecological Economics), & [Anthony McInnis](http://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/user/4922) (Doctoral candidate in the Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources @ University of Vermont), “Beyond Coal: A Resilient New Economy for Appalachia,” Solutions Journal, Volume 1 | Issue 4 | Page 45-52 | Aug 2010, pg. http://tinyurl.com/2g98kh2

The second stage includes developing sustainable forestry initiatives for timber and bioenergy, agroforestry, and ecological agriculture. The sequestration of carbon in timber and soils will be a measure of the success of such a project. There are many examples of developing sustainable forestry industries in Appalachia. They include such organizations as the Healing Harvest Forest Foundation that is helping restore native forest systems through animal powered extraction. Other models are the Appalachian Sustainable Development and Mountain Association for Community and Economic Development (MACED), which help landowners manage timber and bioenergy while protecting the forest ecology. Agroforestry landscapes can also provide resources for non-timber forest products like ginseng and other medicinal plants as well as for craft making and food crops. American ginseng (Panax quinquefolius) sells for up to $400 a pound and has been harvested in Appalachia and sold all over the world for centuries.

The third stage involves economic diversification and the beginning of an entrepreneurial stage. It includes developing both a renewable energy infrastructure and also manufacturing and processing based on regional natural resources. The renewable energy potential of the region is huge. In addition to a range of renewable energy technologies, ancillary manufacturing of materials and products from natural resources offers great opportunities. The list of prospective industries includes biofuels, plastics, polymers, adhesives, and building and composite materials as well as wind and solar technologies.

There is already community support for establishing a wind farm in West Virginia. The Coal River Wind program reported that developing a wind industry rather than removing a mountain for coal would create more jobs, produce local renewable energy, and minimize environmental degradation.31

A Restoration Model Based on Third-Order Ecological Design

Succession on the landscape should dictate biological, technological, and industrial activities at a given site in any given year. Such models have potential for Appalachia. Soil restoration and slurry could feed into a system that produces bioenergy. Agroforestry, conservation forests, and an ecological industrial park would be established on a reclaimed mine site. The interconnected systems would be supported by large amounts of carbon that have been sequestered from the atmosphere to establish an enduring soil foundation. The site would be initially seeded with native grasses. The harvested grasses will be pyrolyzed or burned in a low-oxygen environment. Synthetic fuels from the biochar process would go to power the machinery for managing the landscape. The biochar by-product could be applied to newly established grass plots to increase productivity and soil restoration. The coal slurry could be processed in Eco-Machines that decontaminate the mixture.

After eight years, the soils will be sufficiently mature to grow tree crops. Half of the formerly mined managed grassland area will be designated for a mixture of forest and grasses intended for bioenergy feedstocks and agroforestry. The gas generated will be used for establishing an ecological industrial park. The grassland area will continue to be managed for biofuel feedstock production.

After 16 years, the site will have evolved into a native eastern hardwood forest. It will not yet be mature but will resemble the native forest structure. Half of it will be managed for agroforestry and timber production and the other half for conservation and recreation. Biochar will not be needed on the forest floor. Natural leaf litter will provide the carbon, water retention, and other nutrients necessary for continued growth. The former slurry ponds, having been decontaminated, could be used for aquaculture projects that provide freshwater catfish, bigmouth buffalo fish, and other native species for local restaurants. Excess biochar will be used at the next restoration site, and the entire cycle will be repeated on new lands available for reclamation.

The above constitutes an outline of a workable model for developing a new ecological and economic infrastructure. This would be achieved in part by dissolving the distinction between resource and waste. As is the case in nature, all wastes become nutrients. Ecological design anticipates that every output from an industrial process should become an input in another. The objective is to establish a sustainable economy that starts at restoration and evolves into community development based on widespread education.

Social Frameworks on the Evolving Landscapes

The final stage in restoring the region will be built on emerging economic diversification. It will involve the transfer of ownership of the land and natural resources to the people who live there, especially those who have had a hand in its ecological transformation. The work of Marie Cirillo and the Woodlands Community Land Trust (WCLT) offers one model. WCLT accumulated a large acreage of mountainous lands from absentee landlords and allocated it to local families and businesses to work and manage.

Such a project would require flexible financial institutions, perhaps in the form of regional land-holding organizations or cooperatives. They could provide landowning mortgages or their equivalents to natural-resource managers such as soil builders, foresters, and farmers. Once the land is capable of supporting a community, a twenty-first century equivalent of a Homestead Act should be passed.

Through such initiatives, Appalachia could become a model for the communities of the future, demonstrating how to transform an extractive single-resource economy into a vibrant and diversified one based on environmental stewardship, sustainable development, and social justice. Then in the fullest sense of the term, the land will be reinhabited.

#### Agroforestry leads to climate adaptation

**Ekpo & Asuquo 12** – Professor of Biological Sciences @ Akwa Ibom State University & Professor of Forestry and Environmental Management, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture [Ekpo, F. E & Asuquo. M. E, “Agroforestry Practice as Adaptation Tools to Climate Change Hazards in Itu Lga, Akwa Ibom State,Nigeria,” Global Journal of HUMAN SOCIAL SCIENCE Geography & Environmental GeoSciences, Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal Volume 12 Issue 11 Version 1.0 Year 2012

Developing countries are going to bear the brunt of climate change and suffer most from its negative¶ impacts. Global conventions are not sufficiently effective to halt the increase of atmospheric greenhouse¶ gases (GHGs) concentrations, and we now accept that the primary drivers of climate change are not going to¶ stop. Mitigation efforts will therefore only provide a long¶ term remedy to the effects of climate change. Local¶ climates and terrestrial ecosystems will change, threatening biota and human livelihoods. Yet, even as¶ climate changes, food and fiber production, environmental services and rural livelihoods must¶ improve, and not just be maintained. The degradation in¶ the developing world cannot be allowed to persist.¶ Developing countries are faced with urgent needs for¶ development, to improve food security, reduce poverty and provide an adequate standard of living for growing populations.

Large percentages of the populations of¶ developing countries depend on rainfed agriculture for¶ their livelihoods. Climate change is already affecting¶ agriculture and other sources of livelihood in these¶ countries and this situation is likely to worsen. Recent¶ debates within the UNFCCC process on the relation¶ between global adaptation and mitigation measures¶ lack substance due to lack of pertinent experience on¶ the ground. Discussions are often treated in a much¶ generalized manner and are not specifically related to¶ distinct sectors such as agriculture or forestry (IPCC,¶ 2001). A practical understanding of the link between¶ adaptation and mitigation measures does not yet exist.¶ However, for some decades now agricultural research¶ has been focusing on the questions of increasing the¶ resilience (against drought, flood, erosion, fertility loss,¶ etc.) and productivity of agricultural systems. Increasing¶ system resilience is directly related to increasing the¶ adaptive capacity of farmers.

Agroforestry provides a particular example of a¶ set of innovative practices that are designed to enhance¶ productivity in a way that often contributes to climate¶ change mitigation through enhanced carbon¶ sequestration, and that can also strengthen the¶ system‟s ability to adapt to adverse impacts of changing¶ climate conditions. This study looks into ascertaining the¶ changes in some climatic regimes within Itu Local¶ Government Area, Akwa Ibom State and explores¶ sustainable agroforestry potentials that will enhance¶ resilience and thereby reduce vulnerability of¶ smallholder farmers in the study area.

#### First, South Asia – A climate crisis risks an all-out nuclear exchange that would decimate the region in minutes

**Brennan 08** – Lieutenant in the United States Navy [James F. Brennan, “The China-India-Pakistan Water Crisis: Prospects for Interstate Conflict,” Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF ARTS IN SECURITY STUDIES (FAR EAST, SOUTHEAST ASIA, PACIFIC) from the NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL, September 2008

India and Pakistan’s enduring rivalry provides the groundwork for an unpredictable relationship between these regional powers. The partition instilled a mutual distrust that persists today. Exacerbated by the growing water crisis, the potential for conflict between these countries is high. Furthermore, the possession of nuclear weapons by these countries raises the stakes of the game.

The potential for all-out nuclear exchange is low. However, the potential in light of serious disputes over water resources raises serious concerns for parties interested in maintaining regional security. So, it is important to ensure that water issues be considered in future diplomatic efforts to ensure regional stability. In other words, interested external powers should consider a proactive approach instead of a reactive one. The propensity between these countries for conflict makes a reactive approach undesirable. In the event of a nuclear exchange, China, India and Pakistan would be decimated in minutes and the long-term effects on regional security would last for decades to follow.

The stability of the South Asian region is important for a number of reasons. These countries have a history of tense relations that tend to lead to conflict. Therefore, in order to engage these countries effectively, it may be important to address them separately at first – similar to China’s current approach to regional relations.123 As South Asia approaches a water crisis, the 1960 Indus Water Treaty is a good starting point – as it appears to pose the most relevant challenge as far as large-scale engagement is concerned. If China and South Asia cannot settle potential disputes over water, it may be up to a fourth party, such as the United States, to motivate change. pg. 45-46

#### Extinction

**Robock & Toon 10** - Professor of climatology at Rutgers University & Chair of atmospheric and oceanic scienc­es @ University of Colorado-Boulder [Allan Robock (Director of Rutger’s Center for Environmental Prediction) & Owen Brian Toon (Fellow of the Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics University of Colorado-Boulder, “Local Nuclear War,” Scientific American, January 2010

Why discuss this topic now that the cold war has ended? Because as other nations continue to acquire nuclear weapons, smaller, regional nu­clear wars could create a similar global catastro­phe. New analyses reveal that a conflict be­tween India and Pakistan, for example, in which 100 nuclear bombs were dropped on cities and industrial areas—only 0.4 percent of the world’s more than 25,000 warheads—would produce enough smoke to ~~cripple~~ destroy global agriculture. A regional war could cause widespread loss of life even in countries far away from the conflict.

Regional War Threatens the World

By deploying modern computers and modern cli­mate models, the two of us and our colleagues have shown that not only were the ideas of the 1980s correct but the effects would last for at least 10 years, much longer than previously thought. And by doing calculations that assess decades of time, only now possible with fast, current computers, and by including in our cal­culations the oceans and the entire atmosphere— also only now possible—we have found that the smoke from even a regional war would be heat­ed and lofted by the sun and remain suspended in the upper atmosphere for years, continuing to block sunlight and to cool the earth.

India and Pakistan, which together have more than 100 nuclear weapons, may be the most worrisome adversaries capable of a regional nu­clear conflict today. But other countries besides the U.S. and Russia (which have thousands) are well endowed: China, France and the U.K. have [has] hundreds of nuclear warheads; Israel has more than 80, North Korea has about 10 and Iran may well be trying to make its own. In 2004 this situation prompted one of us (Toon) and later Rich Turco of the University of California, Los Angeles, both veterans of the 1980s investiga­tions, to begin evaluating what the global envi­ronmental effects of a regional nuclear war would be and to take as our test case an engage­ment between India and Pakistan.

The latest estimates by David Albright of the Institute for Science and International Security and by Robert S. Norris of the Natural Resourc­es Defense Council are that India has 50 to 60 assembled weapons (with enough plutonium for 100) and that Pakistan has 60 weapons. Both countries continue to increase their arsenals. In­dian and Pakistani nuclear weapons tests indi­cate that the yield of the warheads would be sim­ilar to the 15-kiloton explosive yield (equivalent to 15,000 tons of TNT) of the bomb the U.S. used on Hiroshima.

Toon and Turco, along with Charles Bardeen, now at the National Center for Atmospheric Re­search, modeled what would happen if 50 Hiro­shima-size bombs were dropped across the high­est population-density targets in Pakistan and if 50 similar bombs were also dropped across In­dia. Some people maintain that nuclear weapons would be used in only a measured way. But in the wake of chaos, fear and broken communications that would occur once a nuclear war began, we doubt leaders would limit attacks in any rational manner. This likelihood is particularly true for Pakistan, which is small and could be quickly overrun in a conventional conflict. Peter R. La­voy of the Naval Postgraduate School, for exam­ple, has analyzed the ways in which a conflict be­tween India and Pakistan might occur and ar­gues that Pakistan could face a decision to use all its nuclear arsenal quickly before India swamps its military bases with traditional forces. Pg. 74-75

#### Second, Chinese climate migration – It risks a war over the Russian Far East

**Weitz 12** - Director of the Hudson Institute’s Center for Political-Military Analysis [Richard Weitz, “Superpower Symbiosis: The Russia-China Axis,” World Affairs, [November/December 2012](http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/issue/novemberdecember-2012), pg. http://tinyurl.com/cjcc3v2

A major worsening of China-Russia ties would actually represent a regression to the mean. The modern Chinese-Russian relationship has most often been characterized by bloody wars, imperial conquests, and mutual denunciations. It has only been during the last twenty years, when Russian power had been decapitated by its lost Soviet empire and China has found itself a rising economic—but still militarily weak—power that the two countries have managed to achieve a harmonious balance in their relationship. While China now has the world’s second-largest economy, Russia has the world’s second most powerful military, thanks largely to its vast reserves of nuclear weapons. But China could soon surpass Russia in terms of conventional military. Under these conditions, Moscow could well join other countries bordering China in pursuing a containment strategy designed to balance, though not prevent, China’s rising power.

Heightened China-Russia tensions over border regions are also a possibility. The demographic disparity that exists between the Russian Far East and northern China invariably raises the question of whether Chinese nationals will move northward to exploit the natural riches of under-populated eastern Russia. Border tensions could increase if poorly managed development, combined with pollution, land seizures, and climate change, drive poor Chinese peasants into Russian territory. Russians no longer worry about a potential military clash with China over border issues, but they still fear that the combination of four factors—the declining ethnic Russian population in the Russian Far East, Chinese interest in acquiring greater access to the energy and other natural resources of the region, the growing disparity in the aggregate size of the Chinese and Russian national economies due to China’s higher growth rate, and suspected large-scale illegal Chinese immigration into the Russian Far East—will result in China’s de facto peaceful annexation of large parts of eastern Russia. Although the Russian Federation is the largest country in the world in terms of territory, China has more than nine times as many people.

With the end of the NATO combat role in Afghanistan, an immediate source of tension could be Russian pressure on China to cease its buck-passing and join Russia in assuming the burden of stabilizing that country. Should US power in the Pacific falter, China and Russia might also become natural rivals for the allegiance of the weak states of East Asia looking for a new great-power patron. But for now such prospects linger in the background as Beijing and Moscow savor a far smoother relationship than the one they shared back in the day, when they competed to see which would achieve the one true communism.

#### Russia will escalate

**Rousseau 12** - Professor and Chair of Political Science and International Relations @ Khazar University [Richard Rousseau, “Will China Colonize and Incorporate Siberia?,” Harvard International Review, July 9, 2012 | 12:07 AM, pg. http://tinyurl.com/c55zp3n

If Siberia is in fact awaiting a Chinese Future, a number of scenarios might unfold over the next decade. The worst-case scenario for Russia is not only the continuation of ethnic Chinese migration but a substantial rise of it in response to changes taking place in northern China. Russia’s Far East would then become predominantly inhabited by ethnics Chinese, resulting in a decisive change in the nature of a region already far-removed from European Russia.

Military aggression, which seems highly improbable for now, cannot be totally ruled out in the long term. Although it is a fact that the Russian army lacks the latest modern weaponry, historically its strength has always lain in its number of troops, not in its cutting-edge technology. At Poltava in 1709, Galicia in 1914 and Stalingrad in 1942, the Russians did not liberate or retake these lands because they had more advanced military technology at their disposal or developed cleverer tactics, but rather because they had a large numerical superiority over the enemy. This numerical advantage would dissipate entirely in the face of the Chinese armed forces, which are ten times larger. The inferiority of Russia’s conventional forces is also aggravated by the shortage of conscripts, a consequence of the country’s demographic decline. However, with regards to nuclear weapons, Russia’s total of approximately 10,000 nuclear warheads surpasses China‘s total of approximately 240 nuclear warheads. The Russian economy may lag far behind China’s, but the Russian Army is still a frightening force and should not be underestimated.

For instance, in June and July 2010, Russian armed forces conducted Vostok 2010, a series of 10-day unprecedented military exercises. These were made up of a set of strategic exercises that involved 20,000 troops, up to 70 warplanes and 30 warships from the Far Eastern, Siberian and Volga-Urals military districts, as well as the Pacific Fleet. Designed primarily to put the military to the test, these wargames were also a warning to Chinese military officials who were present during the exercise. Vostok 2010 simulated a response to a possible attack from China. It included the firing of live ammunition, simulated airborne assaults and amphibious assault landings.

#### Extinction

**Starr 10** - Director of Clinical Laboratory Science Program @ University of Missouri [Steven Starr (Senior scientist @ Physicians for Social Responsibility.), “The climatic consequences of nuclear war” | Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 12 March 2010, Pg. http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/op-eds/the-climatic-consequences-of-nuclear-war]

This isn't a question to be avoided. Recent scientific studies have found that a war fought with the deployed U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals would **leave Earth** virtually **uninhabitable**. In fact, NASA computer models have shown that even a "successful" **first strike** by Washington or Moscow would inflict catastrophic environmental damage that would make agriculture impossible and cause mass starvation. Similarly, in the January Scientific American, Alan Robock and Brian Toon, the foremost experts on the climatic impact of nuclear war, warn that the environmental consequences of a "regional" nuclear war would cause a global famine that could kill one billion people.

#### Only wind solves – It provides a viable alternative to mountaintop removal and pave the way for sustainable forestry

**Haegele 08** [Greg Haegele, “An Alternative to Mountaintop Removal Coal Mining in West Virginia,” Tree Hugger, July 18, 2008, pg. http://www.treehugger.com/renewable-energy/an-alternative-to-mountaintop-removal-coal-mining-in-west-virginia.html

Lorelei Scarbro lives in a place most of us would envy - on 10 acres of lush, green southern West Virginia mountain, where deer, turkeys and other wildlife make regular appearances.

Now Scarbro's land is threatened by mountaintop removal coal mining. If you're not familiar with this practice – it is the most destructive kind of coal mining out there. Companies literally blow up the tops of mountains to reach the coal beneath - leaving a barren, rocky landscape. The companies fill nearby valleys and streams with the waste rock - ruining entire watersheds and frequently the water supplies of nearby communities as well. (You can learn more about this type of mining by visiting our [coal website](http://www.sierraclub.org/mtr).)In Scarbro's case, Marfork Coal Company, a subsidiary of Massey Energy, has applied for four permits (two have been approved) to mine 6,600 acres of Coal River Mountain, including land bordering Scarbro's. The permits would also allow for the construction of at least 19 valley fills, which means mining waste would be desposited in nearly every headwater stream originating from the mountain.

Scarbro and a coalition of environmental and community organizations aren't taking this news from Massey lying down. [Coal River Mountain Watch](http://www.crmw.net) (CRMW) and these groups have an alternative they say the state coal association claims coal opponents never have: [The Coal River Wind Project.](http://www.coalriverwind.org)

The Coal River Wind Project is a proposed 440-Megawatt wind farm consisting of 220 wind turbines to be constructed on the land slated to be blown away for coal mining, and the coalition has done extensive studies on the area to show just how viable an alternative this wind farm would be. According to the project's study, the wind farm would:

• Create 440 megawatts of power, enough to power more than 150,000 homes in West Virginia. • Create more than 200 local employment opportunities during the construction phase, and 40-50 permanent operations and maintenance jobs during the life of the wind farm. • Provide Raleigh County and West Virginia with a source of clean, renewable energy, as well as a sustained tax income that could be used for the construction of new schools for the county. • Allow for concurrent uses of the mountain that could revitalize the local economy and bring sustainable economic development for the surrounding communities.

Adding that the jobs would be longer lasting than the proposed mining jobs, Scarbro said, "This is the viable alternative."

For Rory McIlmoil, who works for CRMW with Scarbro, if the mountain must be developed to meet the growing energy needs of the state, then why wouldn't you choose the option that's less destructive, much cleaner, and creates a more viable economy in the long run?

"This is definitely a 'much lesser of two evils' in terms of environmental impact," said McIlmoil. "The strip-mines will lead to the clearing of over 6,000 acres of native hardwood forest, whereas our maximum estimate for the clearing that would be related to the wind farm is 200 acres."

McIlmoil can get even more detailed in the numbers for turbine siting, just ask him. He's also tallied the wildlife impact.

"And when you talk about the birds and the bats, the loss of 6,600 acres of natural habitat is likely to have a much greater impact on populations than the wind farm would, especially considering the fact that a 10,000-plus acre mountaintop removal site (Kayford Mountain) sits to the north of Coal River Mountain and another 8,000-plus acre site sit to the southwest (the Twilight Mining Complex). So Coal River Mountain is basically a habitat buffer zone between two existing mountaintop removal sites."

Scarbro and other Coal River Wind Project supporters have met with officials from just about every city, state and private agency and organization you can imagine to garner support for the plan - and many like the idea. They also have nationwide support from a number of organizations (including the Sierra Club national and local groups).

McIlmoil added the wind farm isn't just an idea - they even have developers highly interested in it.

Now McIlmoil, Scarbro and the coalition want to meet with Massey Energy and the company that owns the Coal River Mountain property to see if this wind farm plan can become a reality.

"We're hoping (the meeting) happens soon so we can sit down and try to work out possibilities here," said Scarbro.

The coalition behind this wind project has covered all the bases - even answering the question about whether post mountaintop removal land can be used for wind turbines: Scarbro said studies show that post-mountaintop removal land is too unstable for turbines, and trying to stabilize the land would make the building costs exceptionally higher. And because the mountain would be significantly lower than before, building turbines makes no sense due to the dramatic loss of wind power potential.

McIlmoil and Scarbro need all the support they can get, so we urge you to [check out their website](http://www.coalriverwind.org) and help them build a wind farm instead of watching yet another Appalachian mountain get blown away.

"This is not just about green jobs, even though we desperately need those,"said Scarbro. "It's not just about renewable energy, even though we desperately need that. This is about saving the mountain and keeping it intact. We want to save vegetation, wildlife, and continue the Appalachian way of life - hunting, fishing, gathering herbs, and more. These are things we can't do if Massey comes in and destroys everything in its path."

### Unions

#### Advantage: \_\_\_\_\_: Politics

#### Central Appalachia is the key battleground – Federal investment in wind there will facilitate a national political transition

**Bailey 10** – Research and Policy Director @ Mountain Association for Community Economic Development [[Jason Bailey](http://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/user/4907), “Start Appalachian Transition through Green Jobs Investments,” Solutions Journal, Volume 1 | Issue 4 | Aug 2010, pg. http://tinyurl.com/9gxb8bm

Most communities around the world aren’t yet aware of how climate change will drastically impact their land, economy, and way of life. But the downsides of a fossil fuel–based economy are already well known in the coalfields of central Appalachia, a region including southern West Virginia, eastern Kentucky, southwest Virginia, and east Tennessee. Central Appalachia’s coal economy has severely altered the landscape and created communities made up of "haves and have-nots."1 But by creating jobs in ways that improve the land, air, and water, a green jobs strategy can set a new course for a needed economic transition.

Coal mining currently employs around 38,000 people in central Appalachia, and miners make good salaries. But due largely to mechanization, those jobs now make up only about 10 percent of employment in the coal counties, which suffer from high and persistent poverty.2 Most of the benefits of coal extraction have bypassed the region. While more than 20 billion tons of coal have been mined in central Appalachia over the last 100 years, the region contains 23 of the poorest 100 counties in the country, measured by median household income.3,4,5 There has been too little economic diversification beyond retail and social services in central Appalachia, and unemployed and discouraged workers make up a significant share of the working-age population.2 Decreasing coal reserves, the rising competitiveness of energy alternatives, and needed environmental and health restrictions will mean continued decline in central Appalachian coal production and employment over the next few decades.6,7

Green jobs are critical in central Appalachia for a number of reasons. First, an economy based on a different relationship to the land and to energy is essential to avoid the destruction from abusive mining practices that, if allowed to continue, would limit any long-term possibilities. Second, the region’s ancient mountains and diverse forests are among its main assets, and they present numerous income-generating opportunities that do not compromise the integrity of the land. And third, addressing the region’s existing environmental degradation presents immediate green job opportunities. That work is huge and labor intensive, and requires some of the skills and experience of the region’s existing workforce, including those who have worked in coal.

Public investment could advance a green jobs strategy, and the region’s transition could start today in five overlapping green jobs areas:

1. Increase Energy Efficiency in Homes, Buildings, and Businesses

Central Appalachia has high energy usage, related to a historic neglect of energy efficiency. Kentucky’s residential sector, for example, uses 24 percent more energy on average than the nation, and a recent Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) report projected that energy usage in Appalachia will grow at a rate 50 percent higher than the national rate between now and 2030.8,9 High energy usage and inattention to energy efficiency have been fed by low electricity prices from coal-fired power. But those prices are rising dramatically (up 40 percent in Kentucky in the last five years alone) and will increase further in future years.

High energy usage has a lot to do with substandard housing and lack of investment in the existing building infrastructure. More than 100,000 families in central Appalachia lack access to quality housing. Central Appalachian homes are three to four times more likely to be substandard in comparison to homes elsewhere in the nation. Approximately 25 percent of the housing stock consists of manufactured homes, most of which are highly inefficient, a share that rises to 40 percent in some counties.

A number of regional efforts are emerging to deal with these challenges, and they could be accelerated through greater federal financial support. Frontier Housing, a regional nonprofit, has developed a program to replace the estimated 300,000 highly inefficient mobile homes built before the 1976 HUD mobile home code with ENERGY STAR homes. The Mountain Association for Community Economic Development (MACED) is working with a number of rural electric co-ops in eastern Kentucky to create a pilot on-bill financing program for energy efficiency improvements that would be open to residents, commercial businesses, and institutions. And the Federation of Appalachian Housing Enterprises is working to double the number of highly energy efficient green homes built for low-income families through its member organizations. An ARC report found that a set of modeled energy efficiency policies in the region would save Appalachian consumers almost $10 billion annually on their energy bills by 2020 and create over 37,000 jobs.

2. Expand Local Renewable Energy Production

Central Appalachia’s historic reliance on coal has also meant little progress in diversifying into renewable energy sources. However, the region possesses real renewable energy potential. Wind power is possible at distributed and at utility scale, particularly on ridgetops in central Appalachia. With the higher hub heights of modern wind turbines, West Virginia has at least 2,772 megawatts (MW) of wind potential, and the best wind potential in Kentucky is in the counties in the southeastern coalfields.10,11

Community-scale energy from woody biomass is also a significant opportunity. The ARC estimates the total annual biomass resources for the Appalachian states at over 108 million tons.12 Solar potential exists in central Appalachia, particularly for distributed applications of solar thermal and solar photovoltaic (PV). Small, low-power hydro and micro-hydro are also an opportunity; the Idaho National Laboratory has estimated 518 MW of potential in Kentucky and 484 MW in West Virginia.13

Local efforts to develop renewable energy are emerging. Leaders of Kentuckians For The Commonwealth in the former company towns of Benham and Lynch have launched a local initiative to address the need for renewable energy and energy efficiency in the area. The nearby mountains have the greatest wind potential in all of Kentucky, and the rate of residential electricity usage in Benham is one of the highest in the state, in part due to poorly insulated housing stock.14 In southern West Virginia, the leaders of Coal River Wind developed a model and a proposal for a 328-MW wind farm on Coal River Mountain as an alternative to mountaintop removal mining in the same location.15 An economic impact analysis suggests that the wind farm would create more long-term jobs and have a greater economic impact than coal mining—particularly if local production of turbine components could be incorporated.16

Federal investment could support existing efforts and create new models. The USDA's Rural Utilities Service financing for renewable energy production and energy efficiency efforts could assist regional electric utilities in beginning to transition. Setting aside funds for central Appalachia through such sources as the USDA Rural Energy for America Program and the Department of Energy (DOE) Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant could support local planning and establish needed demonstrations of community-scale renewable energy projects.

3. Increase Sustainable Management of Forestland and Build a Sustainable Forest Economy

About 70 percent of the land in central Appalachia is forested, and the region possesses a diverse hardwood forest mix. But the forests have suffered from high-grading—the removal of only high quality trees, which degrades forest quality—and the prevalence of predatory or irresponsible logging practices. Over 90 percent of the forestland is privately owned, most often by families who have small tracts or by absentee landholding companies. There are few incentives or resources for private landowners to pursue sustainable forestland management and few opportunities for local communities to have a say in the use of forestland owned by outside corporate interests.

In this same context, the market for wood products is shifting to sustainably certified wood, a practice supported by government procurement policies. Many of the region’s existing wood processors are obtaining chain-of-custody certification to access these markets, but they lack a local supply of certified wood; in Kentucky, for example, only about 1,000 acres are certified by the Forest Stewardship Council. Other markets for the region’s forests either exist or are emerging, including ecosystem services (for which MACED is now operating a program to broker the sale of working forest carbon credits), woody biomass for energy, and non-timber forest products.

Federal assistance could help establish a certification support center that would help small landowners and wood-products businesses obtain certification. A wood-products competitiveness corporation could help primary and secondary manufacturers grow, modernize, and cooperate. Expanded support for management planning and cost-share programs could increase private forestland management and fill the gap left by federal government budget cuts. To make woody biomass a sustainable opportunity would require more research in order to create harvesting guidelines, understand the relationship between biomass supply and potential demand, and identify which technologies are most beneficial economically and ecologically. And a land bank for community financing and purchase of pre- and post-mine land for sustainable forestry activities could expand local control of land currently owned by outside interests.

4. Support Expansion of a Sustainable Local Foods System

The growing demand for local, healthy, and sustainably produced foods in the region’s urban fringe is juxtaposed with a fairly widespread lack of access to good foods (due to distance, income, and market hurdles), especially for lower income people. Health problems linked to poor diet are a major issue in the region, and efforts to increase access to good local food are a critical part of the solution. In addition, there is significant economic and job creation potential in the food and farming sector. Economist Ken Meter found in 2007 that $2.2 billion in annual income could be created for farmers in Virginia if all of the state’s residents bought local farm products just one day a week.

A number of important models exist in the region. About 60 farmers participate in Appalachian Harvest, a program of Appalachian Sustainable Development (ASD) based in southwest Virginia. Appalachian Harvest farmers grow organic produce and free-range eggs, which ASD then sorts in a packinghouse and sells to about 600 supermarkets and other institutions at a premium under its Appalachian Harvest brand. The Appalachian Center for Economic Networks (ACENet) in Appalachian Ohio has created a commercial kitchen and thermal processing facility for local food entrepreneurs to develop value-added products with the assistance of a food scientist and a business counselor. The Jubilee Project in northeast Tennessee operates a community kitchen, manages a co-op of 30 local farmers, and is accessing markets in the local school system. Other organizations, like Rural Action, are demonstrating success with farmers’ markets and produce auctions.

Federal investment could build upon these local efforts by, for example, creating a grants pool administered by ARC and USDA that would expand these initiatives and launch new ones. Other new USDA financing and assistance efforts supportive of local food enterprises and initiatives could include set-asides for central Appalachia, such as the Rural Microentrepreneur Assistance Program.

5. Invest in Environmental Remediation and Restoration of Land[

Communities in central Appalachia face serious challenges: how to remediate surface-mined land and how to deal with the impacts of acid mine drainage, slurry ponds, and other mine-related issues. While proper remediation methods can never restore land to its pre-mining condition and should not be an excuse for allowing continued destructive practices, there is a need for strategies to address the damage that has already been done. While the 1977 Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA) sought to address the reclamation of land that was mined both before and after passage of the act, numerous problems with the design and implementation of the law have meant inadequate progress.

Problems with current reclamation laws include the historic use of poor reclamation methods that create little or no regeneration; the failure to pay out the full funds in the Abandoned Mine Land (AML) fund and the continuing appropriation of AML monies to western states with no abandoned mine lands left; the lack of a federal commitment to fully address all of the region’s remediation and restoration challenges; and the lack of community visioning and planning processes for what could be done with formerly mined sites.

The federal government should direct more resources to environmental remediation in central Appalachia by changing the formulas in the AML and other programs. It should increase support for innovative and improved efforts at reclamation, including the Appalachian Regional Reforestation Initiative and local efforts like those of East Kentucky Biodiesel, which has plans for “ecological remediation plantations” on formerly mined land that use native species to produce high efficiency bioenergy for local use. Decisions about the best use of these lands should be driven by citizen involvement and local planning.

What’s at Stake

Twenty or thirty years from now, central Appalachia will be a different place than it is today. In one scenario, the land will be decimated by increasingly radical mining practices used to haul out the last tons of coal in the cheapest way possible, leaving the region’s communities further depopulated and demoralized. In a second scenario, it will be a region in the midst of transition. There will be a greater sense of hope, new local businesses and projects forming, more democratic public decision making, and a land that is beginning to heal. Which scenario plays out has implications not just for central Appalachia, but for the rest of the country and beyond. The powerful corporations that are influencing climate, energy, and other policies in this country derive their wealth and political power from places like central Appalachia. Federal investment now in green jobs can start us on the course of transition, and transition here can help make bigger transitions possible elsewhere.

#### Obama’s perceived antagonism undermines populist labor movements.

**Parramore 12** – AlterNet contributing editor. [[Lynn Parramore](http://www.salon.com/writer/lynn_parramore/), “[Why can’t progressives reach white Southern men?](http://www.salon.com/2012/11/05/why_cant_progressives_reach_white_southern_men/),” Monday, Nov 5, 2012 06:24 PM EST, pg. http://www.salon.com/2012/11/05/why\_cant\_progressives\_reach\_white\_southern\_men/

What liberals and progressives don’t seem to understand is that you don’t counter a myth with a pile of facts and statistics. You have to counter it with a more powerful story. And that’s what Obama and the Democrats have repeatedly failed to do. White Southern men want a story that makes them feel proud of America and what it can accomplish. I’m troubled when I hear lefties heap scorn upon the South, partly because I know that the antagonism is precisely what the Mitt Romneys of the world hope for. They want to divide us and keep those regional antagonisms stoked so that the cynical Southern strategy continues to work. Every time a San Franciscan or a New Yorker rails against “rednecks” in the South, he has done Karl Rove’s work for him.

I have argued before that there is an [ancient strain of populism in the South](http://www.alternet.org/election-2012/secret-sauce-what-democrats-need-know-about-north-carolinas-kick-ass-populism) – particularly in places like North Carolina – that Democrats could tap into to speak to the white Southern man in terms that might appeal to him. But the truth is, the Democrats have been marinating in their own pro-business snake oil for so long that they have often forgotten what they might have in common with the unemployed mill worker or the Wal-Mart check-out guy. FDR did not make that mistake. He turned on the electricity at my granddaddy’s tobacco farm and I can tell you that the man, as conservative as he may have been, never forgot it. Instead of hating the white Southern man, why can’t Democrats take a little more time to talk about what they actually might do for him?

The white Southern man, even GOP-leaning, has never liked fat cats. [Reuters/Ipsos polls during this election cycle throughout the Bible Belt](http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/09/11/us-usa-election-poll-bible-belt-idUSBRE88A05H20120911)reveal a large chunk — 38 percent –who say they would be less likely to vote for a candidate who is “very wealthy” than one who isn’t. That’s a lot more than the 20 percent who admit that they would be less inclined to vote for an African-American. Evangelicals were once among the country’s most hard-core economic populists, fighting against Anglican elitists all the way back to the founding era. A distrust of money men is still in their DNA. It’s there, if you know how to speak to it. But have Democrats really done this? All too often, they push regressive taxes and tear away at the social safety net, protecting the big corporate interests that back their campaigns. FDR literally turned on the lights for my grandfather. Barack Obama says he’s on the same page with Mitt Romney when it comes to Social Security. See any problem?

I think by now many of us can see that a real mass movement that can take hold across the country is the only way to make real inroads against the elites who are pushing us towards a barbed-wire economy. But regional antagonisms are not going to get us there.

Where business Democrats fail, the true lefties could step in and talk about shared economic interests. But they’re usually too caught up in the hot-button cultural issues like gay marriage and religion to have a civil conversation. So the fat cats and the Billy Grahams who do their preaching take full advantage (Billy Graham is doing just that in NC right now). If you want to talk about labor unions, how about doing it without denigrating the cultural touchstones that give the white Southern man his sense of pride and place in the world? As soon as you’ve scorned a man’s god, you can have no further conversation with him. One of the reasons that NC doesn’t have much in the way of unions today is that labor organizers from other parts of the country have not been able to have an inclusive conversation with the working class white southern man. Can you look at the rebel flag on his truck and think for a second that he might have pride in the military service of his ancestors and understand that this is not entirely blameworthy? Possible? I”d like to retire the Stars and Bars, too, but I don’t want to end the conversation the second I see it. Can you sense his innate hospitality and understand that it might well extend to a feeling of shared responsibility for those you want to help? I”m not saying that this doesn’t take patience and the shedding the satisfying feeling of self-righteousness that protects us from our own doubts. It’s hard. And sometimes you’re just banging your head against the wall. If you don’t feel like trying, then you can just continue to rail against the white Southern man. And think about how that’s working out for you.

#### Perception that he is hostile to whites prevents a populist coalition. We facilitate unionization

**White 12** [[Walter White](http://www.dailykos.com/user/Walter%20White), “[Building A Progressive Populist Movement in America](http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/03/10/1073194/-Building-A-Progressive-Populist-Movement-in-America),” Daily Kos, Sat Mar 10, 2012 at 03:14 PM PST, pg. http://tinyurl.com/c4zukh2

The key to building a progressive populist movement in America is by getting Middle America to understand that republican/conservative/libertardian ideology is not in their interests.  It makes me ill to listen to working-class republicans intensely argue against social safety nets and labor unions.  I personally feel that it’s actually devolutionary for man/womyn-kind to live under a libertardian system.  Civilization started when people started creating public surpluses and disseminating part of these surpluses into specialties that improved the quality of life for those living in the system.  Scribes, artists, engineers, priests, educators, etc. were able to focus on activities other than sustenance creation and this allowed humans to progress. Conservatives have positive associations with the 1950’s.  Part of the reason the 50’s were a good time in America was because the tax burden was mostly on corporations.  Labor unions were also very strong and it was second nature to assume that the wealthy and big business would assume the tax burden.

To make up for economic policies that decrease the social mobility of Middle America, the GOP offers a “strong foreign policy” for Middle America to feel good about.  This is the neoconservative faction of the GOP.  It makes me even sicker to listen to working class republicans fanatically demanding that America take military action against Syria and/or Iran.  Anything short of total Israeli supremacy in the Middle East is evidence of “hating the Jews.”  Millions of conservative Americans are misled by charlatan Evangelical Preachers into believing Israeli dominance of the Middle East is demanded by “God.”  This religious/ideological narrative (Israel uber alles, the rapture, Judeo-Christianity) has only gained prominence over the last 40 years.  This narrative has risen at the same time as extreme anti-union and anti-social safety net ideology.  All the GOP has to offer Middle America is decreased socioeconomic mobility and a “Judeo-Christian” identity to believe in as they send their sons and daughters to die for corporate, globalist, and Zionist Interests.

So why has Middle America accepted this ridiculous globalist/corporate serving ideology that makes them worse off (What’s a matter with Kansas?)? We have to answer this before we can build this progressive populist movement.  Middle America makes up approximately 50% of America.  This demographic is mostly White (European derived people), but does include a small number of conservatives of other ethnic backgrounds (albeit this number is small).   The reason the GOP has been able to maintain this voting demographic is because the left has been extremely hostile to whites and Christians over the last 50 years (but more so towards “Whiteness” as the left has its own progressive Protestantism).   Because the GOP is not aggressively and overtly anti-White, they “feel” like a better option, when in reality the progressive policies of left are better for Middle America.

So to join Middle America with the liberal left (for the purpose of building a populist coalition) the left will need to purge itself of its anti-white tendencies.  At the same time, Middle America must understand that 50% of the country doesn’t want to live according to all of their “traditional” values.  This relationship between Middle America and the left will require understanding for the other and respect for the other’s preferred way of life.  If America is to work as a diverse nation-state, the key to making this work will be respect for the other.  An evangelical town in the South would support a gay community in San Francisco (and vice versa) because by doing so, they would be supporting their own way of life.

So how is this made to work in terms of policy? The key to making this coalition work (and by extension make America work) is through the constitutional right to freedom of association.  Basically individuals would be free to create communities with whoever they choose.  If people decided they wanted their town to be a modern version of Little House on The Prairie, they could do so.  If other people (let’s say in Vermont) want an eco-socialist region, they could do so as well.  At the same time, federal taxes would increase on the top 10% (including corporations) which would allow for an increase in social welfare spending nation wide.  Middle America will become more open to progressive policies when they don’t feel under constant attack for being who they are.  Once freedom of association is re-implemented, this will greatly reduce much of the stress related to identify politics in America.  Much of the hostility from the right towards nationalized healthcare, increased education spending, and infrastructure spending would go away, as Middle America would no longer associate these issues with the extreme anti-white tendencies of the left.

#### Unions are the only check on corporate dominance

**Madland et al 11** – Director of the American Worker Project @ Center for American Progress Action Fund [Dr. David Madland (PhD in government from Georgetown University), Karla Walter (Senior Policy Analyst with the American Worker Project at the Center for American Progress Action Fund), & Nick Bunker (Special Assistant with the Economic Policy team at the Center for American Progress), “Unions Make the Middle Class Without Unions, the Middle Class Withers,” Center for American Progress, April 2011

Getting harder and harder to provide a check on corporate power

Unfortunately, labor union’s power to represent workers on economic issues has been eclipsed by the money power of corporations and the very wealthy. There are a number of ways that money can be spent to try to influence policy—from political action committee spending in elections to issue advocacy and lobbying. Keeping track of all of these different avenues of spending is nearly impossible, but it is clear that by any¶ measure, corporate spending dominates that of labor unions.

In the 2010 elections, corporate and trade association PACs—organizations that contribute funds and campaign services to federal candidates—outnumbered labor-union PACs by 12 to 1, and their net advantage in direct contributions to candidates was approximately five to one.86 In total, in the 2010 election, corporate and trade association¶ contributions accounted for 72 percent of all PAC contributions while labor unions accounted for 15 percent of all PAC contributions, with business-related PAC spending at $277 million and labor PACs spending $59 million—a gap of $218 million. 87 When you throw in lobbying expenses, the gap grows even bigger. Corporations and industry trade associations accounted for all but one of the top 20 spenders to lobby the federal government in 2010—and spent over $2.8 billion on lobbying, compared¶ to labor, which spent less than $47 million.88 Spending on elections may get more¶ attention from the public, but the effect of increased business lobbying compared to¶ that of labor is of large concern for our political system. Increased lobbying allows¶ business to keep tabs on the behind-the-scenes issues in legislation and regulations. Without a counter in the form of labor, the business community can have a significant effect on the out of sight, but important, parts of our political system.89

And PAC contributions and lobbying are just the tip of the iceberg of corporate political contributions, especially now that the Supreme Court in a recent ruling legalized virtually unlimited corporate spending on campaigns. A small network of hedge fund executives, for example, pumped at least $10 million into Republican campaign committees and allied groups during the 2010 elections through a range of strategies.90 According to the Center for Responsive Politics, the Chamber of Commerce was the top outside spender in the 2010 elections, excluding party committees, contributing $32.8 million.91 When unions were stronger, the gap in spending was significantly smaller—and thus workers voices were on a more even playing field with. But over time, as labor union¶ density declined and campaign costs steadily increased, the gap in spending between labor unions and corporations widened significantly. Consider the comparative spending levels in recent election cycles:

• In the 1977-78 election cycle, corporate PACs contributed $5.6 million more than labor union PACs.

• In 1979-80 the gap grew to $17 million, with labor union PACs contributing $26.4 million and corporate PACs contributing $31.8 million.92

• In 1993-94 the gap in PAC spending between the two was $60 million.

• In the 1995-96 election cycle, the gap rose to $68 million.93

As discussed previously, the gap in PAC spending today is over $200 million. It is clear that corporations rather than the voices of middle class too often dominate electoral¶ discourse in our country today.

The framers of our constitution warned that this sort of unequal power among interest groups would threaten our democracy. When James Madison warned of the¶ “mischief of factions,” he meant that the greatest threat of interest groups was for one¶ or a few of them to wield so much power that they could overwhelm the levers of¶ government and usurp the power of others.94

Unfortunately, other than unions, there is little organized expression of the economic interests of working and middle-class citizens to check corporate lobbying power. Many of the strongest organizations of the left—environmental organizations, women’s rights groups, and civil liberties associations—focus largely on the social¶ concerns rather than economic concerns, and often represent the interests of more¶ affluent constituents.95

Political parties—and the politicians that represent them—are beholden to these¶ coalitions of interest groups as well as to voters. And since voters have limited capacity to monitor and hold politicians and parties accountable, parties are more likely to broker policy deals that will satisfy the interest groups who lobby them.96 As the power¶ differential shifts between unions and corporations, increasingly politicians tend to¶ align themselves with corporations rather than the middle class.97

As a result, bread-and-butter issues for the middle class that are advocated for primarily¶ by unions—such as extension of unemployment benefits, modernization of labor¶ rights laws, increasing the minimum wage, and promoting progressivity in our tax¶ code—will have less likelihood of being enacted. As the columnist David Broder explains: “The link between the decline of progressive politics and with it the near demise¶ of liberal legislation, and the steady weakening of organized labor” is clear.98 Stronger unions would help increase the influence of the middle class on¶ economic policies. Pg. 20-21

#### Corporate dominance risks global famines and pandemics that kill 274,000 people will die per day. US will set the precedent

**Prosser 11** – Project Manager @ AM General Corp. [Tim Prosser (MBA from University of Michigan), Corporate Power Will Eclipse the Power of Governments (Even More Than Today), [Tim Prosser's Futuring Weblog](http://timprosserfuturing.wordpress.com/), [October 17, 2011](http://timprosserfuturing.wordpress.com/2011/10/17/corporate-power-will-eclipse-the-power-of-governments-even-more-than-today/), pg. http://tinyurl.com/cv7jngr

Since the industrial revolution of the 19th century, corporations have evolved and steadily gained power and influence.  Corporate influence on government and media today has been enhanced and refined to the point where corporations have the power to control their appearance in the media as well as to secretly but powerfully influence elections and legislation.  The corporate media have painted a carefully contrived picture that directs attention away from fundamental problems and towards superficial problems that condition events in their favor, as one would expect.   As a result many people today have a view that serves corporate power: seeing “big government” as the problem and corporations as a source of jobs.  This has been used to support the position that corporations should be given all the freedom they need to build their businesses and, hopefully, increase employment.  This is especially visible today as population growth exceeds job growth and the middle and lower classes are seeing their political power, financial strength, and standard of living reduced.  If those ideas were correct, however, we  individuals might not be in the economic positions we’re in, but the corporate media are extremely powerful and have the wherewithal to control what the population knows, so the prospect for positive change is not good.  So where might we be in two or three decades?  Will the power of corporations continue to increase until governments become little more than proxies for multinational corporations? Will the lot of the average person continue to decline?

Soon corporations could effectively rule the world.   In 1990 a corporate strategy professor at one of the top business schools in America told us (I was one of his students) that there were then 100 corporations in existence that each had more financial resources than all but the top 7 countries in the world.  Now, over 20 years later, there is no reason to think the situation has gotten any better, and there are signs it has become much worse as many multinational corporations have turned in record profits even as the world has gone through major economic collapses.  This would not be possible if they weren’t able to quietly steer government actions and manipulate political parties and whole economies.  In particular, the United States’ approach of giving corporations full status as individuals (except for a vote, which would be insignificant anyway) has set a precedent that bolsters corporate power in other countries that have become used to copying the US economy.  That means that corporations not only have global power, but their influence in the United States is multiplied in countries that are easily made dependent on corporations for tax revenues, jobs, and even military assistance.  Nigeria, for example, has long been under the influence of its dominant oil exporter, Shell, which has been able to block reforms and regulations while stripping the country’s oil resources and reducing the majority of its people to poverty and powerlessness, even as it destroys the environment that has fed and provided for them since the beginning of recorded history.  When people are made so helpless and their standard of living is degraded, insurgency and rebellion are inevitable, but that just makes it easier for the government to apply police and military to further subjugate the population.  While Nigeria is an extreme example it is far from alone, and such situations are bound to increase.

If the current trends continue, where might we be in 2041?  As corporations continue to gain power and influence the governments of most countries will increasingly become corporate puppets.  Where the population openly revolts against the poverty and corporate abuses, situations such as exist in Columbia and Afghanistan may arise, where the government has control of only the less mountainous and more fertile parts of the country while the rougher parts of the country are held by rebel groups waging an endless battle for control of territory and resources.

Corporations will become more important and powerful than nations.  As the power of nations is reduced relative to that of corporations, people may become increasingly loyal to their employers and less mindful of national associations.

Countries that resist corporate domination will be shunned and persecuted.  Corporations may wind up in economic and sometimes military confrontations with groups trying to maintain the power of ethnic, national, and religious groups.  The response will be, as we have seen, to first manipulate the media to ignore or derogate these groups so that popular support will be minimized.  The media will also cast these groups as small groups of militants, labeling them “terrorist groups” whenever possible to cement the legal and cultural stigma against them.  The police and military will be used to try to incite violence on the part of even the most nonviolent groups, as any violence will justify the “terrorist” label.  Where whole nations try to resist corporate domination they will be ostracized in the international community and economic sanctions will be used to keep them as weak as possible.  National secret services like the CIA and KGB will be used to destabilize these rogue countries until a corporate-favorable government can be installed.  In some cases the media and politics will be used in a “full court press” to create a case for other countries to make war against them.  If they have already nationalized corporations this case will be made very strongly, and national leaders may even lie about the rogue country having “weapons of mass destruction” in order justify invading them.  In the end they will be pulled back into the world community of corporate-dominated countries at great cost and loss of life, though the pace at which these events take place will be dependent on the resources and market potential the rogue country holds.  As a result, for economically less important countries this could take decades, while for a major oil supplier, for example, this could take place in just a few years.

Corporations may wage war on each other, using nations as proxies.  As nations weaken and corporations gain strength, big companies may only have each other to compete with, and war may break out between them.  Nations may no longer be able to support military forces except where it might be desirable for corporations to use national armies as their proxies in the fight for dominance.   If corporations can already manipulate US politics as they do today, imagine not only what they can do in small countries, but what they might be capable of after several more decades of concentrated effort.

Corporate concentration into fewer, more powerful organizations is likely.  When big corporations can, they naturally increase their power by buying up smaller competitors or driving them out of business.  They can fund whole departments of experts whose sole responsibility is to increase control of the media and cement mechanisms for subtle political control.  They build alliances with companies in other industries that are advantageous to them, and sometimes build conglomerates that work to control many different markets simultaneously.  This suggests a scenario in which the largest nations are controlled by conglomerates while the small countries are still frequently dominated by single multinational corporations, focused on a particular resource in which that country is rich.

Corporations could contribute substantially to widespread disaster.  In the end, corporations’ short term focus on increasing profits will drive humanity into an untenable position – a population too big to feed, limited educational opportunities for most people, decreased innovation especially in the area of basic research, and a generally helpless world population at extreme risk for famine and epidemic.  With the lack of corporate long term planning, infrastructure will grow to be unsustainable, allowing massive failures that will drive large numbers of people to migrate, most losing their life savings in the process, and resulting in an explosion of poverty in the world.  Epidemics will become much harder to control, and sudden decreases in the population of large geographic areas will occur due to fast moving, drug-resistant infections.  Monocultures currently being spread by seed and chemical corporations will increase risk of agricultural failures until they become common, and famine will occur in spite of the global transportation network to move large quantities of food quickly.  With the predicted population of 9 billion by 2045, fully 30% larger than today’s, the problems will create demands for food and energy that will exceed the supply capacity of container ships and air lifts, and while corporations will be affected, they will be little more able to mitigate the disasters than the national governments they’ve weakened to enable corporate dominance.

Eventually corporations will decline, too.  In the end, while it isn’t clear how, corporations will themselves disintegrate due to large scale infrastructure failures and lack of people to maintain their operations.  As the world population declines to a sustainable level populations will fall precipitously and sporadically, possibly over a period of 50-100 years.  As I wrote in a previous article “[The Simple Math: Ignoring the Population Explosion Will Not Make It Go Away](http://timprosserfuturing.wordpress.com/2011/08/21/the-simple-math-ignoring-the-population-explosion-will-not-make-it-go-away/)“, if the population is reduced by 5 billion people over 50 years that will mean an average reduction in population of 274,000 per day not including countering the birth rate.  This is far more than has been seen from any disaster we’re familiar with today.  It is likely that neither corporate nor national powers will be able to do much to mitigate the huge famines and epidemics that will achieve such reductions.

Regulation of corporations on a global scale is needed at once.  If we are to reduce the damage the scenario painted above to humanity and the planet as a whole, we need a global understanding that, while capitalism motivates great achievements and improvements for humanity, the corporate entity established under the banner of capitalism will naturally sub-optimize (detract from) the common good unless it is regulated by government.  Governments themselves have incentive to address this problem, but are presently too mired in political squabbling and too dominated by corporate influence to do anything positive.

It is encouraging to see the Occupy Wall Street movement growing.  Without an uprising of individuals to force governments to regulate the power of corporations now and in the future the scenario I described above could become reality (more than it already is).  I urge all responsible, thinking people to let your elected representatives know how you feel about these issues, and support the “99%” of us by contributing to the Occupy Wall Street movement in any way you can.  We need a sea change in the way government operates and the ways in which corporations are regulated, and as we’ve learned the hard way, only we can make that happen.

#### AND, that makes global wars inevitable. Resource constraint reverses ethical developments that prevent extinction

**Aguilar-Millan et al 10** – Director of research @ European Fu22tures Observatory [Stephen Aguilar-Millan (Member of the Global Advisory Council of the World Future Society and the Board of the Association of Professional Futurists), Ann Feeney (Member of the Association of Professional Futurists and its board and is a Certified Association Executive), Amy Oberg (Managing partner at Future-In-Sight, LLC. 25 years of experience), and Elizabeth Rudd (Risk assessment consultant), “The Post-Scarcity World of 2050-2075,” The Futurist, Jan/Feb 2010, pg. <http://www.eufo.org/psw1.pdf>]

Historically, there have been periods when large numbers of the global population have been reduced due to war, disease, natural disasters or famine. In the next 75 years, such an episode is likely to occur. The world has **several military hot spots**, and weapons able to **eliminate large portions of the population** are more prevalent than in the past. Rogue states or non-state actors such as terrorist organizations may develop these capabilities over the coming decades. **Resource shortages** may lead to heightened tensions, isolationism by countries, and increasing incidents of violence. In order to reduce the possibility of such incidents, we may see the rise of supranational governance and regulation and continued efforts to resolve conflicts through diplomacy and negotiation. The outbreak of disease is also a threat. A **global pandemic**, which, due to global travel, may spread more rapidly than any outbreak in history, could eliminate large numbers of the population. How widespread, and how great the population loss, will be dependent on the ability to curtail the global outbreak and find a cure or vaccination quickly. Inequities in access to health care mean pre-modern nations are likely to sustain a greater proportion of population loss than more-developed nations. **Famine** has the greater impact in pre-modern nations. Post-modern nations may be able to rely on their supranational relationships to assist them through the tough times. Modern nations may have better resources to manage or avoid food scarcity, but pre-modern nations are heavily dependent on aid from other nations. If globalization and access to finance becomes more difficult, coupled with resource shortages within their own countries, aid may decrease to the pre-modern nations, which will increase the duration and severity of famines. Weather patterns are cyclical. As well, there is a growing body of evidence in the early decades of the century indicating global warming. The severity and occurrence of natural disasters is increasing. If this continues, we are likely to have larger numbers of people displaced, and the death toll is likely to increase. In the early decades of the century, birthrates are much higher in modern and pre-modern countries. Economic development—especially in terms of the advancement of women through access to education, to micro-finance, and to birth control—contributes to reductions in birthrates in pre-modern countries. If pre-modern countries can successfully advance economically, this is likely to contribute to reduced population growth. Population will also impact where and how we live. People have lived in some type of dwelling for most of time, usually with family members. People will continue to live together in dwellings, but what will be the location, form, and ownership of those dwellings? The percentage of the global population living in urban areas is expected to increase from 48% in 2003 to 61% by 2030. The UN estimates that most of these urban dwellers will be in developing countries, living in cities in low-lying coastal areas at high risk from flooding due to global warming, making them vulnerable to natural disasters. As resources become scarce, housing prices are likely to rise, making home ownership less affordable; this may impact living arrangements, meaning more people living together in smaller spaces. This in turn could lead to increased crime rates for theft and violence. This may give rise to the countertrend of a return to villages. Villages afford more space and the ability to attain greater self-sufficiency for essentials like food, water, and power. Individual home ownership is common in many countries. Apartments or condominiums are also often individually owned, or sometimes the whole building is owned by a corporation. As global finance and credit markets become tighter, and resource shortages drive up the cost of housing, we may see more people leasing for longer periods of time and more housing owned by larger corporation and retirement funds. Rents are also likely to increase, so more people will likely share a household, thus reversing the growing trend of oneto two-person households. The materials we use to build and the sources of energy we use to heat and power our homes will likely change. Material shortages may drive innovation in recycled building materials and longer-lasting materials. Wind and solar may become more common sources of power. Rooftop, hydroponic, and vertical gardening could enable residential space to be used for food production, as a shortage of soil and arable land make it harder to feed the world’s growing population. It is difficult to conceive of a society without some form of individual ownership. A world in which all goods, services, and accommodation are provided by the government or by corporations seems unlikely. However, it is possible to conceive of one in which what individuals own, and how goods are consumed, changes due to both the availability of resources and also the materials used. Cradle-to-cradle manufacturing, a closed-cycle manufacturing process where nothing is wasted, may become more commonplace. Planned obsolescence in manufactured goods may become a thing of the past. Leasing of goods, where the manufacturer is responsible for repair and/or replacement and recycling of the item, may become more common. Innovation efforts are likely to focus on these types of efforts as resource availability begins to peak, yet demand continues to increase. While many fantasize about reduced workweeks and more leisure time, for the foreseeable future people will continue to work outside the home to earn an income. Where changes may occur is in the nature and quantity of the work. Statistics indicate that, as many countries develop economically, working hours increase. Resource shortages may mean this will eventually begin to show more balance. As the focus turns to efficiency and resource reuse, people are likely to buy less, which means less is produced, although it may be at a higher cost. Population growth means more adults available to work. This may lead to the elimination of child labor. Access to education for women as well as children may also assist in reducing the number of children working outside the home. Advances in health care and improvements in life span and the quality of life may assist people to remain in the workforce longer; this will be especially beneficial for post-modern countries, where the birthrate typically declines as the country advances economically. Greater numbers of people may enter or remain in the workforce. Reduced working hours may be mandated, in order to create more jobs. More people might work part time. Greater self-reliance may mean more need for time outside of work to spend growing food and tending to other essential activities. The time and activities performed at work are likely to change. Leisure activities are also likely to shift, with more physical activities being more local and distance interactions done virtually through the use of technology. The cost and resources available to enable global leisure travel are likely to experience shortages in the age of scarcity. By 2075, perhaps new technologies to enable low-cost, low impact travel may be developed. The desire to do so, however, is more a question of geopolitics, an issue to which we shall now turn. Post-Scarcity Geopolitics The most-plausible scenario of the development of a post-scarcity society would be driven by advances in nanotechnology or other extensions of materials sciences. So, based on the current infrastructure, the breakthrough developments would most likely take place in Western Europe, the United States, Japan, or South Korea, although China or India, or even one of the oil-wealthy Gulf nations, cannot entirely be ruled out. It would be tempting to follow all these possible scenarios, but for the scope of this paper, we will focus on the assumption that the post-scarcity future begins in the developed, Westernized world. By the time we build a post-scarcity capacity enough to build a post-scarcity economy, there will still be **widespread poverty** in many nations, particularly those that were still developing at the time of “peak everything” and many that reverted to developing-nation status under the hardships of climate change, scarcity of potable water, wars, and environmental degradation. Whether led by a spirit of philanthropy, capitalism, or enlightened self-interest, it seems likely that the originating nations would ensure that other nations would receive at least some of the benefits fairly soon. Much geopolitical conflict derives from scarcity or perceived scarcity of land, water, energy sources, mineral wealth, or other physical objects, ones which would be greatly alleviated by a post-scarcity economy. Eliminating or reducing these causes for conflict would be a great step toward international peace. However, it would not create total peace, largely because the capacity to mount deadly attacks would increase at the same time that some reasons for conflict will remain or might even worsen. Some scholars posit that **all historical conflict has been driven by competition over resources**, and that even wars ostensibly over ideologies were truly about scarcity. Political or ideological dominance were ways to an end, rather than the end itself. Certainly for many wars, such as the Crusades and World War II, their arguments are at least plausible. However, conflicts that might have started over scarcity may still capture hearts, minds, and resources by the enticing trappings of politics, religion, or even simply historical grudges. If, as other scholars believe, humans are **inherently a warlike species**, a postscarcity economy will enhance leaders’ ability to create war over causes that might have seemed trivial during a time when there was scarcity to worry about. The status of the natural world is another area that could create conflict. Many arguments for environmental protection are based on the direct and indirect human benefit of natural land and species conservation. The world’s forests act to sequester carbon, clean the air, regulate the temperature, and house animals and plants of current or potential benefit to humankind. In a post-scarcity society where technology can replace all of those functions, there could well be conflict over the appropriate use of whatever wild areas are left between those who see such areas as having intrinsic value, or possible future extrinsic value, and those who wish to use such land for other purposes. So far, we have just looked at the questions in terms of today’s nations and assumed that today’s nation-states are more or less intact by the time of the post-scarcity society. However, the post-scarcity society may well make both today’s states and the idea of a nationstate obsolete. On the other hand, the twentieth- and twenty-firstcentury creation of international groups and agencies from mutual interests rather than shared borders could replace today’s states in a different way. For example, the European Union formed, as an economic union, the European Economic Community, which itself arose from the European Coal and Steel Community. It has broadened its objectives beyond the purely economic or closely related (e.g., free movement of labor) to include social justice (e.g., its powers to legislate against discrimination), environmental policy, foreign policy, and security issues. If it were to change its charter to be one of shared values and common history, such an organization might not only include Turkey, thus adding part of Asia to its scope, but also traditional allies such as the United States. It might even transcend geography and history to become an alliance of democracies, bringing all of North America and large parts of South America, Asia, Africa, and even parts of the Middle East. Of course, the shadows of colonialism may create too great a barrier for some time, and continental alliances, rather than intercontinental, may come first. Some alliances would be unlikely to continue. OPEC, based on commodity production, would likely disappear. The existing NonAligned Movement, originally formed as a response to NATO and the Warsaw Pact nations, has struggled to define itself and its purpose since the collapse of the Cold War, and even now, its membership has little in common. One remaining unifying theme has been fair and sustainable development, but in a mature post-scarcity world, development would be moot for virtually all nations. On the other hand, a post-scarcity society in which the means of living could be created at a micro level, or even at a household level, could make it possible for small, self-selected communities to exist either as parts of a nation-state but largely independent or as entirely autonomous of a nation-state, even as their own nation-state. History suggests that most of these would be beneficial to their members and at worst harmless to others, but also gives us darker warnings of cults and militant groups that attacked other groups or destroyed themselves and took innocents with them. The ability of these organizations to operate with all the capacities of an autonomous nation in a post-scarcity society is a sobering thought. On the other hand, if the pursuit of these groups is control over themselves and their members and no control from an outside world, or if they can at least settle for this, we might find that post-scarcity geopolitics are in fact the road to a lasting peace. Ultimately, the geopolitics of a post-scarcity world depends upon the interactions of humans and groups. While human nature is a constant, human ethics are not, and most of the world’s history, viewed over a long time span, is what most of us would consider the growth of human ethics. For example, things once considered tolerable by the majority of society, such as slavery and indiscriminate slaughter during war, are now mostly condemned, at least in principle if not always in practice, and are greatly reduced. Perhaps this is what has **enabled us to survive** so far—that, while our technical capacities always run ahead of our ethical development, our ethics do keep up just enough. In order for a post-scarcity society to develop in such a way that it adds to net human freedom, justice, and well-being, we need more than ever to reinforce the principles of equality, generosity, tolerance, compassion, and mutual interdependence in what we teach and in what we model before those who will build the post-scarcity world. These values (or **their lack**) will shape whether the post-scarcity world fulfills its promise or **creates the seeds of the destruction of civilization**. Nowhere will this be felt greater than in the post-scarcity financial system. Pg. 289-297

#### AND, Corporate dominance risks uncontrolled nanotech

**Barfield 10** [[Thomas Barfield](http://www.guardian.co.uk/profile/thomas-barfield), “Get ready for a world of nanotechnology,” [guardian.co.uk](http://www.guardian.co.uk/), Thursday 2 September 2010 08.08 EDT, pg. http://tinyurl.com/2vvfjc8

A commonly accepted definition of nanotechnology is that it deals with devices smaller than 100nm in size. A nanometre is one billionth of a metre. A single atom is between a tenth to half a nanometre across; a million or more of them stacked on top of one another would equal the thickness of a piece of paper. Nanotech machines will use individual atoms and molecules as mechanical moving parts, and will enable us to take apart and rebuild just about anything atom by atom.

If this sounds like science fiction, consider that you're carrying trillions of proofs of concept around inside you that could only be viewed with an electron microscope; every time your DNA is transcribed into RNA, or your muscle cells use fuel from food for movement, or your immune system fights off an infection, the work is done by nanomachines – devices built out of atoms and molecules which do mechanical work.

In his book, Engines of Creation, [K Eric Drexler](http://e-drexler.com/p/idx04/00/0404drexlerBioCV.html) reminded readers that every manmade and natural object around us is an arrangement of (mostly very common) atoms and molecules. The ability to arrange those molecules more regularly will allow us to build materials many times stronger and lighter than those used in engineering today. This could bring a [space elevator](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Space_elevator) within reach, allowing us to explore the solar system and exploit the resources of the planets and asteroids cheaply. In the body, nanomachines could fight disease, or even aging, one atom at a time, restoring them to the configurations characteristic of healthy tissue.

An advanced nanotechnology would be capable of repairing the damage we have done to our environment, capturing carbon out of the air and salting it away under the earth, or using it to build the light, strong, diamond-like materials the nanotech-enabled human-scale technology will depend on. Ultimately, the most basic and useful elements we will need (carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, etc) can be harvested out of the air and dirt, and assembled into useful configurations with barely an hour of work. Nanotechnology has the potential to build a post-scarcity material economy – with the same implications we are so awkwardly working through in the post-scarcity information economy.

Drexler didn't shy away from confronting the negative possibilities of uncontrolled nanotech development in his book, and he and other scientists, such as those at the [Centre for Responsible Nanotechnology](http://www.crnano.org/), attempt to raise public awareness of the coming developments, which will inevitably grow out of research into molecular biology and computing (specifically, artificial intelligence and computer-aided design).

There are many terrifying possibilities for nanotechnology; military nanomachines could infiltrate human bodies and systematically tear them apart using the same principles medical nanomachines will use to repair them. An uncontrolled nanomachine designed to replicate itself could lead to the "grey goo" scenario that once [panicked Prince Charles](http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2003/apr/29/nanotechnology.science). Monopolistic practices on the part of the corporation or government that first produces a workable nanotechnology could hoard its benefits for one segment of the population, denying the rest of the world the massively increased prosperity it offers.

The solutions will have to complement one another if this, the biggest technological leap forward since the Industrial Revolution, is to benefit everyone. The most important is collaboration and diplomacy; the democracies that lead the world in scientific research need to collaborate in development and come to agreements that will share benefits and severely restrict weaponisation. Nanotech treaties will have far greater import for the survival of [hu]mankind, and of Earth as an ecosystem, than any nuclear treaty. Even "rogue" states need to be included in these efforts, simply because the new technology will be so desirable that if they are not included, they will push forward with their own, more dangerous and less controlled research.

The other aspect of preparation is education. The electorate need to be adequately informed to understand the debate that will take place and to put pressure on their leaders to choose the right paths. This means that formal science education in schools needs continued support from the ministers setting curriculums, and higher education and research needs support and funding so that we continue to have scientists and engineers capable of contributing to research and to public debate.

We need a forum for discussing the implications and direction of technological change in a way that is open and comprehensible to the public, and whose conclusions and advice ministers take seriously and do not dismiss on ideological grounds. Drexler proposes that such a forum needs the credibility of due process present in a court of law, and the scientific reliability that stems from peer review. Most of all, we need politicians with the courage to resist the temptation to short-termism that comes with limited terms in office, who realise that the debates arising in the coming years will see them legislating the shape of the future.

#### Uncontrolled nano place us all at risk

**Masciulli 11** – Professor of Political Science @ St Thomas University [Joseph Masciulli, “The Governance Challenge for Global Political and Technoscientific Leaders in an Era of Globalization and Globalizing Technologies,” Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society February 2011 vol. 31 no. 1 pg. 3-5

What is most to be feared is enhanced global disorder resulting from the combination of **weak global regulations**; the unforeseen destructive consequences of **converging tech**nologies and economic globalization; military competition among the great powers; and the prevalent biases of short-term thinking held by most leaders and elites. But no practical person would wish that such a disorder scenario come true, given all the weapons of mass destruction (**WMD**s) available now or which will surely become available in the foreseeable future. As converging technologies united by IT, cognitive science, nanotechnology, and robotics advance synergistically in monitored and unmonitored laboratories, we may be blindsided by these future developments brought about by technoscientists with a variety of good or destructive or mercenary motives. The current laudable but problematic openness about publishing scientific results on the Internet would contribute greatly to such negative outcomes.

To be sure, if the global disorder-emergency scenario occurred because of postmodern terrorism or rogue states using biological, chemical, or nuclear WMDs, or a regional war with nuclear weapons in the Middle East or South Asia, there might well be a positive result for global governance. Such a global emergency might unite the global great and major powers in the conviction that a global concert was necessary for their survival and **planetary survival** as well. In such a global great power concert, basic rules of economic, security, and legal order would be uncompromisingly enforced both globally and in the particular regions where they held hegemonic status. That concert scenario, however, is flawed by the limited legitimacy of its structure based on the members having the greatest hard and soft power on planet Earth.

At the base of our concerns, I would argue, are **human proclivities for narrow, short-term thinking** **tied to** individual self-interest or corporate and **national interests** in decision making. For globalization, though propelled by technologies of various kinds, “remains an essentially human phenomenon . . . and the main drivers for the establishment and uses of disseminative systems are hardy perennials: profit, convenience, greed, relative advantage, curiosity, demonstrations of prowess, ideological fervor, malign destructiveness.” These human drives and capacities will not disappear. Their “manifestations now extend considerably beyond more familiarly empowered governmental, technoscientific and corporate actors to include even individuals: terrorists, computer hackers and rogue market traders” (Whitman, 2005, p. 104).

In this dangerous world, if people are to have their human dignity recognized and enjoy their human rights, above all, to life, security, a healthy environment, and freedom, we need new forms of comprehensive global regulation and control. Such **effective global leadership and governance** with robust enforcement powers **alone can adequately respond to destructive current global problems, and prevent new ones**. However, successful human adaptation and innovation to our current complex environment through the social construction of effective global governance will be a daunting collective task for global political and technoscientific leaders and citizens. For our global society is caught in “the whirlpool of an accelerating process of modernization” that has for the most part “been left to its own devices” (Habermas, 2001, p. 112). We need to progress in human adaptation to and innovation for our complex and problematical global social and natural planetary environments through global governance. I suggest we need to begin by ending the prevalent biases of short-termism in thinking and acting and the false values attached to the narrow self-interest of individuals, corporations, and states.

I agree with Stephen Hawking that the long-term future of the human race must be in space. It will be difficult enough to avoid disaster on planet Earth in the next hundred years, let alone the next thousand, or million. . . . There have been a number of times in the past when its survival has been a question of touch and go. The Cuban missile crisis in 1962 was one of these. The frequency of such occasions is likely to increase in the future. We shall need great care and judgment to negotiate them all successfully. But I’m an optimist. If we can avoid disaster for the next two centuries, our species should be safe, as we spread into space. . . . But we are entering an increasingly dangerous period of our history. Our population and our use of the finite resources of planet Earth, are growing exponentially, along with our technical ability to change the environment for good or ill. But our genetic code still carries the selfish and aggressive instincts that were of survival advantage in the past. . . . Our only chance of long term survival is not to remain inward looking on planet Earth, but to spread out into space. We have made remarkable progress in the last hundred years. But if we want to continue beyond the next hundred years, our future is in space.” (Hawking, 2010)

Nonetheless, to reinvent humanity pluralistically in outer space and beyond will require securing our one and only global society and planet Earth through effective global governance in the foreseeable future. And **our dilemma is that** the enforcement powers of **multilateral institutions are not likely to be strengthened because** of the competition for greater (relative, not absolute) hard and soft power by the **great** and major **powers**. They **seek** their **national** or alliance **superiority**, or at least, parity, for the sake of their state’s survival and security now. Unless the global disorder-emergency scenario was to occur soon—God forbid—the great powers will most likely, recklessly and tragically, leave global survival and security to their longer term agendas. Pg. 4-5

#### Incentives will create a lasting populist movement

**Elk 09** - Union organizer and labor journalist who writes for Harper's Magazine, the American Prospect, the Huffington Post and In These Times. He has appeared as a comme­ntator on CNN, Fox News, and NPR. [[Mike Elk](http://www.ourfuture.org/users/new-4013), “Stop The Teabaggers, Give Them Green Jobs: Lessons From the Coalfields of West Virginia,” Campaign for America’s Future, August 27, 2009 - 4:40pm ET, pg. http://tinyurl.com/mq62jx

West Virginia shows us how we could easily win over this key segment of society, working class whites, with a New Deal-style industrial policy. Currently, [81,000](http://www.ourfuture.org/blog-entry/2009083525/a%20href=) in the United States working as coal miners.

On election night 2000, the biggest shocker for me wasn't Florida, but that West Virginia had voted for a conservative Republican presidential candidate for the first time in nearly 70 years.

For decades, West Virginia, with one of the highest rates of unionization in the country, regularly voted for progressive candidates, even being one of only nine other states in 1988 to vote for the epitome of a Massachusetts liberal - Michael Dukakis. To know the story of West Virginia is to know why the progressive movement is failing to win over white working class voters. Because of their primary concern: jobs.

Driving around West Virginia as a young union organizer with Marshall University labor historian Gordon Simmons, I quickly learned that underneath its beautiful mountain lay a history of exploitation, broken promises and economic degradation. Despite being "the Saudi Arabia of Coal," West Virginia is engaged in a yearly neck and neck race with Mississippi for being [the poorest state in the country](http://money.cnn.com/2007/08/28/real_estate/wealthiest_state).

As a result of coal mining, West Virginia has a cancer rate that is [nearly 70% higher than the national average](http://www.grist.org/article/green-theatre-taking-off-broadway-off-coal/). Every day more than [three million pounds of ammonium nitrate explosives (a highly carcinogenic substance)](http://itsgettinghotinhere.org/2009/02/23/from-west-virginia-to-obama-stop-mountaintop-removal) are exploded in mountaintop removal. This is the equivalent of a Hiroshima bomb worth of explosives being dropped on West Virginia every month. Over [100 billion gallons of toxic sludge](http://news.newamericamedia.org/news/view_article.html?article_id=1bbe4b5f450365c1084c27172d95db6d) are contained in poorly regulated, coal sludge reservoirs from mountaintop mining contaminating local water supplies, leading to mind boggling rates of cancer.

A fact that is equally startling as the destruction of the mountains, is the destruction of jobs in West Virginia. Coal mining jobs have gone [down by 75%](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/daryl-hannah/why-i-was-arrested-in-coa_b_224531.html) with the shift to the highly mechanized, mountaintop removal. In the early 1950’s, there were [145,000 miners employed](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/daryl-hannah/why-i-was-arrested-in-coa_b_224531.html) in West Virginia; in 2004 there were just over [16,000 miners employed](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/daryl-hannah/why-i-was-arrested-in-coa_b_224531.html). While employment has decreased in coal mining, [coal production has actually increased dramatically](http://www.ilovemountains.org/resources/#mtreconomy) as a result of the environmentally destructive procedures of mountaintop removal.

Clearly, West Virginians would prefer jobs that didn't destroy their communities and health, but are forced into coal mining because few other jobs exist. As a result, West Virginians desperately fear losing these jobs. The fossil fuel lobby exploits this fear to kill investments in clean energy jobs. The industry uses events like the upcoming free concert called ["Friends of America"](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dave-cooper/rocker-ted-nugent-to-emce_b_258696.html) hosted by Sean Hannity, which has press materials implicitly attacking clean energy legislation, hysterically warning, [“we must keep these [coal mining] jobs from being regulated out of existence](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dave-cooper/rocker-ted-nugent-to-emce_b_258696.html)”.

These industries always say that regulating them will cost jobs - even when it is proven that jobs will be created. This is because they have created a situation where people are hanging on by a thread, paid so little that they desperately cling to what they have and other people are starving in front of them.

The ability of these AstroTurf groups to mobilize people fearing the loss of their jobs led to the dramatic weakening of the Waxman-Markey climate bill and quite possibly health care. We often make fun of teabaggers showing up at town halls, but fail to realize that the reason they are motivated to rebel against change because all change has ever meant to them is job loss and the destruction of their communities.

West Virginia shows us how we could easily win over these key segments of society with a New Deal-style industrial policy. Racial tensions and prejudices in West Virginia have long been as severe as in other places in the South. However as a result of heavy unionization, West Virginians learned to look beyond race to take on the true oppressors - big corporations. West Virginians also remembered the importance that the New Deal played in transforming their lives. It gave them jobs, electricity, roads, and helped to bring the region into the 20th Century.

As result, West Virginians stuck firmly with FDR’s Democratic Party and voted consistently for Democrats for the following five decades. While the once solid Democratic South became the Republican South after passage of Civil Rights legislation, West Virginia -- despite its strong racial tensions -- remained an island of Democratic support, until 2000.

In the 1990s, the generations that had survived the Great Depression, the New Deal, and World War Two began to die out, and a Democratic president forged the job-killing NAFTA trade deal. Support for Democrats in West Virginia suddenly began to weaken. All the new generation knew was rising unemployment and broken promises at the hand of liberal politicians promising them jobs, but instead taking what jobs they had away.

The failure of the progressive movement to advocate for the improvement of the economic conditions of the white working class created a vacuum that allowed right-wing demagoguery to flourish. West Virginians turned to conservative Republicans who promised to protect their country, their most cherished recreational activity - hunting, and the churches at the center of their communities because no one else seemed to be protecting their communities.

In 2000, Republicans in West Virginia portrayed environmentalist Al Gore, who played a key role in passing NAFTA, as a job-killer who would destroy West Virginia's coal-based economy. Ever since then, West Virginia has voted consistently Republican in presidential elections, while at the same time continuing to elect Democratic Senators and Congressman who promised to protect coal producing jobs and fight to keep manufacturing in West Virginia.

In response to the shifting winds against progressives in West Virginia, local activists have called for New Deal-style projects like the [Coal River Wind Project](http://www.coalriverwind.org/) which seeks to create a sustainable, green economy not based on the boom and bust cycles of coal. Recent studies show that Appalachia will be mined out of coal in [20-30 years](http://www.coalriverwind.org). In contrast the wind energy is sustainable industry that is here to stay and could create far more jobs.

It’s estimated that only a $30 billion investment through Senator Sherrod Brown's IMPACT Act [would create 2.5 million jobs](http://www.ourfuture.org/blog-entry/2009083525/%3Chttp:/www.ourfuture.org/blog-entry/2009072808/building-clean-energy-economy-impact-act%3E) - many of them high, paying manufacturing jobs. The IMPACT Act could help replace the nearly [2 million manufacturing jobs that have been lost](http://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.nr0.htm) since the recession began in December 2007.

A New Deal-style industrial policy is crucial as well for winning over the politically elusive, white working class. The New Deal was successful in creating a lasting political coalition because it created lasting political constituencies. As a result of the wide range of people it helped: Social Security for seniors, labor unions for workers, subsidies for small farmers, and jobs for the unemployed, these groups were brought into the Democratic party and stayed there for nearly forty years.

However, a recent poll of non-college educated white males, showed that [only 35% approved of Obama’s performance](http://www.ourfuture.org/blog-entry/2009083525/%3Chttp:/politics.theatlantic.com/2009/08/where_obama_is_losing_ground.php%3E) . Some liberal commentators like Ron Brownstein of the Atlantic Magazine claim that [we don't need the white working class](http://www.ourfuture.org/blog-entry/2009083525/%3Chttp:/politics.theatlantic.com/2009/08/where_obama_is_losing_ground.php%3E) to build a lasting progressive movement. Some argue that we shouldn't waste our effort to reach out to them because we can build majority built simply based upon minorities, women, college educated professionals, and youth.

To that I simply say is if the progressive movement wants to have a lasting impact we should include everyone as the New Deal coalition did. By advocating for New Deal - style industrial policies we can bring in the white working class as part of our movement, help with efforts at racial healing, and could create a lasting political movement that could last for another forty years. Such tactics were successful in the past in bringing the white working class into the party and will be successful in the future.

If the progressive movement put as much energy into advocating for a New Deal-style industrial policy as they have attacking and debunking the teabaggers, there wouldn't be teabaggers at these town hall meetings.

Yes, New Deal-style industrial policy will bring people into the progressive movement. But the real reason we why we need an industrial policy is similar to the one we had under the New Deal: it was the right thing to do. The New Deal helped people. made their lives better, created the middle class, set up regulations that protected people ,and created the solid foundations for the economic revival and amazing growth that followed.

It's time that we again as a progressive movement, embrace an aggressive New Deal-style industrial policy. It's important to just to our growth as a movement, but to our economic growth, our efforts at racial reconciliation, and our betterment as a nation. These are the lessons that West Virginia has to offer us.

#### An Obama jobs project is key – His timidity legitimizes right-wing politics

[**Skocpol**](http://www.politico.com/arena/bio/theda_skocpol.html) **10** - Professor of Government and Sociology @ Harvard University [Theda Skocpol, “Obama and the Democrats Need a Jobs and Taxes Argument for National Recovery,” Politico’s The Arena, Sep. 20, 2010, pg. http://www.politico.com/arena/perm/Theda\_Skocpol\_E8BD76F7-7169-44FC-B779-3993550FC1E6.html

Polls and all kinds of measures of the concerns of most ordinary Americans show very little concern about the federal deficit and spending. Americans want jobs and economic growth - and that is what they want D.C. to focus on. The tea Party and its sympathizers are colorful for TV, but they are only about a quarter of Americans at the most. Activists are about 12-15%. Their biggest impact is on frightened Republican officeholders and nominees, but in policy terms they stand for nothing clear besides deep generational and racial anxieties.

Rank-and-file tea partiers are not even opposed to the core of federal spending for defense, Medicare, and Social Security - many of them are living on these programs and believe they are entitled to them after lifetimes of work (as indeed they are)! Tea partiers may think the federal government is spending a lot on other things, but that is just ignorance (deliberately fed by Fox misinformation campaigns). Many of the grass roots tea partiers are going to be plenty surprised after Republicans take over again and hand out more tax breaks and subsidies to millionaires while gutting Social Security and Medicare.  
The timidity of Democrats and the White House is killing them. All we have heard for months are articles about what they are "considering" or fighting about. Pollsters who have told them they should avoid nationalizing this election have given disastrously bad advice. Events in a country determine whether an election is nationalized or not - and the country is in a deep economic crisis that cuts to the heart of home equity and employment, the core of family security. Obama and the Democrats have long ago needed a national message - about jobs and national recovery, what they are fighting to do, and what right-wingers are obstructing.

Instead, they have tried to engage in preemptive concessions (Orszag, Emanuel) and run and hide - which only emboldens crazy right-wingers all the more - and leaves the media free to focus on colorful extremists and side issues.

History will record this as one of the most tragic moments for Democrats - and above all for this White House. In a severe and ongoing national economic crisis, for the President to hide and cower and dither is amazing. Obama needs new advisors, and he needs to find a backbone. He needs a national narrative, not just fingerpoint at scary tea partiers.   
We are facing a turning point for effective democratic governance in the USA - and the tax cut decisions are really all that matters right now. The wealthy interests trying to knock out this White House understand that. Incredibly, Democrats seem to be on the verge of caving - or punting, which is the same - on tax cut extensions for millionaires and billionaires - giveaways of public resources that will ensure deep cuts  in Social Security and all kinds of vital endeavors going forward.

Massive victories for rabidly pro-rich and government-hating Republicans will lead to years more of deadlock and further deterioration of governmental capacities - just as the United States faces intense competition on the international stage. It is a recipe for permanent national decline.   
If Obama dithers through this, he will be a one term president - and much of what he seems already to have accomplished will be undone, including Affordable Care, which will not be repealed but will be eviscerated. He should be making it clear that he wants a vote now on tax cut extensions for the vast majority of Americans - because this will help recovery and do something for hard-hit millions - and at the same time he should tell the House and Senate that if they want to vote separately on tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires, they can do it, but if that passes, he will veto it.

Democrats still have the ability to bring two separate bills to the floor - and they should do it. Obama should not accept the cuts for millionaires and billionaires and he should tell all Americans why, loud and clear. This is both popular and the right thing to do for the country. If Obama made this declaration up front, it would support those in the House and Senate who are willing to oppose tax giveaways for the super-rich.   
Democrats on taxes are trying to use a national interest issue as an ambiguous political wedge, trying to pretend to favor tax cuts for the middle class up until the November election, while quietly preparing to extend tax cuts for the rich, too (or in effect allow that by turning things over to Republicans). It will not work. It never works for a political party to seem to be playing politics rather than focusing on America's needs. And if they extend millionaire/billionaire tax cuts even temporarily, this is a sure sign that they have betrayed the national interest and do not deserve to hold office. That is hard thing for someone with my political sympathies to say, but it is the truth.   
If Democrats are blown out in this election after this kind of cowardly performance, Americans who want a stronger nation need to create an alternative vehicle for a muscular liberalism focused on national greatness - with a prime focus on jobs for all Americans as the first goal. Tea Partiers have shown that they can dismantle and redirect the Republican Party. Meanwhile, soliciters for the DNC, DSCC, and DCCC keep asking for money for - what? Beyond "reelect us," they never say. They fudge - while offering a constant media spectacle of indecision and retreat.

### Solvency

#### USDA special category solves development and modeling

**MACED 10** [Mountain Association for Community Economic Development, “Economic Transition in Central Appalachia: Ideas for the Appalachian Regional Development Initiative” April 8, 2010

2. Expand local renewable energy production

Central Appalachia’s historic reliance on coal has also meant little progress in diversifying into renewable energy sources. However, the region possesses real potential for renewable energy from a number of sources. Wind power is possible at a distributed scale and at utility scale on ridgetops in Central Appalachia. At least 3,830 MW of wind potential exists on private land in West Virginia.8 The best wind potential in all of Kentucky is in the counties in the southeastern coalfields.9 A recent National Renewable Energy Laboratory study indicated that at the higher hub heights of modern wind turbines, the wind potential in the region’s states is greater than was often previously assumed.10

Leaders of Kentuckians For The Commonwealth in the towns of Benham and Lynch have launched the Benham and Lynch Community Energy Initiative to address the need for renewable power and energy efficiency in these small former company towns in the heart of the coalfields. The Initiative has partnered with the Massachusetts Institute o Technology and MACED to conduct initial research on the potential of local wind generation. The nearby mountains have the highest wind potential in all of Kentucky. The communities are also pursuing energy efficiency projects, as the town of Benham uses the highest amount of electricity per residential customer of any utility in the state.11 See more about the Benham and Lynch proposal in the appendix. In southern West Virginia, the leaders of Coal River Wind have developed a model and a proposal for a 328 MW wind farm on Coal River Mountain as an alternative to mountaintop removal mining in the same location.12 An economic impact analysis suggests greater long-term jobs and economic impact from the wind farm than from mining--particularly if local production of turbine components can be incorporated.13

Community-scale woody biomass for energy is also a significant opportunity. The ARC estimates that the total annual biomass resources for the Appalachian states at over 108 million tons.14 Solar potential exists in Central Appalachia particularly in distributed applications for solar thermal and solar PV. Small and micro-hydroelectric power has a significant potential. The Idaho National Laboratory has estimated 518 MWa of potential in Kentucky and 484 MWa in West Virginia.15

The region is also a potential site for the manufacturing of components for solar, wind and other energy sources. An ARC report found that counties in Appalachia as a whole currently possess almost 200,000 jobs in parts manufacturing industries that could be modified to produce renewable energy components. Those jobs represent 3,000 manufacturers within the region with the potential to be retooled to become part of the renewable energy industry. 28,000 of those jobs are in counties currently categorized as economically distressed or at risk of becoming distressed.16 Also, non-profits like¶ MACED and the Kentucky Highlands Investment Corporation (KHIC) are providing training, financing and technical assistance for renewable energy entrepreneurs in solar, biofuels and other areas such as through KHIC’s recent Energy Boot Camp program.17

Recommendations:

Provide grant funding and financing for community-scale renewable energy demonstrations in the areas of wind, solar, low-impact woody biomass and low impact hydro.

Community-scale renewable energy production that is locally owned has the potential to maximize the economic benefits of energy production for local communities. In addition, community-scale projects can be high-efficiency, reusing waste heat in the case of biomass projects and minimizing line loss. A program to create local demonstrations across the region, including at public buildings and institutions like hospitals, in small town main street areas, and at a county scale could go a long way in leveraging new beneficial energy activity. A proposal from East Kentucky Biodiesel to create a pilot pyrolysis/gasification facility utilizing biomass grown on former surface mine land, explained on page 19, has the potential to be the first stage of a regional network of community-scale bioenergy production. A wide range of USDA and DOE programs promoting renewable energy and energy efficiency projects could be set aside or repurposed for efforts of this kind.

Expand USDA Rural Utility Service (RUS) financing for renewable energy production (and energy efficiency) to utilities located in Central Appalachia.

President Obama’s 2011 budget proposes additional funds to USDA “to help transition fossil fuel-dependent utilities to renewable energy.”18 Central Appalachian utilities are among the most fossil fuel dependent in the country, reliant on coal in aging power plants for well over 90 percent of their electricity. A 2009 study by the Ochs Center for Metropolitan Studies showed that East Kentucky Power Cooperative, a major provider of electricity in the Appalachian Kentucky, could create 8,750 jobs and inject $1.7 billion into the regional economy through a program of energy efficiency investments and expanded renewable energy capacity.19 A combination of grants and loans through RUS (and similar USDA programs like REDLG) to Central Appalachian utilities could help them begin to make this transition and create new jobs and economic opportunities in the process. One potential step forward in this direction is the new Rural Energy Savings Program legislation filed by in the House by Rep. James Clyburn and in the Senate by Sen. Jeff Merkley.20 It would create a pool of RUS funds for rural electric coops to create on-bill financing programs.

Create a special category and set-aside of USDA Rural Energy for America (REAP) grants and guaranteed loans for renewable energy and energy efficiency projects in Central Appalachia.

The USDA REAP program provides valuable, much needed funds for small businesses, farmers and others to pursue renewable energy projects and energy efficiency improvements. Even with expanded funding for this program, however, valuable projects including ones MACED has helped support are being denied funding. Those projects that are receiving REAP grants are creating important models in the region. Organizations like MACED and the Natural Capital Investment Fund in West Virginia can also provide financing to small businesses that can be packaged with REAP grants, which will help leverage federal dollars and increase impact.

Fund community-based wind monitoring efforts to help communities assess the feasibility of wind power.

Wind power along the ridgelines of Central Appalachia is widely recognized as an important regional opportunity. However, there is a lack of site-specific data for communities to understand the actual opportunities for wind development in the region, holding back project development. A program of grants and equipment loans could help communities better assess these opportunities. Support the establishment of renewable energy component manufacturing in the coalfields of Central Appalachia.

Manufacturing of component parts for the wind and solar supply chain offer some of the greatest economic opportunities for the nation as a whole. However, the lack of manufacturing infrastructure in the heart of Central Appalachia threatens to leave the region out of these opportunities. An initiative should be developed with the goal of establishing at least one significant supply chain manufacturer in the coalfields of Central Appalachia. This initiative should include research to identify if there are any opportunities with existing manufacturers in the region. If no such opportunities arise, the focus should be on the feasibility of establishing a new facility. New approaches like the Cleveland model of community-based, worker-owned companies in new green industries are promising ways to create jobs that help low-income workers accrue long-term wealth.21 A project to establish a model facility in a coalfield community could go a long way in creating good opportunities and promoting a needed discussion about the region’s energy future.

Provide competitive grants for school-based renewable energy projects eligible for schools in Central Appalachia.

A number of potential models exist for renewable energy production at the school level, which can save schools money and create important opportunities for student and community learning. The model of Russell High School in Greenup County, Kentucky, is one example of the use of wind and solar demonstrations to save money and provide training for vocational students. Opportunities also exist to fund fuels-for-schools initiatives (like those in the western U. S.) utilizing local, sustainably harvested woody biomass as a building heat source. Support workforce training and enterprise development in the new renewable energy industries.

MACED and other entrepreneurial development organizations like the Natural Capital Investment Fund have worked with a number of entrepreneurs in the region interested in starting new companies in wind, biomass, or solar. These folks lack access to training that would deepen their understanding of the technologies, and often lack the business management skills to make their fledgling enterprises survive. In Kentucky, for example, state tax credits were recently enacted for renewable energy installations like solar panels, but included requirements that installers be North American Board of Certified Energy Practitioner (NABCEP) certified. Only a handful of people in the entirestate have that certification. Federal workforce and business services dollars could support targeted scholarship, training, and technical assistance programs that could help more renewable energy businesses get off the ground. As mentioned in the energy efficiency section above, the Department of Labor green jobs training programs such as the Green Capacity Building program, Energy Training Partnerships, and Pathways out of Poverty program could be allocated for such investments. Pg. 8-11

## 2AC

### 2AC Case

#### We are two decades away manufacturing on a mass scale.

McGaughran 10—Honors in Environmental Studies @ University of Colorado—Boulder [Jamie L. McGaughran, “FUTURE WAR WILL LIKELY BE UNSUSTAINABLE FOR THE SURVIVAL AND CONTINUATION OF HUMANITY AND THE EARTH‘S BIOSPHERE,” A thesis submitted to the University of Colorado at Boulder in partial fulfillment of the requirements to receive Honors designation in Environmental Studies, May 2010, pg. <http://citizenpresident.com/uploads/Whole_Thesis_Future_War_UnSstnble.pdf>]

Noted futurist Kurzweil speculates that within the next two decades we will be living in a world capable of molecular manufacturing on a mass scale (Kurzweil, 2005). ―Molecular manufacturing is a future technology that will allow us to build large objects to atomic precision, quickly and cheaply, with virtually no defects. Robotic mechanisms will position and react molecules to build systems to complex atomic specification‖ (Institute for Molecular Manufacturing, 1997). Progress in numerous prototype situations with nearly endless possibilities are continuously being achieved. In the near future we may see viruses being used as batteries to power artificial immune systems patrolling alongside our natural immune systems within the human body (Researchers Build Tiny Batteries with Viruses, 2006). In consideration of future developments of this nature, the coming decades may look completely alien to our current understanding and perception of reality. Science is fast working on developing artificial immune systems to complement and enhance our very capable natural immune systems (Burke and Kendall, 2010). Our world may seem to be evolving slower than it really is because when these technologies mature and come to market things will operate and look very different in our day to day reality. We could see the weaponization of synthetic organisms complete with artificial immune systems storming the battlefield or worse, civilian areas. Pg. 16

#### Advancements in molecular manufacturing are speeding up—nanobots will exist.

McGaughran 10—Honors in Environmental Studies @ University of Colorado - Boulder [Jamie L. McGaughran, “FUTURE WAR WILL LIKELY BE UNSUSTAINABLE FOR THE SURVIVAL AND CONTINUATION OF HUMANITY AND THE EARTH‘S BIOSPHERE,” A thesis submitted to the University of Colorado at Boulder in partial fulfillment of the requirements to receive Honors designation in Environmental Studies, May 2010, pg. <http://citizenpresident.com/uploads/Whole_Thesis_Future_War_UnSstnble.pdf>]

It is conjectured in some scientific circles that when molecular manufacturing comes of age it will represent a significant technological breakthrough comparable to that of the Industrial Revolution, only accomplished in a much shorter period of time (Nanotechnology: Dangers of Molecular Manufacturing, 2010). The late Nobel Prize winner in physics, Richard Feynman, spoke of wanting to build billions upon billions of tiny factories, exact duplicates of each other, which would ceaselessly manufacture and create anything atom by atom. Feynman is quoted as saying ―The principles of physics, as far as I can see, do not speak against the possibility of maneuvering things atom by atom. It is not an attempt to violate any laws; it is something, in principle, that can be done‖ (Hey, 2002). These types of developments may very well require a new paradigm in thinking. It appears that we are moving into the realm of microscale coherence, intelligence, computing and information storage. Multiple fields such as bioinformatics, robotics and AI are experiencing full scale technological revolutions and opening up new sub fields such as Quantum Computing and molecular manufacturing. Although we continue to see and experience technological advancement in the macro world as illustrated in the continuation of smaller, faster computers, space satellites and the beginnings of commercial space flight, rather, it is in the realm of the microworld in which the biggest changes are yet to come. Pg. 20-21

#### Nanowars risk extinction—it allows for undetected botulism attacks.

McGaughran 10—Honors in Environmental Studies @ University of Colorado - Boulder [Jamie L. McGaughran, “FUTURE WAR WILL LIKELY BE UNSUSTAINABLE FOR THE SURVIVAL AND CONTINUATION OF HUMANITY AND THE EARTH‘S BIOSPHERE,” A thesis submitted to the University of Colorado at Boulder in partial fulfillment of the requirements to receive Honors designation in Environmental Studies, May 2010, pg. <http://citizenpresident.com/uploads/Whole_Thesis_Future_War_UnSstnble.pdf>]

Human technology is moving more towards the nano and micro scales as can be seen from figure 3. According to the Center for Responsible Nanotechnology ‗CRN‘ (Nanotechnology: Dangers of Molecular Manufacturing, 2010), when molecular manufacturing begins, this technology has the potential to open an unstable arms race between competing and socially differing nations. The mere overuse of cheap nanoproducts alone could inflict widespread environmental damage. This pales in comparison to using nanotechnology as weaponry with its affects on the environment. Nanofactories would be small enough to fit in a suitcase and unleash an unfathomable amount of payloads. One scenario the CRN raises is the possibility of a **human species extinction** nanotechnology. They use an example of small insects being approximately 200 microns to estimate the plausible size for a nanotech-built antipersonnel weapon capable of seeking and injecting toxin into unprotected humans. The human lethal dose of botulism toxin [a natural toxin manipulated by humans] is about 100 nanograms or about 1/100 the volume of the weapon. As many as 50 billion toxin-carrying devices—theoretically enough to kill every human on earth—could be packed into a single suitcase (Nanotechnology: Dangers of Molecular Manufacturing, 2010).

Nanowarfare will change how war is conducted. Soldiers will not be required to be on the battlefield when micro killing devices can be more effective and potentially **remain invisible and mysterious** to the enemy forces. As a result of small integrated computers coming into existence, nanoscale weapons could be aimed at remote targets in time and space. Consequently, this will not only impair the targets defense, but also will reduce post-attack detection and accountability of the attacking party (Nanotechnology: Dangers of Molecular Manufacturing, 2010). Pg. 25-26

#### Grey goo is an existential risk.

McGaughran 10—Honors in Environmental Studies @ University of Colorado - Boulder [Jamie L. McGaughran, “FUTURE WAR WILL LIKELY BE UNSUSTAINABLE FOR THE SURVIVAL AND CONTINUATION OF HUMANITY AND THE EARTH‘S BIOSPHERE,” A thesis submitted to the University of Colorado at Boulder in partial fulfillment of the requirements to receive Honors designation in Environmental Studies, May 2010, pg. <http://citizenpresident.com/uploads/Whole_Thesis_Future_War_UnSstnble.pdf>]

Future war technology may have the potential to hasten the breach of ecological thresholds and create dangerous positive feedback loops. With the birth of various forms of nanotechnology, there may be serious consequences for those used as weapons. Nanotech that targets individuals may have little to no environmental consequences. However, other forms of nanotech such as ‗grey goo‘ or little eating machines could pose an existential risk to the planet itself as well as the human species and the biosphere. Grey goo involves molecular nanotechnology in the form of self-replicating nanorobots or universal assemblers that could assemble objects of any scale atom by atom. They could fuel themselves by consuming the base elements of the Earth‘s biosphere just as life has done for billions of years except in this case, this one pathological species of nanobots could consume all matter on Earth while building more of themselves, a scenario known as ecophagy (eating the environment). Depending from where the Grey goo tragedy starts, this technological nightmare could wipe out all life on Earth in a matter of hours to a matter of days (Kurzweil, 2005). Whether or not they could continue to fuel themselves on the remaining geosphere and consume the entirety of the planet remains unknown. More research is needed in this area. There are other scenarios such as ‗Grey dust‘ where these same self-replicating nanobots consume elements available in airborne dust and sunlight for energy and ‗Grey lichens‘ where they use carbon and other elements on rocks for power (Kurzweil, 2005). Pg. 39-40

### 2AC T subs

#### 1. We meet –

#### 2. Substantially means a considerable amount

Arkush 02 (David, J.D. Candidate Harvard Law School, “Preserving "Catalyst" Attorneys' Fees Under the Freedom of Information Act in the Wake of Buckhannon Board and Care Home v. West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources,” Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review Vol. 37 <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/crcl/vol37_1/arkush.pdf>)

Plaintiffs should argue that the term "substantially prevail" is not a term of art because if considered a term of art, resort to Black's 7th produces a definition of "prevail" that could be interpreted adversely to plaintiffs. 99 It is commonly accepted that words that are not legal terms of art should be accorded their ordinary, not their legal, meaning, 100 and ordinary-usage dictionaries provide FOIA fee claimants with helpful arguments. The Supreme Court has already found favorable, temporally relevant definitions of the word "substantially" in ordinary dictionaries: "Substantially" suggests "considerable" or "specified to a large degree." See Webster's Third New International Dictionary 2280 (1976) (defining "substantially" as "in a substantial manner" and "substantial" as "considerable in amount, value, or worth" and "being that specified to a large degree or in the main"); see also 17 Oxford English Dictionary 66-67 (2d ed. 1989) ("substantial": "relating to or proceeding from the essence of a thing; essential"; "of ample or considerable amount, quantity or dimensions"). 101

#### 3. Prefer

#### a) The word “substantially” is ambiguous and can have no predictable limiting function

**Stark 97** – patent attorney from Tennessee (Stephen, “NOTE: KEY WORDS AND TRICKY PHRASES: AN ANALYSIS OF PATENT DRAFTER'S ATTEMPTS TO CIRCUMVENT THE LANGUAGE OF 35 U.S.C., Journal of Intellectual Property Law, Fall, 1997 5 J. Intell. Prop. L. 365, lexis)   
In patent law, ambiguity of claim language necessarily results in uncertainty in the scope of protection. This uncertainty impairs all of society--the patentee, the competitor, and the public. The process of determining a particular meaning to define a term in a patent claim may result in ambiguity. 1. Ordinary Meaning. First, words in a patent are to be given their ordinary meaning unless otherwise defined. [n30](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1296265187901&returnToKey=20_T11113197108&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.43807.141755266784#n30) However, what if a particular word has multiple meanings? For example, consider the word "substantial." The Webster dictionary gives eleven different definitions of the word substantial. [n31](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1296265187901&returnToKey=20_T11113197108&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.43807.141755266784#n31) Additionally, there are another two definitions specifically provided for the adverb "substantially." [n32](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1296265187901&returnToKey=20_T11113197108&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.43807.141755266784#n32) Thus, the "ordinary meaning" is not clear. The first definition of the word "substantial" given by the Webster's Dictionary is "of ample or considerable amount, quantity, size, etc." [n33](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1296265187901&returnToKey=20_T11113197108&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.43807.141755266784#n33) Supposing that this is the precise definition that the drafter had in mind when drafting the patent, the meaning of "ample or considerable amount" appears amorphous. This could have one of at least the following interpretations: (1) almost all, (2) more than half, or (3) barely enough to do the job. Therefore, the use of a term, such as "substantial," which usually has a very ambiguous meaning, makes the scope of protection particularly hard to determine.

#### c) Education –about a few big affs trade off with the intricacies of the topic – debates will become repetitive

#### 4. No limits explosion – small affs don’t solve anything, aren’t strategic – they’ll lose to generics

#### 5. Reasonability – prevents a race to the bottom to exclude us and trade-off with substance

### 2AC Rare Earth

#### Supply shortages coming now

**A. China reserves**

**Giacalone12’**

Joseph A. Giacalone, Ph.D., is Professor of Economics and Holder of the Henry George Chair in Economics, St. John’s University, USA. Dr. Giacalone earned his B.A. and Ph.D. at Columbia University and his MBA at St. John's University. He previously served fifteen years as Associate Dean and four years as Dean of the College of Business Administration. His publications are in the areas of health care economics, business and economic history, economic thought, industry studies, and collegiate business education. Journal of International Energy Policy – Spring 2012 Volume 1, Number 1 The Market For The “Not-So-Rare” Rare Earth Elements Joseph A. Giacalone, St. John’s University, USA

Many experts argue that there are sufficient world reserves to meet the forecasted increases in consumption for the foreseeable future (Hendrick & Cordier, 2010). However, the abundance of rare earth mineral reserves does not seem to be enough to mitigate the current state of crisis regarding an impending supply shortage. This is because no matter how abundant world reserves are, without the necessary resources to extract the raw materials from the ground and with continued reliance on a China as the dominant source of supply, production will neither be able to meet nor sustain anticipated future demand.

#### B. Cars

Field et all 12’

Elisa Alonso, Andrew M. Sherman, Timothy J. Wallington, Mark P. Everson, Frank R. Field, Richard Roth, and Randolph E. Kirchain. Massachusetts Institute of Technology comprehensive study. “Evaluating Rare Earth Element Availability: A Case with Revolutionary Demand from Clean Technologies.” February 13, 2012. http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es203518d

Finally, two interesting conclusions emerge from these projections. First, the projected demand for REs for wind energy is small compared to projected demand for vehicle applications. In other words, the automotive industry is expected to be a more significant driver of the change in RE demand than wind power generation over the next 25 years. Second, the increase in demand for magnets from these wind and automotive products, especially in the case of Scenario D, results in higher ratios of Nd, Pr, and most significantly, Dy (Figure 4).

#### REM resource conflicts will instead spur governments to increase long term supply capacity

Abraham 12’

David Former Visiting Scholar, RIETI. “The Battle for New Resources: Minor minerals in green technologies.” ABRAHAM, March 26, 2012

The lines for the battle over new resources and green technology are shaping up along national lines, between China and Japan over rare earths; between the US and China over subsidies to the solar industry; between Korea and Japan in developing lithium resources in Bolivia. Some of these disagreements, such as the rare earth conflict between Japan and China, are paradoxically positive for long-term natural resource security: the conflict highlighted the increasing shortage of certain rare earth elements and spurred investment in new projects that will increase long-term supply capacity. It also highlighted the increasing reliance on minor metals for products the world now relies upon and restarted the discussion on government’s role in natural resource security. 42

#### Plan causes domestic mining

**Johnson 12** [Keith, “Bill Passes to Boost Rare-Earth Elements Production,” 7-12, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303644004577523064235675688.html?mod=googlenews_wsj>]

Once self-sufficient in rare-earth minerals production, the U.S. ceded the market to China over the last two decades, partly because of environmental concerns over energy-intensive mining and partly because of falling global demand and prices.

However, the growth of the clean-energy sector, in particular, galvanized global demand for many rare-earth elements and has kick-started interest in revitalizing U.S. production in recent years.

#### Wind power now

**A. Globally**

**Sahu ‘13**

Bikash Kumar Sahu, Moonmoon Hiloidhari, D.C. Baruah, Energy Conservation Laboratory, Department of Energy, Tezpur University, Tezpur, Assam 784028, India, “Global trend in wind power with special focus on the top five wind power producing countries,” Renewable andSustainableEnergyReviews19(2013)348–359

In the last few decades the world has witnessed tremendous growth in wind industry sector. Today wind represents 36% of total renewable energy generated worldwide. By the end of 2011, globally more than 238 GW wind power is installed, 14 times greater than the cumulative installed capacity of the year 2000 as shown in Fig. 3. Almost 70% of the global capacity is added alone in the last 5 years (2007–2011). Globally 41.24 GW of new wind power is installed alone in 2011. The World Wind Energy Association (WWEA) has projected that by the year 2015 and 2020, global wind power capacity will increase up to 600 and 1500 GW, respectively [18].

**B. PTC**

**Bloomberg 1/2**/13

Bloomberg news, “U.S. Credit Extension May Revive Stalled Wind Industry,” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-01-02/wind-tax-credit-extension-seen-driving-growth-trade-group-says.html>

The one-year extension of a U.S. tax credit for wind power includes modified terms that may revive an industry that’s expected to stall this year. The production tax credit was due to expire at the end of 2012 and the extension was part of yesterday’s passage of the bill to avert the so-called fiscal cliff that would have imposed income tax increases for most U.S. workers. Unlike past extensions, Congress is now allowing the credit to cover wind farms that begin construction in 2013, not just those that go into operation. Uncertainty last year over whether the policy would be renewed is a key reason the U.S. is expected to install 4,800 megawatts of turbines this year, down from an estimated 11,800 megawatts in 2012, Bloomberg New Energy Finance said in a November report. “This extension allows the industry to reactivate development that had been on hold since mid-year,” Tom Vinson, senior director of federal and regulatory affairs at the American Wind Energy Association, said today in an interview. “The start-construction language provides a longer period of certainty than prior extensions.” Delayed Recovery The full benefits of the extension may not be felt this year, Justin Wu, Hong Kong-based head of wind analysis at New Energy Finance, said by e-mail. “Though too late for this year, it will allow the U.S. market to see some recovery in 2014.” Spain’s Iberdrola SA (IBE), the second-largest builder of U.S. wind farms with more than 4,800 megawatts in operation, would have pursued few new wind developments this year without the revised language. Manufacturers and installers of wind turbines had sought the revision to allow for the 18 months to 24 months needed to develop new wind farms. “That was pretty critical to resuming development,” Paul Copleman, an Iberdrola spokesman, said today in an interview. “Without that, the extension might not have had any impact this year. We’re in a good position to get some construction started.”

PTC extension will massively increase US wind production

**Substitution Solves**

#### Pool 12’

RELEASING THE RARE EARTHS Engineering & Technology May 2012 Rebecca Pool

Projects aimed at replacing rare-earth materials in magnets for, say, wind turbines and electric vehicles in a bid to relieve an over-reliance on China’s supplies are also growing. Only late last year, the US Department of Energy awarded $4.5m to the Ames Laboratory at Iowa State University to research rare-earth alternatives. In its first project, the organisation will work with General Motors, NovaTorque and Molycorp to create a new powerful magnet with high temperature stability for electric vehicle motors. The high-strength magnet will be based on the rare-earth element cerium, which is four times more abundant than neodymium, the critical element used in today’s permanent magnets. In the second project, Ames Laboratory scientists will team with Pacific Northwest National Laboratory on research to develop a manganese-based magnet, as a rare-earth free alternative to rare-earth permanent magnets. These magnets hold the potential to double the magnetic strength relative to today’s magnets while using cheaper and readily available raw materials. These projects are just two examples of many more being carried out around the world. At the time of writing, Japanese government had just pledged $65m in subsidies for projects that reduce the need for magnets containing rare elarth elements dysprosium and neodymium.

#### No impact to China-Japan

Swanström & Kokubun, ‘8

[Niklas, Program Director of the Central Asia -Caucasus Institute and Silk Road Studies Program, Ryosei, Director, Institute of East Asian Studies, Keio University, “Sino-Japanese Relations: The Need for Conflict Prevention and Management,” <http://www.c-s-p.org/flyers/9781847186201-sample.pdf>]

The Sino-Japanese relationship during the last decade has been marked by political strife and tension both among the elite as well as at the grassroots. Fortunately, this has not escalated into a military conflict, even though the tension has been troublesome, especially at a political level. Throughout this period, trust between the states and their populations has decreased and both peoples have commonly viewed the “other side” with a great deal of skepticism. This has changed since 2006, but the political relationship is still very fragile and with the demise of former Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and the emergence of a new leader in Prime Minister Yasuo Fukuda it is relatively difficult to predict future development and how China will perceive these changes. Furthermore, the political reshuffling that occurred at the seventeenth Party Congress of the Chinese Communist Party has been largely unnoticed despite its importance for the bilateral relations. The political tension between China and Japan has been reinforced by negative perceptions at the grassroots. Nonetheless the current tension is not only a question regarding tension over contemporary issues but it also has a strong historical linkage that is still vivid, especially for the Chinese. Japan’s occupation of sizeable areas of China in the first half of the 20th century and—according to the Chinese a failure by the Japanese to apologize for this—still is crucial for China. History has been widely used by both sides, at times justifiably and at other times seemingly more to stir up confusion and cause tension. It is important to note here that the large majority of the ruling elite is eager to improve the relations between the two states and they have viewed recent improvements in relations with keen interest.

The PTC triggers their disads but doesn’t solve the aff- that’s the 1ac card

Offshore wind now

UPI 3/4/14 (U.S. inching closer to offshore wind¶ http://www.upi.com/Business\_News/Energy-Resources/2013/03/04/US-inching-closer-to-offshore-wind/UPI-50091362402077/)

BOSTON, March 4 (UPI) -- BOSTON, March 4 (UPI) -- The U.S. Interior Department said it was moving closer to issuing its first leases for offshore wind energy developments in the Atlantic Ocean.

Outgoing Interior Secretary Ken Salazar told an offshore wind conference in Boston that offshore wind energy was priority for his department.

"We have made impressive gains, approving dozens of utility-scale solar, wind and geothermal projects in the west and transitioning from planning to commercial leasing for offshore wind," he said.

U.S. President Barack Obama launched plans for a lease sale off the U.S. East Coast for wind energy development. The Energy Department said offshore wind has the potential to produce as much as 4,000 gigawatts of renewable electricity.

Salazar said his department has identified at least six areas off the East Coast that are suitable for wind energy development. The wind potential in those areas would eventually generate enough electricity to meet the annual electricity demands of 1.4 million households.

**US exports a lot of wind now**

**Zhang 3/8**/13 (Moran, US-China Trade: China Loves America’s Green Technology¶ Published on International Business Times (http://www.ibtimes.com)¶ http://www.ibtimes.com/print/us-china-trade-china-loves-americas-green-technology-1116313¶ )

As unlikely as it may sound, the U.S. actually has a trade surplus with China -- in the clean energy sector. The United States' strength in the advanced manufacturing of components and capital equipment to produce finished clean energy technologies has led to a $1.63 billion surplus in the clean energy trade over China, according to a new report .

More than half a trillion dollars’ worth of goods and services passed between the world’s two leading economies in 2011, the most recent year for which complete data is available, according to a study released by the Pew Charitable Trusts. The study is based on data gathered and analyzed by market research firm Bloomberg New Energy Finance.

The two countries are the largest and second-largest global electricity markets and greenhouse gas emitters and the leading recipients of clean energy investment. Nearly two of every five dollars invested in clean energy worldwide since 2004 has gone to one country or the other.

All told, the U.S. and China traded more than $8.5 billion worth of clean energy goods. U.S. firms enjoyed surpluses in all three major clean energy sectors: solar, wind and energy smart technologies, or products that use energy efficiently.

Solar energy product exports are the largest component of U.S.-China clean energy trade for both countries. Combined, firms based in the two nations traded more than $6.5 billion worth of products and services in 2011.

China used its manufacturing and labor edge to produce large numbers of cells and turbines. But the U.S. focused successfully on high-margin goods and services that ultimately raked in greater profits. On a net basis, the U.S. enjoyed a $913 million surplus in the solar sector in 2011.

In addition, many jobs associated with China’s high-volume manufacturing operations are low-skill, low-wage jobs. Over time, China’s advantage in low-cost labor is eroding because of the steady wage growth of its workers.

Photo: The Pew Charitable Trusts Many jobs associated with China’s high-volume manufacturing operations are low-skill, low-wage jobs.

As with solar, the U.S. wind industry -- the smallest component of the three main sectors of clean energy trade between the two countries -- excels in relatively high-margin specialty materials produced by large firms and in sensitive electronic and other control systems, with U.S. trade to China totaling $534.9 million.

China’s largest trade contributors are wind turbine towers -- a trade driven almost entirely by logistical concerns rather than pure cost advantages -- and turbine rotors manufactured under a U.S.-China joint venture. China’s wind energy exports to the U.S. totaled $388.7 million. Overall, U.S. firms had a net trade surplus of over $146 million.

**Recycling Solves**

**ORNL** 12/3/**12** (Number 377 | December 3, 2012¶ Magnetic idea: Rare-earth recycling¶ http://www.ornl.gov/info/news/pulse/no377/story3.shtml)

Rare-earth recycling.

Recycling keeps paper, plastics, and even jeans out of landfills. Could recycling rare-earth magnets do the same? Perhaps, if the recycling process can be improved.

Scientists at DOE’s Ames Laboratory are working to more effectively remove the neodymium, a rare earth element, from the mix of other materials in a magnet. Initial results show recycled materials maintain the properties that make rare-earth magnets useful.

The current rare earth recycling research builds on Ames Laboratory’s decades of rare-earth processing experience. In the 1990s, Ames Lab scientists developed a process that uses molten magnesium to remove rare earths from neodymium-iron-boron magnet scrap. Back then, the goal was to produce a mixture of magnesium and neodymium because the neodymium added important strength to the alloy, rather than separate out high-purity rare earths because, at the time, rare earth prices were low.

But rare earth prices increased tenfold between 2009 and 2011 and supplies are in question. Therefore, the goal of today’s rare-earth recycling research takes the process one step farther.

“Now the goal is to make new magnet alloys from recycled rare earths. And we want those new alloys to be similar to alloys made from unprocessed rare-earth materials,” said Ryan Ott, the Ames Laboratory scientist leading the research. “It appears that the processing technique works well. It effectively removes rare earths from commercial magnets.”

Ott’s research team also includes Ames Laboratory scientist Larry Jones and is funded through a work for others agreement with the Korea Institute of Industrial Technology. The research group is developing and testing the technique in Ames Lab’s Materials Preparation Center, with a suite of materials science tools supported by the DOE Office of Science.

“We start with sintered, uncoated magnets that contain three rare earths: neodymium, praseodymium and dysprosium,” said Ott. “Then we break up the magnets in an automated mortar and pestle until the pieces are 2-4 millimeters long.

Next, the tiny magnet pieces go into a mesh screen box, which is placed in a stainless-steel crucible. Technicians then add chunks of solid magnesium.

A radio frequency furnace heats the material. The magnesium begins to melt, while the magnet chunks remain solid.

“What happens then is that all three rare earths leave the magnetic material by diffusion and enter the molten magnesium,” said Ott. “The iron and boron that made up the original magnet are left behind.”

The molten magnesium and rare-earth mixture is cast into an ingot and cooled. Then they boil off the magnesium, leaving just the rare earth materials behind.

“We’ve found that the properties of the recycled rare earths compare very favorably to ones from unprocessed materials,” said Ott. “We’re continuing to identify the ideal processing conditions.”

The next step is optimizing the extraction process. Then the team plans to demonstrate it on a larger scale.

“We want to help bridge the gap between the fundamental science and using this science in manufacturing,” said Ott. “And Ames Lab can process big enough amounts of material to show that our rare-earth recycling process works on a large scale.”

### 2AC Geothermal

#### Wind is key because it directly competes with mountaintop removal because MTR eliminates wind potential – that’s necessary to create an alternative economy – that’s Hagel

#### Geothermal legally cannot displace MTR

**Williamson 11** – Assistant Attorney General, Wyoming Office of the Attorney General, Water and Natural Resources Division [JEREMIAH I. WILLIAMSON, “ARTICLE: THE FUTURE OF U.S. GEOTHERMAL DEVELOPMENT: ALTERNATIVE ENERGY OR GREEN PIPE DREAM?,” Texas Journal of Oil, Gas, and Energy Law, 2011 – 2012 7 Tex. J. Oil Gas & Energy L. 1

Geothermal resource projects on public lands are also subject to a multiple-use land planning mandate under the Geothermal Steam Act, which requires that geothermal developments coexist with other land uses. [n61](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1352550074712&returnToKey=20_T16011334559&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.741821.4409118722" \l "n61) As a result, the development of geothermal resources on public lands may not reach full potential where other conflicting land uses exist. Geothermal projects can also run into problems with the Endangered Species Act where utilization of subsurface water resources threatens critical habitat. [n62](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1352550074712&returnToKey=20_T16011334559&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.741821.4409118722" \l "n62)

Links to politics

Links to e-prices

#### Geothermal causes earthquakes – prevents public acceptance and modelling

Giardini 09 (Domenico, Director of the Swiss Seismological Service. “Geothermal quake risks must be faced.” Nature 462.17: December 2009. <http://rglsun1.geol.vt.edu/NGDS/Other/Giardini,%202009,%20Geothermal%20quake%20risks%20must%20be%20faced%20-%20Nature.pdf>.)

Deep geothermal energy is increasingly being explored as an attractive alternative energy source. Conventional hydrothermal resources, such as hot springs in geothermal areas, have been effectively exploited in the past century, but their distribution and potential for supplying electricity is somewhat limited. Tapping deep geothermal energy offers new prospects. An enhanced geothermal system (EGS), originally called a ‘hot dry rock’ system, involves drilling a hole at least 3 kilometres deep into a layer of non-porous rock where temperatures are higher than 100 °C. Fluids are pumped under high pressure into the rock (a process called stimulation), which induces it to fracture, generating micro-earthquakes, thereby increasing its permeability and creating a reservoir for the fluid. The ruptures generate elastic waves that are detectable by sensitive seismic networks. Once a reservoir of permeable rock larger than a cubic kilometre has been formed, additional holes are drilled to extract heat from the rock mass by circulating fluids through the fracture network. The brute-force approach of EGS is attractively simple. And it has, theoretically, the capacity to generate large amounts of alternative energy by tapping a virtually unlimited source — the heat stored deep inside Earth. An expert panel convened at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge in 2006 estimated that EGS could provide up to 100,000 megawatts of electricity in the United States by 2050, or about 10% of the current national capacity — a very large proportion for an alternative energy source. In October, the United States announced that up to US$132.9 million from the recovery act would be directed at EGS demonstration projects, and big names including Google have invested in the technology. The drawback is that such enhanced geothermal systems can induce earthquakes. The initial stimulation creates micro-earthquakes that might be felt at the surface or even produce damage. And the pressurized water forced into the rock could interact with existing deep faults, generating potentially large quakes. The probability of this happening is not large, but needs to be considered. In addition, geothermal energy is more profitable if it generates electricity and heating at the same time. That means that customers have to be close to the energy source, so it is attractive for operators to develop geothermal-energy sites in urban areas, where earthquakes are more problematic. Thousands of deep geothermal sites will have to be developed for geothermal energy to supply a sizeable component of the global energy need. If a significant fraction of these induce seismic action under dense urban areas that is felt or is damaging, this will exceed the natural rate of activity in stable continental areas. Man-made rather than natural earthquakes are already the dominant component of seismicity in mining districts in countries such as Poland and the Czech Republic, but is society across Europe and elsewhere ready to accept this threat in urban areas? In a recent case in California, a planned EGS site at the Geysers, a geothermal power field about 100 kilometres north of San Francisco, met with public resistance and fell under review by the Department of Energy (even though the company involved had completed an appropriate seismicity review). In September, that project was suspended because of technical difficulties. For an enhanced geothermal system located near a city or in an area already hit by past large earthquakes, the increased seismic risk requires developing mitigation strategies, such as restricting the pressure or location of pumped fluids. Open and comprehensive information and education needs to be provided to the public and to authorities before, during and after the project. The risks must be openly recognized and assessed, and thought needs to be given to how to insure against damage caused by the projects. Discussion is needed with all stakeholders — including scientists, politicians and the public — to decide what level of risk is acceptable. Otherwise society risks a public backlash that could unnecessarily quash a promising alternative-energy technology. The Basel story One of the first purely commercially oriented EGS projects — the Deep Heat Mining project — was initiated in Basel, Switzerland, in 1996 by the Geopower Basel (GPB) consortium. In my view, what started as a promising greenenergy initiative turned into a messy affair. It is a textbook example of how the failure to come to terms fully with the possibility of producing earthquakes in an urban area (by everyone involved — including the public) became in itself the largest risk to the whole Enhanced geothermal systems, such as this planned one in California, must undergo quake risk analysis. Discussion needs to be open about how exploitation of Earth’s internal heat can produce earthquakes, says Domenico Giardini, so that the alternative-energy technology can be properly utilized. J. WILSON/THE NEW YORK TIMES/REDUX/EYEVINE 848 Vol 462|17 December 2009 OPINION 848-849 Opinion - Geothermal MC CNS.indd 848 848-849 Opinion - Geothermal MC CNS.indd 848 10/12/09 16:41:31 10/12/09 16:41:31 © 2009 Macmillan Publishers Limited. All rights reservedconcept of geothermal exploitation. We can learn important lessons from the case, which should serve in securing a long-term future to this promising energy source. Basel, an industrial centre of Europe’s chemical and pharmaceutical industry, borders France and Germany, and more than 700,000 people live in the area. It has a history of earthquakes; in 1356, the city was severely damaged by a magnitude-6.7 quake, the largest ever recorded in central Europe. Preparing for a commercial EGS project in an industrial zone took several years. In October 2006, the injection well reached its final depth of 5 kilometres, and was ready for the injection of high-pressure fluids into the granite. A monitoring system was installed, with six borehole seismometers installed near the injection well and up to 30 seismic surface stations in the Basel area, and a contingency shutdown plan in case of felt earthquakes. Nevertheless, the Swiss Seismological Service, which had no regulatory power in this case, communicated to GPB and the Basel authorities that the service had not seen what it would consider an adequate seismic risk analysis for the project. The local authority confirms that GPB had a valid permit, and had met all that permit’s conditions. On 2 December 2006, GPB began injecting water into the well with increasing flow rates. As expected, thousands of micro-earthquakes were recorded. Because of the strongly increased seismic activity felt at the surface, injection was stopped on 7 December. A few hours later, a magnitude-3.4 event rattled the local population, causing fear and anger, and receiving international media attention. In a press release on 9 December, GPB announced its regret for the incident, saying the tremors produced by the project were larger than expected. Slight nonstructural damage, such as fine cracks in plaster, was claimed by many homeowners and paid by GPB’s insurance. The incident also led to a court case against an individual — not GPB — that starts this week. Since the water injection stopped, seismicity in the area has slowly decayed. Three years later, sporadic seismicity inside the stimulated rock volume is still being detected by the down-hole instruments. This EGS project has been on hold, awaiting the completion of an independent risk analysis by a consortium of seismologists and engineers, selected by state authorities following an international bid. The study was released on 10 December this year, and public authorities have now decided to suspend the project. There have been several other forays into enhanced geothermal energy projects in Europe, some of which have been associated with earthquakes. The European Hot Dry Rock geothermal-energy project in nearby Soultzsous-Forêts, France, has been developed to a depth of 5 kilometres over the past decade. During stimulation, seismicity was generated there with a maximum local magnitude of 2.9. The plant was adapted to reduce the earthquake risk, and is scheduled to begin producing electricity in January 2010. At 2 megawatts, it will be the largest commercial EGS site in operation. Felt earthquakes are also occasionally associated with natural geothermal systems. In Landau, Germany, a 3-kilometre-deep system was constructed in naturally permeable layers, and earthquakes were not expected. However, seismicity was felt a year after the start of energy production, in 2007, and suspended operations for many months. In both of these cases the geothermal exploitation is carried out in more-rural areas without a known history of large earthquakes. Realistic approach The risk of overreaction to the risks inherent in deep geothermal projects is very real. The establishment of an overly harsh regulatory framework would penalize the geothermal industry in comparison to other energy sectors that carry a recognized risk of inducing seismicity, such as gas extraction or coal mining. From their outset, EGS projects need to be thought of both as pilot projects with scientific unknowns and as commercial ventures with technological and financial risks. Companies need to have allocated enough of their budget to scientific investigations not directly related to the exploitation of heat. Local authorities need to avoid being enticed by the promises of alternative energy, and to remember to ask the right questions. Risk evaluations need to be done before — not after — these projects begin. Even if the right questions are asked at the right time, the scientific and engineering community is hard pressed to provide a consensus opinion on how seismic hazards can be assessed with confidence and minimized. The empirical data include only a handful of well-monitored EGS experiments; models are consequently poorly constrained. The European Commission has approved the Geothermal Engineering Integrating Mitigation of Induced Seismicity in Reservoirs (GEISER) project to improve the knowledge base and suggest procedures and regulations for the future exploitation of deep geothermal energy. However, many EGS projects are expected to open in the years before the GEISER project produces useful results. The Basel programme is likely to have a strong effect on the insurance cost of future projects associated with induced seismicity. The damage claims in Basel amounted to more than $9 million, which seems a high toll for a local magnitude-3.4 event (although this is hard to say definitively, because data on small non-structural damages from past earthquakes have never been comprehensively collected). The damage in each building never reached the 10% property level that is normally applied as deductible by home insurance policies. For a natural event, the damage would have been covered by the homeowners, but for a manmade event, the whole cost was picked up by the company’s liability insurance. This of course opens a difficult issue. How would we treat a magnitude-5.5 earthquake hitting Basel in, say, 30 years? Could we prove whether it was natural or not? Who would cover the damage? The public reacts with a vengeance if it perceives that a known problem has been hidden. More than this, earthquakes invariably raise primordial fears. Waking up the sleeping terror that lurks in the deep is the plot of numerous horror movies; here it has an all-too-real meaning. It is now becoming clear to the public, local authorities, the geothermal industry and regulatory agencies that deep geothermal systems carry a small risk — as do most technologies in the energy sector. Dams can break, nuclear power plants may fail, carbon dioxide released from the oil and gas contributes to global warming, and EGS projects can create damage through induced earthquakes. The open question is whether or not society is able to find ways to balance and accept these risks. A wellinformed discussion is needed to find out.

#### Logistical barriers and delay

**Williamson 11** – Assistant Attorney General, Wyoming Office of the Attorney General, Water and Natural Resources Division [JEREMIAH I. WILLIAMSON, “ARTICLE: THE FUTURE OF U.S. GEOTHERMAL DEVELOPMENT: ALTERNATIVE ENERGY OR GREEN PIPE DREAM?,” Texas Journal of Oil, Gas, and Energy Law, 2011 – 2012 7 Tex. J. Oil Gas & Energy L. 1

On the policy front, Congress has provided only short-term assurances to developers dependent on long-term support to achieve economic viability. Geothermal resources require many years to locate, develop, and produce economically, and short-term congressional support thus provides only limited incentive for development. Projects able to take advantage of favorable policies still face the considerable problem of connecting to the electricity transmission grid. Gaining approval for transmission projects can take many years and add substantial costs to geothermal resource development.

#### Not appropriate for Appalachia

**MIT 06** [Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “The Future of Geothermal Energy: Impact of Enhanced Geothermal Systems (EGS) on the United States in 21st Century,” 5/2006

The accessible geothermal resource, based on existing extractive technology, is large and contained in¶ a continuum of grades ranging from today’s hydrothermal, convective systems through high- and¶ mid-grade EGS resources (located primarily in the western United States) to the very large,conduction-dominated contributions in the deep basement and sedimentary rock formations¶ throughout the country. By evaluating an extensive database of bottom-hole temperature and regional¶ geologic data (rock types, stress levels, surface temperatures, etc.), we have estimated the total EGS¶ resource base to be more than 13 million exajoules (EJ). Using reasonable assumptions regarding how¶ heat would be mined from stimulated EGS reservoirs, we also estimated the extractable portion to¶ exceed 200,000 EJ or about 2,000 times the annual consumption of primary energy in the United¶ States in 2005. With technology improvements, the economically extractable amount of useful energy¶ could increase by a factor of 10 or more, thus making EGS sustainable for centuries. Pg. 4

#### Delay and tech immaturity deter investors

AOL Energy 12 (“Geothermal Energy Risk the Focus as Opportunities Evaluated.” AOL Energy, January 27, 2012. http://energy.aol.com/2012/01/27/midamerican-calls-on-policymakers-to-lower-geothermal-investment/.)

Technology was also a barrier to investor expectations as seismic surveying used in the oil and gas industry was not always transferable to geothermal resources that were often variable with complex geology and chemistry to consider.

Gevan Reeves, a director at Calpine Energy, owner of Geysers in California, said: "Geothermal is a significant endeavor just in the exploratory phase. There's still uncertainty over resource and how it will behave over time and you continually try to refine that as you get closer to your permitting and contract phase.

"On the cost of production vis a vis the other renewable technologies there is a very long lead time, long construction. Just to order a steam turbine takes 18 months ... we also have the shortest expiration of the federal cash grant funding in 2013 compared with 2016 for the [solar] investment tax credit (ITC). And recent rounds of utility procurement have been largely weighted toward PV."

Karl Gawell, executive director of the Geothermal Energy Association, said: "The geology resources are more complicated, the technologies we have in order to see the reservoir from the surface without drilling have much higher degrees of uncertainty. We've seen the first new investment by federal government in 2008-2009 - first time in 30 years, which is what happened with oil and gas. But that investment was made in the 1920s. But when you find oil and gas you know how much your product is worth. If we've got a four year lead time and you don't know whether you've got a project that's going to be economically viable for another four to five years."

Wind is key to solve our populism advantage- only wind creates an economically feasible model

**Wind eliminates mercury pollution.**

**Rosenberg 8** (Ronald H., Professor of Law, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and Director, American Legal Systems (LLM) Graduate Program, William and Mary Law School, Making Renewable Energy a Reality--Finding Ways to Site Wind Power Facilities, William and Mary Environmental Law and Policy Review, Spring, 2008, 32 Wm. & Mary Envtl. L. & Pol'y Rev. 635)

3.Total Elimination of Air Pollutants and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Probably the strongest advantage of wind power is the absence of air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Thermoelectric fossil-fuel-fired plants generate the largest percentage of American electricity. n121 They are also the largest single CO2 contributor, even exceeding contributions from all forms of transportation. n122 Wind power, by definition, does [\*661] not burn any fuel so it does not emit any air pollutants or greenhouse gases. This lack of air emissions is a permanent feature of a wind power facility. Conventional fossil fuel combustion also results in sulfur dioxide, **nitrogen oxides**, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, hydrocarbons, **mercury** and otheremissions which are considered to be air pollutants of concern to the public's health and safety and regulated under clean air laws. n123 Additionally, the absence of carbon dioxide resulting from wind power contributes to the reduction of global warming gases. With the increased emphasis on the elimination of greenhouse gases, n124 the substitution of fossil-fuel-generated electricity with non-combustion-produced electricity will reduce the rate of growth of greenhouse gas emissions from America's electrical energy sector. As American climate change policy begins to embrace more rigorous greenhouse gas reduction goals, wind power could be viewed as a viable energy alternative to electricity generated from coal and natural gas.

**That prevents endocterine disruption.**

**Balabanič 11** (D, Rupnik M, Klemenčič AK., Scientists @ the Pulp and Paper Institute – Ljubljana, Slovenia, Negative impact of endocrine-disrupting compounds on human reproductive health, Reprod Fertil Dev. 2011;23(3):403-16)

There is increasing concern about chemical pollutants that are able to mimic hormones, the so-called endocrine-disrupting compounds (EDCs), because of their structural similarity to endogenous hormones, their ability to interact with hormone transport proteins or because of their potential to disrupt hormone metabolic pathways. Thus, the effects of endogenous hormones can be mimicked or, in some cases, completely blocked. A substantial number of environmental pollutants, such as polychlorinated biphenyls, dioxins, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, phthalates, bisphenol A, pesticides, alkylphenols and heavy metals (arsenic, cadmium, lead, **mercury**), have been shown to disrupt endocrine function. These compounds can cause reproductive problems by decreasing sperm count and quality, increasing the number of testicular germ cells and causing male breast cancer, cryptorchidism, hypospadias, miscarriages, endometriosis, impaired fertility, irregularities of the menstrual cycle, and infertility. Although EDCs may be released into the environment in different ways, the main sources is industrial wastewater. The present paper critically reviews the current knowledge of the impact of EDCs on reproductive disorders in humans.

**Extinction.**

**WDP 97** (Western Daily Press, 10/6/1997, Diana's gone all sari-eyed, Lexis)

For new research claims that PMT - which is supposed to be due to drops in oestrogen levels - is a myth, it's all in the mind, just an excuse used by women when they have those perfectly normal random bouts of depression or irritability which men get too. Only men don't have a convenient hormonal syndrome they can blame. Oestrogen is clearly tricky stuff, for elsewhere, scientists are blaming it for the potential **extinction of mankind**. Oestrogen in the atmosphere - and the industrial chemicals and pesticides, which mimic it - are, they say, causing increases in cancer and dramatic drops in fertility in males of many species, including humans. It could, indeed, wipe out **the human race**. We don't dispute the way high levels of testosterone can affect males, so how come people are so eager to deny that similar changes in oestrogen levels can make us women a bit tetchy at times? Surely if it's powerful enough to result in the destruction of planetary life, it's not unreasonable to think oestrogen might also cause a teensy- weensy bit of disturbance in women now and again?

**Prosser says that corporate control causes disease- that cause extinction**

Keating, 9 -- Foreign Policy web editor

(Joshua, "The End of the World," Foreign Policy, 11-13-9, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2009/11/13/the\_end\_of\_the\_world?page=full, accessed 9-7-12, mss)

How it could happen: Throughout history, plagues have brought civilizations to their knees. The Black Death killed more off more than half of Europe's population in the Middle Ages. In 1918, a flu pandemic killed an estimated 50 million people, nearly 3 percent of the world's population, a far greater impact than the just-concluded World War I. Because of globalization, diseases today spread even faster - witness the rapid worldwide spread of H1N1 currently unfolding. A global outbreak of a disease such as ebola virus -- which has had a 90 percent fatality rate during its flare-ups in rural Africa -- or a mutated drug-resistant form of the flu virus on a global scale could have a devastating, even civilization-ending impact. How likely is it? Treatment of deadly diseases has improved since 1918, but so have the diseases. Modern industrial farming techniques have been blamed for the outbreak of diseases, such as swine flu, and as the world’s population grows and humans move into previously unoccupied areas, the risk of exposure to previously unknown pathogens increases. More than 40 new viruses have emerged since the 1970s, including ebola and HIV. Biological weapons experimentation has added a new and just as troubling complication.

#### A recent study by 22 scientists concurs. It improves on previous models and concludes that we are causing rapid and irreversible critical transitions

**Barnosky et al 12** - Professor of Integrative Biology @ UC Berkeley [Dr. Anthony D. Barnosky (Professor of Paleontology @ UC Berkeley), Dr. Elizabeth A. Hadly (Professor of Biology @ Stanford University, Jordi Bascompte (Integrative Ecology Group @ Estación Biológica de Doñana) Eric L. Berlow (TRU NORTH Labs), James H. Brown (Professor of Biology @ The University of New Mexico), Mikael Fortelius (Professor of Geosciences and Geography @ University of Helsinki), Wayne M. Getz (Professor of Environmental Science@ UC Berkeley), John Harte (Professor of Environmental Science@ UC Berkeley) Alan Hastings (Professor of Environmental Science@ UC Davis) Pablo A. Marquet (Departamento de Ecología, Facultad de Ciencias Biológicas, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile) Neo D. Martinez (Pacific Ecoinformatics and Computational Ecology Lab) Arne Mooers (Professor of Biological Sciences @ Simon Fraser University, Peter Roopnarine (California Academy of Sciences), Geerat Vermeij (Professor of Geology @ UC Davis) John W. Williams (Professor of Geography @ University of Wisconsin), Rosemary Gillespie (Professor of Environmental Science@ UC Berkeley) Justin Kitzes (Professor of Environmental Science@ UC Berkeley), Charles Marshall (Department of Integrative Biology, UC Berkeley), Nicholas Matzke(Department of Integrative Biology, UC Berkeley), David P. Mindell (Department of Biophysics and Biochemistry @ UC San Francisco), Eloy Revilla (Department of Conservation Biology, Estación Biológica de Doñana) & Adam B. Smith (Center for Conservation and Sustainable Development, Missouri Botanical Garden) “Approaching a state shift in Earth’s biosphere,” Nature 486, (07 June 2012) pg. 52–58

Humans now dominate Earth, changing it in ways that threaten its ability to sustain us and other species[1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref1), [2](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref2), [3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3). This realization has led to a growing interest in forecasting biological responses on all scales from local to global[4](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref4), [5](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref5), [6](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref6), [7](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref7).

However, most biological forecasting now depends on projecting recent trends into the future assuming various environmental pressures[5](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref5), or on using species distribution models to predict how climatic changes may alter presently observed geographic ranges[8](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref8), [9](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref9). Present work recognizes that relying solely on such approaches will be insufficient to characterize fully the range of likely biological changes in the future, especially because complex interactions, feedbacks and their hard-to-predict effects are not taken into account[6](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref6), [8](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref8), [9](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref9), [10](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref10), [11](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref11).

Particularly important are recent demonstrations that ‘critical transitions’ caused by threshold effects are likely[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12). Critical transitions lead to state shifts, which abruptly override trends and produce unanticipated biotic effects. Although most previous work on threshold-induced state shifts has been theoretical or concerned with critical transitions in localized ecological systems over short time spans[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [13](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref13), [14](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref14), planetary-scale critical transitions that operate over centuries or millennia have also been postulated[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), [12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [15](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref15), [16](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref16), [17](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref17), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18). Here we summarize evidence that such planetary-scale critical transitions have occurred previously in the biosphere, albeit rarely, and that humans are now forcing another such transition, with the potential to transform Earth rapidly and irreversibly into a state unknown in human experience.

Two conclusions emerge. First, to minimize biological surprises that would adversely impact humanity, it is essential to improve biological forecasting by anticipating critical transitions that can emerge on a planetary scale and understanding how such global forcings cause local changes. Second, as was also concluded in previous work, to prevent a global-scale state shift, or at least to guide it as best we can, it will be necessary to address the root causes of human-driven global change and to improve our management of biodiversity and ecosystem services[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), [15](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref15), [16](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref16), [17](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref17), [19](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref19).

It is now well documented that biological systems on many scales can shift rapidly from an existing state to a radically different state[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12). Biological ‘states’ are neither steady nor in equilibrium; rather, they are characterized by a defined range of deviations from a mean condition over a prescribed period of time. The shift from one state to another can be caused by either a ‘threshold’ or ‘sledgehammer’ effect. State shifts resulting from threshold effects can be difficult to anticipate, because the critical threshold is reached as incremental changes accumulate and the threshold value generally is not known in advance. By contrast, a state shift caused by a sledgehammer effect—for example the clearing of a forest using a bulldozer—comes as no surprise. In both cases, the state shift is relatively abrupt and leads to new mean conditions outside the range of fluctuation evident in the previous state.

Threshold-induced state shifts, or critical transitions, can result from ‘fold bifurcations’ and can show hysteresis[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12). The net effect is that once a critical transition occurs, it is extremely difficult or even impossible for the system to return to its previous state. Critical transitions can also result from more complex bifurcations, which have a different character from fold bifurcations but which also lead to irreversible changes[20](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref20).

Recent theoretical work suggests that state shifts due to fold bifurcations are probably preceded by general phenomena that can be characterized mathematically: a deceleration in recovery from perturbations (‘critical slowing down’), an increase in variance in the pattern of within-state fluctuations, an increase in autocorrelation between fluctuations, an increase in asymmetry of fluctuations and rapid back-and-forth shifts (‘flickering’) between states[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [14](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref14), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18). These phenomena can theoretically be assessed within any temporally and spatially bounded system. Although such assessment is not yet straightforward[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18), [20](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref20), critical transitions and in some cases their warning signs have become evident in diverse biological investigations[21](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref21), for example in assessing the dynamics of disease outbreaks[22](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref22), [23](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref23), populations[14](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref14) and lake ecosystems[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [13](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref13). Impending state shifts can also sometimes be determined by parameterizing relatively simple models[20](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref20), [21](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref21).

In the context of forecasting biological change, the realization that critical transitions and state shifts can occur on the global scale[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), [12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [15](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref15), [16](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref16), [17](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref17), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18), as well as on smaller scales, is of great importance. One key question is how to recognize a global-scale state shift. Another is whether global-scale state shifts are the cumulative result of many smaller-scale events that originate in local systems or instead require global-level forcings that emerge on the planetary scale and then percolate downwards to cause changes in local systems. Examining past global-scale state shifts provides useful insights into both of these issues.

Earth’s biosphere has undergone state shifts in the past, over various (usually very long) timescales, and therefore can do so in the future ([Box 1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#bx1)). One of the fastest planetary state shifts, and the most recent, was the transition from the last glacial into the present interglacial condition[12](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref12), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18), which occurred over millennia[24](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref24). Glacial conditions had prevailed for ~100,000 yr. Then, within ~3,300 yr, punctuated by episodes of abrupt, decadal-scale climatic oscillations, full interglacial conditions were attained. Most of the biotic change—which included extinctions, altered diversity patterns and new community compositions—occurred within a period of 1,600 yr beginning ~12,900 yr ago. The ensuing interglacial state that we live in now has prevailed for the past ~11,000 yr.

Occurring on longer timescales are events such as at least four of the ‘Big Five’ mass extinctions[25](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref25), each of which represents a critical transition that spanned several tens of thousands to 2,000,000 yr and changed the course of life’s evolution with respect to what had been normal for the previous tens of millions of years. Planetary state shifts can also substantially increase biodiversity, as occurred for example at the ‘Cambrian explosion’[26](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref26), but such transitions require tens of millions of years, timescales that are not meaningful for forecasting biological changes that may occur over the next few human generations ([Box 1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#bx1)).

Despite their different timescales, past critical transitions occur very quickly relative to their bracketing states: for the examples discussed here, the transitions took less than ~5% of the time the previous state had lasted ([Box 1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#bx1)). The biotic hallmark for each state change was, during the critical transition, pronounced change in global, regional and local assemblages of species. Previously dominant species diminished or went extinct, new consumers became important both locally and globally, formerly rare organisms proliferated, food webs were modified, geographic ranges reconfigured and resulted in new biological communities, and evolution was initiated in new directions. For example, at the Cambrian explosion large, mobile predators became part of the food chain for the first time. Following the K/T extinction, mammalian herbivores replaced large archosaur herbivores. And at the last glacial–interglacial transition, megafaunal biomass switched from being dominated by many species to being dominated by Homo sapiens and our domesticated species[27](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref27).

All of the global-scale state shifts noted above coincided with global-scale forcings that modified the atmosphere, oceans and climate ([Box 1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#bx1)). These examples suggest that past global-scale state shifts required global-scale forcings, which in turn initiated lower-level state changes that local controls do not override. Thus, critical aspects of biological forecasting are to understand whether present global forcings are of a magnitude sufficient to trigger a global-scale critical transition, and to ascertain the extent of lower-level state changes that these global forcings have already caused or are likely to cause.

Global-scale forcing mechanisms today are human population growth with attendant resource consumption[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), habitat transformation and fragmentation[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), energy production and consumption[28](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref28), [29](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref29), and climate change[3](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref3), [18](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref18). All of these far exceed, in both rate and magnitude, the forcings evident at the most recent global-scale state shift, the last glacial–interglacial transition ([Box 1](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#bx1)), which is a particularly relevant benchmark for comparison given that the two global-scale forcings at that time—climate change and human population growth[27](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref27), [30](http://www.nature.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html#ref30)—are also primary forcings today. During the last glacial–interglacial transition, however, these were probably separate, yet coincidental, forcings. Today conditions are very different because global-scale forcings including (but not limited to) climate change have emerged as a direct result of human activities.

### 2AC A2 states

#### Perm do both.

#### \*\*\* Uniform implementation is a voting issue – shifts the focus from the topic mechanism. Lacks literature. Kills actual education about federalism because states exist as disuniform laboratories. Must be a voter to correct skewed research practices. Proves uniform guideline counterplans solve their offense.

#### \*\*\* 50 state fiat is a voting issue - shifts the focus from the topic mechanism. Even if lit exists it’s implemented as a contrivance. Proves the net benefit solves their offense.

#### Aff ground – teams fiat through differences between states and USFG. We lose the plan mechanism. Proves state modeling counterplans solve their offense.

#### \_ A USDA set aside is key –

#### a) Energy model – REAP grants signal commitment and feasibility– symbolic value matters – that’s Bailey and MACED

#### c) Certification – wind entrepreneurs lack credentials to access state incentives. Federal involvement results in job training. That’s MAECD.

#### \_ States will recruit large corporations – kills solvency

**Flaccavento 10** - Founder of Appalachian Sustainable Development (ASD) and SCALE, Inc [[Anthony Flaccavento](http://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/user/4896), “The Transition of Appalachia,” Solutions Journal, Volume 1 | Issue 4 | Page 34-44 | Aug 2010, pg. http://tinyurl.com/39kwh4h

Much of the current public debate on Appalachia focuses on the benefits and problems associated with coal mining, even though employment in the region’s two largest coal-producing states, West Virginia and Kentucky, has declined by more than 70 percent over the past three decades,5 primarily due to mechanization.

State resources intended to increase employment and diversify the economy still focus predominantly on the recruitment of companies from outside the region. As a 2008 study by the Mountain Association for Community Economic Development showed, Kentucky spent 80 percent of its total economic development dollars on recruitment incentives for outside corporations. And it’s not just Kentucky: economist Michael Shuman documents state and local government expenditure of $50 billion annually on such recruitment and other subsidies for large companies nationwide, while public resources devoted to homegrown businesses are minimal by comparison.6 Federal subsidies of large businesses are greater still; the Cato Institute estimates that they total $87 billion each year.6 It is likely that the majority of these federal funds subsidize ecologically extractive or damaging industries, according to a 2003 study by the Green Scissors Coalition.7

At the same time, a wide range of enterprises and initiatives designed to build a more sustainable economy and healthier, more resilient communities has begun to emerge in the region. They vary in scale and stage of development, but, in general, they are more ecologically sustainable because of the way they are produced and the greatly reduced transport distances to market. They use asset-based strategies, building and adding value to the ecological, cultural, and human strengths of the region. They cultivate self-reliance for producers and the broader community. And they build cooperative networks that help overcome isolation, estrangement, and problems of scale.

As these initiatives have grown in number and scale, elected leaders and local, state, and federal agencies have taken notice. The Appalachian Regional Commission, for instance, launched an "Asset Based Development" program several years ago, while the USDA more recently created a Community Facilities loan and grant program to spur local infrastructure development. Both of these programs were, in part, based upon successful initiatives in central Appalachia. In some cases, state and federal agencies have become active partners with these initiatives—for example, the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development supports locally based agricultural and cultural enterprises in a number of ways. More broadly, public policy has begun to shift toward greater support for "sustainable development" and locally led economic strategies, though it remains inconsistent and generally inadequate throughout the region.

#### c) REAP goes to small producers

**USDA 12** [United States Department of Agriculture, “Rural Development Energy Programs,” Last Modified:10/18/2012, pg. http://tinyurl.com/byzfwbl

The Rural Energy for America Program provides assistance to agricultural producers and rural small businesses to complete a variety of projects, including renewable energy systems, energy efficiency improvements, renewable energy development, energy audits, and feasibility studies. [Read more](http://www.rurdev.usda.gov/BCP_Reap.html)

#### States can’t solve – It allows Republicans to benefit from the populist movement

**Lind 09** [[Michael Lind](http://www.salon.com/writer/michael_lind/), “[Can populism be liberal?,” Monday, Nov 23, 2009 08:05 PM EST, pg. http://www.salon.com/2009/11/24/populism\_3/](http://www.salon.com/2009/11/24/populism_3/)

Could a new wave of populist independents be steered into the Democratic Party? Alas, that seems unlikely, if Democrats are viewed as the compromised, establishmentarian governing party. Moreover, the Republican Party benefited from the last two populist upheavals. Richard Nixon built the generation-long hegemony of the Republicans on the anger of George Wallace voters, and, following the campaign of Ross Perot in 1992, Newt Gingrich captured anti-system reformism to build a Republican congressional majority for most of the period between 1994 and 2006.

Parramore- Obama’s perceived antagonism undermines populist labor movements.

White- Perception that he is hostile to whites prevents a populist coalition. We facilitate unionization

#### An Obama jobs project is key – His timidity legitimizes right-wing politics

[**Skocpol**](http://www.politico.com/arena/bio/theda_skocpol.html) **10** - Professor of Government and Sociology @ Harvard University [Theda Skocpol, “Obama and the Democrats Need a Jobs and Taxes Argument for National Recovery,” Politico’s The Arena, Sep. 20, 2010, pg. http://www.politico.com/arena/perm/Theda\_Skocpol\_E8BD76F7-7169-44FC-B779-3993550FC1E6.html

Polls and all kinds of measures of the concerns of most ordinary Americans show very little concern about the federal deficit and spending. Americans want jobs and economic growth - and that is what they want D.C. to focus on. The tea Party and its sympathizers are colorful for TV, but they are only about a quarter of Americans at the most. Activists are about 12-15%. Their biggest impact is on frightened Republican officeholders and nominees, but in policy terms they stand for nothing clear besides deep generational and racial anxieties.

Rank-and-file tea partiers are not even opposed to the core of federal spending for defense, Medicare, and Social Security - many of them are living on these programs and believe they are entitled to them after lifetimes of work (as indeed they are)! Tea partiers may think the federal government is spending a lot on other things, but that is just ignorance (deliberately fed by Fox misinformation campaigns). Many of the grass roots tea partiers are going to be plenty surprised after Republicans take over again and hand out more tax breaks and subsidies to millionaires while gutting Social Security and Medicare.  
The timidity of Democrats and the White House is killing them. All we have heard for months are articles about what they are "considering" or fighting about. Pollsters who have told them they should avoid nationalizing this election have given disastrously bad advice. Events in a country determine whether an election is nationalized or not - and the country is in a deep economic crisis that cuts to the heart of home equity and employment, the core of family security. Obama and the Democrats have long ago needed a national message - about jobs and national recovery, what they are fighting to do, and what right-wingers are obstructing.

Instead, they have tried to engage in preemptive concessions (Orszag, Emanuel) and run and hide - which only emboldens crazy right-wingers all the more - and leaves the media free to focus on colorful extremists and side issues.

History will record this as one of the most tragic moments for Democrats - and above all for this White House. In a severe and ongoing national economic crisis, for the President to hide and cower and dither is amazing. Obama needs new advisors, and he needs to find a backbone. He needs a national narrative, not just fingerpoint at scary tea partiers.   
We are facing a turning point for effective democratic governance in the USA - and the tax cut decisions are really all that matters right now. The wealthy interests trying to knock out this White House understand that. Incredibly, Democrats seem to be on the verge of caving - or punting, which is the same - on tax cut extensions for millionaires and billionaires - giveaways of public resources that will ensure deep cuts  in Social Security and all kinds of vital endeavors going forward.

Massive victories for rabidly pro-rich and government-hating Republicans will lead to years more of deadlock and further deterioration of governmental capacities - just as the United States faces intense competition on the international stage. It is a recipe for permanent national decline.   
If Obama dithers through this, he will be a one term president - and much of what he seems already to have accomplished will be undone, including Affordable Care, which will not be repealed but will be eviscerated. He should be making it clear that he wants a vote now on tax cut extensions for the vast majority of Americans - because this will help recovery and do something for hard-hit millions - and at the same time he should tell the House and Senate that if they want to vote separately on tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires, they can do it, but if that passes, he will veto it.

Democrats still have the ability to bring two separate bills to the floor - and they should do it. Obama should not accept the cuts for millionaires and billionaires and he should tell all Americans why, loud and clear. This is both popular and the right thing to do for the country. If Obama made this declaration up front, it would support those in the House and Senate who are willing to oppose tax giveaways for the super-rich.   
Democrats on taxes are trying to use a national interest issue as an ambiguous political wedge, trying to pretend to favor tax cuts for the middle class up until the November election, while quietly preparing to extend tax cuts for the rich, too (or in effect allow that by turning things over to Republicans). It will not work. It never works for a political party to seem to be playing politics rather than focusing on America's needs. And if they extend millionaire/billionaire tax cuts even temporarily, this is a sure sign that they have betrayed the national interest and do not deserve to hold office. That is hard thing for someone with my political sympathies to say, but it is the truth.   
If Democrats are blown out in this election after this kind of cowardly performance, Americans who want a stronger nation need to create an alternative vehicle for a muscular liberalism focused on national greatness - with a prime focus on jobs for all Americans as the first goal. Tea Partiers have shown that they can dismantle and redirect the Republican Party. Meanwhile, soliciters for the DNC, DSCC, and DCCC keep asking for money for - what? Beyond "reelect us," they never say. They fudge - while offering a constant media spectacle of indecision and retreat.

#### Republican Governors get credit for the cp

**Wessler 12** – Investigative reporter and researcher @ Colorlines.com and the Applied Research Center [Seth Freed Wessler, “The Tea Party Will Still Run the States, No Matter Who Wins the Presidency,” Colorlines, Thursday, November 1 2012, 10:26 AM EST, pg. http://tinyurl.com/ceqe6v6

|  |
| --- |
| The 2010 elections, in which Republicans seized 23 state legislative chambers from Democrats and secured 29 governor’s mansions, catapulted the GOP into a control seat over the shape of state-level policy. While President Obama and Republicans in Congress fought tooth and nail over nearly every aspect of the president’s agenda, Republicans in the states had remarkable leeway to make policy as they wished.  Over the past two years, Republican state legislators have introduced a round of tea party inspired bills to restrict reproductive health access, impose barriers on voting, undercut the safety net and healthcare access and make life unlivable for immigrants. The battles these bills spurred are certain to continue in the coming years, whatever happens at the federal level.  Recently, there seems to be a sense of relief among liberal and progressive commentators who observe that the swell of conservative populist rage is settling. Pundits have taken to noticing that not once has Mitt Romney publicly associated himself with the tea party, and few congressional candidates appear to be running on the tea party mantle. “Tea party thinking is dead,” declared the liberal [Washington Post opinion writer EJ Dion](http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/ej-dionne-the-tea-partys-drubbing-in-2012/2012/10/24/185416ea-1e0e-11e2-9cd5-b55c38388962_story.html) last week, referring to Romney’s move the center in recent debates.  Indeed, the tea party storm that hit the nation like Sandy two years ago seems to have retreated from view.  Yet despite a year’s worth of polling showing voters less attached to tea party symbolism, there’s no indication that the politics insurgent GOP candidates brought with them are going anywhere. The persistence of these conservative politics is nowhere more clear than at the state level.  Election watchers, including the National Council of State Legislatures, project the 2012 elections are unlikely to shift the composition of state legislative chambers. Election watchers say the current legislative field is more stable than it’s been in nearly a decade.  A review of the current state political map reveals that the make up of legislative chambers is unlikely to budge much at all after Nov. 6. That’s because Republicans who seized power in 2010 arrived just in time to redraw maps for their own benefit. The redistricting process following the 2010 Census thus left Republicans firmly in control of a majority of state legislative chambers. |

#### They will bust state budgets

**Ravitch 12** - Former Lieutenant Governor of New York [Richard Ravitch, “State Budget Crisis Must Be Addressed, Before It's Too Late,” Huffington Post, Posted: 07/17/2012 11:09 am, pg. http://tinyurl.com/9sa3nrh

Many of us have read about the bankruptcy issues facing cities such as Scranton, Stockton and Central Falls, but when we combine the totality of the problem and look at the ability of the states to meet their obligations to public employees, to creditors and most critically to the education and well-being of their citizens, we are a threatened nation.

Our states and local governments bear a heavy burden, given that the U.S. Constitution leaves to states the responsibility for most domestic governmental functions: States and their localities largely finance and build public infrastructure, educate our children, maintain public safety and serve as the social safety net. State and local governments spend $2.5 trillion annually and employ over 19 million workers -- 15 percent of the national total and six times as many workers as the federal government.

I am hopeful the substantial array of facts that our Task Force has assembled will motivate Washington, our states and localities to commit to breaking down the disconnect that seems to permeate more and more.

To summarize, certain large expenditures are growing at rates that exceed reasonable expectations for revenues, including Medicaid, pension funds and health care benefits. And, at the same time, the capacity to raise revenues is increasingly impaired because of declines in sales, gas and income taxes. In addition, there are the spillover effects of the federal budget crisis on state and local governments, and state actions will have spillover impact on local governments.

Going forward, business as usual will not work. The storm warnings are there. Only an informed public can demand that the political systems -- federal, state and local -- recognize these problems and take effective action. The costs, whether in service reductions or higher revenues -- will be large. Deferring action can only make the ultimate costs even greater.

#### Fed key – four reasons

**Kay, 2012** [ Energy Federalism: Who Decides? David Kay Cornell Community and Regional Development Institute (CaRDI) July 2012 http://devsoc.cals.cornell.edu/cals/devsoc/outreach/cardi/programs/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&PageID=1071714]

Centralized Federalism

Sovocool list four significant benefits of the centralized theory, a theory which has provided the legal support for a strong federal role throughout American history. The first benefit finds modern expression in the language of environmental economics by highlighting the economic efficiency of internalizing economic externalities such as transboundary pollution. The essential logic is that the decisions are most efficient and fair when decision makers represent all constituencies who will experience significant costs and benefits of the decision. Small, decentralized authorities have few incentives to attend to impacts on those outside their own jurisdiction.

The second benefit is derived from a regulatory theory that favors economic investment. From this perspective, the uniformity and consistency of regulation imposed by a single authority lowers the costs of regulation for manufacturers and investors, in particular if they are active in multiple jurisdictions. Of course, the efficiency of lowering investment costs is not perceived as a benefit by those who see the investments as detrimental.

The third benefit is also fundamentally about economic advantage and efficiency. It posits that uniformity in regulation across jurisdictions enables economies of scale in regulation itself. Larger scale enables greater efficiencies in regulatory administration and enforcement as well as in research that provides the scientific basis for the regulation itself. An additional complexity is involved in the scaling of influence and power. In particular, some argue that there is an inherent mismatch between local politicians and corporate interests. In particular,

the former have relatively meager financial, legal and technical capacities and are arguably more likely to be “captured” or even overwhelmed by the interests of a few key businesses. They may simply be more likely to make either unwarranted or unnecessary concessions to economic interests to the detriment of environmental ones.

The final benefit is categorically different: “it promotes distributive justice and a minimum standard of environmental quality, thus preventing a race to the bottom” among the states. The idea here is that a centralized authority is logically necessary to impose minimum standards and, in the face of competition for capital investment, practically more likely to guarantee a minimum standard of human health and environmental quality that applies to all. Of course, to be valid the aggregate minimum must indeed be higher than the minimum among the separate smaller governments.

### 2AC E-Prices

#### Corporate dominance turns offshoring

**Marx & Kelly 07** - Director of Corporate Ethics International (CEI) & Fellow with the Tellus Institute [Michael Marx & Marjorie Kelly, “Who Will Rule?,” Yes! Magazine, Pg. posted Jul 29, 2007, pg. http://www.yesmagazine.org/issues/stand-up-to-corporate-power/who-will-rule?b\_start:int=1&set\_language=en

Corporate power lies behind nearly every major problem we face—from stagnant wages and unaffordable health care to overconsumption and global warming. In some cases, it is the cause of the problem; in other cases, corporate power is a barrier to system-wide solutions. This dominance of corporate power is so pervasive, it has come to seem inevitable. We take it so much for granted, we fail to see it. Yet it is preventing solutions to some of the most pressing problems of our time.

With global warming a massive threat to our planet and a majority of U.S. citizens wanting action, why is the U.S. government so slow to address it? In large part because corporations use lobbying and campaign finance to constrain meaningful headway.

Why are jobs moving overseas, depressing wages at home, and leaving growing numbers under- or unemployed? In large part because trade treaties drafted in corporate-dominated back rooms have changed the rules of the global economy, allowing globalization to massively accelerate on corporation-friendly terms, at the expense of workers, communities, and the environment.

Why are unions declining and benefits disappearing? In large part because corporate power vastly overshadows the power of labor and governments, and corporations play one region off against another, busting unions to hold down labor costs while boosting profits, fueling a massive run-up in the stock market.

Why were electricity, the savings and loan industry, and other critical industries deregulated, contributing to major debacles whose costs are borne by the public? In large part because free market theory, enabled by campaign contributions and lobbying, seduced elected officials into trusting the marketplace to regulate itself.

With all this happening, why do we not read more about the pervasiveness of corporate power? In large part because even the “Fourth Estate,” our media establishment, is majority owned by a handful of mega-corporations.

Big corporations have become de facto governments, and the ethic that dominates corporations has come to dominate society. Maximizing profits, holding down wages, and externalizing costs onto the environment become the central dynamics for the entire economy and virtually the entire society.

What gets lost is the public good, the sense that life is about more than consumption, and the understanding that markets cannot manage all aspects of the social order.

What gets lost as well is the original purpose of corporations, which was to serve the public good.

A Movement for the Public Good  
The solution is to bring corporations back under citizen control and in service to the public good. The main components of such a movement already exist—including organized labor, environmentalists, religious activists, shareholder activists, students, farmers, consumer advocates, health activists, and community-based organizations.

We've seen the power of ordinary people working together on the streets of Seattle in 1999, challenging the World Trade Organization. We've seen them achieve impressive results curbing sweatshop abuses, limiting tobacco advertising, challenging predatory lending practices at home and abroad, and protecting millions of acres of forests, to name just a few successes.

We've also seen the growth of community-friendly economic designs like worker-owned enterprises, co-ops, and land trusts that, by design, put human and environmental well-being first.

Focus on Corporate Power  
Each of these movements advocates for healthy communities, for a moral economy, and for the common good. If they acted together, they would possess enormous collective power. But as yet there is no whole, only disconnected parts. Despite many achievements, the gap in power between corporations and democratic forces has widened enormously in recent decades.

Activists and citizens are beginning to turn this around. We can build on this work. But if we are to close the gap in power, our strategies must evolve. We need to dream bigger, to speak with one voice across issue sectors, and to act more strategically. We need to focus less on symptoms of corporate abuse and more on the underlying cause—excessive corporate power. We must recognize that ultimately our struggle is for power. It is not just to make corporations more responsible, but to make them our servants, in much the same way that elected officials are public servants.

We need what the movement now lacks: a coherent vision of the role we want corporations to play in our society and a strategy for achieving that vision. It's about putting We the People back in charge of our future, rather than the robotic behemoths that set their sights on short-term growth and high profits, regardless of the consequences.

The streams of many small movements must flow together into a single river, creating a global movement to bring corporations back under the control of citizens and their elected governments. The urgent need for unified action impelled a small group of organizations to initiate a long-term Strategic Corporate Initiative (SCI), of which we are a part.

#### Investor withdrawal from gas will cause price spikes

Kobb, 2/18/13 [Kurt Cobb is an author, speaker, and columnist focusing on energy and the environment. Resilience (a project of the Post Carbon Institute). “Investors are subsidizing natural gas consumers. But it won't last.”. http://www.csmonitor.com/Environment/Energy-Voices/2013/0218/Investors-are-subsidizing-natural-gas-consumers.-But-it-won-t-last]

Investors have essentially subsidized natural gas through huge loss-making investments, creating an oversupply that has sent prices significantly below the average cost of new production. That means consumers get cheap natural gas while investors kick themselves for not realizing that they were buying into a flawed concept—one that oil and gas consultant Art Berman has called “an improbable business model that has no barriers to entry except access to capital, that provides a source of cheap and abundant gas, and that somehow also allows for great profit.”

The conventional wisdom is that prices are likely to stabilize between $3 and $4 per mcf and stay there for the rest of the decade as the natural gas drilling juggernaut continues. There just one problem with this outlook. The juggernaut has most definitely NOT continued.

Since the last week of August 2008 when the count of active U.S. natural gas drilling rigs peaked at 1606, the number of active rigs has plunged to just 425 for the week ending February 8.

Investors who helped to fuel the boom included hedge funds, wealthy individuals and institutional investors, all of whom chipped in a lot of money to finance the drilling of individual wells for what turned out to be meager payouts. None are eager to get burned that badly again.

In addition, the share prices of publicly traded drillers such as Chesapeake Energy, Devon Energy, Encana, and Southwestern Energy—who put an extraordinarily large proportion of their efforts and funds into finding natural gas (as opposed to oil)—have plummeted. That decline has for now made raising new capital through stock issuance a relatively rare event.

Furthermore, many drillers—who borrowed heavily to help finance their drilling efforts—now find themselves deeply in debt, groaning under the weight of interest charges and loan repayments. But, they’ve been unable to do much except sell assets to counter the devastating effects that low natural gas prices continue to have on their balance sheets.

It’s hard to imagine the same investors and banks deciding that for the rest of the decade, they’ll keep repeating what they’ve just done.

As for the drillers, they have moved on. They have already repositioned their rigs for drilling oil which is currently fetching a splendidly profitable price near $100 a barrel, that is, near the historically high levels seen since 2008. It turns out that even the natural gas drillers don’t believe the natural gas story any more if we judge by their actions. Indeed, even the biggest booster of the cheap (but somehow profitable) natural gas forever narrative, Chesapeake Energy, has given up and turned its focus to oil.

So, where does that leave the working stiffs who heat their homes with natural gas, the utilities who burn it to make electricity, and the chemical manufacturers who use it as a feedstock for many chemicals including nitrogen fertilizer? They all face an uncertain future in which natural gas prices are likely to rise significantly, perhaps even returning to the double-digit nosebleed levels of 2008 before gun-shy investors and drillers will dare to take the necessary steps to bring on significant new supply.

Which begs the question: What if drillers and investors wait that long to move back into the natural gas fields in force?

Petroleum geologist Jeffrey Brown of Export Land Model fame offered a startling response in a conversation at a recent conference I attended. The production decline rates of the shale gas wells that are providing the bulk of new U.S. supplies are so high—60 percent in the first year and up to 85 percent by the end of the second year—that we may never be able to return to today’s production level.

That would certainly put the nail in the coffin of the natural gas abundance narrative.

#### Wind power key to stabilize against price spikes.

Matthew Wald, 2/17/2013. “Could Wind Power Cool New England’s Price Fever?” New York Times, http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/02/17/could-wind-power-cool-new-englands-price-fever/.

[As I reported in Saturday’s paper](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/16/business/electricity-costs-up-in-gas-dependent-new-england.html), New England is experiencing a remarkable spike in electricity prices brought on by high heating demand and rising natural gas prices for electric generators.

What role, if any, could renewable energy play in solving this problem?

At the Union of Concerned Scientists, the senior energy analyst Michael B. Jacobs, who has a blog called the [Energy Roller Coaster](http://blog.mikejacobs-energy.com/), has been sounding the alarm about over-reliance on natural gas in New England and Texas. The solution, he said, would be to turn to more renewable energy sources like wind so that the demand for gas would be smaller at clinch times.  
“You don’t have nearly so much of a price spike if you have more renewables in your portfolio,’’ he said.

Wind advocates made a similar argument when the price of natural gas was high about five years ago: that even if wind energy was expensive, it could have a major impact on the price of gas by cutting demand slightly. In the commodity markets, small shortages or surpluses can result in huge price swings.

#### Economy resilient to high prices.

Lotterman, ’12 [Ed, professor of economics at Augsburg College. “High gas prices have been around before”. http://www.edlotterman.com/2012/03/18/high-gas-prices-have-been-around-before/#.USjl-6WyCds]

The U.S. economy, like other market economies, is more resilient than many people give it credit for. It can adjust to higher energy prices, just as it repeatedly has in the past. And, if history and economic theory are guides, sharp increases in the price of any resource usually are followed by long periods in which prices rise by less than average inflation.

Start by considering how gas prices have evolved in the past century. Ignoring inflation, a slow increase occurred from 1919 to 1973. Since then, an upward trend took hold that saw sharp spikes whenever there was trouble in the Mideast, usually followed by declines as tensions eased.

The first such spike came after the 1973 Arab-Israeli War when Arab-dominated OPEC first flexed its muscles and U.S. gas prices rose from 39 cents a gallon in 1973 to 57 cents a gallon in 1975. There were subsequent spikes as the regime of the Shah of Iran began to crumble in 1979, and from 2002 to 2008 with the Iraq War.

Prices fell from 2008 into 2009 but have since risen, particularly as the West’s confrontation with Iran over its nuclear program has become more acute.

Interestingly, the 1991 Gulf War was not accompanied by a dramatic increase in prices because Saudi Arabia and its Arab allies sharply increased oil output to counteract any shortfalls caused by the conflict.

If one adjusts for inflation, the picture looks much different, with a general downtrend from 1919 to 1972 followed by great volatility thereafter. The 17-year period from 1986 through 2003 had lower prices than at any time prior, including the 1950s and 1960s that many of my generation remember as the glory days of cheap gas and muscle cars.

Prices are high now and likely to get higher unless there is some miraculous easing of tension with Iran, but we are not in a markedly worse position than 30 years ago when mean household incomes were 29 percent lower than now, adjusted for inflation.

Higher crude oil and gasoline prices pose challenges for households and national economies in the short run because it takes time to adjust to changes. In the short run, if an individual has to pay more for gas, she may have substantially less to spend on other things. Higher diesel fuel means it costs more to till an acre of ground, construct a mile of road or deliver a ton of freight.

So prices of many goods rise, although the overall price level may be kept constant if the central bank clamps an iron hand on the money supply.

But in the longer run, both households and national economies adjust. In general, the growth of our gross domestic product since the mid-1970s has been somewhat slower than in the 30 years before, but we have seen good growth. Plus, the amount of all energy and of petroleum products needed to produce a dollar’s worth of output has fallen sharply. The U.S. now uses only half as much energy relative to GDP as we did 40 years ago.

Moreover, we can continue to improve. Countries including the United Kingdom, Germany and Japan produce 20 percent to 30 percent more GDP per unit of energy used than we do, with comparable median household incomes.

#### Grid parity solves the link

Randall, 3/14/12 - Tom Randall is a deputy sustainability editor for Bloomberg News [“Wind Innovations Drive Down Costs, Stock Prices”. Bloomberg. http://go.bloomberg.com/multimedia/wind-innovations-drive-down-costs-stock-prices/]

The world’s wind-power capacity increased 113-fold over the past 20 years. As installations increase, turbines become more efficient and electricity prices decline. For a growing number of countries, this means wind power is now cheaper than conventional energy sources, even without government subsidies.

Wind's ‘Learning Curve’

This chart shows how the cost of producing a wind turbine falls as more turbines are produced. The improved efficiencies of technology and scale -- the industry's learning curve -- reduce wind-power prices by 7 percent every time installed capacity doubles. The price for a megawatt of wind power dropped by almost half since 1991.

The global turbine price is currently lower than the industry's historic learning curve by about 60,000 euros ($78,000) per megawatt. Oversupply and competition from China have led manufacturers like Vestas, the world's largest turbine maker, to cut prices. The company's shares tumbled 68 percent in the last year.

Wind's Golden Goal

Wind electricity providers have begun to reach what energy experts call the "golden goal" of grid parity, when operating fields of wind turbines is as cheap as burning coal or natural gas. Falling natural gas prices makes it harder for wind to compete in the US, despite its good wind resources. However, rising natural gas prices in Europe are making wind more competitive

Countries with high power prices and strong winds are already past parity: Brazil, Italy, Argentina, Canada, the U.K. and Portugal. As time passes, the country bubbles expand to represent growing capacity and shift right to reflect increased turbine efficiency.

"The cost of producing wind energy needs to come down to reach parity," said Stefan Linder, an analyst at Bloomberg New Energy Finance. "However in the best locations onshore wind is already competitive with fossil fuel electricity, and most wind farms in fair resource areas will be at parity by 2016."

#### New regulations cause price spikes

Michael Bastasch 11/7 The Daily Caller News Foundation http://dailycaller.com/2012/11/07/energy-industry-could-be-hit-by-tougher-regulations-in-obama-second-term/2/

The energy industry could see itself under a renewed attack by regulators and environmental groups during President Barack Obama’s second term as the administration could tighten regulations on oil, gas, and coal. “It’s going to be a rougher second term for oil and gas given the way the environmental debate is going and the diminished incentive Obama has to protect oil and gas after his last election is behind him,” said Robert McNally, a former White House energy adviser under George W. Bush and current head of the Rapidan Group consulting firm. Reuters reports that Obama slowed fossil fuel regulations during the campaign as his challenger Mitt Romney championed expanding drilling and more state authority over oil and gas regulation while painting Obama as anti-fossil fuel. “Obama streamlined regulation on drilling for natural gas from shale and delayed finalizing rules on mercury emissions from power plants,” according to Reuters. “The light touch may have helped the president gain support from voters anxious about jobs in gas-rich Pennsylvania and Ohio.” Despite the regulatory slowdown, it has been reported that the Environmental Protection Agency has more than 50 staffers gearing up for a “November Surprise” to finish new greenhouse gas standards. “[I]t’s pretty clear that if President Obama secures a second term, the Obama-EPA will have a very busy next four years, moving full speed ahead to implement numerous major rules and regulations that he has delayed or punted due to the upcoming election,” reads a report by Inhofe on EPA actions during an Obama second term. The brunt of the environmental regulations have been felt by the coal industry and have contributed to the planned shutdown of more than 200 coal-fired generators across 25 states, reports the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity. Coal mining companies and miners also saw 9,000 mining jobs were lost in October, with mining employment decreasing by 17,000 jobs since May of this year. ‘We will see energy prices continue to go up as a result of these policies,” Thomas J. Pyle, president of the Institute for Energy Research told the Daily Caller News Foundation, adding that “coal is toast” in an Obama second term due to onerous EPA regulations. Coal company shares fell in pre-market trading on the news of President Obama’s re-election, including shares of Alpha Natural Resources which previously announced layoffs for 1,200 workers and the closing of eight coal mines partly due to “a regulatory environment that’s aggressively aimed at constraining the use of coal.” “(The drop is) 100 percent related to election results,” said Eric Green, senior managing partner at Penn Capital Management. The Obama administration could also revive some rules which were rejected by the courts, like the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR), which was recently struck down in federal court, and estimated to cost $853 million “I think under Obama [CASPR] would come back, probably reinstated in 2014,” Kevin Massy, associate director of the Brookings Institution’s Energy Security Initiative told the Daily Caller News Fondation. However, there are still other major regulations still in place, seven of which will cost 887,000 jobs per year, with annual costs as high as $16.7 billion per year according to a report by National Economic Research Associates (NERA). Fracking could also be in jeopardy as the Obama EPA is expected to release two reports on fracking which could set the tone for regulation in his second term. The shale oil and gas boom has almost exclusively taken place on private and state lands which means its largely out of federal hands, but that could change, says Pyle. “What Obama will certainly continue to do is try to regulate the technology that makes [fracking] possible,” Pyle said. “His EPA has been caught with their hand in the cookie jar on several occasions trying to claim that fracking has caused groundwater contamination, and it hasn’t.”

#### Turn: Nanotech will undermine the utility of US’ relative power gap—it will crush our military influence.

McGaughran 10—Honors in Environmental Studies @ University of Colorado - Boulder [Jamie L. McGaughran, “FUTURE WAR WILL LIKELY BE UNSUSTAINABLE FOR THE SURVIVAL AND CONTINUATION OF HUMANITY AND THE EARTH‘S BIOSPHERE,” A thesis submitted to the University of Colorado at Boulder in partial fulfillment of the requirements to receive Honors designation in Environmental Studies, May 2010, pg. <http://citizenpresident.com/uploads/Whole_Thesis_Future_War_UnSstnble.pdf>]

More than just human civilization is threatened with extinction from weaponized nanotechnology. The entire planet could be devastated and our biosphere could be irreversibly damaged. Nanoweapons can generate myriad forms of weaponry. They can be eco-friendly in one attack and eco-devastating in another. According to Admiral David E. Jeremiah, ViceChairman (ret.), U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, in an address at the 1995 Foresight Conference on Molecular Nanotechnology, "Military applications of molecular manufacturing have even greater potential than nuclear weapons to radically change the balance of power." He describes nanotechnology‘s potential to destabilize international relations.

Molecular manufacturing may reduce economic influence and interdependence, encourage targeting of people as opposed to factories and weapons, and reduce the ability of a nation to monitor its potential enemies. It may also, by enabling many nations to be globally destructive, eliminate the ability of powerful nations to "police" the international arena. By making small groups self-sufficient, it can encourage the breakup of existing nations (Nanotechnology: Dangers of Molecular Manufacturing, 2010). The Center for Nanotechnology illustrates a comparative analysis of nanotech weaponry vs. nuclear weaponry and their site contains insightful and thought provoking information regarding the future of nanotechnologies. One question addressed by the CNR is the effect of nanotechnology on the global community. They explore whether nanotech weaponry would either stabilize or destabilize the world. A factor that may have prevented a large scale nuclear war post WWII, and during the Cold War between the U.S. and U.S.S.R., appeared to be the global consequences of utilizing nuclear weapons. The devastation and long lasting effects of radiation have been well documented and disseminated to the public. An example of these consequences occurred in Japan in 1945 with the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The consequences of nuclear war include the death of innocent people along with devastating radioactive effects that could linger for long periods of time. It is no longer just a military conflict. Civilians will be killed along with the destruction of valuable resources and military targets. Thus, up to the present time, nuclear weapons controlled by rational acting States have been successful at preventing nuclear war . ―Nuclear weapons perhaps can be credited with preventing major wars since their invention‖ (Nanotechnology: Dangers of Molecular Manufacturing, 2010). But this is only the case because they have thus far been kept out of the hands of irrational actors.

### 2AC Politics

#### Winners win on controversial issues and pc not key

Hirsh, National Journal, 2-7-13

(Michael, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital,” http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207?page=1, accessed 2-7-13)

Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger.¶ But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”¶ALL THE WAY WITH LBJ¶ Sometimes, a clever practitioner of power can get more done just because [they’re] he’s aggressive and knows the hallways of Congress well. Texas A&M’s Edwards is right to say that the outcome of the 1964 election, Lyndon Johnson’s landslide victory over Barry Goldwater, was one of the few that conveyed a mandate. But one of the main reasons for that mandate (in addition to Goldwater’s ineptitude as a candidate) was President Johnson’s masterful use of power leading up to that election, and his ability to get far more done than anyone thought possible, given his limited political capital. In the newest volume in his exhaustive study of LBJ, The Passage of Power, historian Robert Caro recalls Johnson getting cautionary advice after he assumed the presidency from the assassinated John F. Kennedy in late 1963. Don’t focus on a long-stalled civil-rights bill, advisers told him, because it might jeopardize Southern lawmakers’ support for a tax cut and appropriations bills the president needed. “One of the wise, practical people around the table [said that] the presidency has only a certain amount of coinage to expend, and you oughtn’t to expend it on this,” Caro writes. (Coinage, of course, was what political capital was called in those days.) Johnson replied, “Well, what the hell’s the presidency for?”¶ Johnson didn’t worry about coinage, and he got the Civil Rights Act enacted, along with much else: Medicare, a tax cut, antipoverty programs. He appeared to understand not just the ways of Congress but also the way to maximize the momentum he possessed in the lingering mood of national grief and determination by picking the right issues, as Caro records. “Momentum is not a mysterious mistress,” LBJ said. “It is a controllable fact of political life.” Johnson had the skill and wherewithal to realize that, at that moment of history, he could have unlimited coinage if he handled the politics right. He did. (At least until Vietnam, that is.)

#### Agency set-aside doesn’t link – not legislation and doesn’t require additional funding

They don’t have a pc key card

#### Strong bipartisan support for the REAP

**Learner 12** - Executive Director of the Environmental Law & Policy Center [Howard A. Learner, “Clean-Energy Programs Key to Rural U.S.,” National Journal, May 14, 2012 7:11 AM, pg. http://tinyurl.com/b85fecc

The Senate Agriculture Committee wisely redirected funding to the Farm Bill’s Energy Title, which has strong bipartisan support. These clean energy programs provide a new source of income for farmers and rural small businesses, create rural jobs and enhance economic development, and produce environmental quality benefits for everyone.

The Rural Energy for America Program (REAP), in particular, is a success story. It crosses agricultural sectors and provides value in every state. REAP's competitive cost-share grants have helped support a broad range of 8,000 wind, solar, biogas and energy efficiency projects in rural communities. Since the 2008 Farm Bill, REAP grants have leveraged more than $1 billion in private investments, creating jobs during a historic economic crisis.

The Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP) spurs new opportunities for growing sustainable biomass crops. BCAP provides cost-sharing and risk-sharing for innovative farmers who plant sustainable “energy crops” such as perennial grasses. There’s a future for these energy crops that reduce erosion, improve water quality, promote conservation and expand agricultural opportunities.

Under the 2008 Farm Bill, REAP did not include corn ethanol. While USDA recently added ethanol blender pumps to REAP, only 8 percent of 2011 program funds were used for this purpose. By contrast, 38 percent of program funds were directed to energy efficiency programs and 25 percent for solar energy systems on farms and rural small businesses. These programs cut energy costs for farmers, create jobs, reduce pollution and help rural electric co-ops.

Since 2002, Farm Bill clean energy programs have enjoyed bipartisan support because they are achieving success in promoting homegrown, clean energy in rural America. Renewing core Energy Title programs with sufficient funding attracts private investment, creates jobs and increases clean energy production. This achieves the goals of agriculture, investors and environmentalists, and it enhances economic stability in rural communities.

#### Issues are compartmentalized

**LEE  05** The Rose Institute of State & Local Government – Claremont McKenna College – Presented at the Georgia Political Science Association 2005 Conference  
[Andrew, “Invest or Spend?:Political capital and Statements of Administration Policy in the First Term of the George W. Bush Presidency,” http://a-s.clayton.edu/trachtenberg/2005%20Proceedings%20Lee.pdf]  
Instead of investing political capital, the president may spend it on an initiative. When spending political capital, the president does not necessarily  expect higher approval ratings. President Clinton’s first term actions to balance the budget and normalize trade with China did not yield returns. In fact, balancing the budget in 1993 was a reason for the change of congressional control from the Democrats to the Republicans (Panetta 2002, 201-02). In President Bush’s first term, he accrued a large amount of capital from the September 11th attacks, and subsequently spent a substantial portion pursuing the Iraq war.  Political capital is not equal in all policy areas. Commenting on President Clinton’s term, President George W. Bush said, “I felt like he tried to spend capital on issues that he didn't have any capital on at first, like health care” (quoted in Suellentrop 2004). In spending political capital, the president diminishes his political strength by initiating or pushing a policy proposal with no intent on return. A president can spend capital for noble goals such as a balanced budget, the end of Saddam Hussein’s regime, or to veto legislation. The theory of political capital as it relates to SAPs is that presidents are more likely to spend political capital through a presidential veto because they have the power to do so. In times of increased political capital, the relative strength of SAP wording will also increase because the president has greater flexibility to take stands on particular issues. This analysis is a case study of the first Bush term’s adherence to this hypothesis.

#### Lots of Thumpers

FOX NEWS 3 – 4 – 13 http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/03/04/recurring-budget-crises-could-put-squeeze-on-obama-second-term-priorities/

The automatic spending cuts that kicked in over the weekend effectively added another administrative headache for a White House and Congress that have struggled with even the most perfunctory tasks.

At a certain point, something's got to give.

The day-in, day-out debate and speechifying and crisis management are getting to a point where they could overshadow the other planks of President Obama's second-term agenda -- for now, anyway.

"He has a very ambitious agenda with both the sequester and his separate policy priorities, and there is a bandwidth issue at the end of the day," said John Ullyot, a longtime senior Senate aide and Republican strategist.

For starters, agencies must now figure out how to trim their fiscal waistlines, while the president tries anew to negotiate a more "balanced" deal out of Congress -- all while trying to avert a government shutdown and secure another debt-ceiling increase.

Still, all the items from the president's campaign and State of the Union address supposedly remain on the docket: immigration reform, gun control, policies to curb climate change, an increase in the minimum wage and expanded access to preschool.

Over the weekend, President Obama stressed his commitment to pursuing all those items. White House Press Secretary Jay Carney reiterated that message Monday from the briefing room.

But while administration officials have insisted that Washington can walk and chew gum, the president's first term stands as a cautionary tale. The president devoted his political capital and time to passing the health care overhaul, while other legislative items were pushed off.

Obama has revived some -- immigration reform -- and introduced others -- gun control -- at the start of his second term. But politics and a crowded agenda could already be tainting the Washington waters.

#### Ignore the bipartisan talk – masking

REUTERS 3 – 6 – 13 [<http://www.trust.org/alertnet/news/hopes-for-a-political-thaw-sprout-in-wintry-washington>]

Now Obama appears to be looking for allies among a dozen or so rank-and-file Republican senators who have indicated they would be willing to work with the White House.

If he is successful, he could forge a bipartisan Senate majority on issues that could force the Republican-controlled House to act.

Senator Lindsey Graham of South Carolina, who says he would back a budget deal that includes up to $600 billion in new revenue in exchange for reforms to the Medicare and Medicaid health programs, was among those invited to the dinner at a hotel near the White House.

According to a source, Graham drew up the list of invitees to the dinner at a small expensive hotel, The Jefferson, near the White House.

Senator Pat Toomey of Pennsylvania, who also was invited, said any deal must include "long-term structural reforms" of Medicaid and Medicare - something Obama has indicated he is willing to discuss despite objections from some of his fellow Democrats.

"I am happy to work with the president if he is willing to work with us," Toomey said.

Julian Zelizer, a historian at Princeton University, said the accommodating talk from both sides masked the fact that neither party was budging much.

"There is a tension between the rhetoric and actually taking the votes," he said. "They might be speaking differently, but it's not clear they are willing to make a deal."

#### Sequester thumps immigration - bashing

KRAUSHAAR 2 – 28 – 13 Managing Editor, Politics for the National Journal [Josh Kraushaar, President Obama’s Losing Hand on the Sequester Fight, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/against-the-grain/president-obama-s-losing-hand-on-the-sequester-fight-20130228>]

President Obama’s Losing Hand on the Sequester Fight

By spending all his political capital over the budget cuts, the president risks losing it all on immigration reform and gun control.

To understand why the White House is aggressively contesting Bob Woodward’s account of who’s responsible for the sequester, you only have to take a look at how high the political stakes are for President Obama. Instead of tactically conceding on a short-term fix that would provide for smarter spending cuts -- as the Republicans did during the fiscal-cliff fight, when the White House held more leverage -- Obama has chosen to pick a fight over the fairness of deep spending cuts, at the expense of more significant items on his plate.

Now the White House’s entire agenda, from guns to immigration, is in jeopardy, and the president’s approval is taking a hit, with much more on the line in the coming month.

The headlines from the NBC/Wall Street Journal poll, released Wednesday, seemed like good news for the president, but there are plenty of warning signs embedded within the survey. President’s Obama’s job-approval rating dropped 3 points overall since last December, to 50 percent, and his economic job approval is a mediocre 44 percent, down 5 points in the past two months. Despite the GOP’s deep unpopularity, Democrats hold only a statistically insignificant 2-point edge, 32 percent to 30 percent, over which party was best able to handle the economy. Republicans hold a 16-point edge on which party is best-equipped to control spending, even higher than their pre-2010 midterm standing.

Most notably, on the sequester, the White House held only a narrow advantage when respondents were presented the arguments for and against it. A bare 50 percent majority agreed with the president’s argument that the cuts “are too severe,” while 46 percent argued it is “time for dramatic measures.” Asked what Congress should do, 53 percent supported either keeping the cuts or implementing more significant spending cuts, with 37 percent backing a plan with fewer cuts. It’s hardly the sign of a presidential mandate on the subject, and a reminder that there is widespread concern over spending and the federal debt.

The White House’s strategy to exaggerate the immediate impact of the cuts has backfired, at least to some degree. The Washington Post reported that Education Secretary Arne Duncan falsely claimed that public school teachers were already receiving pink slips. The Pew Research Center this week found that only 30 percent of voters thought the spending cuts would have an impact on their personal finances – much lower than the 43 percent who believed the fiscal cliff posed a danger on that front.

And even if you concede that the president holds the upper hand in the coming month as the cuts are implemented (a point that seems awfully tenuous), it’s worth remembering the cost he’s paying for putting all his focus on the sequester. As I pointed out in last week’s column, there’s a reason why presidents from both parties have angered their bases by promoting legislation to the middle – be it Bill Clinton’s welfare reform, George W. Bush’s education package or George H.W. Bush’s tax hike.

Obama has a lot more to gain politically on immigration and gun control -- winning long-term issues for Democrats -- and there’s plenty of evidence that congressional Democrats and Republicans are (gasp!) working together to forge bipartisan agreement. On gun control, liberal Sen. Chuck Schumer of New York and conservative Sen. Tom Coburn of Oklahoma are negotiating a possible deal that would expand background checks for gun sales, with signs that some of the Senate Republican Caucus would be on board. On immigration, Republican leaders are all but begging for a deal so they can improve their outreach with Hispanics well before the 2016 presidential election. Passing bipartisan immigration reform and some gun-control measures would provide Obama with a long-term legacy and provide Democrats with twin political victories of their own heading into the midterms.

But these issues also hang at the mercy of congressional Republicans, who don’t have much goodwill with this White House. Poisoning the well on a sequester fight focuses on the short game instead of the long. Picking fights with Bob Woodward underscores how much this White House has gambled on the issue, and how much it has to lose. Already, Democrats are concerned there’s no backup plan on gun control if the Schumer-Coburn negotiations break down. Reaching a deal on immigration, meanwhile, relies on winning over some skeptical House Republicans, whom the president has been relentlessly bashing in this sequester fight.

What’s ironic is that the much-maligned Congress is actually pretty close on crafting bipartisan legislation on long-intractable subjects of gun control and immigration. But it’s the White House, with the political attention span of a cable news cycle, that is risking losing it all for betting Obama will come out ahead in this messy fiscal fight.

#### It won’t pass – multiple reasons

**Witman 3/6/13** (Luke, The Examiner, “Talks on immigration reform progressing, but hurdles remain”, March 6, 2013, http://www.examiner.com/article/talks-on-immigration-reform-progressing-but-major-hurdles-remain)

However, despite the shared commitment from Republican and Democratic lawmakers to push forward a bipartisan immigration reform bill, **a number of major roadblocks still stand in the way of this actually happening.** Earlier today, Ariz. Sen. John McCain stated that **the single biggest hurdle** Senate Republicans have encountered thus far is working with labor unions on the establishment of viable visa programs both for highly skilled STEM workers and lower skilled agriculture workers. McCain admitted that coming to a compromise with unions could be impossible.¶ Last week, McCain made another potential hurdle to immigration reform clear, when he stated that potentially **allowing U.S. citizens in same sex partnerships with immigrants to petition for legal residency status for their spouses should not be a part of the debate**. According to McCain, **introducing what he calls “social issues” into the proceedings will certainly derail bipartisan cooperation.** Civil rights activists argue that it is vital that current immigration law be amended so that LGBT citizens are given the same rights as heterosexuals.¶ Finally, **it has also become clear that comprehensive immigration reform can not pass until lawmakers are sure the U.S.-Mexico border is properly secured.** Republicans are calling for an increased security presence at the nation’s southern border to ensure that individuals and contraband are not free to filter freely into this country. **If Democrats hope to get bipartisan support for an immigration reform bill**, they will have to prove to Republicans that the necessary infrastructure, technology and manpower are in place to keep the border effectively secure.

Doesn’t say high skilled solves

#### No risk of cyberattack and no impact if it does happen

Birch, 10/1/**12** – former foreign correspondent for the Associated Press and the Baltimore Sun who has written extensively on technology and public policy (Douglas, “Forget Revolution.” Foreign Policy. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/10/01/forget\_revolution?page=full)

"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." The question of how seriously to take the threat of a cyber attack on critical infrastructure surfaced recently, after Congress rejected a White House measure to require businesses to adopt stringent­ new regulations to protect their computer networks from intrusions. The bill would have required industries to report cyber security breaches, toughen criminal penalties against hacking and granted legal immunity to companies cooperating with government investigations. Critics worried about regulatory overreach. But the potential cost to industry also seems to be a major factor in the bill's rejection. A January study by Bloomberg reported that banks, utilities, and phone carriers would have to increase their spending on cyber security by a factor of nine, to $45.3 billion a year, in order to protect themselves against 95 percent of cyber intrusions. Likewise, some of the bill's advocates suspect that in the aftermath of a truly successful cyber attack, the government would have to bail the utilities out anyway. Joe Weiss, a cyber security professional and an authority on industrial control systems like those used in the electric grid, argued that a well-prepared, sophisticated cyber attack could have far more serious consequences than this summer's blackouts. "The reason we are so concerned is that cyber could take out the grid for nine to 18 months," he said. "This isn't a one to five day outage. We're prepared for that. We can handle that." 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.
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#### Doesn't solve sustainability, cost or timescales

Pollack 11 (Andrew, biotechnology reporter for the NYT, master’s in civil and environmental engineering from MIT. “A Lot of Hot Water, but Not Much Is Being Used to Produce Electricity.” The New York Times, May 9, 2011. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/10/business/energy-environment/10yenside.html?ref=geothermalpower.)

Unlike solar or wind energy, geothermal power cannot be developed quickly because it takes years to explore and develop a field — analogous to prospecting for oil.

And largely because of drilling expenses, a geothermal power station costs about three times as much to build as a coal-fired plant of similar capacity, said Masaho Adachi, president of the Okuaizu Geothermal Company, which owns the geothermal facility here. But he said that high upfront cost is offset over time, because geothermal plants do not burn fuel.

Nonetheless, Okuaizu, a subsidiary of Mitsui Mining and Smelting, is losing money. But Mr. Adachi said the geothermal business would become more viable if the Parliament, as expected, enacted a law to require electric companies to buy geothermal energy at a premium.

Geothermal power, while considered clean energy, is not always perfectly renewable because a hot water field can be tapped more quickly than it can be renewed. The power plant here, which opened in 1995, is rated at 65 megawatts of capacity, but production has fallen to only half that level.

#### Investors dislike geothermal – can’t measure the risk

Dunn 10 (Craig, geologist. “Geothermal energy investment and its risks.” Think Geoenergy, March 14, 2010. http://thinkgeoenergy.com/archives/4090.)

In the geothermal energy industry, there is a problem with risk. This problem is not necessarily tied up in the danger or loss side of the equation—both developers and project investors are keenly aware that some projects may never produce a single electron worth of electricity. The problem is in understanding and quantifying the uncertainty. How much of a chance is there that a project will fail? For any financial investment, and specifically for any energy project to get funded, investment professionals need to “run the numbers.” What is my risk and potential reward? And, one key question: “what is the possibility of a zero return on my investment,” or, in the above analogue, a bridge failure?¶ Say there was a million-dollar reward at the other side of the canyon and the bridge had a one-in-a-million chance of failing…would you cross? Likely, most people would “risk it” and cross the bridge. How about a $100 reward and a one-in-a-hundred chance of bridge failure? Now, people are starting to re-assess the risk-to-reward ratio; they are “managing their risk.” So, here’s where it gets tricky. What if there was no confidence in the odds of a bridge failure? Meaning the bridge could fail at any time. How could someone assess the risk to reward?¶ As much as they might like you to believe otherwise, institutional investors do not risk their lives when they invest in projects, but there is significant financial risk when one considers the number of zeroes involved with any major energy project.¶ Here is where the predicament lies for geothermal energy development, as the reward for geothermal energy development is high. According to the US Department of Energy, geothermal energy has one of the lowest levelized costs (average cost of power production over the life of a power plant) of any power supply. Unlike wind or solar, geothermal energy does not rely on variable sources of energy; the earth’s heat provides baseload power without fuel costs. Geothermal energy development has one of the smallest environmental footprints for land use and CO2 production, and can be a source of both power and heat. When this cost-effective, clean, renewable energy is needed most, investors should be more than interested in “crossing the bridge.” So, why then is geothermal energy not the investor’s first choice for energy investment dollars?¶ The answer comes back to quantifying risk to reward. Like any energy development, geothermal projects have an element of risk. Any honest energy developer will admit that not everything goes according to plan and not everything stays on budget. A big issue for geothermal energy is the vast majority of capital risk on the front-end, including: exploration risk, drilling risk, and power facility construction risk, just to name a few. It is not unreasonable to assume that a geothermal energy developer will spend almost 95% of its capital budget before putting electrons on the grid and beginning to recover the reward. Although this is a distinct disadvantage for geothermal energy development, comparably to fossil fuels and other renewable energy sources for power generation, this is still not the key problem. Successful investors do not avoid risk, they manage it. The real issue is correctly quantifying the risk by identifying all the potential pitfalls. If the investor understands the risk, they could put a number on it (the bridge fails one in 100 times), and then they could decide what a reasonable reward should be and “manage their risk.”

#### Geothermal links to the disad
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<http://www.resourceinvestor.com/2009/09/11/how-to-invest-in-rare-earth-metals>

Rare earth elements or rare earth metals are a collection of seventeen chemical elements in the periodic table, namely scandium, yttrium, and the fifteen lanthanoids. The use of rare earth elements in modern technology has increased dramatically over the past years. For example, dysprosium has gained significant importance for its use in the construction of hybrid car motors. Unfortunately, this new demand has strained supply, and there is growing concern that the world may soon face a shortage of the materials. This is where the investment opportunity unfolds.

The story of rare earth metals is mostly one of China producing and exporting while Japan, America and everyone else is importing. Rare earth metals are vital to new technologies such as iPhones and flat screen televisions, green energy technology such as wind, solar and geothermal and critical to the future of hybrid and electric cars. Rare Earth Elements and Heavy Rare Earths are a strategic choke point held in China's hands as they produce 95% of REEs. Lately China has been squeezing that choke point, which could lead to declining worldwide supply and skyrocketing prices. This has Western governments worried, as the rare earth metals are also key to high-tech military applications. An article from the Telegraph reports on draft plans in China to restrict exports of rare earths:

"Beijing is drawing up plans to prohibit or restrict exports of rare earth metals that are produced only in China and play a vital role in cutting edge technology, from hybrid cars and catalytic converters, to superconductors, and precision-guided weapons. A draft report by China's Ministry of Industry and Information Technology has called for a total ban on foreign shipments of terbium, dysprosium, yttrium, thulium, and lutetium. Other metals such as neodymium, europium, cerium, and lanthanum will be restricted to a combined export quota of 35,000 tonnes a year, far below global needs."

#### Mountaintop removal causes ecosystem destruction

**Winston 09** – MS in Environmental Studies from Ohio University [Laurie E. Winston, Clean Coal Technology: Environmental Solution or Greenwashing? A thesis presented to the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences of Ohio University In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Science, August 2009

Mountaintop removal devastates communities, destroys plant and animal life, and¶ pollutes our water and air. It also results in what may seem like an obvious effect: the removal of entire mountaintops. The central Appalachian regions of West Virginia and Kentucky are home to some of the most diverse plant and animal species on the planet, including many invertebrate species who live in very few locations worldwide and depend on the Appalachian environment (Burns, 2007). The Appalachian deciduous forests are the second most diverse ecosystem in the world behind the tropical rainforest. When mountaintop forests are turned into grasslands, serious ecosystem alteration results, affecting much more than just the Appalachian region. Ecosystem fluctuations cause changes in migrating birds, insects, aquatic species, and mountain runoff, all of which affects surrounding regions and ultimately the increasingly interconnected world. Mountaintop removal in West Virginia alone has resulted in the elimination or disruption of 244 plant and animal species. The people of Appalachia depend on the forest’s diversity, as¶ they harvest many herbs and medicinal plants from it (Pancake, 2006). Pg. 87-88