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**1AC—Adv 1**

**Advantage One – Politics**

**Political polarization due to Tea Party influence is destroying the American political system.**

**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.

**Central Appalachia is the key battleground. Federal investment in wind power could create 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.

**Incentives short-circuit the Tea party rebellion against Obama and foster political compromise.**

**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%3D) 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%3A//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%3A//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%3A//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.

**Obama must act for Appalachia to short-circuit tea party influence.**

**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**.

**Tea party influence will cause an abandonment of US influence abroad.**

**Burns 11** - Professor of diplomacy and international politics @ Harvard University [Nicholas Burns, “America’s new isolationism,” Boston Globe, November 11, 2011, pg. http://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/2011/11/11/america-new-isolationism/jrA6hAi7sNaH157pq0XbBK/story.html

THE FIRST World War, the “Great War’’ that ended 93 years ago today, saw the United States emerge as a global power. But the war’s most lasting historical impact was its aftermath. Rather than use its battlefield success to win a critical peace in Europe, the United States **turned inward**. Massachusetts Senator Henry Cabot Lodge pushed the Senate to reject President Wilson’s League of Nations. An insular America chose isolation from the world and failed to lead when Hitler and Mussolini rose to power. The ultimate irony was that the “war to end all wars’’ led directly to an even more cataclysmic World War II two decades later.

This most urgent lesson of the Great War should give us pause as we arrive at another **crossroads** in our history with a clear choice to make about our role in the world. The 9/11 decade yielded a bitter and failed intervention in Iraq and stalemate in Afghanistan. After spending more than $1 trillion on the two wars alone, losing more than 6,200 young soldiers, and experiencing the trauma of recession since 2008, it is not surprising that **voices of isolation are returning** to our national debate. They can be heard on the extreme left of the Democratic Party and, especially, on the **Tea Party**-dominated **Republican right**.

Our internationalist president was right to declare in June that “it is time to focus on nation-building here at home’’ as rebuilding our economy and restoring national self-confidence are urgent necessities. And, while this new isolationism is not a full-blown call of retreat from the world, there is a palpable shift in attitude in Congress. It is an insidious turning inward by congressional budget leaders whose Draconian **cuts will deny us the ability to lead globally** at the very time when it is most critical for our economic health and political future.

How else can we understand the shifting winds in Washington? In its manic drive to slash budgets, Congress risks cutting the muscle from our extraordinary armed forces just when we need them to protect against a newly **emboldened Iran** and a **rising Chinese military**. Congress also plans to gut the State Department budget and cripple the ability of US diplomats and foreign-aid officials to lead on complicated challenges from climate change to terrorism to nuclear proliferation. Lawmakers have already cut by half critical Title VI money that funds university study of vital foreign languages such as Arabic. A congressional committee even passed a bill last week making it illegal for American diplomats to talk to Iranian officials.

This runaway desire to rid ourselves of responsibility in the world has been a major force in the rush for the exits in both Iraq and Afghanistan. The new insularity is clearly visible in the Republican presidential debates. Of the eight candidates, only Mitt Romney and Jon Huntsman can be described as true internationalists. Herman Cain boasts he does not know the name of the president of an important Central Asian country. Ron Paul and Rick Perry appear to represent a strain of **Tea Party** sentiment that would have us dig a deep moat around America, pull up the drawbridges, and defend ourselves against foes imagined and real. More importantly, international issues barely figure in the Republican debates. There have been few serious foreign policy discussions even though America faces its most complex and dangerous international agenda since World War II.

Meanwhile, unlike Americans at the end of the Great War, we live in a dramatically different world, one much more integrated and connected. In sharp contrast to the world of 1918, our economic fortunes will rise or fall based on our ability to compete internationally and to export. Our national security depends on creating international coalitions to fight the crime and drug cartels and terrorist groups infiltrating our borders. Our young people will succeed or fail in large part on their ability to live and work across national boundaries. A country living in isolation cannot even hope to take on, much less win, the greatest battles ahead - **nuclear prolif**eration, **global poverty**, restoring **economic growth** and stability. Turning away from global responsibilities is is a **one-way ticket to failure**.

This is a big and defining issue for the United States. It matters greatly for our future. We still have leaders in both parties, President Obama, Senator John Kerry, and Senator John McCain among them, who understand how important we are to the world and how much our success at home depends on that international leadership role. An earlier generation of leaders failed that test following the Great War. We should expect much more from our current leaders in both parties as we approach a critical election year in 2012.

**Miscalculated great power wars will be more likely. Multi-polarity is inherently unstable.**

**Khalilzad 11** – Counselor @ [Center for Strategic and International Studies](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Center_for_Strategic_and_International_Studies) [Dr. [Zalmay Khalilzad](http://www.nationalreview.com/author/259022) (Former [U.S. Ambassador to Afghanistan](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Ambassador_to_Afghanistan), [U.S. Ambassador to Iraq](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Ambassador_to_Iraq) and United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations. PhD in international studies from the University of Chicago), "[The Economy and National Security,” National Review Online, February 8, 2011 4:00 A.M.](http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad), pg. http://www.nationalreview.com/blogs/print/259024

Today, economic and fiscal trends pose the **most severe long-term threat** to the United States’ position as global leader. While the United States suffers from fiscal imbalances and low economic growth, the economies of rival powers are developing rapidly. The continuation of these two trends could lead to a shift from American primacy toward a multi-polar global system, leading in turn to increased geopolitical rivalry and even war among the great powers.

The current recession is the result of a deep financial crisis, not a mere fluctuation in the business cycle. Recovery is likely to be protracted. The crisis was preceded by the buildup over two decades of enormous amounts of debt throughout the U.S. economy — ultimately totaling almost 350 percent of GDP — and the development of credit-fueled asset bubbles, particularly in the housing sector. When the bubbles burst, huge amounts of wealth were destroyed, and unemployment rose to over 10 percent. The **decline of tax revenues** and massive countercyclical spending put the U.S. government on an unsustainable fiscal path. Publicly held national debt rose from 38 to over 60 percent of GDP in three years.

Without faster economic growth and actions to reduce deficits, publicly held **national debt** is projected to reach dangerous proportions. If interest rates were to rise significantly, annual interest payments — which already are larger than the defense budget — would crowd out other spending or require substantial tax increases that would undercut economic growth. Even worse, if unanticipated events trigger what economists call a “sudden stop” in credit markets for U.S. debt, the United States would be unable to roll over its outstanding obligations, precipitating a **sovereign-debt crisis** that would almost certainly compel a **radical retrenchment** of the United States internationally.

Such scenarios would reshape the international order. It was the economic devastation of Britain and France during World War II, as well as the rise of other powers, that led both countries to relinquish their empires. In the late 1960s, British leaders concluded that they lacked the economic capacity to maintain a presence “east of Suez.” Soviet economic weakness, which crystallized under Gorbachev, contributed to their decisions to withdraw from Afghanistan, abandon Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, and allow the Soviet Union to fragment. If the U.S. debt problem goes critical, the United States would be compelled to retrench, **reducing its military spending** and **shedding international commitments**.

We face this domestic challenge while other major powers are experiencing rapid economic growth. Even though countries such as China, India, and Brazil have profound political, social, demographic, and economic problems, their economies are growing faster than ours, and this could alter the global distribution of power. These trends could in the long term produce a multi-polar world. If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. The closing of the gap between the United States and its rivals could intensify geopolitical competition among major powers, increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, and undercut our will to preclude or respond to international crises because of the higher risk of escalation.

The stakes are high. In modern history, the longest period of peace among the great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership. By contrast, **multi-polar systems have been unstable**, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both **world wars.**

American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of **arms races, miscalculation**, or other crises spiraling into **all-out conflict**. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions.

As rival powers rise, Asia in particular is likely to emerge as a zone of great-power competition. Beijing’s economic rise has enabled a dramatic military buildup focused on acquisitions of naval, cruise, and ballistic missiles, long-range stealth aircraft, and anti-satellite capabilities. China’s strategic modernization is aimed, ultimately, at denying the United States access to the seas around China. Even as cooperative economic ties in the region have grown, China’s expansive territorial claims — and provocative statements and actions following crises in Korea and incidents at sea — have roiled its relations with South Korea, Japan, India, and Southeast Asian states. Still, the United States is the most significant barrier facing Chinese hegemony and aggression.

Given the risks, the United States must focus on restoring its economic and fiscal condition while checking and **managing the rise** of potential adversarial regional powers such as China. While we face significant challenges, the U.S. economy still accounts for over 20 percent of the world’s GDP. American institutions — particularly those providing enforceable rule of law — set it apart from all the rising powers. Social cohesion underwrites political stability. U.S. demographic trends are healthier than those of any other developed country. A culture of innovation, excellent institutions of higher education, and a vital sector of small and medium-sized enterprises propel the U.S. economy in ways difficult to quantify. Historically, Americans have responded pragmatically, and sometimes through trial and error, to work our way through the kind of crisis that we face today.

**Extinction.**

**Burford 12** – PhD candidate in Poli Sci @ University of Auckland [Lyndon Burford (New Zealand representatives on the Study Group on Countering the Proliferation of WMD in the Asia-Pacific region. This study group is hosted by the ASEAN Regional Forum.,) “No Such Thing as a Free Lunch,” The Nonproliferation Review, Volume 19, Issue 2, 2012, pg. 229-239

Nuclear activities create inherent security risks. Threats arising from military nuclear activities include, among other things, the further dissemination or use of nuclear weapons—including limited or **full-scale nuclear war**, whether accidental, **miscalculated**, or intentional—and nuclear or **radiological accidents or terrorism**, which in extreme cases may **lead to nuclear war**.7 In the civilian sector, the 1986 Chernobyl and 2011 Fukushima disasters demonstrated that severe nuclear accidents might also threaten international security. Today, nuclear risks are increasing due to a range of factors: the threat of further nuclear dissemination, the development of a nuclear arms race in South Asia, the growth of dual-use industries and strategic trade flows, and the potential horizontal and vertical expansion of nuclear energy programs. The nature of these risks transcends national borders. As a result, nuclear risks cannot be addressed effectively by a single powerful state, or even a coalition of committed states. The weakest link in the chain undermines the security of all countries, so maintaining international security **requires all countries** to support nuclear control efforts.

**Tea party influence causes 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

**Extinction.**

**Avery 12** – Professor of [quantum chemistry](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quantum_chemistry) and [thermodynamics](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thermodynamics) @ University of Copenhagen, [John Scales Avery (Associate with the Nobel Peace Prize recipient [Pugwash Conferences](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pugwash_Conferences) on Science and World Affairs), “Iran: Automatic Escalation to World War III?,” TRANSCEND Media Service, Oct 28, 2012, pg. http://tinyurl.com/bgqjxw5

A few days ago Brigadier General Amir Ali Hajizadeh , who is in charge of the Revolutionary Guards missile systems told Iran’s Arabic-language television network that should Israel and Iran engage militarily, “nothing is predictable… and it will turn into **World War III**”.

He added that Iran would deem any Israeli strike to be conducted with US authorisation, so “whether the Zionist regime attacks with or without US knowledge, then we will definitely attack US bases in Bahrain, Qatar and Afghanistan.”
The first point to notice is that an attack on Iran by Israel would be both criminal and insane. It would be criminal because it would be a violation of the United Nations Charter and the Nuremberg Principles. It would be insane because it would initiate a conflict that might **escalate in an unpredictable way**. Such a conflict might easily be the start of a Third World War.

But what General Hajizadeh proposes in his statement is perhaps even more criminal and even more insane.

Let us suppose that Netanyahu’s and his government carry through their irresponsible plan of attacking Iran. If Iran then responds by attacking US bases in Bahrain, Qatar and Afghanistan, then the **escalation of the conflict would be absolutely automatic**. US leaders would then have no choice. They would be forced to respond by attacking Iran, despite the danger that **Russia, China and Pakistan** would be drawn into the conflict on the side of Iran.

One is reminded of the start of World War I, when a small conflict started by Austria to punish the Serbian Panslavic Movement escalated into a global disaster which still casts a shadow over the world almost a century later. The difference between 1914 and 2012 is that today we possess **all-destroying thermonuclear weapons**. A new world war could lead to the destruction of human civilization and much of the biosphere.

**1AC—Adv 2**

**Advantage Two – Sustainability**

**Wind power in Central Appalachia is a model for global sustainable development.**

**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.

**The regions transition to wind power provides a workable model for sustainability and ecological restoration.**

**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 feedstock’s 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.

**Such a model would be exported globally.**

**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

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 are coming absent sustainability.**

**Gowdy 7** - 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 **W**eapons of **M**ass **D**estruction 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.

**There are almost a dozen likely extinction scenarios.**

**Shahan 9** – Director/editor @ [CleanTechnica](http://cleantechnica.com/) and [Planetsave](http://planetsave.com/) [[Zachary Shahan](http://ecolocalizer.com/author/zshahan/), “Global Collapse, Human Survival & the Planet’s Boundaries, Eco Localizer, September 24, 2009, pg. http://ecolocalizer.com/2009/09/24/global-collapse-human-survival-the-planets-boundaries/

Global Environmental Collapse

Scientists from the US, Europe, and Australia identified **nine planetary thresholds** that, if crossed, could mean the world will crash. This is more than your computer crashing, though. This is about **total environmental collapse**.

The lead author, [Johan Rockström](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2009-09/asu-iss092309.php), director of the Stockholm Resilience Centre at Stockholm University, says: “Human pressure on the Earth system has reached a scale where **abrupt** global environmental change can no longer be excluded. To continue to live and operate safely, humanity has to stay away from critical ‘hard-wired’ thresholds in Earth’s environment, and respect the nature of planet’s climatic, geophysical, atmospheric and ecological processes.”

If we do not respect the Earth’s limits, the authors say that we will bring about environmental changes comparable or greater than the greatest natural forces in the world.

The Anthropocene Age

Scientists have already named this the “Anthropocene” age, the time since the industrial revolution when humans have become the main actors influencing global environmental change.

The environment is not a thing out in the wild that we can visit. The environment is something we live in and use. We drink water, we eat the Earth’s food, we breathe its air, to live. We are a part of the environment. We are changing it to such a degree now, however, it is likely to look completely different in the future, perhaps not even livable for us if we do not change in new ways.

The Planet’s Limits

The scientists identified nine planetary boundaries — concerning climate change, stratospheric ozone, land use change, freshwater use, biological diversity, ocean acidification, nitrogen and phosphorus inputs to the biosphere and oceans, aerosol loading and chemical pollution.

The three boundaries believed to have been crossed already are climate change, biological diversity and nitrogen input to the biosphere.

Co-author, [Diana Liverman](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2009-09/asu-iss092309.php), professor of environmental science and senior fellow of Oxford University’s Environmental Change Institute, and professor of geography and development at the University of Arizona, says: “Three of the boundaries we identify – 350 parts per million of atmospheric carbon dioxide, biodiversity extinction rates more than 10 times the background rate, and no more than 35 million tons of nitrogen pollution per year – have already been exceeded with fossil fuel use, land use change, and agricultural pollution, driving us to unsustainable levels that are producing **real risks to our survival**.”

Species Loss

In the case of biological diversity (or species loss), the scientists found that the global limit is 10 extinctions per million species per year and the rate today is more than [100 extinctions per million species](http://ecolocalizer.com/2009/04/02/11-extinct-animals-that-have-been-photographed-alive/) per year. Before the industrial revolution, the value was between 0.1 and 1 extinction per million species per year. This is a great change, and not something that we can undo.

The situation in the other areas can be comparable if we do not act in a more sustainable way today and in the future.

Hope

The world lives on hope. The authors say that we are not doomed yet. Rockström states: “Transgressing planetary boundaries may be devastating for humanity, but if we respect them we have a bright future for centuries ahead.”

Co-author Sander van der Leeuw, director of the School of Human Evolution and Social Change at Arizona State University, says: “On a finite planet, at some point, we will tip the vital resources we rely upon into **irreversible decline** if our consumption is not balanced with regenerative and **sustainable activity**.” We must find a sustainable balance in everything. We must change our systems to produce what we take. Otherwise, the planet has its limits.

**\*9 Tresholds are (1) climate change, (2) ozone, (3) land use change, (4) freshwater use, (5) biodiversity, (6) ocean acidification, (7) nitrogen and phosphorus inputs, (8) aerosol loading and (9) chemical pollution**

**Only wind power could solve – it provides a viable alternative to unsustainable development.**

**Haegele 8** [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."

**1AC—Plan**

**The United States federal government should create a special category for Central Appalachia wind power in the United States Department of Agriculture’s Rural Energy for America Program.**

**1AC—Solvency**

**Contention Three – Solvency**

**Federal creation of a USDA special category is key to workforce training 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 ridge tops 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

**Wind incentives are necessary to create a sustainable alternative model.**

**Zeller 10** [[TOM ZELLER Jr.](http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/people/z/tom_jr_zeller/index.html?inline=nyt-per) “A Battle in Mining Country Pits Coal Against Wind,” New York Times, Published: August 14, 2010, pg. http://tinyurl.com/8ctubyz

Critics say the practice, known as “mountaintop removal mining,” is as devastating to the local environment as it is economically efficient for coal companies, one of which is poised to begin carving up Coal River Mountain. And that has Ms. Scarbro and other residents of western Raleigh County in a face-off of their own.

Their goal is to save the mountain, and they intend to do so with a wind farm. At least one study has shown that a wind project could be a feasible alternative to coal mining here, although the coal industry’s control over the land and the uncertain and often tenuous financial prospects of wind generation appear to make it unlikely to be pursued. That, residents say, would be a mistake.

“If we don’t stop this,” Ms. Scarbro says, adjusting the flowers on her husband’s grave, “one day we’ll be standing on a big pile of rock and debris, and we’ll be asking, ‘What do we do now?’ ”

For many renewable-energy advocates outside the region, the struggle at Coal River Mountain has become emblematic of an effort across the country to find alternatives to fossil fuels. They have lent money, expertise and high-profile celebrities like Daryl Hannah and [James Hansen](http://www.columbia.edu/~jeh1/mailings/2009/20090203_CoalRiverMountain.pdf), the [NASA](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/n/national_aeronautics_and_space_administration/index.html?inline=nyt-org) climate scientist, to help residents advance their case for wind power and to make it a test case for others pursuing similar projects nationwide.

The mountain, which is privately owned and leased to coal interests, is also one of the last intact mountaintops in a region whose contours have otherwise been irreversibly altered by extreme surface-mining techniques. Preserving its peaks for a wind farm, plan advocates say, could provide needed job diversification for impoverished towns that otherwise live or die by the fortunes of coal.

[Don L. Blankenship](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/b/don_l_blankenship/index.html?inline=nyt-per), the chief executive of [Massey Energy](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/companies/massey-energy-company/index.html?inline=nyt-org), the largest coal company in West Virginia and the one planning to cut into Coal River Mountain’s peaks, has repeatedly called assertions of long- and short-term environmental damage exaggerated.

“There are a lot of misstatements out there,” Mr. Blankenship says. “I don’t find the environmental damage to be nearly what people say they find it to be, and we’re struggling with whether the true objective of all these regulations is to protect the environment, or whether it’s simply to stop the mining of coal.”

While the odds remain slim that wind power will replace coal mining here, proponents say that changes in state and federal mining regulations could tilt things in their favor.

“We want to make it economically unfeasible to do mountaintop mining,” Ms. Scarbro says.

COAL mining of all kinds has long played a vital role in the West Virginia economy, and the state still sits on more than 30 billion tons of coal reserves, [according to federal estimates](http://www.eia.doe.gov/cneaf/coal/page/acr/table15.html). It [produced](http://www.eia.doe.gov/cneaf/coal/page/acr/tables2.html) 158 million tons in 2008, second only to Wyoming, at 468 million. And with roughly half of the United States’ electricity derived from coal-fired power plants, the incentive to keep digging here is strong — particularly in the handful of counties in the southwest corner of the state, where a majority of its 20,000 coal-industry jobs are concentrated.

Still, that number is down substantially from a peak of 130,000 jobs in the 1940s, and the decrease suggests less about production than about the rise of mechanized surface mining, including mountaintop removal. The resulting debris — a mixture of rock, dirt and other leftovers known as “spoil” — is dumped into valleys and streams below.

Hundreds of feet of elevation are sometimes removed, with equal amounts of nearby valley filled in, creating a peculiar landscape of high, wide plateaus in various stages of revegetation, encircled by the pointy, forested peaks native to the area.

Outside the industry, mountaintop removal mining has few defenders, and it has come under increasing regulatory scrutiny for its environmental impact. Mining companies, however, value it as a cost-effective way to gain access to coal deposits that otherwise couldn’t be reached.

[Two studies](http://www.ilovemountains.org/reclamation-fail/details.php#reclamation_study) released this spring by environmental groups, the [Natural Resources Defense Council](http://www.nrdc.org/) and [Appalachian Voices](http://www.appvoices.org/), used aerial and satellite analysis to document at least 500 mountaintops and roughly 1.2 million acres in four states that have been altered by mountaintop removal. The Appalachian Voices report estimated that 352,000 acres and 136 mountains have been affected in West Virginia alone.

Federal and state permits have long been granted for this type of mining, though that appears to be changing. The [Environmental Protection Agency](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/e/environmental_protection_agency/index.html?inline=nyt-org) [signaled this spring](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/02/science/earth/02coal.html?_r=1) that it would be instructing its regional offices to raise the bar for permitting valley fills, which have been linked to increases in potentially hazardous chemicals downstream.

If the guidance is enforced, it could make mountaintop removal mining, at least as it is now practiced, all but impossible — but that remains far from certain.

Coal industry executives and landowners, meanwhile, argue that flattened mountaintops are easier to develop for agriculture, housing, shopping centers or even [wind farms](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/w/wind_power/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier).

Massey Energy’s Mr. Blankenship — whom detractors often try to portray as a Luciferian overlord of fossil fuel production— relies on what he sees as an elementary cost-benefit analysis when discussing wind power: if you make coal mining more expensive, the cost of electric power goes up.

“If you raise the cost of a kilowatt-hour from a nickel to a quarter, then some American plant producing aluminum, or cars, or whatever, it goes out of business, because you can then put your factories in Asia, where you can get that electricity for a nickel or less,” Mr. Blankenship says.

Ms. Scarbro sees things differently. “While I’d be happy if no man ever had to go underground again to mine a lump of coal, I also know that we need it,” she says. “We need coal for steel, and we need steel to make wind turbines. But I am 100 percent against mountaintop removal mining.”

Shoving aside the coffee table in her living room, Ms. Scarbro — the 55-year-old daughter, granddaughter, mother-in-law and widow of West Virginia coal miners — unfolded a map depicting the three parts of Coal River Mountain that Massey plans to surface-mine. She pointed out her home on the map, near the end of a winding, forested hollow supporting walnut trees, wild ginseng and a variety of fruit trees.

The forests in this part of the state are among the most biologically diverse in the world///

. Although stressed by two centuries of development, including 100 years of underground coal mining, the steep ridges and valleys still support a staggeringly diverse tree canopy, dozens of herb and mushroom species, plentiful stocks of perch, trout and catfish, a variety of native and migratory birds, a veritable rainbow of salamanders as well as coyotes, deer, black bears and bobcats.

Ms. Scarbro reckons that curbing mountaintop removal, by whatever means, would not only protect some of that diversity — and perhaps help lure more tourists — but would also create more coal jobs, because it would make coal companies go back to more labor-intensive underground mining. That would presumably include an expansion of jobs at Coal River Mountain, which has long been mined from below.

Throw a large wind farm into the mix, Ms. Scarbro says — and perhaps even a turbine factory — and the coal-dependent economies around the mountain might diversify and thrive.

“The problem is, nobody here has any choices,” Ms. Scarbro says. “The miners doing mountaintop removal don’t have any choices, because they need their jobs to provide for their families. And people like me have no choice but to fight it, because if we don’t, nothing will change.”

THE idea for a wind project first surfaced in 2006, after [David Orr](http://www.oberlin.edu/envs/faculty_pages/orr.htm), a professor of environmental studies at Oberlin College in Ohio, approached researchers at the [National Renewable Energy Laboratory](http://www.nrel.gov/), part of the Department of Energy, about its analysis of wind potential around the country.

“We were supporting lots of groups trying to stop mountaintop removal and to do remediation at former sites,” Professor Orr says. “But we realized that, while that’s fine, it’s hard to get something done if you’re always just against something. So we began looking for alternatives to mountaintop mining.”

The lab’s wind resource maps showed West Virginia’s potential as modest compared with that of blustery states like North Dakota and Montana. And the best wind in the state tended to be in the northeast corner, far from the southern heart of coal country.

Undeterred, Professor Orr reached out to [WindLogics](http://www.windlogics.com/), a St. Paul-based company that provides wind resource assessments for utility-scale projects. Using computer modeling, WindLogics produced a detailed assessment of specific sites in West Virginia — including Coal River Mountain — suggesting that the winds atop some peaks even in coal country were strong and steady enough to support a wind farm.

By 2008, those models had been folded into an economic comparison between future surface mining at Coal River Mountain and the proposed placement of a 164-turbine, 328-megawatt wind farm along its spine. [The analysis](http://is.gd/e4cBI) — which Professor Orr, the [Sierra Club](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/s/sierra_club/index.html?inline=nyt-org) and other groups helped finance on behalf of [Coal River Mountain Watch](http://www.crmw.net/), a community group in the once-bustling town of Whitesville — found that the energy potential of the mountain’s coal, and the royalties that would accrue to companies owning land there, vastly outstripped anything a wind farm could replicate, at least in the short term.

The longer view, however, seemed to argue strongly for a wind farm.

Using wind turbine tax rules established by the state in 2007, the researchers calculated that a wind farm of the size proposed for Coal River Mountain would generate $1.74 million in annual tax revenue for Raleigh County. That’s roughly equal to the total coal taxes the county collected for the 2007-2008 fiscal year, according to the state auditor.

The portion of added tax revenue that would arise from surface mining Coal River Mountain was estimated at $36,000 a year for the next 17 years, at which point the resource would be exhausted. But a wind farm could keep generating revenue indefinitely for the county. It would also generate several hundred construction jobs, and several dozen permanent maintenance jobs.

Luring a turbine production plant while continuing to mine coal underground could generate more than 1,000 jobs, the report found. And Rory McIlmoil, a former member of Coal River Mountain Watch and now a project manager for the energy and climate-change practice at [Downstream Strategies](http://www.downstreamstrategies.com/), which produced the economic analysis, said that despite the coal industry’s protestations to the contrary, a decapitated Coal River Mountain would no longer be suitable for wind development.

“If you decrease the elevation, you decrease the wind resource,” he said. “There would be no more utility-scale wind up there.”

## \*\*\* 2AC

**2AC—Topicality**

**The plan would siphon money from non-topical programs.**

**USDA 12** [United States Department of Agriculture, ”The Rural Energy for America Program (REAP),” Last Modified:10/26/2012, pg. <http://tinyurl.com/6qaza7>n

The REAP program is comprised of the following components:

The Renewable Energy System and Energy Efficiency Improvement Guaranteed Loan and Grant Program provides financial assistance to agricultural producers and rural small businesses to purchase, install, and construct renewable energy systems; make energy efficiency improvements; use renewable technologies that reduce energy consumption; and participate in energy audits, renewable energy development assistance, and feasibility studies. [Read more](http://www.rurdev.usda.gov/BCP_ReapResEei.html)

**This would mean an increase in loans and grants.**

**USDA 12** [United States Department of Agriculture, ”The Rural Energy for America Program (REAP),” Last Modified:10/26/2012, pg. <http://tinyurl.com/6qaza7>n

The Rural Energy for America Program (REAP) provides assistance to agricultural producers and rural small businesses to complete a variety of projects. Offering both loan guarantees and grants, the REAP program helps eligible applicants install renewable energy systems such as solar panels or anaerobic digesters, make energy efficiency improvements such as installing irrigation pumps or replacing ventilation systems, and conduct energy audits and feasibility studies.

**CI – Webb**

**Durational expansion is an increase.**

**WP 8** (Words and Phrases, vol. 20B, p. 265)

Minn.App. 2004. A durational modification of child support is as much an “increase” as monetary modification, and the needs of subsequent children must be considered when determining the indefinite extension of the support obligation pursuant to statute providing that, when a party moves to “increase” child support, the circumstances change and the adjudicator is obligated to consder the needs of after-born children. M.S.A. § 518.551.—State ex rel. Jarvela v. Burke, 678 N.W.2d 68, review denied.—Child S 255, 350.

**2AC—Politics Adv**

**There is no substitute for US engagement – It’s sustainable as long as we deal with the debt.**

**Lieber 11** – Professor of Government and International Affairs @ Georgetown University. [Dr. Robert J. Lieber, “Can the US Retain Primacy?,” Israel Journal of Foreign Affairs V:3 (2011)

As a consequence of China’s increasing assertiveness, the American response becomes critical. Throughout the past half-century, the US presence has underpinned stability in East Asia, though there has been no equivalent of an Asian NATO and most of the regional security relationships with Washington have been on a bilateral basis. These have been both formal, as with Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, and Australia, as well as ad hoc with other East and Southeast Asian countries. China’s neighbors are especially attentive to indications of whether Washington has not only the capacity, but the will to maintain its East Asian role. American support for Asian allies is seen not so much as confronting China as in deterring it. A case in point is freedom of the seas and insistence on freedom of navigation for American vessels through the East China and South China Seas. Conversely, an American policy of disengagement and retrenchment would be more likely to lead to disarray, as countries scrambled to mollify Beijing, while Japan and South Korea might instead opt to develop their own nuclear weapons.

The American Future and the International Distribution of Power

With the passage of time, the increasing effects of globalization, and the rise of major regional states, it is no surprise that there have been shifts in the international distribution of power. Though it once seemed likely that Japan and an increasingly integrated European Union would be leading actors, both have encountered difficulties that seriously limit their influence. Indeed, the considerably increased share of world GDP now represented by China and other East Asian countries has come largely at the expense of the Europeans and Japanese. Meanwhile, the US has experienced a much smaller erosion in its own relative share of world GDP and production, in both cases still maintaining close to the proportion— about one-fifth, depending on how it is measured—for which it had accounted since the 1970s.

The hopes of the post-Cold War era for a benign new world order do not fit the realities of the twenty-first century. The international environment in which the US finds itself is one in which there are both stubborn and lethal threats. Nuclear proliferation, terrorism, radical Islamism, uncooperative or hostile regional powers, dangers from failing or failed states, and cyber war are the most serious, though by no means the exclusive dangers to the US, its national security, and its vital interests. Cooperation and burden sharing with allies remains important, but the capabilities of America’s long-standing alliance partners have lessened. In turn, emerging democracies and regional powers such as Brazil, India, Turkey, Indonesia, and South Africa cannot be relied upon to cooperate with the US in the way that Western Europe and Japan did for half a century.

The implications of these dangers and of the limits of allied and multilateral cooperation are two-fold. First, the international environment is one in which threats to the US cannot be managed by deferring to others. Second, while burden sharing and collaboration with other countries and institutions can be helpful and at times essential, there is no substitute for American engagement and leadership. These realities create a compelling need to maintain international commitments, and while they do not guarantee that policymakers and the public will continue to support such a role, they provide a powerful motivation to do so, even in the face of constrained resources.

America’s predominance continues to be vital in terms of its own interests and security, as well as for the maintenance of international order and stability, and it remains the world’s principal provider of collective goods. The capacity of the US to sustain its position is still a subject of debate, and there has been some attrition in America’s economic and military strength relative to other countries. Nevertheless, it retains far more power resources than any of its potential challengers. America possesses an enormous advantage in its flexibility and adaptability, and while its sometimes dysfunctional democratic political system is much criticized, throughout its history it has ultimately shown itself able to act in response to crises. America’s core problems, especially those of deficit and debt, are manageable provided there is the political will to tackle them. Matters of policy, public choice, and leadership are critical, but there is nothing inherent in its domestic society or in the international arena that precludes the US from continuing to play a leading world role. Pg. 33-34

**Yes escalation.**

**Limited war is impossible --- escalation is inevitable.**

**White 11** (Jeffrey – defense fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, What Would War With Iran Look Like, National Interest, July/August 2011,

http://www.the-american-interest.com/article-bd.cfm?piece=982)

**In general, the more expansive a war’s goals as a plan escalates from strike to campaign to broad offensive, the greater the force needed to achieve those goals, the greater the uncertainty in achieving them, and the greater the consequences of both success and failure. Moreover,** a war’s goals at the outset of conflict may not remain stable. Early sudden successes or unanticipated failures can lead to the escalation of initially limited goals**, particularly if terminating hostilities proves difficult.** Lateral expansion **as well** as escalation is **also** possible: Iranian leaders might surrender **or agree to a truce** but be unable to enforce **a similar decision on** Hezbollah **leaders or terror agents around the world. This leads to yet another layer of complexity and uncertainty: Whose war would this be?**

**Alliances draw in outside powers.**

**White 11** (Jeffrey – defense fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, What Would War With Iran Look Like, National Interest, July/August 2011,

http://www.the-american-interest.com/article-bd.cfm?piece=982)

A U.S.-Iranian war would **probably** not be fought by the U**nited** S**tates** 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 U**nited** S**tates** 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 allie**s (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** attack**ing** 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.**

**Iranian doctrine ensures escelation.**

**White 11** (Jeffrey – defense fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, What Would War With Iran Look Like, National Interest, July/August 2011,

http://www.the-american-interest.com/article-bd.cfm?piece=982)

If Iran’s advantage lies in broadening and widening a conflict once begun, how might we expect its leaders to go about it? At least three types of escalation are open to Tehran: horizontal, vertical and domain. Horizontal escalation involves the spread of hostilities from beyond the immediate area of conflict to additional geographic areas and political actors.13 Iran’s means and methods, as discussed above, give it the ability to escalate horizontally within the Middle East region and beyond to include Europe and the United States. Vertical escalation involves the employment of new or increasingly potent weapons systems, attacking new types of targets, or introducing additional types of forces into the conflict.14 What begins as essentially a fight between U.S. and allied air and naval strike assets and Iranian air defense assets could be quickly expanded by Iran to the use of offensive missile systems and naval surface and sub-surface forces in retaliation. Iranian escalation to the employment of WMD (if a war occurred after an Iranian breakout) seems unlikely short of an imminent threat to the regime, but that threat would be hanging in the air as fighting escalated. Domain escalation refers to the expansion of the conflict from the purely military domain to the diplomatic, economic and social domains, in which Iran has some advantages. In summary, an attack on Iran could produce dynamics that would push either or both sides to escalate the conflict even if neither had an interest or an initial intention to do so. Iranian civilian casualties, for example, could provoke Iran to step up its response. This becomes more likely as the scale of a U.S. attack increases. Downed U.S. aircrews could lead to search and rescue operations that could become significant military actions in their own right. The need to restrike targets that were missed or inadequately damaged could also prolong the conflict and involve additional forces. As the conflict developed, internal and external political pressures could press both antagonists to escalate the fighting.

**Strikes bad.**

**Striking Iran fails - success is impossible, it destroys US influence, spurs hard-line elements, and causes war.**

**Kaye 11** (Dalia Dassa, Visiting Professor and Fellow -- UCLA's International Institute and Burkle Center for International Relations, “Why bombing Iran is still a bad idea,” http://mideast.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/10/21/why\_bombing\_iran\_is\_still\_a\_bad\_idea)

First, the operational challenges of a military attack remain daunting. Iran's nuclear facilities are widely dispersed and deeply buried and so difficult, if not impossible, to eliminate. An Israeli attack would be even more challenging, though not impossible, due to long distances to Iranian targets and over flight challenges. Second, and more significantly, the aftermath of an attack could be devastating militarily and politically. It could unleash a wave of Iranian retaliation against U.S. forces, allies, and interests. Iran maintains a wide array of levers across the region, including militia groups it has trained and funded, that it could employ to retaliate against U.S. forces or diplomatic personnel, particularly in countries like Iraq. Iranian missiles have ranges that can reach Israel and all its Gulf Arab neighbors, including those hosting U.S. military forces. Such an attack could also backfire by fomenting nationalist sentiment within Iran (particularly if large numbers of civilians are killed) and boost support for more hard-line elements within the regime that current policies are attempting to marginalize. It could also increase Iranian incentives to obtain nuclear weapons to avoid such attacks in the future, while undermining painstaking U.S. efforts to bolster international and regional support for economic and diplomatic pressure against Iran. In short, there are serious risks associated with this option with little potential to actually solve the problem, and possibly making it harder to solve in the future. A military strike would be particularly damaging in a post Arab spring environment, in which public opinion is already hostile toward U.S. policies. Even if Arab governments may quietly welcome forceful U.S. actions, Arab publics are far more sympathetic to Iran's anti-Western positions. Despite Iran's waning regional influence as Arab revolts and Turkish activism have decreased its relevance in the resistance narrative, Arab publics would likely rally behind Iran in the face of an attack. Additionally, they could constrain their governments' ability to support US-backed efforts to isolate Iran. Some may view the assassination plot as an opportunity to bring the military option back to the table, believing that only a forceful response to Iran's actions will prevent the country from striking again. However this type of response would be a strategic mistake. A military attack would isolate the United States rather than Iran, further weakening U.S. influence regionally and globally while giving an increasingly isolated and vulnerable Iran a second chance.

**Iran Proliferation.**

**Iran uses nuclear capabilities for deterrence.**

**Waltz 12** (Kenneth, Member of the faculty at the University of California, Berkeley and Columbia University, scholar of international relations, “Why Iran Should Get the Bomb Nuclear Balancing Would Mean Stability” July/August 2012 http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137731/kenneth-n-waltz/why-iran-should-get-the-bomb)

**One reason the danger of a nuclear Iran has been grossly exaggerated is that the debate surrounding it has been distorted by misplaced worries and fundamental misunderstandings of how states generally behave in the international system. The first prominent concern, which undergirds many others, is that the Iranian regime is innately irrational. Despite a widespread belief to the contrary,** Iranian policy is made not by "mad mullahs" but by perfectly sane ayatollahs who want to survive just like any other leaders. Although Iran's leaders indulge in inflammatory and hateful rhetoric, they show no propensity for self-destruction. **It would be a grave error for policymakers in the United States and Israel to assume otherwise. Yet that is precisely what many U.S. and Israeli officials and analysts have done. Portraying Iran as irrational has allowed them to argue that the logic of nuclear deterrence does not apply to the Islamic Republic. If Iran acquired a nuclear weapon, they warn, it would not hesitate to use it in a first strike against Israel, even though doing so would invite massive retaliation and risk destroying everything the Iranian regime holds dear**. Although it is impossible to be certain of Iranian intentions, it is far more likely that if Iran desires nuclear weapons, it is for the purpose of providing for its own security, not to improve its offensive capabilities **(or destroy itself). Iran may be intransigent at the negotiating table and defiant in the face of sanctions, but it still acts to secure its own preservation.** Iran's leaders did not, for example, attempt to close the Strait of Hormuz despite issuing blustery warnings that they might do so after the EU announced its planned oil embargo in January. The Iranian regime clearly concluded that it did not want to provoke what would surely have been a swift and devastating American response to such a move. **Nevertheless, even some observers and policymakers who accept that the Iranian regime is rational still worry that a nuclear weapon would embolden it, providing Tehran with a shield that would allow it to act more aggressively and increase its support for terrorism. Some analysts even fear that Iran would directly provide terrorists with nuclear arms. The problem with these concerns is that they contradict the record of every other nuclear weapons state going back to 1945. History shows that when countries acquire the bomb, they feel increasingly vulnerable and become acutely aware that their nuclear weapons make them a potential target in the eyes of major powers. This awareness discourages nuclear states from bold and aggressive action. Maoist China, for example, became much less bellicose after acquiring nuclear weapons in 1964, and India and Pakistan have both become more cautious since going nuclear. There is little reason to believe Iran would break this mold.**

**2AC—States CP**

**Obama leadership is critical.**

**Boyer 8** [[Peter J. Boyer](http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/bios/peter_j_boyer/search?contributorName=peter%20j%20boyer) “The Appalachian Problem” The New Yorker, October 6, 2008, pg. http://tinyurl.com/3qy524

Virginia Democrats knew, however, that, impressive as Obama’s primary victory was, the most notable result from that day’s voting might have come in the only district he lost—the Virginia ninth, which includes Lebanon. The rout there—by thirty-two points—had troubling implications for Obama’s chances in Virginia as a whole, and beyond. The southwestern region, rising from the Roanoke Valley up to the Appalachian Plateau, is a place of small farms, coal mines, and chronic economic hard times. It was settled in the eighteenth century by Scots-Irish Calvinists who fled Anglican-dominated Ulster and, eventually, came to that portion of Virginia which the planter aristocracy didn’t want. Their descendants live in small hill towns that are nearer, in mileage and in spirit, to the old factory town of Ironton, Ohio, than to the glass office towers of northern Virginia. Three weeks after the Virginia primary, the mostly white, working-class voters of southern Ohio, a significant portion of them of Scots-Irish descent, helped deliver that state to Hillary Clinton. In the next weeks, their kin did the same in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Indiana, and Kentucky. It became clear that if Obama hoped to win in November he would probably have to overcome his Appalachia problem.

In May, Tim Kaine, Obama’s national co-chairman, wrote a memorandum to the candidate, urging him not to write off southwestern Virginia; if the region votes against Obama in the general election by the same margins it did in the Democratic primary, John McCain will almost certainly win the state. “I said, first, don’t assume that Hillary Clinton really racking up a margin there means that you’re just not going to do well,” Kaine told me recently. Kaine explained to Obama that the hill people were skeptics, but could be convinced. “Presence really matters,” Kaine says he told Obama. “They’re not used to seeing somebody come by and ask for their vote in a Presidential campaign. And my thought was, If you go, and show ’em that you’re really interested, and they get a chance to see you more up close and personal than in a TV ad, a little bit of presence might go a long way in that part of the state.”

**Does not solve sustainability – states will recruit large corporations.**

**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 "sutainable development" and locally led economic strategies, though it remains inconsistent and generally inadequate throughout the region.

**2AC—Politics DA**

**Won’t pass – partisanship.**

**Reasoner 1/4** retired government employee with many years of experience in immigration administration, law enforcement, and national security matters [W.D. Reasoner, 'Immigration Reform' – Coming Soon to a Congress Near You!, <http://cis.org/reasoner/immigration-reform-coming-soon-congress-near-you>]

Those bright, sunny days immediately following reelection of the president seem to be facing the possibility of scattered showers, possibly thunderstorms, where "comprehensive immigration reform" (CIR) is concerned – so, at least, hints the Los Angeles Times in an article published last weekend.

This is in stark contrast with a story published a scant couple of weeks previously by the same newspaper, which began confidently, "As soon as the confrontation over fiscal policy winds down, the Obama administration will begin an all-out drive for comprehensive immigration reform, including seeking a path to citizenship for 11 million illegal immigrants, according to officials briefed on the plans."

What's changed?

Weeks of partisan wrangling over a deal to avoid leaping over the fiscal cliff, which remains unfinished business because, in the end, they passed a stopgap measure which didn't address government spending levels;

Another fight likely in the immediate future as the federal government once again hits its debt limit; and

Divisive battles over the size and shape of new gun control legislation (if any).

Nonetheless, advocates for CIR (their euphemism for amnesty) **are steadfastly denying that any change may be in the wind,** choosing instead to show a confident face to the world: "'They are not in competition; they are complementary,' said Angela Kelley, an expert on immigration at the Center for American Progress, a liberal think tank in Washington [referring to gun control and immigration legislation]. 'The White House can walk and chew gum, as can lawmakers.'"

How curious. Since when are gun control and amnesty for illegal aliens complementary? If I were a conspiracy theorist, I might think there were a "vast left-wing conspiracy" afoot.

But going back to the walking-and-chewing gum analogy: I'm not so sure about that, and neither apparently is a majority of the American public. As recently as November 26, 2012, the Gallup organization published the results of a poll showing congressional approval ratings at a paltry 18 percent.

**And there is hefty reason for the skepticism**. Our political leaders led us, lemming-like, to the edge of the fiscal cliff - which was of their making - and have repeatedly addressed the debt ceiling by short-term temporary measures because they seem to be incapable of arriving at any long-term, strategic solutions. I not only doubt that they can walk and chew gum, at this point there's a legitimate question as to whether they can tie their own shoes.

This Congress taking on massive immigration reform bill will have the same effect on the body politic as a python after it's tried to eat the whole pig on one sitting - **lethargy, inaction, and, quite possibly, terminal paralysis** from having swallowed more, much more, that it can digest.

So ask yourself: Do you really trust either Congress or the administration to handle anything as complex and nuanced as a comprehensive immigration reform bill in an intelligent and meaningful way? Do you? I know my answer to that.

**Strong bipartisan support for 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.

**No Republican opposition.**

**Kotkin 12** [[Joel Kotkin](http://blogs.forbes.com/joelkotkin/), “The Republican Party's Fatal Attraction To Rural America,” Forbes, 3/14/2012 @ 2:12PM , pg. http://tinyurl.com/b2rxb5l

Rick Santorum’s big wins in Alabama and Mississippi places the Republican Party in ever greater danger of becoming hostage to what has become its predominate geographic base: rural and small town America. This base, not so much conservatives per se, has kept Santorum’s unlikely campaign alive, from his early win in Iowa to triumphs in predominately rural and small-town dominated Kansas, Mississippi, North Dakota and Oklahoma. The small towns and rural communities of states such as Michigan and Ohio also sheltered the former Pennsylvania senator from total wipeouts in races he would otherwise have lost in a blowout.

If America was an exclusively urban or metropolitan country, Mitt Romney would be already ensconced as the GOP nominee and perhaps on his way towards a real shot at the White House. In virtually every major urban region — which means predominately suburbs — Romney has generally won easily. [Mike Barone](http://campaign2012.washingtonexaminer.com/blogs/beltway-confidential/romney-appeal-affluent-suburbs-could-change-map/400536), arguably America’s most knowledgeable political analyst, observes that the cool, collected, educated Mitt does very well in affluent suburbs, confronting President Obama with a serious challenge in one of his electoral sweet spots.

Outside the Mormon belt from Arizona to Wyoming, however, sophisticated Mitt has been a consistent loser in the countryside. This divergence between rural and suburban/metro America, poses a fundamental challenge to the modern Republican Party. Rural America constitutes barely 16 percent of the country, down from 72 percent a century ago, but still constitutes the party’s most reliable geographic base. It resembles the small-town America of the 19th century, particularly in the South and West, that propelled Democratic Party of Nebraska’s William Jennings Bryan to three presidential nominations.

Yet like Bryan, who also lost all three times, what makes Santorum so appealing in the hinterlands may prove disastrous in the metropolitan regions which now dominate the country. Much of this is not so much particular positions beyond abortion, gay rights, women’s issues, now de rigueur in the GOP, but a kind of generalized sanctimoniousness that does not play well with the national electorate.

We can see this in the extraordinary difference in the religiosity between more rural states, particularly in the South, and the rest of country. Roughly half of all Protestants in Mississippi, Alabama and Oklahoma, according to the [Pew Center on Religion and Public Life,](http://religions.pewforum.org/) are evangelicals, not including historically black churches. In contrast, evangelicals make up a quarter or less of Protestants nationally and less still in key upcoming primary states such as Pennsylvania, [New York](http://www.forbes.com/places/ny/new-york/), California and Connecticut, where the percentages average closer to 10 percent.

Let me be clear: Urbanity is not the key issue here. Cities have become so lock-step Democratic as to be essentially irrelevant to the Republican Party. Instead it’s the suburbs — [home to a record 51 percent of the population](http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/smart-takes/rural-us-population-lowest-in-history-demographers-say/17982) and growing overall more than [10 times as fast as urban areas](http://www.ruralhome.org/storage/research_notes/rural_research_note_population_change.pdf) — that matter the most. Much of the recent suburban growth has taken place in exurbs, where many formerly rural counties have been swallowed, essentially metropolitanizing the countryside.

What accounts for the divergence between the suburban areas and rural areas? A lot may turn on culture. Small towns and villages may be far from the isolated “idiocy of rural life” that Marx referred to, but rural areas still remain someone more isolated and still somewhat less “wired” in terms of broadband use than the rest of the country.

Despite the popularity of country music, rural residents do not have much influence on mainstream culture. Most Hollywood executives and many in New York still commute from leafy ‘burbs. Few of our cultural shapers and pundits actually live predominately in the countryside, even if they spend time in bucolic retreats such as Napa, Aspen or Jackson Hole.

Until the recent commodity boom, much of rural America was suffering. And even today, poverty tends to be higher overall in rural areas than in urban and especially suburban countries. Some areas, notably in North Dakota and much of the Plains, are doing very well, but rural poverty remains entrenched in a belt from Appalachia and the deep South to parts of west Texas, New Mexico and California’s Central Valley.

Rural areas generally do not have strong ties to the high-tech economy now leading much of metro growth. This remains a largely suburban phenomenon, urban only if you allow core cities to include their hinterlands. All the nation’s strongest tech clusters — Silicon Valley, Route 128, [Austin](http://www.forbes.com/places/tx/austin/), north [Dallas](http://www.forbes.com/places/tx/dallas/), Redmond/Bellevue in [Washington](http://www.forbes.com/places/dc/washington/), [Raleigh](http://www.forbes.com/places/nc/raleigh/)-Durham — are primarily suburban in form. High tech tends to nurture a consciousness among conservatives more libertarian than socially conservative and populist. Not surprisingly, libertarian Ron Paul often does best in these areas and among younger Republican voters.

Another key difference: a lack of ethnic diversity. There are now many Hispanics living in rural areas, but they are largely not citizens and most are recent arrivals, attracted by jobs in the oil fields, slaughterhouses and farms. Many small towns, unlike suburbs, remain more homogeneous than suburbs, emerging as the most heterogeneous of all American geographies. Ethnic cultural cross-pollination occurs regularly in metropolitan suburbs; this is not so common in rural America.

Equally important, environmental issues spin differently in rural areas than in suburbs. Energy development and agriculture drive many rural economies. In some areas, like Ohio and western Pennsylvania, shale oil and gas is bringing long moribund regions back to life. In the Dakotas, parts of Louisiana, Texas and Wyoming, it is ushering in a potentially long-term boom. In contrast, there aren’t many oil and gas wells located next to malls and big housing tracks.

This does not mean that suburban voters share the anti-fossil fuel green faith of the urban core. But for them “drill baby drill” represents more a matter of price at the pump than a life and death issue for the local economy. Suburbanites feel the energy issue, but do not live it the way more rural communities do. One of the great ironies of American life is that those who live closest to nature are often less ideologically “green” than those, particularly urbanites, residing in an environment of concrete, glass and steel.

Rural America, of course, is changing, with many areas, particularly in the Plains, getting richer and better educated. These areas are growing faster than the national average and attracting immigrants from abroad and people from other U.S. regions. Yet the influence of newcomers, new wealth and new technology is still nascent. The political pace in rural America today still is being set by an aging, overwhelmingly white and modestly educated demographic.

Until the Republican nomination fight is settled, the party’s pandering to the sensibilities of such conservatives in rural areas could prove fatal to its long-term prospects. A Santorum nomination almost guarantees a replay of the Bryan phenomena; no matter how many times he runs, he will prove unlikely to win, even against a vulnerable opponent. Even in losing, his preachy, divisive tone — on contraception, prayer, the separation of church and state — has opened a gap among suburban voters that Obama will no doubt exploit.

**Now thumpers –**

**-Energy.**

**Weber 1/1** Fox News Analyst [Joseph Weber, Guns, immigration, fiscal issues emerge as top priorities for Obama, new Congress, http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/01/01/gun-control-immigration-reform-fiscal-issues-emerge-as-top-issues-for-new/]

The president on Sunday said energy issues are also on his high-priority list, specifically how the country can produce more energy in environmentally conscious ways, and mentioned 15 times in an interview with NBC News the need for further deficit reduction.

Congressional leaders appeared reluctant over the lame duck session to say what will be their top priorities.

A spokesman for House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, whose office plays a major role in setting the agenda, said lawmakers were focused on solving the fiscal crisis.

**-Wind PTC**

**Daily Caller 1/1** [‘Fiscal cliff’ deal includes one-year extension for wind tax credits, <http://dailycaller.com/2013/01/01/fiscal-cliff-deal-includes-one-year-extension-for-wind-tax-credits/>]

According to the Congressional Budget Office, extensions of energy tax benefits will cost more than $10.3 billion over five years and more than $18.1 billion over ten years. The Joint Committee on Taxation reported that a one-year extension of the wind PTC alone would cost $12.1 billion.

The federal wind Production Tax Credit was implemented in 1992 to get the wind industry on its feet, and has since been renewed seven times. The tax credit extension divided Republicans on Capitol Hill.

In September, forty-seven House Republicans sent a letter in September to House Speaker John Boehner urging him to allow the wind PTC to expire.

“We believe that the Solyndra scandal has demonstrated that it is time for the federal government to stop picking winners and losers in the energy marketplace,” the letter said. “Twenty years of subsidizing wind is more than enough.”

**-Budget fights.**

**LA Times 12/31** Obama wins 'fiscal cliff' victory, but at high cost, [http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-fiscal-cliff-analysis-20130101,0,6417926.story?fb\_ref=fb\_widget](http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-fiscal-cliff-analysis-20130101%2C0%2C6417926.story?fb_ref=fb_widget)

The announcement Monday night of Senate agreement on a compromise to avert part of the "fiscal cliff" meant that for the first time in two decades, Republicans in Congress were preparing to vote in favor of a bill that raised taxes, an extraordinary concession to the nation's fiscal woes and the president's reelection.

But Obama's victory fell short of what he had campaigned for, and came at a high cost. Even if the House later Tuesday or Wednesday musters the votes to approve the bill that the Senate was to vote on in the wee hours of Tuesday morning, the terms of this compromise guarantee another pitched battle over spending and taxes within months.

Whether the agreement announced Monday evening turns out to be truly a victory for Obama or a lost opportunity, as many of his liberal critics feared, will depend heavily on how that next battle turns out.

The agreement to freeze income tax rates for most Americans while allowing them to rise for the wealthiest dealt only with the most pressing elements of the fiscal storm Congress and the president created last year. A newly elected Congress will begin work in a few days and **immediately will need to start negotiating yet another deal.** That next fight will be aimed at further reducing the long-term deficit and raising the debt ceiling before the government runs out of money to pay its bills — a deadline that will hit sometime in late February or March.

The persistent battle over spending, which already has consumed Washington for two years, threatens to block Obama's other major legislative priorities, including immigration reform and gun control.

**-Gun control.**

**Nye 12/31** [JAMES NYE and MIKE JACCARINO, Daily Mail, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2254868/Obama-Gun-control-President-opens-Meet-Press-Newtown-massacre.html?ito=feeds-newsxml]

Obama book ended his revelation with **vows to put his 'full weight' behind the push for new gun control legislation** aimed at avoiding another massacre of the like that robbed 20 first graders' - and six adults - of the their lives at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut on Dec. 14.

'It is not enough for us to say, 'This is too hard so we're not going to try,' Obama said. 'So what I intend to do is I will call all the stakeholders together. I will meet with Republicans. I will meet with Democrats. I will talk to anybody.'

When Gregory expressed skepticism he could galvanize Americans on the the issue of gun control, Obama referenced an iconic Oval Office predecessor who also confronted entrenched and accepted traditions that many felt had to change in the interest of the public good.

'This is not going to be simply a matter of me spending political capital,' Obama said. 'One of the things you learn, having now been in this office for four years, is the old adage of Abraham Lincoln's. That with public opinion there's nothing you can't do and without public opinion there's very little you can get done in this town.

'So I'm going to be putting forward a package and I'm going to be putting my full weight behind it. And I'm going to be making an argument to the American people about why this is important and why we have to do everything we can to make sure that something like what happened at Sandy Hook Elementary does not happen again.'

Obama's comments come as the schoolroom shooting has elevated the issue of gun violence to the forefront of public attention.

Authorities say the shooter, Adam Lanza, killed himself and also killed his mother at their home.

The slayings have prompted renewed calls for greater gun controls. The National Rifle Association has resisted those efforts vociferously, arguing instead that schools should have armed guards for protection.

'I am skeptical that the only answer is putting more guns in schools,' Obama said. 'And I think the vast majority of the American people are skeptical that that somehow is going to solve our problem.'

Obama said he intended to press the issue with the public.

**'Will there be resistance? Absolutely there will be resistance,**' he said.

**No PC.**

**Gillespie 1/2** Editor in chief of Reason.com and Reason TV [Nick Gillespie, Fiscal Cliff Deal Raises Taxes, Delays Sequestration...And Will Cut Spending!, <http://reason.com/blog/2013/01/02/fiscal-cliff-deal-raises-taxes-delays-se>]

Obama got his bump up during his first year or so in office. Part of it was due to George W. Bush greasing the skids by bailing out the big banks and GM and Chrysler, part of it due to Obama's decisive win over John McCain. But even his re-election **hasn't given him political capital** to spend after a first term spent pushing through a still-unpopular health-care plan that's gonna be a total bear to implement over the next couple of years. And **everyone knows he's got no second-term agenda** (if he had, we would have heard about it sometime during last year's campaign, wouldn't we have?).

Anything can happen of course.

**Nothing in the bill yet.**

**CF News 1/6** Central Florida News [Will 113th Congress increase chance for immigration reform?, <http://www.cfnews13.com/content/news/cfnews13/news/article.html/content/news/articles/cfn/2013/1/6/will_113th_congress_.html>]

President Barack Obama has vowed that immigration reform will be a top priority for his administration this year and may get some help.

The 113th Congress is made up of the largest class of Latino members ever.

But, the big question is, just **what is likely to be part of the overhaul?**

"You're at the center of this nation's future," said Vice President Joe Biden at a ceremony to welcome the largest number of Latinos in Congress ever.

It’s a critical mass that could help efforts to pass sweeping changes to the immigration system.

It's a top priority for the president, who won more than 70 percent of the Hispanic vote in November.

After the election, House Speaker John Boehner signaled Republicans could support comprehensive action on immigration.

"I'm not talking about 3,000 page bill,” Boehner said. “I'm talking about a common sense step-by-step approach that will secure our borders, allow us to enforce the laws and fix a broken immigration system."

Democratic Congressman Luis Gutierrez leads the immigration task force for the Hispanic caucus.

"When you deal with the fiscal cliff, this is where the Congress is at -- far apart. Guns -- far apart. On immigration, much closer. Have we all signed on the dotted line, no. No there's a lot of work to be done. But the commitment is there to getting the work done," Gutierrez said.

So what might comprehensive legislation look like?

The president said it should include measures to beef up border security, punish companies that purposely hire undocumented workers and give the roughly 11 million undocumented immigrants here a way to obtain legal status.

Groups that want to restrict immigration are skeptical.

"The president himself has said he doesn't think these laws are enforceable,” Dan Stein said. “How on Earth is Congress ever going to be convinced to pass a package of the kind he's talking about, when no guarantees can be made to the general public that the laws will be respected."

They are doubts that could signal a long road ahead for this legislative push.

"Right now, what's interesting on immigration is everyone is talking the talk and that includes Democrats and Republicans,” said John Gramlich. “But again, there's a big difference between talking the talk and walking the walk on policy."

**One of the big issues surrounding immigration reform is just how to do it**.

Democrats want it to be addressed in one big bill and Republicans are pushing for several smaller ones, because the issue is so complex.

**Winners win.**

**Hunter 10** [Daily Kos Contributing Editor, *Political death by a thousand cuts*, http://www.dailykos.com/storyonly/2010/11/17/921164/-Political-death-by-a-thousand-cuts]

It may be a petty, minor thing, but this is getting to the point where Obama is looking weak in many, many separate situations, and it's becoming a car wreck for the White House. Having him doing public post-election soul searching; having him give repeated noises in the press about preemptively caving on whatever it is the GOP might be asking for: it's a messaging/political disaster. He took a stout midterm loss and turned it into his own midterm disaster. At some point someone in this White House has to start figuring out that, screw actual policy, they're getting their asses kicked purely on the PR front, and Obama's not going to get reelected if he looks like a quivering pushover. We know from the healthcare fiasco that there's a bunch of folks in this White House who care more about protecting Obama's image than actually getting useful stuff done: well, image-hoarders, now might be the perfect time to pay attention to what the nice news channels are telling you. Instead, this is rapidly becoming another perfect example of being so miserly with your "limited" political capital that you end up losing all of it. Obama is keeping his powder so dry that he's losing battles without firing a shot. Long story short, if McConnell or Boehner can't find time to meet at the president's convenience, Obama should just call off the meeting and be done with it. When you're President of the United States you shouldn't be losing pissant little power plays.

Famine doesn’t cause war ---- it makes people too hungry to fight

Barnett in ’00 (Jon, Australian Research Council fellow and Senior Lecturer in Development Studies @ Melbourne U. School of Social and Environmental Enquiry, Review of International Studies, “Destabilizing the environment-conflict Thesis”, 26:271-288, Cambridge Journals Online)

Considerable attention has been paid to the links between population, the environment and conflict. The standard argument is that population growth will overextend the natural resources of the immediate environs, leading to deprivation which, it is assumed, will lead to conflict and instability either directly through competition for scarce resources, or indirectly through the generation of ‘environmental refugees’. For example, according to Myers: ‘so great are the stresses generated by too many people making too many demands on their natural-resource stocks and their institutional support systems, that the pressures often create first-rate breeding grounds for conflict’.37 The ways in which population growth leads to environmental degradation are reasonably well known. However, the particular ways in which this leads to conflict are difficult to prove. In the absence of proof there is a negative style of argumentation, and there are blanket assertions and abrogations; for example: ‘the relationship is rarely causative in a direct fashion’, but ‘we may surmise that conflict would not arise so readily, nor would it prove so acute, if the associated factor of population growth were occurring at a more manageable rate’.38 It is possible though, that rather than inducing warfare, overpopulation and famine reduce the capacity of a people to wage war. Indeed, it is less the case that famines in Africa in recent decades have produced ‘first rate breeding grounds for conflict’; the more important, pressing, and avoidable product is widespread malnutrition and large loss of life.

## \*\*\* 1AR

### In – Within the Limits

#### “In” indicates within a place or limits

**Random House Dictionary 2012**

1. (used to indicate inclusion within space, a place, or limits): walking in the park.

2. (used to indicate inclusion within something abstract or immaterial): in politics; in the autumn.

3. (used to indicate inclusion within or occurrence during a period or limit of time): in ancient times; a task done in ten minutes.

4. (used to indicate limitation or qualification, as of situation, condition, relation, manner, action, etc.): to speak in a whisper; to be similar in appearance.

5. (used to indicate means): sketched in ink; spoken in French.

6. (used to indicate motion or direction from outside to a point within) into: Let's go in the house.

7. (used to indicate transition from one state to another): to break in half.

8. (used to indicate object or purpose): speaking in honor of the event.

#### “In” indicates a position within the limits or boundaries

**Merriam-Webster Dictionary 2012** (http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/in)

1 a —used as a function word to indicate inclusion, location, or position within limits <in the lake> <wounded in the leg> <in the summer>

b : into 1 <went in the house>

### AT: Strikes prevent nuclearization

#### Strikes will delay their acquisition time by only a couple of years

Kahl 12—Professor of Security Studies at Georgetown University [Colin H. Kahl (Former US Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East), “Not Time to Attack Iran: Why War Should Be a Last Resort,” Foreign Affairs, March/April 2012, pg. http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137031/colin-h-kahl/not-time-to-attack-iran]

Even if a U.S. strike went as well as Kroenig predicts, there is little guarantee that it would produce lasting results. Senior U.S. defense officials have repeatedly stated that an attack on Iran's nuclear facilities would stall Tehran's progress for only a few years. Kroenig argues that such a delay could become permanent. "Those countries whose nuclear facilities have been attacked -- most recently Iraq and Syria," he writes, "have proved unwilling or unable to restart their programs." In the case of Iraq, however, Saddam Hussein restarted his clandestine nuclear weapons program after the 1981 Israeli attack on the Osirak nuclear reactor, and it required the Gulf War and another decade of sanctions and intrusive inspections to eliminate it. Iran's program is also more advanced and dispersed than were Iraq's and Syria's, meaning it would be **easier to reconstitute**. A U.S. strike would damage key Iranian facilities, but it would **do nothing to reverse the nuclear knowledge Iran has accumulated or its ability to eventually build new centrifuges**.

### AT: Close to the bomb

#### Khamenei has not made a final decision.

Kahl 12—Professor of Security Studies at Georgetown University [Colin H. Kahl (Former US Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East), “Not Time to Attack Iran: Why War Should Be a Last Resort,” Foreign Affairs, March/April 2012, pg. http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137031/colin-h-kahl/not-time-to-attack-iran]

Kroenig argues that there is an urgent need to attack Iran's nuclear infrastructure soon, since Tehran could "produce its first nuclear weapon within six months of deciding to do so." Yet that last phrase is crucial. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has documented Iranian efforts to achieve the capacity to develop nuclear weapons at some point, but there is no hard evidence that Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei has yet made the final decision to develop them.

#### Years away from Iran having a testable bomb

Kahl 12—Professor of Security Studies at Georgetown University [Colin H. Kahl (Former US Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East), “Not Time to Attack Iran: Why War Should Be a Last Resort,” Foreign Affairs, March/April 2012, pg. http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137031/colin-h-kahl/not-time-to-attack-iran]

In arguing for a six-month horizon, Kroenig also misleadingly conflates hypothetical timelines to produce weapons-grade uranium with the time actually required to construct a bomb. According to 2010 Senate testimony by James Cartwright, then vice chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, and recent statements by the former heads of Israel's national intelligence and defense intelligence agencies, even if Iran could produce enough weapons-grade uranium for a bomb in six months, **it would take it at least a year to produce a testable nuclear device and considerably longer to make a deliverable weapon**. And David Albright, president of the Institute for Science and International Security (and **the source of Kroenig's six-month estimate**), recently told Agence France-Presse that there is **a "low probability"** that the Iranians would actually develop a bomb over the next year even if they had the capability to do so. Because there is no evidence that Iran has built additional covert enrichment plants since the Natanz and Qom sites were outed in 2002 and 2009, respectively, any near-term move by Tehran to produce weapons-grade uranium would have to rely on its declared facilities. The IAEA would thus detect such activity with sufficient time for the international community to mount a forceful response. As a result, the Iranians are **unlikely to commit to building nuclear weapons** until they can do so much more quickly or out of sight, which could be years off.

### Turns ME war

#### The conflict will quickly escalate to involve Syria, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia and the UAE

Kahl 12—Professor of Security Studies at Georgetown University [Colin H. Kahl (Former US Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East), “Not Time to Attack Iran: Why War Should Be a Last Resort,” Foreign Affairs, March/April 2012, pg. http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137031/colin-h-kahl/not-time-to-attack-iran]

Keeping other states in the region out of the fight would also prove more difficult than Kroenig suggests. Iran would presume Israeli complicity in a U.S. raid and would **seek to drag Israel into the conflict** in order to undermine potential support for the U.S. war effort among key Arab regimes. And although it is true, as Kroenig notes, that Israel remained on the sidelines during the 1990-91 Gulf War, **the threat posed by Iran's missiles and proxies today is considerably greater than that posed by Iraq two decades ago**. If Iranian-allied Hezbollah responded to the fighting by firing rockets at Israeli cities, Israel could launch an all-out war against Lebanon. Syria///

n President Bashar al-Assad might also try to use the moment to divert attention from the uprising in his country, launching his own assault on the Jewish state. Either scenario, or their combination, could lead to a wider war in the Levant.

Even in the Gulf, where U.S. partners are sometimes portrayed as passive, Iranian retaliation might draw Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates into the conflict. The Saudis have taken a much more confrontational posture toward Iran in the past year, and Riyadh is unlikely to tolerate Iranian attacks against critical energy infrastructure. For its part, the UAE, the most hawkish state in the Gulf, might respond to missiles raining down on U.S. forces at its Al Dhafra Air Base by attempting to seize Abu Musa, Greater Tunb, and Lesser Tunb, three disputed Gulf islands currently occupied by Iran.

### 1NC—Econ Decline Doesn’t Cause War

#### 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)."