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**2AC—Topicality**

**We meet --- the plan trades off within the REAP budget.**

**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.

**C/I – loans, grants, tax incentives, rebates, and production incentives.**

**Schoofs 4** (Sam, Calvin College, Washington Internships for Students of Engineering Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers, 6 August 2004 A federal Renewable Portfolio Standard: Policy Analysis and Proposal, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2004/WISE2004-SamSchoofsFinalPaper.pdf, accessed 9-20-12, CMM)

D. Renewable Energy Policy Overview¶ There are two main categories of renewable energy policies. The first category gives some financial incentives to encourage renewable energy that includes tax incentives, grants, loans, rebates, and production incentives [13]. Tax incentives cover personal, sales, property, and corporate taxes and they help to reduce the investment costs and to reward investors for their support of renewable energy sources [12], [13]. As an example, 24 states currently have some form of grant program in place that ranges from as small as $500 up to $1,000,000 [13]. ¶ The second category of renewable energy policies is called rules and regulations, which mandate a certain action from an obligated entity. Included within this category are renewable portfolio standards, equipment certification, solar/wind access laws, and green power purchasing/aggregation polices [13]. As an example, equipment certification allows the states to regulate the performance criteria that equipment is required to meet in order to be eligible.

**Substantial means to a large degree**

**W&P 2** (Words and Phrases Permanent Edition, “Substantially,” Volume 40B, p. 324-330 October 2002, Thomson West)

N.D.Ill. 2002. Under ADA, “substantially” in phrase substantially limits, means considerable, or to a large degree.

**2AC—Sus Adv**

**Nothing outweighs.**

**Farrell 09** [[Paul B. Farrell](http://www.marketwatch.com/Search?m=Column&mp=Paul%20B.%20Farrell&pmrkt=true), The coming Population Wars: a 12-bomb equation,” Market Watch, September 29, 2009|pg. http://tinyurl.com/cwzxdld

ARROYO GRANDE, Calif. (MarketWatch) -- So what's the biggest time-bomb for Obama, America, capitalism, the world? No, not global warming. Not poverty. Not even peak oil. What is the absolute biggest, one like the trigger mechanism on a nuclear bomb, one that'll throw a wrench in global economic growth, ending capitalism, even destroying modern civilization?

The one that -- if not solved soon -- renders all efforts to solve all the other problems in the world, irrelevant, futile and virtually impossible?

News flash: the "Billionaires Club" knows: Bill Gates called billionaire philanthropists to a super-secret meeting in Manhattan last May. Included: Buffett, Rockefeller, Soros, Bloomberg, Turner, Oprah and others meeting at the "home of Sir Paul Nurse, a British Nobel prize biochemist and president of the private Rockefeller University, in Manhattan," reports John Harlow in the London TimesOnline. During an afternoon session each was "given 15 minutes to present their favorite cause. Over dinner they discussed how they might settle on an 'umbrella cause' that could harness their interests."

The world's biggest time-bomb? Overpopulation, say the billionaires.

And yet, global governments with their $50 trillion GDP, aren't even trying to solve the world's overpopulation problem. G-20 leaders ignore it. So by 2050 the Earth's population will explode by almost 50%, from 6.6 billion today to 9.3 billion says the United Nations.

And what about those billionaires and their billions? Can they stop the trend? Sadly no. Only a major crisis, a global catastrophe, a collapse beyond anything prior in world history will do it. Here's why:

Civilizations collapse fast, crises trigger, leaders clueless

"One of the disturbing facts of history is that so many civilizations collapse," warns Jared Diamond, an environmental biologist, Pulitzer prize winner and author of "Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed." Many "civilizations share a sharp curve of decline. Indeed, a society's demise may begin only a decade or two after it reaches its peak population, wealth and power."

Other voices are darker, shrill: "We're past the point of no return." "It's already too late." "The end is near." As with Rome's collapse, it happens fast. Clueless leaders are caught off-guard, like Greenspan, Bernanke and Paulson a couple years ago.

Call it "WWIII: The Population Wars." A few years ago Fortune analyzed a classified Pentagon report predicting that "climate could change radically and fast. That would be the mother of all national security issues" Population unrest would then create "massive droughts, turning farmland into dust bowls and forests to ashes." And "by 2020 there is little doubt that something drastic is happening ... an old pattern could emerge; warfare defining human life." War will be the end-game: For capitalism, civilization, earth?

**The status quo triggers massive bird deaths.**

**Sovacool 9** (Benjamin K., Assistant Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, part of the National University of Singapore. He is also a Research Fellow in the Energy Governance Program at the Centre on Asia and Globalization. He has worked in advisory and research capacities at the U.S. National Science Foundation’s Electric Power Networks Efficiency and Security Program, Virginia Tech Consortium on Energy Restructuring, Virginia Center for Coal and Energy Research, New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Semiconductor Materials and Equipment International, and U.S. Department of Energy’s Climate Change Technology Program. He is the co-editor with Marilyn A. Brown of Energy and American Society: Thirteen Myths (2007) and the author of The Dirty Energy Dilemma: What’s Blocking Clean Power in the United States (2008). He is also a frequent contributor to such journals as Electricity Journal, Energy & Environment, and Energy Policy, Contextualizing avian mortality: A preliminary appraisal of bird and bat fatalities from wind, fossil-fuel, and nuclear electricity, Energy Policy, Volume 37, Issue 6, June 2009, Pages 2241–2248)

5. Conclusions

The issue of avian mortality and electricity generation is certainly complex. Avian wildlife can perish by striking wind turbines, nuclear power plant cooling structures, transmission and distribution lines, and smokestacks at fossil fuel-fired power stations. Birds can starve to death in forests ravaged by acid rain, ingest hazardous and fatal doses of mercury, drink contaminated water at uranium mines and mills, or die in large numbers as climate change wreaks havoc on migration routes and degrades habitats. Power plants directly and indirectly kill many different types of species, different members of the same species, at different times and in different ways.

For wind turbines, the risk appears to be greatest to birds striking towers or turbine blades and for bats suffering barotrauma. For fossil-fueled power stations, the most significant fatalities come from climate change, which is altering weather patterns and destroying habitats that birds depend on. For nuclear power plants, the risk is almost equally spread across hazardous pollution at uranium mine sites and collisions with draft cooling structures. Yet, taken together, fossil-fueled facilities are about **17 times more dangerous to birds** on a per GWh basis than wind and nuclear power stations. In absolute terms, wind turbines may have killed about 7000 birds in 2006 but fossil-fueled stations killed **14.5 million** and nuclear power plants **327,000** (see Table 5 and Fig. 1).

Three conclusions, however, must be stated when observing the estimates provided by Table 5 and Fig. 1. First, far more detailed, rigorous, and sophisticated analysis is called for that takes into account the complexities of the wind, fossil-fueled, and nuclear energy fuel cycles. The shortcomings of this preliminary study are as obvious as they are numerous: a focus on bird deaths but not bird births8; a small sample size for wind, coal, and nuclear facilities that may not be representative; a focus on individual species such as the wood thrush or waterfowl to produce overall estimates of avian mortality that are definitely not representative (and undoubtedly conservative); a presumption that coal was only mined using mountaintop removal (thereby excluding the impacts from other types of coal mining); fatalities that happened on particular days and weeks that were then presumed to be the only ones throughout the year (also resulting in conservative estimates); an assumption that only carbon dioxide emissions from power plants contribute to climate change (again conservative for excluding other greenhouse gases); highly uncertain deaths attributed to climate change that may be prevented if future greenhouse gas emissions are significantly reduced.

While the rudimentary numbers presented here are intended to provoke further research and discussion, they nonetheless still emphasize the importance of providing estimates of avian mortality per unit of electricity generated. Metrics such as fatalities per turbine, transmission line, or power plant structure per year, as well as estimates of the absolute number of avian deaths attributed to agriculture, communication towers, cats, and automobiles, tell us nothing about the avian fatalities involved with producing a GWh of electricity. Such metrics do not enable meaningful comparison among electricity sources, and are open to abuse from many strong opponents and proponents of wind energy. More than anything else, this study is a call for equal and careful study and observation of the avian mortality associated with other electricity sources besides wind power so that the issue can be properly balanced and contextualized.

Second, while the avian deaths attributed to fossil fuel, wind, and nuclear power plants do vary, they also imply that there is no form of electricity supply completely benign to birds. The best strategy for preserving avian wildlife, therefore, would be to encourage the more efficient use of energy before any type of new power plant or wind farm is constructed.

Third, and perhaps more important, for it applies to many types of assessment beyond the electricity sector, is the lesson that the most visible impacts from a given technology are not always the most egregious. Wind turbines seem to present a significant threat to birds because all of their negative externalities are concentrated in one place, while those from conventional and nuclear fuel cycles are spread across space and time. Avian mortality and wind energy has consequently received far more attention and research than the avian deaths associated with coal, oil, natural gas, and nuclear power systems, even though this study suggests that wind energy may be the least harmful to birds. The first-order estimates of avian mortality per GWh offered here imply that fossil fuels may be more dangerous to avian wildlife (and nuclear power plants slightly more dangerous) than wind farms, and they remind us that what can sometimes be considered the most obvious consequence of a particular energy system may not always be the most meaningful or important.

**Wind power has no effect on bird populations.**

**Drewitta 8** (Allan L., Natural England, Peterborough, United Kingdom, Rowena H.W. Langstonb – Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Sandy, Bedfordshire, United Kingdom, Collision Effects of Wind-power Generators and Other Obstacles on Birds, Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci. 1134: 233–266 (2008). C 2008 New York Academy of Sciences)

Effects of Collision Mortality on Populations

This review shows that collision with man- made structures is a significant cause of avian mortality. However, in nature conservation terms, the critical issue is whether or not this source of mortality is sufficiently great to cause population declines or prevent population recovery, either at a biogeographical scale or more locally at priority sites. Unfortunately, the majority of **existing studies** do not address the issue of population level effects, and even among the few that do, the findings are often inconclusive.

The strongest evidence of collision mortality affecting bird populations comes from studies of particularly vulnerable species that are present in relatively high numbers in the vicinity of wind turbines. The most vulnerable species ap- pear to be large birds of prey, which are both highly susceptible to collision and are relatively long-lived with low productivity (K-strategists) and are thus less able to compensate for in- creased levels of adult mortality. Even small increases in mortality of breeding adults may lead to population decline. The clearest evi- dence to date comes from the long-term study of golden eagles affected by wind turbines at Altamont Pass, California. This study shows that a high level of collision mortality has re- duced productivity in the local population to the point where it effectively acts as a sink, de- pending on immigration for its maintenance (Hunt 2002; Hunt & Hunt 2006). Other stud- ies of local populations of birds of prey affected by wind turbines have, in some cases, revealed similarly high levels of mortality (e.g., Follestad et al. 2007; Lekuona & Ursu ́a 2007). Although population effects have **yet to be detected,** there are indications of wind farms acting as sinks in some of these cases.

Evidence for impacts on local populations of other groups of birds is **scant**. Perhaps the strongest available evidence is from the study of nesting terns at Zeebrugge, Belgium (Everaert & Stienen 2006). This study estimated additional mortality for two species of at least 1.5% as a result of birds colliding with tur- bines as they return to their nests. As with birds of prey, seabirds, such as terns, are long-lived, and it is suggested that, for some species, in- creases to mortality of greater than 0.5% could have a serious impact (Dierschke et al. 2003). Long-term, detailed monitored is necessary to explore the consequences of collision mortality for the tern populations at Zeebrugge. Else- where, the lack of growth of breeding Dalma- tian pelican colonies in Greece and the local extinction of rock ptarmigans in Scotland have both been attributed, at least partly, to the con- sequences of additional mortality caused by collisions with overhead wires (Watson 1982; Crivelli et al. 1988). However, in both cases there is no direct evidence that collision mortality is a **significant causative factor** of the observed population effects.

Regarding more wide-scale impacts of col- lision mortality, at a regional or even national scale, there is currently **no clear evidence** for population-level effects for **any species**. The only study that indicates that wider-scale ef- fects might emerge is that by Bevanger (1995) of capercaillies in Norway. This study suggests that the total annual loss of capercaillies due to collisions with power lines, in combination with losses due to hunting and the destruction and fragmentation of habitats, may result in local population reductions which, eventually, might lead to national declines.

In an effort to assess the potential impact of collision mortality on birds, many authors have attempted to estimate national mortal- ity levels resulting from collisions with partic- ular structures (e.g., Banks 1979; Koops 1987; Klem 1990; Ogden 1996; USFWS 2000). Al- though such estimates are necessarily very approximate, being based on **small** and potentially **unrepresentative samples** and often lacking correction for **observer bias** and removal of corpses by scavengers, they do at least indicate the likely order of magnitude of fatalities. Thus, combining the estimates for mortality caused by communication towers, power lines, and win- dow strike indicates that, as a minimum, sev- eral hundred million birds are killed annually by collisions in the United States alone.

Although such broad estimates indicate the scale of fatalities, they are less helpful in de- termining the likelihood of population reduc- tions. This is because not all species of birds are **equally affected** by collision mortality and, of those that are significantly affected, some are better able to withstand increased mortality than others. The population response is the key to the likelihood of an impact: the con- sequences of any source of mortality for a bird population depends on its population dynamics and the role of density dependence and thus its ability to compensate for increases in mortality levels (e.g., Newton 1998; Liley & Sutherland 2007). Even low collision rates may be signifi- cant for those species that are long-lived, with a low reproductive rate, which are likely to be more sensitive to changes in adult mortality and thus less able to compensate by increasing productivity (e.g., Newton 1998).

**Tech advances solve.**

**Sovacool 9** (Benjamin K., Energy Governance Program, Centre on Asia and Globalisation, Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore, Contextualizing avian mortality: A preliminary appraisal of bird and bat fatalities from wind, fossil-fuel, and nuclear electricity, Energy Policy, Volume 37, Issue 6, June 2009, Pages 2241–2248)

Furthermore, the type of wind technology can significantly reduce bird fatalities. Altamont Pass, for example, is located near bird migration routes and has terrain, such as craggy landscapes and various canyons, making it ideal for birds of prey, and it is populated with mostly **outdated turbine designs**. It takes between 15 and 34 Altamont turbines to produce as much electricity as one modern turbine, and early turbines were mounted on towers at the same level as bird flight paths (60–80 feet in height).

**Newer wind farms**, however, can produce the same amount of electricity with **fewer turbines**, and turbines are mounted on towers that typically **avoid birds** at a height of 200–260 feet. Latest capacities are between 2.5 and 4 MW, the turbines tend to be spaced at a greater distance between each other, and many blades have **slower rotational speeds**. These turbines have gotten **more efficient** as their capacity factors have improved, and developers have gotten **better at siting** and installing them (Distefano, 2007). It is standard practice in the Pacific Northwest of the United States for all wind projects to involve habitat mapping, nest surveys, and general avian use surveys with a particular focus on threatened, engendered, or sensitive species. The standards are **so strict** they often cause developers to significantly modify the layout of wind farms and to abandon high-risk projects (Linehan and Andy, 2004).

Death rates of all flying animals have decreased in recent years as wind power entrepreneurs have installed larger turbine blades that turn more slowly, and have used advanced thermal monitoring and radar tracking to site turbines more carefully. Developers commonly avoid placing wind farms in areas of high nesting or seasonal density of birds, remove potential perches on lattice towers, and utilize micrositing and bird sensitivity mapping to position turbines in ways that minimize intersection with flight paths (Bright et al., 2008).

A study that focused only on one or two wind farms, therefore, could produce exceptionally high or low estimates of avian mortality as a result of the specific weather, type of wind farm, number of birds in the area, species of birds, quality of researchers collecting carcasses, terrain and siting, and form of wind technology that are not representative for all or even most wind turbines.

**2AC—Pltx Adv**

**Tea Party influence is increasing.**

**Penketh 12** - Freelance journalist [Anne Penketh, “A moderate Romney returns as a hostage to the extremist right,” The National, Nov 1, 2012, pg. http://tinyurl.com/ap3tj9e

Washington Post commentator Harold Meyerson predicted last week that in the event of a Romney victory, the Tea Party-backed radicals would stage a "blitzkrieg" on day one of his presidency. It's a perfectly plausible scenario: since the Republicans retook the House of Representatives in the 2010 midterm elections, the Tea Party extremists have held the party hostage. Among their doubtful achievements is to have prevented agreement on raising the debt ceiling and curbing the $16 trillion (Dh59 trillion) federal deficit.

You can be sure that Paul Ryan, a T

ea Party ideologue who is currently House budget chairman, would as vice president be tasked with ensuring the demolition of Mr Obama's healthcare reform. If the Senate passes to the Republicans, his job would be all the easier.

The Bush-era neocon hawks, who delivered the 2003 Iraq war on a false premise, would probably be back in the saddle. Now the refrain is: bomb Iran. On foreign policy, Mr Romney's advisers include former UN ambassador John Bolton, who may nurture hopes of becoming secretary of state, a post also coveted by Mr Sununu. Dan Senor, who once promoted President George W Bush's "Freedom Agenda", has an eye on the post of national security adviser. Other Romney associates include waterboarding apologist Cofer Black, hardline judicial adviser Robert Bork and immigration adviser Kris Kobach. There's not a moderate among them.

This is the company that Mr Romney keeps. Few have been taken in by his recent pivot to become "moderate Mitt". Even in Mormon Utah, the state's biggest paper, The Salt Lake City Tribune, expressed dismay at Mr Romney's "servile" courtship of the Tea Party. An editorial last week concluded that his "shameless" flip-flopping across the board means that the former saviour of the Salt Lake City Olympics cannot be trusted. The paper's endorsement therefore went to Mr Obama.

The influence of the Tea Party in the polarisation of political discourse in America cannot be underestimated. Even a staunch conservative analyst like Norman Ornstein blames the Republican Party for the unprecedented poison in the system that has left Congress gridlocked and at rock bottom in terms of public approval ratings. In a new book written with Brookings Institution expert Thomas Mann, It's Even Worse than it Looks, they describe the party as an "insurgent outlier".

Any pretence of bipartisanship vanished two years ago when Senate minority leader Mitch McConnell pledged that he would devote all his energy to the defeat of Mr Obama. Ornstein and Mann say the Republicans' loyalty now is clearly to party over country. They conclude that the partisan polarisation has passed a critical point, "leading to something more troubling that we have ever seen".

The result of the bitter point-scoring is that "the government seems incapable of taking and sustaining public decisions responsive to the existential challenges facing the country".

Nobody in Washington expects the gridlock to vanish after the election. The incivility of political discourse is here to stay. In the case of a narrow majority for either party in House and Senate, the trench warfare will worsen with Republicans and Democrats in permanent campaign mode.

**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.**

**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—Pristine PIC

**First, if we don't put wind in these areas we will just shift to mountaintop removal, which is worse – causes extinction.**

**Biggers 9** - Co-founder of the [Coal Free Future Project](http://coalfreefutureproject.org/). [Jeff Biggers, “[Declaration of Clean Energy Independence: We Need a Road Map to a Coal Free Future](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jeff-biggers/declaration-of-clean-ener_b_565669.html),” Huffington Post, Posted: May 6, 2010 07:54 AM, pg. http://tinyurl.com/2bg2kp4

In the wake of the worst coal mining disaster in 40 years, compromise and political machinations this spring have resulted in a regulatory crisis of failure; workplace safety in the mines, including the black lung scandal, has emerged as a national tragedy; toxic coal ash remains uncategorized as hazardous waste; mountaintop removal operations and devastating strip mining in 24 states continue under regulatory plunder, not abolishment; billions of taxpayers' dollars pour down the black hole of carbon capture and storage boondoggles, increasing coal production; climate legislation hangs in the balance of political games.

In 1776, Thomas Paine challenged our country to embrace the cause of independence over compromise. In a moment of crisis, he declared: "We have it in our power to make the world over again."

Our modern-day Paine, James Hansen at the NASA Goddard Center, has issued a similar clarion call: "Coal is the single greatest threat to civilization and all life on our planet. Our global climate is nearing tipping points."

It's time to envision a coal-free future. It's time for clean energy independence.

We need a road map for a coal-free future. Not a hodge-podge collection of new regulations.

Coal mining, which provides 45 percent of our electricity, will not end tomorrow. Every coal miner deserves a right to a sustainable livelihood; given the legacy of our coal miners, we also believe no coal miner should be displaced from his or her job until we develop clean energy alternatives. This means that coalfield residents, like all Americans, deserve a road map for a feasible transition to clean-energy jobs -- including a Coal Miner's GI Bill for retraining and a massive reinvestment in sustainable economic development in coalfield communities -- before we reach a point of no return.

The coalfields should be ground zero for President Obama's clean energy initiatives, Al Gore's Repower America, and all green jobs projects.

All coal mining communities know that the first time in 25 years, utilities coal stockpiles have increased during the summer; absentee coal companies are cutting jobs and idling higher-cost mines to keep their stock holders happy in a period of slumping demand; recent U.S. Geological Survey estimates place "peak coal" production as early as 2020.

As grandchildren of black-lung-afflicted coal miners from Kentucky, Illinois, and southwestern Virginia, we honor our families' sacrifices in recognizing, not denying, the true cost of coal. Our grandfathers benefited from a transition to mechanization to improve mine safety. The time has come for a transition to clean-energy jobs.

Coal is not cheap nor clean; coal has been killing us -- for over 200 years. Over 104,000 Americans have died in coal-mining accidents; three coal miners die daily from black-lung disease. Millions of acres of forests and farmlands have been strip-mined into oblivion; pioneering communities have been plundered. Half of Americans live within an hour of a toxic coal ash dump.

The Physicians for Social Responsibility recently found that coal "contributes to four of the top five causes of mortality in the U.S. and is responsible for increasing the incidence of major diseases."

The National Academy of Scientists totaled costs of coal at more than $62 billion in "external damages" to our health and lives. A West Virginia University report noted the coal industry "costs the Appalachian region five times more in early deaths than it provides in economic benefits." In Kentucky, according to a Mountain Association of Community Economic Development study, coal may provide $528 million in state revenue, but costs $643 million in state expenditures.

Nothing has motivated our commitment for clean energy more than the tragedy of mountaintop-removal and nationwide strip mining in 24 states. We have seen the devastation of clear-cutting our nation's great forests and carbon sink of Appalachia and blowing up its oldest mountain range. We have met the casualties of absentee commerce; grieving parents who have lost loved ones to coal slurry-contaminated water; veterans and elderly who endure blasting, fly rock and silica dust; families who have seen their homes washed away in floods caused by erosion; streams poisoned with mining waste; boarded-up communities, strangled by a boom-and-bust single economy.

The plunder of Appalachia and all coalfield communities must end.

More so, with coal-fired plants contributing over 30 percent of our CO2 emissions, everyone's fate is connected to the coalfields now.

"Clean coal" carbon capture and storage plans are not only chimeras for Big Coal profit, but will ultimately increase coal production by 20-30 percent.

In the end, our fiduciary responsibility to our children demands a new way of generating our electricity in Kentucky and the country. It also affords us a great opportunity for economic and social revitalization

Clean energy independence, not coal, will bring more sustainable jobs.

Wind, solar, hydropower and turbine manufacturing, along with weatherization, retrofitting appliances and homes, could create jobs. The Appalachian Regional Commission found that "energy-efficiency investments could result in an increase of 77,378 net jobs by 2030" in the region.

For us, such a clean energy revolution began with the proposed [Smith # 1 coal-fired plant](http://www.kftc.org/our-work/stop-smith) in eastern Kentucky, which was recently set aside. Instead of a costly coal-fired dinosaur, a recent study found that a combination of "energy efficiency, weatherization, hydropower and wind power initiatives in the East Kentucky Power Cooperative region would generate more than 8,750 new jobs for Kentucky residents, with a total impact of more than $1.7 billon on the region's economy over the next three years."

Ultimately, this clean energy independence would meet the energy needs of EKPC customers and cost less than the proposed coal plant.

A coal-free future began in Kentucky, in the heartland of our nation's coalfields. Now it's time to imagine a coal-free future for the rest of the country.

**Plus --- NEPA and FWS regulation prevent habitat destruction.**

**Sutton 5** (Victoria Sutton & Nicole Tomich, Paul Whitfield Horn Professor of Law and Director of the Center for Biodefense, Law and Public Policy; JD from Texas Tech, Harnessing Wind is Not (by Nature) Environmentally Friendly, Spring, 22 Pace Envtl. L. Rev. 91, Pace Environmental Law Review)

On May 13, 2003, the U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service ("FWS") issued "Interim Guidance to Avoid and Minimize Wildlife Impacts from Wind Turbines" (hereinafter "Interim Guidance"). n55 The Interim Guidance was prepared by the FWS's Wind Turbine Siting Working Group to assist the wind energy industry in avoiding and minimizing impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat through: (1) **proper evaluation** of potential wind energy development sites; (2) proper **location** and **design** of turbines and associated structures within sites selected for development; and (3) **pre and post-construction** research and **monitoring** to identify and assess impacts to wildlife. n56 The potential to harm wildlife populations from an additional source of mortality and adverse habitat impacts makes "careful evaluation of proposed facilities essential." n57 The guidelines include site evaluation instructions, site development recommendations, turbine design and operation recommendations, and also discuss the use of the Potential Impact Index (PII) for the implementation of land based wind energy facilities. n58 While interim guidance does not have the force of law, it is often used to test the kind of regulation which will ultimately be drafted in the future.

The FWS's Interim Guidance specifically states that the guidelines "are not intended nor shall they be construed to limit or preclude the Service from exercising its authority under any law, statute, or regulation, and to take enforcement action against any individual, company, or agency, or to relieve any individual, company, or agency of its obligations to comply with any applicable Federal, State, or local laws, statutes, or regulations." n59 This indicates [\*100] a **willingness** on the part of the federal government to preserve any applicable federal, state, or local law or regulation for **enforcement** against wind farm operations and owners, to which this guidance is directed.

**2AC—China DA**

**Doesn’t solve conflict.**

**Gelpi 5** (Christopher, Joseph, Associate Professor and Professor of Political Science, Duke University, “Democracy, Interdependence, and the Sources of the Liberal Peace”, Journal of Peace Research)

As we have already emphasized, increasing levels of trade between an autocratic and democratic country are unlikely to constrain the former from initiating militarized disputes against the latter. As depicted in Figure 1, our analysis indicates that an increase in trade dependence by an autocratic challenger on a democratic target from zero to 5% of the former's GDP would increase the probability of the challenger’s dispute initiation from about 0.31% to 0.29%. Thus, the overall probability of dispute initiation by an autocratic country against a democracy is fairly high (given the rarity of disputes) at 23 nearly .3% per country per year. Moreover, increased trade does little or nothing to alter that risk. Increases in trade dependence also have little effect on the likelihood that one autocracy will initiate a conflict with another. In this instance, the probability of dispute initiation remains constant at 0.33% regardless of the challenger’s level of trade dependence.

**2AC—Politics DA**

**Strong 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.

**Winners win – that's advantage 1 – more theoretical evidence.**

**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.

**Obama has no agenda.**

**AP 12/26** [Charles Babington, Obama Agenda Provides Long Work List To Tackle When He Returns, <http://www.timesleaderonline.com/page/content.detail/id/543590/Obama-has-lengthy-work-list-to-tackle.html?nav=5010>]

Even with a full plate of challenges and a hostile party controlling the House, she said, "I think Obama absolutely has to go big on immigration."

The White House has declined to detail the president's plans for a second-term agenda. Once the deficit-spending problems known as the "fiscal cliff" are addressed, said White House spokeswoman Jamie Smith, "President Obama looks forward to working on a number of issues that are critical to our future, from immigration to energy, to education and national security direction."

 **Status quo triggered their energy links.**

**-Generally.**

**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.”

**Now thumpers –**

**-Hagel.**

**Walt 12/26** The Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international relations at Harvard University [Stephen M. Walt, What's at stake in the Hagel affair, http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/12/26/whats\_at\_stake\_in\_the\_hagel\_affair]

Three aspects of the affair do merit brief comment, however. First, I'm baffled by the Obama administration's handling of the whole business. What in God's name were they trying to accomplish by floating Hagel's name as the leading candidate without either a formal nomination or a vigorous defense? This lame-brained strategy gave Hagel's enemies in the Israel lobby time to rally their forces and turn what would have been a routine appointment into a cause célèbre. If Obama backs down to these smear artists now, he'll confirm the widespread suspicion that he's got no backbone and he'll lose clout both at home and abroad. If he goes ahead with the appointment (as he should), **he'll** have to spend a bit of political capitaland it will be a distraction from other pressing issues. And all this could have been avoided had the White House just kept quiet until it was ready to announce its nominee. So whatever the outcome, this episode hardly reflects well on the political savvy of Obama's inner circle.

**-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.

**PC theory is wrong.**

**Dickinson 9** [Matthew, Professor of Political Science at Middlebury College, Previously Taught at Harvard University under the supervision of Presidential Scholar Richard Neustadt, *Presidential Power: A NonPartisan Analysis of Presidential Politics*, May 26th, http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/]

As for Sotomayor, from here the path toward almost certain confirmation goes as follows: the Senate Judiciary Committee is slated to hold hearings sometime this summer (this involves both written depositions and of course open hearings), which should lead to formal Senate approval before Congress adjourns for its summer recess in early August. So Sotomayor will likely take her seat in time for the start of the new Court session on October 5. (I talk briefly about the likely politics of the nomination process below). What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a **misleading** gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an **outcome** with actual **evidence** of presidential influence. Once we **control** for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda setting – **not arm-twisting**. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost **nothing** to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee. If we want to measure Obama’s “power”, then, we need to know what his real preference was and why he chose Sotomayor. My guess – and it is only a guess – is that after conferring with leading Democrats and Republicans, he recognized the overriding practical political advantages accruing from choosing an Hispanic woman, with left-leaning credentials. We cannot know if this would have been his ideal choice based on judicial philosophy alone, but presidents are never free to act on their ideal preferences. Politics is the art of the possible. Whether Sotomayer is his first choice or not, however, her nomination is a reminder that the power of the presidency often resides in the president’s ability to dictate the alternatives from which Congress (or in this case the Senate) must choose. Although Republicans will undoubtedly attack Sotomayor for her judicial “activism” (citing in particular her decisions regarding promotion and affirmative action), her comments regarding the importance of gender and ethnicity in influencing her decisions, and her views regarding whether appellate courts “make” policy, they run the risk of alienating Hispanic voters – an increasingly influential voting bloc (to the extent that one can view Hispanics as a voting bloc!) I find it very hard to believe she will not be easily confirmed. In structuring the alternative before the Senate in this manner, then, Obama reveals an important aspect of presidential power that **cannot be measured** through legislative box scores. Of perhaps greater significance – not one of you predicted Sotomayor’s nomination, and thus no one is the recipient of an “It’s the Fundamentals, Stupid!” T-Shirt. I am deeply, deeply disappointed in all of you. If it were in my power, those diplomas that were handed out in the pouring rain would be rescinded. What kind of an education did you pay for? I’m shocked…SHOCKED!

**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)."

## \*\*\* 1AR

### Impact D

#### There is no causal relationship between the economy and conflict—the best study proves.

Brandt and Ulfelder 11—\*Patrick T. Brandt, Ph.D. in Political Science from Indiana University, is an Assistant Professor of Political Science in the School of Social Science at the University of Texas at Dallas. \*\*Jay Ulfelder, Ph.D. in political science from Stanford University, is an American political scientist whose research interests include democratization, civil unrest, and violent conflict. [April, 2011, “Economic Growth and Political Instability,” Social Science Research Network]

These statements anticipating political fallout from the global economic crisis of 2008–2010 reflect a widely held view that economic growth has rapid and profound effects on countries’ political stability. When economies grow at a healthy clip, citizens are presumed to be too busy and too content to engage in protest or rebellion, and governments are thought to be flush with revenues they can use to enhance their own stability by producing public goods or rewarding cronies, depending on the type of regime they inhabit. When growth slows, however, citizens and cronies alike are presumed to grow frustrated with their governments, and the leaders at the receiving end of that frustration are thought to lack the financial resources to respond effectively. The expected result is an increase in the risks of social unrest, civil war, coup attempts, and regime breakdown.

Although it is pervasive, the assumption that countries’ economic growth rates strongly affect their political stability has not been subjected to a great deal of careful empirical analysis, and evidence from social science research to date does not unambiguously support it. Theoretical models of civil wars, coups d’etat, and transitions to and from democracy often specify slow economic growth as an important cause or catalyst of those events, but empirical studies on the effects of economic growth on these phenomena have produced mixed results. Meanwhile, the effects of economic growth on the occurrence or incidence of social unrest seem to have hardly been studied in recent years, as empirical analysis of contentious collective action has concentrated on political opportunity structures and dynamics of protest and repression.

This paper helps fill that gap by rigorously re-examining the effects of short-term variations in economic growth on the occurrence of several forms of political instability in countries worldwide over the past few decades. In this paper, we do not seek to develop and test new theories of political instability. Instead, we aim to subject a hypothesis common to many prior theories of political instability to more careful empirical scrutiny. The goal is to provide a detailed empirical characterization of the relationship between economic growth and political instability in a broad sense. In effect, we describe the conventional wisdom as seen in the data. We do so with statistical models that use smoothing splines and multiple lags to allow for nonlinear and dynamic effects from economic growth on political stability. We also do so with an instrumented measure of growth that explicitly accounts for endogeneity in the relationship between political instability and economic growth. To our knowledge, ours is the first statistical study of this relationship to simultaneously address the possibility of nonlinearity and problems of endogeneity. As such, we believe this paper offers what is probably the most rigorous general evaluation of this argument to date.

As the results show, some of our findings are surprising. Consistent with conventional assumptions, we find that social unrest and civil violence are more likely to occur and democratic regimes are more susceptible to coup attempts around periods of slow economic growth. At the same time, our analysis shows no significant relationship between variation in growth and the risk of civil-war onset, and results from our analysis of regime changes contradict the widely accepted claim that economic crises cause transitions from autocracy to democracy. While we would hardly pretend to have the last word on any of these relationships, our findings do suggest that the relationship between economic growth and political stability is neither as uniform nor as strong as the conventional wisdom(s) presume(s). We think these findings also help explain why the global recession of 2008–2010 has failed thus far to produce the wave of coups and regime failures that some observers had anticipated, in spite of the expected and apparent uptick in social unrest associated with the crisis.

#### Depressions force focus on internal problems—prevents military conflict.

Deudney 91—Daniel Deudney is Hewlett Fellow in Science, Technology, and Society at the Center for Energy and Environmental Studies at Princeton [April, 1991, “Environment and Security: Muddled Thinking,” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists 47.3, Proquest]

Poverty Wars. In a second scenario, declining living standards first cause internal turmoil. then war. If groups at all levels of affluence protect their standard of living by pushing deprivation on other groups class war and revolutionary upheavals could result. Faced with these pressures, liberal democracy and free market systems could increasingly be replaced by authoritarian systems capable of maintaining minimum order.9 If authoritarian regimes are more war-prone because they lack democratic control, and if revolutionary regimes are warprone because of their ideological fervor and isolation, then the world is likely to become more violent. The record of previous depressions supports the proposition that widespread economic stagnation and unmet economic expectations contribute to international conflict. Although initially compelling, this scenario has major flaws. One is that it is arguably based on unsound economic theory. Wealth is formed not so much by the availability of cheap natural resources as by capital formation through savings and more efficient production. Many resource-poor countries, like Japan, are very wealthy, while many countries with more extensive resources are poor. Environmental constraints require an end to economic growth based on growing use of raw materials, but not necessarily an end to growth in the production of goods and services. In addition, economic decline does not necessarily produce conflict. How societies respond to economic decline may largely depend upon the rate at which such declines occur. And as people get poorer, they may become less willing to spend scarce resources for military forces. As Bernard Brodie observed about the modein era, “The predisposing factors to military aggression are full bellies, not empty ones.”’” The experience of economic depressions over the last two centuries may be irrelevant, because such depressions were characterized by under-utilized production///

 capacity and falling resource prices. In the 1930 increased military spending stimulated economies, but if economic growth is retarded by environmental constraints, military spending will exacerbate the problem. Power Wars. A third scenario is that environmental degradation might cause war by altering the relative power of states; that is, newly stronger states may be tempted to prey upon the newly weaker ones, or weakened states may attack and lock in their positions before their power ebbs firther. But such alterations might not lead to war as readily as the lessons of history suggest, because economic power and military power are not as tightly coupled as in the past. The economic power positions of Germany and Japan have changed greatly since World War 11, but these changes have not been accompanied by war or threat of war. In the contemporary world, whole industries rise, fall, and relocate, causing substantial fluctuations in the economic well-being of regions and peoples without producing wars. There is no reason to believe that changes in relative wealth and power caused by the uneven impact of environmental degradation would inevitably lead to war. Even if environmental degradation were to destroy the basic social and economic fabric of a country or region, the impact on international order may not be very great. Among the first casualties in such country would be the capacity to wage war. The poor and wretched of the earth may be able to deny an outside aggressor an easy conquest, but they are themselves a minimal threat to other states. Contemporary offensive military operations require complex organizational skills, specialized industrial products and surplus wealth.

### 1AR Thumpers

**Hagel fight coming Monday**

**LA TIMES 1 – 4 – 13** Obama expected to nominate Chuck Hagel as secretary of Defense, [http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-obama-to-nominate-chuck-hagel-secretary-defense-20130104,0,6113862.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-obama-to-nominate-chuck-hagel-secretary-defense-20130104%2C0%2C6113862.story)

 President Obama is expected to nominate Chuck Hagel, a former Republican senator and Vietnam veteran, to be secretary of Defense, officials said, setting up a confirmation battle with lawmakers and interest groups critical of his views on Israel and Iran.

White House officials said Friday afternoon that the president hadn’t formally offered the job to Hagel, but others familiar with the process said that the announcement could come as soon as Monday

By nominating a Republican to run the Defene Department, Obama gives his second-term national security team a bipartisan cast at a time when the White House is rapidly winding down the war in Afghanistan and planning for even deeper cuts in the defense budget.

But the choice also sets the stage for a possibly difficult confirmation fight over Hagel with Israel’s defenders in Washington, some of whom mounted a public campaign to head off his nomination in recent weeks, criticizing Hagel for his past comments calling on Israel to negotiate with Palestinians and for his opposition to some sanctions aimed at Iran.

Hagel, who would replace Leon E. Panetta as Defense secretary, has also been criticized by liberal Democrats and gay rights organizations for calling a Clinton administration ambassadorial nominee “openly, aggressively gay” — a comment Hagel recently apologized for.

#### Hagel destroys Obama’s agenda

Politico, 1-7-13 <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/why-barack-obama-picked-chuck-hagel-85822.html?hp=t1_3>, “Why President Obama Picked Chuck Hagel”

For the White House, the political dynamics surrounding the Hagel nomination are different than those for Susan Rice, another longtime friend of Obama who removed herself from consideration for secretary of state in December, she said, to spare the president. She was concerned Republican anger over her role in the Benghazi attacks would distract from his second-term agenda.

“It was clear from early on that many in Congress, especially Republicans, were going to make a witch hunt and an example out of Susan Rice,” a person close to Obama said. “I think that the Rice case was obviously a case where it would seemingly have been an insurmountable challenge.”

White House officials said Hagel has a clearer path toward confirmation. Still, a major fight over Hagel could lead to many of the same distractions Rice sought to avoid — tripping up other major items on the president’s agenda, including immigration, the economy and now gun control.