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Coal production is extraction of coal from coal mines

EIA, US Energy Information Administration, no date

(“Glossary,” <http://www.eia.gov/tools/glossary/index.cfm>)

Coal production:  The sum of sales, mine consumption, issues to miners, and issues to coke, briquetting, and other ancillary plants at mines. Production data include quantities extracted from surface and underground mines, and normally exclude wastes removed at mines or associated reparation plants.

#### They don’t extract more, they modify the processing cycle

Precision—technical distinctions are crucial in energy production debates

Brown, judge – Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, ‘59

(John R., “CONTINENTAL OIL COMPANY, Petitioner, v. FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,” Dissenting Opinion, 266 F.2d 208; 1959 U.S. App. LEXIS 5196; 10 Oil & Gas Rep. 601)

 In my judgment the Court by this opinion engages in impermissible fact finding for which it has neither statutory warrant nor technical competence. It interprets the Natural Gas Act in terms of what it conceives is necessary effectually to enforce what it deems to be the policy of the law. In doing so it ignores the plain words of Congressional limitation on the basic power of the Federal Power Commission. Worse, it reads out of the Act both these words and the equally emphatic technical meaning ascribed to them not less than three times by the Supreme Court. Apparently from the demands of administrative necessity it reads the word 'production' of natural gas as entirely removed from the technical context of the oil and gas business, as though Congress were using it in the colloquial or everyday sense concerning [\*\*14] the production of wheat, or corn, or cattle or shirts. Finally, it seems to me to say that since, in the determination of jurisdictional sales, Phillips Petroleum Company v. State of Wisconsin, 1954, 347 U.S. 672, 74 S.Ct. 794, 98 L.Ed. 1035, is though by many to have ridden roughshod over the same exemption, everything fell before that awesome decision even though the subject of our case is not sales, but production which is the essence and the exact subject of the exclusion.

The law may be imperfect. What Congress has prescribed may be something less than completely effective. But when Congress has spoken in terms of the strongest prohibition that 'the provisions of this act \* \* \* shall not apply \* \* \* to the production \* \* \* of natural gas,' it is our duty faithfully to apply this exclusion. It is not our province either to ignore these positive terms or gloss over them with some easy construction under any supposed duty that 'we must give to the terms the meaning that will effectuate and not the one that would frustrate the purpose of the law.' That purpose is described in the opinion as 'the intent \* \* \* to regulate \* \* \* interstate sales' -- [\*\*15] a statement which is, to say the least, an oversimplification since that purpose is in the very same sentence 1 of the Act which imposes this positive prohibition.

Only our interpretation gives meaning to the phrase “energy production”—it’s about producing energy assets

Noyes, non-profit and local government consultant in Wilmington, DE, contributor – Daily Kos, 12/8/’5

(Tommy, “Economics and the Environment, Part 1: What Happens When We Light a Fire,” <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2005/12/08/170460/--Economics-and-the-Environment-Part-1-What-Happens-When-We-Light-a-Fire>)

If we wish to be precise, we wouldn't use the phrase "energy production." Most of what we call "energy production" involves burning something.

A ton of coal is an asset. Smoke coming out a smokestack is not an asset.

Setting fire to an asset is not production. It can economically useful by keeping us warm or converting iron ore to steel, but it is not, strictly speaking, production, defined as the creation of an asset.

This simple rephrasing of what happens when we light a fire leads to useful insights into economics and the environment. Consider the similar phrase, "timber production." A tree standing in a forest may not be considered to have any economic value. But when a logger cuts down the tree, it becomes an asset as soon as it hits the ground and is hauled off to the lumber mill.

Limits—their interpretation allows affs that impact the entire energy sector

Sagar, PhD materials science, Oliver, PhD engineering, and Chikkatur, PhD physics, ‘5

(Ambuj, Hongyan, and Ananth, all three are research fellows – Kennedy School of Govt @ Harvard, 7 Vt. J. Envtl. L. 1)

The energy sector encompasses activities relating to the production, conversion, and use of energy. Energy production includes the extraction of primary energy forms such as coal, oil, and natural gas, or growing biomass for energy uses. Energy conversion pertains to the transformation of energy into more useful forms: this includes the refining of petroleum to yield products such as gasoline and diesel; the combustion of coal in power plants to yield electricity; the production of alcohol from biomass, etc. Energy end-use encompasses the final use of energy forms in industrial, residential, commercial, transportation and other end-uses.
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#### Coal is inextricably linked to globalized neoliberalism—the role of the ballot is to reject their productivist revision to corporatist exploitation in favor of coal communities

**McNeil ‘5** (Bryan, Assistant Professor of Anthropology at American University, “Global Forces, Local Worlds: Mountaintop Removal and Appalachian Communities,” in *The American South in a Global World,* ed. James Peacock and Harry Watson, Carrie Matthews, UNC Press 2005, AM)

While the Appalachian coal industry has a product that is associated with an older industrial age and does not have highly mobile production centers associated with new economy industries, the forces shaping the coal industry over the past twenty years resemble those that continue to drive global capitalism. The collusion between government and corporations creating ineffective law enforcement illustrated by weight limits and regulatory appointments, weakened unions, and reduced environmental regulations associated with mountaintop removal have altered the experience of living in the communities of southern West Virginia. Many residents, including those who work in the mines, have come to resent what they see as the industry’s power over the politics and economics of the region, as well as increasing burdens the community bears as a result of mining activity. In such contexts, the abstract policies of global capitalism become embodied in conflicts between homeowners, parents, workers, and companies. Because of the extensive amount of land required, many people have been bought out of or forced off their land by coal companies. Entire mountain communities have disappeared in this fashion. In more established towns like Whitesville, once a thriving hub of mining and trade in the Coal River region, significant resistance to mountaintop removal has emerged. Residents complain about the explosions that rattle their homes, damaging foundations and wells, and they attribute the increasing frequency of floods to the vast tracts of treeless and geologically disturbed land in the surrounding mountains. Subtly, however, these complaints have grown to include things like ambient coal dust, road damage from overweight trucks, trains loading at all hours of the night, repeated releases of toxic black sludge into streams, and other nuisances and violations of law. These issues are more general to the mining industry and not exclusive to mountaintop removal. The way citizens include these complaints, blurring the distinction between mountaintop removal and industry practices in general, indicates that mountaintop removal has become symbolic of broader concerns in the community. Mountaintop removal has become, for many people, not just a flagrant disregard for public safety, mountain lifestyles, and landscapes, but a symbol of the industry’s political power, greed, and contempt for mountain communities. One of the organizations that promote this point of view is Coal River Mountain Watch (CRMW). ‘Working with state and regional groups like Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition, West Virginia Highlands Conservancy, and Citizens Coal Council, CRMW raises awareness of coal issues and promotes alternatives to mountaintop removal within its local community. Founded with the help of activists and academics working in the Appalachian Mountains, the group is made up primarily of local residents who have lived in Coal River their entire lives. Selma King is one such member.5 Selma grew up in Old Creek Hollow. Old Creek, during Selma’s childhood in the 1950s, wound more than ten miles from the main road back into the mountains to a tunnel that led through the mountain to another community on the other side of the ridge. Today; a gate blocks the road a few miles short of the old tunnel. Past the gate on company property the tunnel sits beneath an enormous valley fill. After moving to Cleveland as a teenager, then to several southern Cities after marrying, Selma returned to Old Creek to raise her family. “I just had to come home,” she said watching over her toddler grandson as we spoke. Selma was at home during the first of what have become frequent incidents of flooding. One of Selma’s neighbors, a woman in her late eighties, swore she had never seen the creek rise out of its banks, but on Memorial Day weekend the entire hollow was flooded with thick, muddy water, logging debris, and trash. Many homes were damaged; no lives were lost. More floods have occurred since, but after the first one, Selma prepared herself by packing all of her valuables and a suitcase of clothes in her car. “I’m ready,” she said, “if I’m lucky enough to get out next time’ While personal experiences like Selma’s are common to people in the community who actively Oppose mountaintop removal, sentiment is deeply divided within the community. Many residents who are not members of CRMW are also torn between the economic impact of the coal industry and the environmental and social damage that it causes. The land where Debbie’s small business sits has been in her family for seven generations. Debbie becomes visibly distraught when she speaks of the current state of the mining industry. The men in her family have worked in the mines since before she was born. Every piece of food I’ve ever put in my mouth has come from the coal industry,” she says, reflecting on the profound influence coal has had on her family. Nevertheless, her deep ties to the local community and the mountain landscape lead her to resent the social and environmental effects of mountaintop removal. In addition, Debbie finds herself in a strange relationship with local union miners. Locals accuse Massey of bringing in nonunion workers from other parts of the state while many local union miners are unemployed. Though her grandfather was an early union organizer and she was raised in a union household, Debbie’s business is out of favor with locals because it caters largely to nonunion miners. Despite her family’s long history in mining, Debbie finds herself in opposition to coal industry practices like mountaintop removal. The economics of the coalfields, however, often prevent people like Debbie from speaking out against the industry. The only well-paying jobs in the region are those in coal or related industries such as the railroad. While most of the United States was enjoying the economic expansion of the 90s, West Virginia was largely bypassed. West Virginia still ranks at or near the bottom of the fifty states in nearly every economic category. When the nation slipped into recession, however, the combination of Bush administration energy initiatives and the rush to build power plants after California’s 2001 energy scare created a short-lived miniboom in the coal industry. While the national economy was shrinking, coal companies were, for a time, hiring workers. Lacking a clear economic alternative, Virginia residents feel torn, forced to choose between their economy and their communities and environment. Community-Based Opposition Within such a divided community, organizing resistance to the industry is particularly challenging. In the Appalachian region, the UMWA is the only successful model for organizing opposition to coat industry policy. The tendency of global capitalism to undermine the power of organized tabor has created a void for representing community concerns against those of industry. Groups such as MW attempt to fill that void. During previous decades, the opposition between industry and labor as a comparatively centralized affair in which the two sides exerted pressure on each other and government officials in an attempt to win concessions. The arrangements of global capitalism tend to diffuse these centers of power by hamstringing unions with regulations and reduced memberships while veiling company responsibility behind a corporate maze of subsidiaries and subcontractors. CRMW and similar groups appear to be an attempt not to maintain the old union-versus-company dynamic hut to construct a new form of opposition to work within the framework of globalization. The group educates residents about the adverse effects of the coal industry within the community and serves as a community resource center. People contact the group’s office for emergency telephone numbers, for advice on filing legal grievances against mines and reporting violations of environmental or safety regulations, or to coordinate cleanup efforts to remove potentially damaging debris from flood-prone streams. The group also represents community concerns at public hearings and meetings with industry and regulators. Along with state and regional groups, CRMW contributes to educating policy makers, organizing demonstrations against harmful industry practices, and supporting legislative and regulatory change that will benefit the community, By working both locally and within a network of state and regional organizations, CRMW offers residents the opportunity to act directly in their community and address the systemic causes of their problems, which they believe are rooted in industry practice and government policy. During the recent legislative debate over coal trucks, for example, CRMW was part of a coalition that advocated not just the enforcement of weight limits but also a change in the pay structure for truck drivers. Instead of being paid by the amount they haul or the number of trips they make, the coalition supported a standard hourly wage for truck drivers to reduce the economic incentive to exceed speed and weight limits. The group argued that such an arrangement would mitigate any adverse effects of the weight limits on truck drivers and create many more driving jobs at the same time. While the proposal was not included in the bill, it is an example of how these organizations are trying to create alternatives that will help preserve the fabric of the community rather than serve particular and often polarizing interests. In addition to diffusing centers of power, globalization is profoundly influencing social and cultural life. With its emphasis on efficiency, technology, and economic logic, global capitalism is infringing on the meaningful social worlds in which people live. The conflict between the mine workers and community residents is over the character of the community. While many of the workers express resentment toward mountaintop removal and company operating practices in general, they are frustrated by their inability to affect the situation. They would rather continue mining in whatever fashion is available than lose their well-paid lobs. People like Selma do not want to have their homes and sense of security threatened by the practices of the coal industry With fewer and fewer people receiving the benefits of mining jobs and more and more burdens being borne by the community, they argue that mining is an increasingly bad deal. Conclusion Within the spectrum of issues arising from globalization, the mountaintop removal case provides an example of a complex dispute over the future of a community. Politicians, company officials, and mine supporters dismiss mountaintop removal opponents as “extreme environmentalists.” Most members of local organizations such as CRMW, however, do not fit the extreme environmentalist profile provided by contemporary environmental politics and direct action groups such as Greenpeace. Members are lifelong residents of the region; many are the wives or children of miners, and some are retired miners themselves. Mining opponents invoke mountaintop removal and environmental rhetoric like the Clean Water Act in much the same way that logging opponents invoked the spotted owl in Oregon. Activists in Oregon incorporated the spotted owl to attract legal and political attention into an already ongoing and deeply divided conflict between the logging industry and communities in southern Oregon (Brown I9). The Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act endow nonhuman elements of the environment with legal and political power. Owls and streams have rights and legal protection that people do not enjoy. With the century-old power of the coal industry over the state government, and without significant union representation, ordinary people in Vest Virginia do not have any strong political representation. Drawing attention to the Clean Water Act is a way to garner political and legal support against powerful energy companies (coal and others with an interest in the outcome, notably electric utilities). Industry opponents are, in fact, concerned with their streams and are aware of environmental issues and have environmental sensibilities. For most mountaintop removal opponents, however, these issues are part of a larger social negotiation over a valued way of life, the character of their community, and confronting corporate power. The debate over mountain top removal extends beyond common contemporary views of environmental ism to include equally important discussions of economic policy, industry regulation, and participation in democratic processes. One of the ways groups like CRMW make their point is to examine critically the character of the community. While mining has been the dominant political and economic force in the region for more than a century the organization and its members point out that there have always been other important aspects of mountain life. People have always hunted in the mountains, fished in the rivers, gardened on the hillsides, and eaten alongside their neighbors at seasonal ramp dinners. While there are many other examples of community practices, these all involve interaction with the mountain Landscape. As companies accumulate control over, restrict access to, and physically remove more and more mountain land, the ability of residents to participate in these culturally valued activities is restricted. While mountaintop removal makes sense in the economic logic of coal companies and politicians, it is emotionally offensive to someone whose childhood home or favorite hunting ground has been destroyed. Because culture in this sense cannot be quantified and included in cost-benefit logic, it is often excluded from consideration by decision makers. Confrontations like that over mountaintop removal and emerging organizations like CRMW are drawing attention to the need for more comprehensive negotiations over the multiple and intertwined concerns that arise when global economic forces and social values conflict. Confrontations like **m**ountain**t**op **r**emoval are at the same time about the environment, economy, government regulation, and corporate policy. When the forces of globalization—forces that have heretofore been rep resented as unstoppable—are situated within specific communities like Coal River, people struggle to create new formats for discussing and confronting these complicated topics. It seems clear that the outcome of their efforts will influence the future of concepts like community, place, culture, and opposition, concepts that have not yet solidified in a world being reshaped by the political and economic magma of globalization.

#### The system’s unsustainable – only shift from energy EMPIRES to MULTITUDES averts extinction

Shor 10

<http://www.stateofnature.org/locatingTheContemporary.html>

Fran Shor teaches in the History Department at Wayne State University. He is the author of Dying Empire: US Imperialism and Global Resistance (Routledge 2010).

Attributing the debilitation of the U.S. economy to a mortgage crisis or the collapse of the housing market misses the truly epochal crisis in the world economy and, indeed, in capitalism itself. As economist Michael Hudson contends, "the financial 'wealth creation' game is over. Economies emerged from World War II relatively free of debt, but the 60-year global run-up has run its course. Financial capitalism is in a state of collapse, and marginal palliatives cannot revive it." According to Hudson, among those palliatives is an ironic variant of the IMF strategies imposed on developing nations. "The new twist is a variant on the IMF 'stabilization' plans that lend money to central banks to support their currencies - for long enough to enable local oligarchs and foreign investors to move their savings and investments offshore at a good exchange rate." The continuity between these IMF plans and even the Obama administration's fealty to Wall Street can be seen in the person of Lawrence Summers, now the chief economic advisor to Obama. As further noted by Hudson, "the Obama bank bailout is arranged much like an IMF loan to support the exchange rate of foreign currency, but with the Treasury supporting financial asset prices for U.S. banks and other financial institutions ... Private-sector debt will be moved onto the U.S. Government balance sheet, where "taxpayers" will bear losses." [4] So, here we have another variation of the working poor getting sapped by the economic elite! In fact, one estimate of U.S. federal government support to the elite financial institutions is in the range of $10 trillion dollars, a heist of unimaginable proportions. [5] Given the massive indebtedness of the United States, its reliance of foreign support of that debt by countries like China, which has close to $2 trillion tied up in treasury bills and other investments, a long-term crisis of profitability, overproduction, and offshoring of essential manufacturing, it does not appear that the United States and, perhaps, even the capitalist system can avoid collapse. Certainly, there are Marxist economists and world-systems analysts who are convinced that the collapse is inevitable, albeit it may take several generations to complete. The question becomes whether a dying system can be resuscitated or, if something else can be put in its place. One of the most prominent world systems scholars, Immanuel Wallerstein, puts the long-term crisis of capitalism and the alternatives in the following perspective: Because the system we have known for 500 years is no longer able to guarantee long-term prospects of capital accumulation, we have entered a period of world chaos. Wild (and largely uncontrollable) swings in the economic, political, and military situations are leading to a systemic bifurcation, that is, to a world collective choice about the kind of new system the world will construct over the next fifty years. The new system will not be a capitalist system, but it could be one of two kinds: a different system that is equally or more hierarchical and inequalitarian, or one that is substantially democratic and equalitarian. [6] What Wallerstein overlooks is the possibility that a global crisis of capitalism with its continuous overexploitation and maldistribution of essential resources, such as water, could lead to a planetary catastrophe. [7] While Wallerstein and many of the Marxist critics of capitalism correctly identify the long-term structural crisis of capitalism and offer important insights into the need for more democratic and equalitarian systems, they often fail to realize other critical predicaments that have plagued human societies in the past and persist in even more life-threatening ways today. Among those predicaments are the power trips of civilization and environmental destructiveness. Such power trips can be seen through the sedimentation of power-over in the reign of patriarchal systems and an evolutionary selection for that power-over which contaminates society and social relationships. Certainly, many of those predicaments can also be attributed to a 5000 year history of the intersection of empire and civilization. Anthropologist Kajsa Ekholm Friedman analyzes that intersection and its impact in the Bronze Age as an "imperialist project..., dependent upon trade and ultimately upon war." [8] However, over the long rule of empire and especially within the last 500 years of the global aspirations of various empires, "no state or empire," observes historian Eric Hobsbawm, "has been large, rich, or powerful enough to maintain hegemony over the political world, let alone to establish political and military supremacy over the globe." [9] While war and trade still remain key components of the imperial project today and pretensions for global supremacy persist in the United States, what is just as threatening to the world as we know it is the overexploitation and abuse of environmental resources. Jared Diamond brilliantly reveals how habituated attitudes and values precluded the necessary recognition of environmental degradation which, in turn, led to the collapse of vastly different civilizations, societies, and cultures throughout recorded history. [10] He identifies twelve contemporary environmental challenges which pose grave dangers to the planet and its inhabitants. Among these are the destruction of natural habitats (rainforests, wetlands, etc.); species extinction; soil erosion; depletion of fossil fuels and underground water aquifers; toxic pollution; and climate change, especially attributable to the use of fossil fuels. [11] U.S. economic imperialism has played a direct role in environmental degradation, whether in McDonald's resource destruction of rainforests in Latin America, Coca-Cola's exploitation of underground water aquifers in India, or Union Carbide's toxic pollution in India. Beyond the links between empire and environmental destruction, unless we also clearly understand and combat the connections between empire and unending growth with its attendant "accumulation by dispossession", we may very well doom ourselves to extinction. According to James Gustave Speth, Dean of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, the macro obsession with growth is also intimately related to our micro habituated ways of living. "Parallel to transcending our growth fetish," Speth argues, "we must move beyond our consumerism and hyperventilating lifestyles ... This reluctance to challenge consumption has been a big mistake, given the mounting environmental and social costs of American "affluenza," extravagance and wastefulness." [12] Of course, there are significant class and ethnic/racial differences in consumerism and lifestyle in the United States. However, even more vast differences and inequities obtain between the U.S. and the developing world. It is those inequities that lead Eduardo Galeano to conclude that "consumer society is a booby trap. Those at the controls feign ignorance, but anybody with eyes in his head can see that the great majority of people necessarily must consume not much, very little, or nothing at all in order to save the bit of nature we have left." [13] Finally, from Vandana Shiva's perspective, "unless worldviews and lifestyles are restructured ecologically, peace and justice will continue to be violated and, ultimately, the very survival of humanity will be threatened." [14] For Shiva and other global agents of resistance, the ecological and peace and justice imperatives require us to act in the here and now. Her vision of "Earth Democracy" with its emphasis on balancing authentic needs with a local ecology provides an essential guidepost to what we all can do to stop the ravaging of the environment and to salvage the planet. As she insists, "Earth Democracy is not just about the next protest or next World Social Forum; it is about what we do in between. It addresses the global in our everyday lives, our everyday realities, and creates change globally by making change locally." [15] The local, national, and transnational struggles and visions of change are further evidence that the imperial project is not only being contested but also being transformed on a daily basis. According to Mark Engler, "The powerful will abandon their strategies of control only when it grows too costly for them to do otherwise. It is the concerted efforts of people coming together in local communities and in movements spanning borders that will raise the costs. Empire becomes unsustainable ... when the people of the world resist." [16] Whether in the rural villages of Brazil or India, the jungles of Mexico or Ecuador, the city squares of Cochabama or Genoa, the streets of Seattle or Soweto, there has been, and continues to be, resistance around the globe to the imperial project. If the ruling elite and many of the citizens of the United States have not yet accepted the fact that the empire is dying and with it the concentric circles of economic, political, environmental, and civilizational crises, the global multitudes have been busy at work, digging its future grave and planting the seeds for another possible world. [17]
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#### Obama has the leverage to win a deal on the fiscal cliff now

Cohn, 11/7

(Columnist-New Republic, “How the Election Reset the "Fiscal Cliff" Debate,” http://www.tnr.com/blog/plank/109904/boehner-statement-fiscal-cliff-revenue-election-obama-leverage)

Of course, it’s not clear how much ground Boehner really conceded. His statement was ambiguous, just like the signals he sent during the 2010 negotiations over whether and how to raise the nation's debt ceiling. He could simply have been describing a tax plan that, according to discredited supply-side economic theories, would generate new revenue from additional economic growth. Says one senior Democratic aide in the Senate: Boehner is clearly trying to sound a conciliatory note in the wake of an election that didn’t go their way. That much is welcome. But if you unpack what he was saying, it’s not really a new position on taxes. He only opened the door to revenues through “dynamic scoring” as opposed to good, old-fashioned revenues that aren’t based on a supply-side economic theory and that can be scored by [the Joint Committee on Taxation]. A more detailed parsing by Suzy Khimm yields a similar conclusion: Boehner doesn't appear to be offering more than he did in the summer of 2011. That might not be surprising, given the pressure Boehner faces from conservatives within his caucus. But, given the political circumstances, it's still a remarkable statement about how Republicans plan to approach this negotiation. After all, this election didn’t simply put Obama back into office. It also **altered the political environment for the deficit debate**, in a way that should **make Obama and the Democrats much stronger.** Remember, when Obama and the Republicans were debating these issues in 2011, Obama was at his weakest. A few months earlier, the Democrats had recently suffered a devastating, humiliating defeat in the midterm elections. The recovery had stalled and unemployment, at 9.5 percent, was about to start rising again. Obama’s approval rating was bottoming out at about 45 percent. Today, by contrast, the recovery seems to be well underway, with unemployment below 8 percent and, most likely, on the way down. Obama’s approval rating is up to 48 percent. He just won a presidential election, with a sizeable margin in the electoral college and a surprisingly comfortable margin in the popular vote. At last count, Obama was beating Romney by 50 percent to 48 percent, or a difference of nearly 3 million votes. Democrats didn’t take control of the House, which is to be expected given gerrymandering. But, to almost everybody’s surprise, they picked up two seats in Senate. And, as Greg Sargent points out, "the influx of new arrivals means a **more liberal and energetic Democratic caucus.**" That’s no small thing: Throughout the first two years of Obama’s presidency, the need to appease conservative Democrats in the Senate constrained Obama’s maneuvering room. Most important of all, perhaps, a major issue in the presidential election was the question of whether to raise taxes on the wealthy. It was a theme of all the big convention speeches, a regular staple of Obama’s campaign appearances, and a point Obama invoked at every one of the debates. The other big change since last time is the policy circumstances. During the 2011 debate, which was about whether to raise the debt ceiling, Republicans held the leverage. Both sides feared the consequences of doing nothing, given the economic repercussions if the government had to start defaulting on bills. But some Republicans were so opposed to spending they considered inaction the lesser of evils. And Obama, as a sitting president about to seek reelection, knew he’d bear political responsibility for the resulting economic damage. This time, Republicans probably feel they have more to lose. The automatic cuts affect a wide variety of programs, but they hit defense spending particularly hard. Obama doesn’t have to run for reelection anymore. And he wants taxes on the wealthy to go up. Allowing the Bush tax cuts to expire would accomplish that, although Obama would likely react by trying to restore—or effectively replace—the cuts for the middle class. As folks like Jonathan Chait have been saying for a while, **Obama appears to have a much stronger bargaining position** this time around. And during a press conference on Wednesday, Vice President Biden seemed to say he agreed. “There was a clear, a clear sort of mandate," Biden said, "about people coming much closer to our view about how to deal with tax policy.” But liberals will be watching closely—very closely—to make sure the White House and congressional Democrats put this leverage to good use. Neera Tanden, president of the Center for American Progress and occasional TNR contributor, puts it this way: It would be deeply discouraging to all those who have worked so hard over the last two years to elect the president and expand the Democratic majority in the senate to simply reset the fiscal cliff negotiations back to where it was a year and a half ago, with too little revenue on the table and too many hits to beneficiaries. And that is why I expect that any final negotiation will better reflect the priorities of the American people.

Plan is extremely controversial and gets pegged on Obama

AP 9/21/12 [“House moves to quash Obama coal, gas rules,” Kxan, http://www.kxan.com/dpp/news/national/House-moves-to-halt-Obama-coal-gas-rules\_56118543]

Rep. Bill Johnson, who authored the act, **challenged Obama** to follow through on his State of the Union vow to support an all-of-the-above approach to American energy. Coal makes for dicey politics for Democrats in energy-producing West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Montana and other states. The 2010 defeat of former Virginia Rep. Rick Boucher, a 14-term lawmaker from a coal-heavy district, was largely attributed to a vote supporting cap-and-trade. Energy issues have flared in several competitive House and Senate races this year, with Democrats seeking distance from Obama and their party. In West Virginia, Democratic Sen. Joe Manchin, facing re-election in November, has embraced the GOP's "war on coal" language and echoed their attacks on the EPA. Both candidates in North Dakota's tossup Senate race have criticized Obama for hampering energy production.¶ Democrats voting with Republicans Friday to support the package included Reps. Nick Rahall of West Virginia, Mark Critz of Pennsylvania and Ben Chandler of Kentucky.¶ The White House, warning that the bills wouldn't survive Obama's veto pen, said the legislation rolls back public health safeguards and measures that will save Americans money — and not only on their gas bills. Obama officials pegged the annual savings from the health benefits of the rules at up to $90 billion.¶ **Debate over the measures exposed a growing rift between those in Congress who champion cheap energy regardless of the source and those whose constituencies demand they stand up for coal.** Massachusetts Rep. Edward Markey, the top Democrat on the House Natural Resources Committee, said Republicans were breaching their own principles by favoring coal over natural gas, the price of which has plummeted in recent years.

#### Obama must use capital to secure a fiscal cliff solution—key to avoid global depression

Sullivan, 11/9

(The Daily Dish, “Now, Govern,” http://andrewsullivan.thedailybeast.com/2012/11/now-govern.html)

I'm as amazed as everyone else by the results on Tuesday night, and they're still sinking in. The new America won; and the 1980s lost. Not everything can be solved by cutting taxes and dropping bombs, a majority of Americans have resolved; the Great Recession was not an ordinary one; the way forward not as glib or as easy for the right as Mr Iraq War would have you believe. But it would be a huge error, it seems to me, if the president decided to bask in his stunning victory, rather than seeing it as a **precious moment for the expenditure of political capital**. We are facing automatic massive tax hikes and huge, crude spending cuts starting January 1 if we cannot get a bipartisan deal on Bowles-Simpson lines (of course there is room for tweaking and bargaining). **A failure to get that kind of deal would tip the US and the world into a new global depression.** We need to think of the fiscal cliff as we did the Super Storm Sandy. It's unlike anything we have encountered in recent times. But when Chris Christie threw partisanship to the literal winds and embraced the president in an emergency (and vice-versa), we saw a glimpse of what can happen, of what Obama actually promised all along he could bring about, and what he has yet failed to do. His re-election has re-capitalized him. He should use that capital, it seems to me, **immediately, when it is at its peak. There are obvious contours for a deal**: the parameters that both the president and the Speaker came close to in the summer of 2011. The Speaker has publicly reiterated that he is open to new revenues; the president has said he is aware of the need to cut the cost of entitlements in the future. The cost-controls in the ACA may help, and should be aggressively tested, but we have no more proof of their success than we did when Bush promised that huge tax cuts would generate growth and employment for the middle class. That's why they had a sunset on them. Some kind of premium support option or later retirement age are by no means unreasonable complements to innovative rethinking of healthcare, given the exponential growth of spending on everything we now call "health." Tax reform along 1986 lines is obviously the most productive common ground. Get us to three simple rates; get rid of the myriad deductions, including those for mortgage interest and state taxation. End all those corporate loopholes. Some of this will hurt the middle class - but rates can stay the same even as revenues rise; and there is simply no way to get to fiscal sanity without some sacrifice from the middle as well as the top. I think Obama has every reason to put the successful and wealthy back near the tax bracket Bill Clinton left us with. But equally, doing so without radical tax reform is a non-starter for the GOP, and they have a legitimate constitutional veto. Then take an axe to the Pentagon, as Simpson-Bowles did. The perpetual war machine has become a kind of entitlement in itself, draining the country of resources we need at home, in pursuit of global hegemony that is becoming counter-productive to actual, you know, self-defense. Then we have to consider increasing premiums for the elderly who are better off, and to put back into Obamacare that end-of-life power-of-attorney discussion for everyone on Medicare that Sarah Palin called "death panels". A mandatory discussion of power-of-attorney issues for Medicare is not a "death panel." It's a wise nudge for people to be able to control their lives in advance. To invest so many resources into extending a dying person's life by a few days (when we don't even know for sure in many cases if the person wants that extra care), is completely irrational, when we desperately need to invest in education for the young. And yes, that is a choice we have to make, and we are making it now. We are now putting the last gasps of the old over the first steps of the young. That needs re-balancing a bit. Many Democrats will argue that they have a mandate for higher tax rates for the wealthy. I think they have a mandate for more revenues from the wealthy and a fairer, simpler tax code. The GOP retained the House and they are a part of this country's leadership. Start afresh. Bring them in fully for this deal. Reach out to Ryan as well as Boehner. Many Democrats cannot bear the idea of cutting Medicare benefits, but I want to echo Kevin Drum in saying: it's gotta happen. Many Republicans abhor the idea of drawing down from a Cold War posture in defense. They need to get over themselves too. The only question is if the president will aggressively take the lead on this, treating it with the same urgency he did a super-storm, and fulfill his promise of breaking through the red-blue divide for pragmatic solutions to our actual problems. He deserves a brief rest, of course. Everyone does. But Americans re-capitalized their president for a reason: to govern, to forge the legislative compromises that can set our fiscal course toward sanity again. This time, he does not have the time to lead from behind. We need him out front, telling us the fiscal truth and showing a way forward. He does not need to be elected again. He can be a mediator between both parties rather than the representative of one. He has to give the House GOP an honorable way out of their Tea Party nonsense, and tax reform is the obvious way to do it. This must be doable. And if it is achieved, Obama's true promise of getting us past these inane ideological battles toward a workable future will be secure. And contra Krugman, I do believe that renewed confidence in America's long-term fiscal standing will help investment and employment and growth again. **But the president needs to be bold;** and magnanimous. **And fast**.
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Venture capital is pouring into renewable tech – causes massive tech innovation and full adoption

Charles Fletcher, Associate at Intellectual Property based Lawfirm, 11 [“VCs and the cleantech funding divide,” AltAssets, November 3, http://old.altassets.net/index.php/private-equity-features/by-author-name/article/nz18489.html]

This article discusses how, whilst venture capital funds have historically preferred to invest in the latter due to the fact they are capital efficient and easier to exit, investment in the former could be set for an increase, as novel methods emerge to invest in capital intensive cleantech and companies get wise to more creative fundraising techniques.¶ Strategies for funding capital intensive projects¶ While many VCs have shied away from capital-intensive cleantech for obvious reasons, there is increasingly a realisation that the capital-intensive sub sector presents opportunities for value realisation. As the cleantech market matures a little, many investors are taking a second look at some of the technologies that might previously have been deemed to be too capital intensive. This is partly in order to diversify their portfolio, but partly because there is a perception that there are great opportunities to be had. At the same time, cleantech companies themselves are looking very closely at ways of addressing the investor concerns traditionally associated with these sectors.¶ Some of the external financing strategies which capital intensive cleantech companies should evaluate in determining their business plan include the following:¶ Licensing¶ There are many ways in which licensing techniques can be used to expedite a company's path to profitability, and those in capital-intensive sectors should be sure they are alive to licensing opportunities accordingly. Recently, there has been particularly strong evidence of clean technologies being developed in-house and then manufactured cheaply abroad under license. The appeal of this is obvious in terms of the time and capital costs involved in setting up an in-house manufacturing operation.¶ Not only should a licensing model be considered for the core business of a company: if it holds non-core IP or applications which it does not wish to prioritise, due to shortage of capital or other reasons, then it should consider extracting some value from these assets by licensing them to an interested partner.¶ Corporate venture investors¶ While traditionally earlier stage external financing strategies would have been funded by risk-sharing syndicates of institutional VCs, venture arms of corporate venturers (including major utilities in particular) are increasingly seeking to back promising development programs at all stages of development using these techniques, whether alone or as part of a syndicate. Corporate venturers are not bound by any prescribed investment criteria, or by the demands of their LPs in the same way as institutional VC funds – major corporations making cleantech venture investments as a way of meeting their own strategic objectives include BASF, Boeing, GE, Honda, Intel, Norsk Hydro, Mitsubishi, Motorola, Royal Dutch Shell, Siemens and Unilever. The corporates are happy to address the cleantech funding gap if the technology excites them.¶ Traditionally, corporate involvement has tended to be seen most often in the later stages of development, when **there is a measure of comfort that the product is likely to reach the market**. However, corporate venturers are increasingly making investments at an earlier stage, and this can be attributed at least in part to their aims of aiding a culture of innovation, stimulating a "knowledge ecosystem" within high priority areas for development, and producing a much more focused pipeline of new technologies to complement their existing operations.¶ Corporate spin-out¶ This is a technique which can be used where companies hold a variety of under-funded intellectual property assets, or where they are not pursuing alternative applications/ markets for their technology due to funding constraints.¶ Corporate spin-outs enable companies to extract value from under-funded intellectual property assets by moving them across into a separate autonomous company into which external investors may invest venture capital.¶ So from a development perspective, a capital-intensive cleantech company can set up a separate self-contained development company into which it will contribute one or more of its products in return for a lump sum payment. This provides the capital-intensive cleantech company with a modest cash return, but typically it will also retain a minority stake in the new company to enable it to benefit in any future upside, and it may also negotiate future opt-in rights to increase its holding in the future.¶ It will always be worthwhile for technology companies in all sectors to analyse and appraise whether they are making the best use of all their IP: if the answer is no, then it may be appropriate to break the IP down into constituent parts to be commercialised separately.¶ Venture development¶ In “venture development”, a funding technique honed in the biotech sector, the holder of an under-funded capital-intensive cleantech development opportunity could create a development company with external capital, which will often be VC-backed.¶ Such venture development is distinct from development spin-outs, in that ownership of development programs will be traded for an option to repurchase at a later stage (i.e. after proof of concept) on pre-negotiated terms.¶ The capital-intensive cleantech company could retain day-to-day control of these development programs, albeit that their ownership will effectively have been "pawned".¶ Royalty financing¶ Like venture development, royalty financing is a feature of the biotech sector which may be applicable to capital-intensive cleantech. Royalty financing involves an external investor paying a lump sum up-front for the right to receive current and/or future revenue on a product.¶ Smaller biotech companies, having successfully navigated their way to the later stages of development for any given drug, will often take royalties in exchange for distribution rights from a big pharma partner. This can work for them because they have no direct routes to market themselves and it will enable them to use the precious cash revenue from the royalty stream to develop other candidates in their portfolio. By the same token, capital-intensive cleantech companies, having proven their concept, could take royalties in exchange for distribution rights from a major utility.¶ Royalty deals in the biotech sector tend to take place at later stages of development because it is easier to quantify the royalty streams with relative certainty. However, the lack of revenues is not an insurmountable barrier to royalty financing: in biotech, “direct investment” techniques can be used whereby the initial lump sum investment takes place where there are no royalty revenues in place yet, but rather is by reference to “synthetic royalties”.¶ Public funding¶ While not the focus of this article, any discussion of the cleantech funding gap would be incomplete without mention of state backed sources of finance.¶ In the US, the US Department of Energy, the US Department of Agriculture and the 2008 Farm Bill have been instrumental in subsidising emerging clean technology sectors, including solar, wind and biofuels.¶ In the UK, the Carbon Trust has its own dedicated cleantech venture funds, which is one of the UK’s leading co-investors in clean technology. These funds are not just about profit – their focus is on reducing carbon emissions as well as earning financial return. Thus, the Carbon Trust can be a valuable source of financing for companies looking to bridge the cleantech funding gap.¶ Capital intensive cleantech companies should explore all options for obtaining favourable state finance (including grants, subsidies and direct investment opportunities): private investors increasingly expect companies to have done so as a matter of routine.¶ Summary¶ The dynamic of the venture capital model, which requires large multiple returns on investment, place restrictions on the ability of venture capital firms alone to fund some capital intensive clean technology companies. In addition, the recent economic environment has dramatically impacted private company valuations and their ability to raise equity.¶ Companies in the cleantech sector which can demonstrate that they have the most potential to deliver a quick return on investment will receive most interest from VC investors – indeed this is true in any sector. In contrast, more ambitious, capital intensive projects are less likely to generate the same levels of appeal to VCs. This has meant that, with VC investment levels down, many capital intensive new technologies offering incremental improvements or facilitative methods have found it extremely difficult to generate the levels of funding they require. By contrast, clean technologies which improve existing infrastructures, rather than consign them to the past completely (e.g. smart grid technology), have been particularly well placed.¶ However, while there is little doubt that a funding gap exists in the capital-intensive cleantech sphere, the cleantech sector remains a relatively new playing field of investment. As the market for clean technologies matures and new investment models become recognised, this funding gap will become **increasingly surmountable for high quality opportunities**. Drawing from licensing and partnering techniques seen in sectors such as biotech, and focused state support, there is an undoubted future for capital intensive cleantech, and increasingly creative approaches are being looked at to address this funding gap.

The plan trades off with renewables – saps capital

EJLFCC 8

Environmental Justice Leadership Forum on Climate Change, The Fallacy of Clean Coal, <http://www.jtalliance.org/docs/Fallacy_of_Clean_Coal.pdf>

The impact that government financial support has on the development and adoption of wide-scale energy technology cannot be understated. As with any government spending, the money that goes toward coal **limits the resources available for other energy R&D**. The continued absorption of coal’s financial costs by the federal government through investment in CCS technology will cause investment in renewable energy and efficiency to suffer. 37 In addition, government investment in CCS restricts financial investments in energy subsidies, green jobs, and efficiency programs that target low-income communities. This unintended consequence is particularly unacceptable for community groups working to position the new “green economy” as a way to bring jobs and resources to un- and underemployed populations. For these groups and others working to improve environmental, public health, and economic equality, a massive shift in government investments is needed to make alternative energy sources viable. Continuing to invest billions in non-renewable energy sources like CCS diverts funds away from new clean technologies and delays full-scale climate change mitigation strategies.

Solves water scarcity

Muys et al 11 [Jerome C. Muys, Jr., Jeffrey M. Karp, and Van P. Hilderbrand, Jr. Sullivan & Worcester LLP, “The Intersection Between Water Scarcity And Renewable Energy” April, http://www.sandw.com/assets/htmldocuments/Intersection%20Between%20Water%20Scarcity%20and%20Renewable%20Energy%20-%20Muys%20Karp%20Hilderbrand%20W0230759.PDF]

The starting point for any discussion of the intersection between water scarcity and renewable energy is the now generally-accepted correlation between climate change and water resource impacts, which is creating further¶ imperatives for both reduction of GHG emissions and water¶ conservation. Most projections conclude that the water resource impacts of climate change will almost certainly be both diverse and wide-ranging, necessitating the implementation of new protocols for allocating water resources such as the Model Interstate Water Compact. However, a less obvious impact of predicted water shortages will be on the future ability to site new renewable energy facilities and, perhaps more importantly, on which¶ types of renewable energy gain prominence in the future. Consequently, water reuse and reclamation facilities are¶ increasingly being co-located with renewable energy¶ projects, and, indeed, technological development in the two¶ areas has begun to converge in ways that were completely¶ unforeseen twenty years ago.

#### Extinction

Reilly ‘2

(Kristie, Editor for In These Times, a nonprofit, independent, national magazine published in Chicago. We’ve been around since 1976, fighting for corporate accountability and progressive government. In other words, a better world, “NOT A DROP TO DRINK,” <http://www.inthesetimes.com/issue/26/25/culture1.shtml>)

\*Cites environmental thinker and activist Vandana Shiva Maude Barlow and Tony Clarke—probably North America’s foremost water experts

The two books provide a chilling, in-depth examination of a rapidly emerging global crisis. “Quite simply,” Barlow and Clarke write, “unless we dramatically change our ways, between one-half and two-thirds of humanity will be living with severe fresh water shortages within the next quarter-century. … The hard news is this: Humanity is depleting, diverting and polluting the planet’s fresh water resources so quickly and relentlessly that every species on earth—including our own—is in mortal danger.” The crisis is so great, the three authors agree, that the world’s next great wars will be over water. The Middle East, parts of Africa, China, Russia, parts of the United States and several other areas are already struggling to equitably share water resources. Many conflicts over water are not even recognized as such: Shiva blames the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in part on the severe scarcity of water in settlement areas. As available fresh water on the planet decreases, today’s low-level conflicts can only increase in intensity.
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#### The 50 States should substantially increase tax credits for integrated gasification combined cycle on coal plants.

States tax credits for energy are great

Ralis, 6

(Sr. Regulatory Counsel-National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, “Congress Got it Right: There’s No Need to Mandate Renewable Portfolio Standards,” 27 Energy L. J. 451)

State incentives, like their federal counterparts, provide critical benefits for renewable resources that do not distinguish among consumer groups. Many states offer tax credits/rebates to various taxpayer groups. For instance, residential consumers in Idaho, North Carolina, North Dakota, and Utah can receive personal tax credits on equipment and installation costs for renewable heating and/or electric generation. n74 In New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, and Oklahoma, commercial and industrial consumers can receive corporate tax credits on property using renewable systems. n75 The credits can be focused on those renewable technologies that are available in individual states. Likewise, manufacturers of renewable equipment in North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Washington can receive corporate tax credits, which can be used to attract manufacturing jobs to the state, and can also be focused on manufacturers locating in depressed communities within the state. n76 Renewable systems in Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, and Tennessee may be eligible for special property assessments to reduce the tax burden on those who make significant capital investments in renewable technologies. n77 Purchasers of renewable equipment and systems in Florida, Idaho, and Nevada can receive rebates on sales taxes, lowering the up-front cost of renewable energy technologies, which is often the greatest barrier to investment. n78 Similarly, in states such as California, Illinois, and Rhode Island, purchasers of renewable equipment and systems can receive state rebates on a percentage of the actual equipment or system costs or on a MWh basis, which also serves to lower the up-front costs of investment in renewable energy technologies. n79

## warming

#### CCS not fast enough to solve

UCS 11 [Barbara Freese is a senior policy analyst/advocate with the UCS Climate and Energy Program, Steve Clemmer is director of energy research and analysis for the UCS Climate and Energy Program, Claudio Martinez is a risk analyst with the UCS Climate and Energy Program, Alan Nogee is the director of climate and energy strategy and policy for the UCS Climate and Energy Program, “A Risky Proposition The Financial Hazards of¶ New Investments in Coal Plants, Union of Concerned Scientists, March, PDF]

Carbon-capture retrofits cannot be counted on to cut emis- sions affordably. While projects to demonstrate the potential of carbon capture and storage (CCS) are important, it would be financially reckless to make coal-plant investments based on the assumption that CCS retrofits will provide an affordable way for those plants to avoid a future price on CO2 emissions. There¶ are still no coal-fired power plants using CCS on a commercial scale. Design estimates indicate that CCS could increase the cost of energy from a new pulverized coal plant by 78 percent, and costs would be even greater if CCS were added as a retrofit (ITF CCS 2010). It is always possible that future advances¶ in CCS technology will drive such costs down substantially, but the CCS projects under development today have faced serious cost overruns and delays. Moreover, the fall in natural gas prices, concern over future coal supplies and prices, and the failure of the 111th Congress to pass climate legislation— which would have put a price on carbon and established mas- sive subsidies for CCS—may further delay CCS development.

Warming locked in—current construction and no international deal means it will be runaway

Harvey, environment reporter – the Guardian, 11/9/’11

(Fiona, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/nov/09/fossil-fuel-infrastructure-climate-change>)

The world is likely to build so many fossil-fuelled power stations, energy-guzzling factories and inefficient buildings in the next five years that it will become impossible to hold global warming to safe levels, and the last chance of combating dangerous climate change will be "lost for ever", according to the most thorough analysis yet of world energy infrastructure.

Anything built from now on that produces carbon will do so for decades, and this "lock-in" effect will be the single factor most likely to produce irreversible climate change, the world's foremost authority on energy economics has found. If this is not rapidly changed within the next five years, the results are likely to be disastrous.

"The door is closing," Fatih Birol, chief economist at the International Energy Agency, said. "I am very worried – if we don't change direction now on how we use energy, we will end up beyond what scientists tell us is the minimum [for safety]. The door will be closed forever."

If the world is to stay below 2C of warming, which scientists regard as the limit of safety, then emissions must be held to no more than 450 parts per million (ppm) of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere; the level is currently around 390ppm. But the world's existing infrastructure is already producing 80% of that "carbon budget", according to the IEA's analysis, published on Wednesday. This gives an ever-narrowing gap in which to reform the global economy on to a low-carbon footing.

If current trends continue, and we go on building high-carbon energy generation, then by 2015 at least 90% of the available "carbon budget" will be swallowed up by our energy and industrial infrastructure. By 2017, there will be no room for manoeuvre at all – the whole of the carbon budget will be spoken for, according to the IEA's calculations.

Birol's warning comes at a crucial moment in international negotiations on climate change, as governments gear up for the next fortnight of talks in Durban, South Africa, from late November. "If we do not have an international agreement, whose effect is put in place by 2017, then the door to [holding temperatures to 2C of warming] will be closed forever," said Birol.

But world governments are preparing to postpone a speedy conclusion to the negotiations again. Originally, the aim was to agree a successor to the 1997 Kyoto protocol, the only binding international agreement on emissions, after its current provisions expire in 2012. But after years of setbacks, an increasing number of countries – including the UK, Japan and Russia – now favour postponing the talks for several years.

Both Russia and Japan have spoken in recent weeks of aiming for an agreement in 2018 or 2020, and the UK has supported this move. Greg Barker, the UK's climate change minister, told a meeting: "We need China, the US especially, the rest of the Basic countries [Brazil, South Africa, India and China] to agree. If we can get this by 2015 we could have an agreement ready to click in by 2020." Birol said this would clearly be too late. "I think it's very important to have a sense of urgency – our analysis shows [what happens] if you do not change investment patterns, which can only happen as a result of an international agreement."

Nor is this a problem of the developing world, as some commentators have sought to frame it. In the UK, Europe and the US, there are multiple plans for new fossil-fuelled power stations that would contribute significantly to global emissions over the coming decades.

The Guardian revealed in May an IEA analysis that found emissions had risen by a record amount in 2010, despite the worst recession for 80 years. Last year, a record 30.6 gigatonnes (Gt) of carbon dioxide poured into the atmosphere from burning fossil fuels, a rise of 1.6Gt on the previous year. At the time, Birol told the Guardian that constraining global warming to moderate levels would be "only a nice utopia" unless drastic action was taken.

The new research adds to that finding, by showing in detail how current choices on building new energy and industrial infrastructure are likely to commit the world to much higher emissions for the next few decades, blowing apart hopes of containing the problem to manageable levels. The IEA's data is regarded as the gold standard in emissions and energy, and is widely regarded as one of the most conservative in outlook – making the warning all the more stark. The central problem is that most industrial infrastructure currently in existence – the fossil-fuelled power stations, the emissions-spewing factories, the inefficient transport and buildings – is already contributing to the high level of emissions, and will do so for decades. Carbon dioxide, once released, stays in the atmosphere and continues to have a warming effect for about a century, and industrial infrastructure is built to have a useful life of several decades.

Yet, despite intensifying warnings from scientists over the past two decades, the new infrastructure even now being built is constructed along the same lines as the old, which means that there is a "lock-in" effect – high-carbon infrastructure built today or in the next five years will contribute as much to the stock of emissions in the atmosphere as previous generations.

The "lock-in" effect is the single most important factor increasing the danger of runaway climate change, according to the IEA in its annual World Energy Outlook, published on Wednesday.

Existing carbon triggers the impact

Daniel **Rirdan 12**, founder of The Exploration Company, “The Right Carbon Concentration Target”, June 29, <http://theenergycollective.com/daniel-rirdan/89066/what-should-be-our-carbon-concentration-target-and-forget-politics?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=The+Energy+Collective+%28all+posts%29>

James Hansen and other promi­nent cli­ma­tol­o­gists are call­ing to bring the CO2 atmos­pheric level to 350 parts per million. In fact, an orga­ni­za­tion, 350.org, came around that ral­ly­ing cry. This is far more radical than most politicians are willing to entertain. And it is not likely to be enough. The 350ppm target will not reverse the clock as far back as one may assume. It was in 1988 that we have had these level of car­bon con­cen­tra­tion in the air. But wait, there is more to the story. 1988-levels of CO2 with 2012-levels of all other green­house gases bring us to a state of affairs equiv­a­lent to that around 1994 (2.28 w/m2). And then there are aerosols. There is good news and bad news about them. The good news is that as long as we keep spewing mas­sive amounts of particulate matter and soot into the air, more of the sun’s rays are scattered back to space, over­all the reflec­tiv­ity of clouds increases, and other effects on clouds whose over­all net effect is to cool­ing of the Earth sur­face. The bad news is that once we stop polluting, stop run­ning all the diesel engines and the coal plants of the world, and the soot finally settles down, the real state of affairs will be unveiled within weeks. Once we fur­ther get rid of the aerosols and black car­bon on snow, we may be very well be worse off than what we have had around 2011 (a pos­si­ble addi­tion of 1.2 w/m2). Thus, it is not good enough to stop all green­house gas emis­sions. In fact, it is not even close to being good enough. A carbon-neutral econ­omy at this late stage is an unmit­i­gated disaster. There is a need for a carbon-negative economy. Essentially, it means that we have not only to stop emitting, to the tech­no­log­i­cal extent pos­si­ble, all green­house gases, but also capture much of the crap we have already out­gassed and lock it down. And once we do the above, the ocean will burp its excess gas, which has come from fos­sil fuels in the first place. So we will have to draw down and lock up that carbon, too. We have taken fos­sil fuel and released its con­tent; now we have to do it in reverse—hundreds of bil­lions of tons of that stuff.

China outweighs and won’t be influenced by the plan

Harvey, environment reporter – the Guardian, 11/9/’11

(Fiona, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/nov/09/fossil-fuel-infrastructure-climate-change>)

Birol also warned that China – the world's biggest emitter – would have to take on a much greater role in combating climate change. For years, Chinese officials have argued that the country's emissions per capita were much lower than those of developed countries, it was not required to take such stringent action on emissions. But the IEA's analysis found that within about four years, China's per capita emissions were likely to exceed those of the EU.

In addition, by 2035 at the latest, China's cumulative emissions since 1900 are likely to exceed those of the EU, which will further weaken Beijing's argument that developed countries should take on more of the burden of emissions reduction as they carry more of the responsibility for past emissions.

In a recent interview with the Guardian recently, China's top climate change official, Xie Zhenhua, called on developing countries to take a greater part in the talks, while insisting that developed countries must sign up to a continuation of the Kyoto protocol – something only the European Union is willing to do. His words were greeted cautiously by other participants in the talks.

Continuing its gloomy outlook, the IEA report said: "There are few signs that the urgently needed change in direction in global energy trends is under way. Although the recovery in the world economy since 2009 has been uneven, and future economic prospects remain uncertain, global primary energy demand rebounded by a remarkable 5% in 2010, pushing CO2 emissions to a new high. Subsidies that encourage wasteful consumption of fossil fuels jumped to over $400bn (£250.7bn)."

Meanwhile, an "unacceptably high" number of people – about 1.3bn – still lack access to electricity. If people are to be lifted out of poverty, this must be solved – but providing people with renewable forms of energy generation is still expensive.

Charlie Kronick of Greenpeace said: "The decisions being made by politicians today risk passing a monumental carbon debt to the next generation, one for which they will pay a very heavy price. What's seriously lacking is a global plan and the political leverage to enact it. Governments have a chance to begin to turn this around when they meet in Durban later this month for the next round of global climate talks."

One close observer of the climate talks said the $400bn subsidies devoted to fossil fuels, uncovered by the IEA, were "staggering", and the way in which these subsidies distort the market presented a massive problem in encouraging the move to renewables. He added that Birol's comments, though urgent and timely, were unlikely to galvanise China and the US – the world's two biggest emittters – into action on the international stage.

"The US can't move (owing to Republican opposition) and there's no upside for China domestically in doing so. At least China is moving up the learning curve with its deployment of renewables, but it's doing so in parallel to the hugely damaging coal-fired assets that it is unlikely to ever want (to turn off in order to) to meet climate targets in years to come."

Warming won’t cause extinction

Barrett, professor of natural resource economics – Columbia University, ‘7

(Scott, Why Cooperate? The Incentive to Supply Global Public Goods, introduction)

First, climate change does not threaten the survival of the human species.5 If unchecked, it will cause other species to become extinction (though biodiversity is being depleted now due to other reasons). It will alter critical ecosystems (though this is also happening now, and for reasons unrelated to climate change). It will reduce land area as the seas rise, and in the process displace human populations. “Catastrophic” climate change is possible, but not certain. Moreover, and unlike an asteroid collision, large changes (such as sea level rise of, say, ten meters) will likely take centuries to unfold, giving societies time to adjust. “Abrupt” climate change is also possible, and will occur more rapidly, perhaps over a decade or two. However, abrupt climate change (such as a weakening in the North Atlantic circulation), though potentially very serious, is unlikely to be ruinous. Human-induced climate change is an experiment of planetary proportions, and we cannot be sur of its consequences. Even in a worse case scenario, however, global climate change is not the equivalent of the Earth being hit by mega-asteroid. Indeed, if it were as damaging as this, and if we were sure that it would be this harmful, then our incentive to address this threat would be overwhelming. The challenge would still be more difficult than asteroid defense, but we would have done much more about it by now.

Natural variability makes the impact inevitable and means that oceans will adapt—their studies don’t assume this

Hofmann, Professor of Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology – University of California Santa Barbara et al., ‘11

(Gretchen E., “High-Frequency Dynamics of Ocean pH: A Multi-Ecosystem Comparison,” *PLoS ONE* Vol. 6, No. 12)

Since the publication of two reports in 2005–2006 [1], [2], the drive to forecast the effects of anthropogenic ocean acidification (OA) on marine ecosystems and their resident calcifying marine organisms has resulted in a growing body of research. Numerous laboratory studies testing the effects of altered seawater chemistry (low pH, altered pCO2, and undersaturation states - Ω - for calcium carbonate polymorphs) on biogenic calcification, growth, metabolism, and development have demonstrated a range of responses in marine organisms (for reviews see [3]–[8]). However, the emerging picture of biological consequences of OA – from data gathered largely from laboratory experiments – is not currently matched by equally available environmental data that describe present-day pH exposures or the natural variation in the carbonate system experienced by most marine organisms. Although researchers have documented variability in seawater carbonate chemistry on several occasions in different marine ecosystems (e.g., [9]–[15]), this variation has been under-appreciated in these early stages of OA research.

Recently, a deeper consideration of ecosystem-specific variation in seawater chemistry has emerged (e.g., [16]–[18]), one that is pertinent to the study of biological consequences of OA. Specifically, assessments of environmental heterogeneity present a nuanced complement to current laboratory experiments. The dynamics of specific natural carbonate chemistry on local scales provide critical context because outcomes of experiments on single species are used in meta-analyses to project the overall biological consequences of OA [7], [19], to forecast ecosystem-level outcomes [20], and ultimately to contribute to policy decisions [21] and the management of fisheries [22], [23]. As noted earlier [24], natural variability in pH is seldom considered when effects of ocean acidification are considered. Natural variability may occur at rates much higher than the rate at which carbon dioxide is decreasing ocean pH, about −0.0017 pH/year [25], [26]. This ambient fluctuation in pH may have a large impact on the development of resilience in marine populations, or it may combine with the steady effects of acidification to produce extreme events with large impacts [24]. In either case, understanding the environmental variability in ocean pH is essential.

Although data on the natural variation in the seawater CO2 system are emerging, nearly all high-resolution (e.g. hourly) time series are based on pCO2 sensors, with comparatively few pH time series found in the literature. From a research perspective, the absence of information regarding natural pH dynamics is a critical data gap for the biological and ecological arm of the multidisciplinary investigation of OA. Our ability to understand processes ranging from physiological tolerances to local adaptation is compromised. Specifically, laboratory experiments to test tolerances are often not designed to encompass the actual habitat exposure of the organisms under study, a critical design criterion in organismal physiology that also applies to global change biology [27]–[29]. It is noted that neither pH nor pCO2 alone provide the information sufficient to fully constrain the CO2 system, and while it is preferred to measure both, the preference for measuring one over the other is evaluated on a case-by-case basis and is often dictated by the equipment available.

In this light, data that reveal present-day pH dynamics in marine environments and therefore ground pH levels in CO2 perturbation experiments in an environmental context are valuable to the OA research community in two major ways. First, estimates of organismal resilience are greatly facilitated. Empiricists can contextualize lab experiments with actual environmental data, thereby improving them. Notably, the majority of manipulative laboratory experiments in OA research (including our own) have been parameterized using pCO2 levels as per the IPCC emission scenario predictions [30]. One consequence of this practice is that organisms are potentially tested outside of the current exposure across their biogeographic range, and tolerances are not bracketed appropriately. This situation may not be a lethal issue (i.e. negating all past observations in experiments where environmental context was not known); however, the lack of information about the ‘pH seascape’ may be translated through these organismal experiments in a manner that clouds the perspective of vulnerability of marine ecosystems. For example, recent data on the heterogeneity of pH in coastal waters of the Northeastern Pacific [31], [32] that are characterized by episodic upwelling has caused biologists to re-examine the physiological tolerances of organisms that live there. Specifically, resident calcifying marine invertebrates and algae are acclimatized to existing spatial and temporal heterogeneity [17], [18], and further, populations are likely adapted to local to regional differences in upwelling patterns [33].

Secondly, in addition to improving laboratory experiments, data regarding the nature of the pH seascape also facilitate hypothesis-generating science. Specifically, heterogeneity in the environment with regard to pH and pCO2 exposure may result in populations that are acclimatized to variable pH or extremes in pH. Although this process has been highlighted in thermal biology of marine invertebrates [34], such insight is not available with regard to gradients of seawater chemistry that occur on biogeographic scales. With that said, recent field studies have demonstrated that natural variation in seawater chemistry does influence organismal abundance and distribution [16], [35], [36]. With our newfound access to pH time series data, we can begin to explore the biophysical link between environmental seawater chemistry and resilience to baseline shifts in pH regimes, to identify at-risk populations as well as tolerant ones. Additionally, the use of sensors in the field can identify hidden patterns in the CO2 system, revealing areas that are refugia to acidification or carbonate undersaturation; such knowledge could enable protection, management, and remediation of critical marine habitats and populations in the future.

The recent development of sensors for in situ measurements of seawater pH [37], [38] has resulted in the ability to record pH more readily in the field in a manner that can support biological and ecological research. Since 2009, the Martz lab (SIO) has constructed 52 “SeaFET” pH sensors for 13 different collaborators (see http://martzlab.ucsd.edu) working in a broad range of settings. Using subsamples of data from many of these sensors, here we examine signatures of pH heterogeneity, presenting time series snapshots of sea-surface pH (upper 10 m) at 15 locations, spanning various overlapping habitat classifications including polar, temperate, tropical, open ocean, coastal, upwelling, estuarine, kelp forest, coral reef, pelagic, benthic, and extreme. Naturally, at many sites, multiple habitat classifications will apply. Characteristic patterns observed in the 30-day snapshots provide biome-specific pH signatures. This comparative dataset highlights the heterogeneity of present-day pH among marine ecosystems and underscores that contemporary marine organisms are currently exposed to different pH regimes in seawater that are not predicted until 2100.

Results

Overall, the patterns of pH recorded at each of the 15 deployment sites (shown in Figure 1, Table 1) were strikingly different. Figure 2 presents the temporal pattern of pH variation at each of these sites, and, for the sake of comparison, these are presented as 30-day time series “snapshots.” Note that all deployments generated >30 days of data except for sensors 3, 4, and 13, where the sensors were deliberately removed due to time constraints at the study sites. Though the patterns observed among the various marine ecosystems are driven by a variety of oceanographic forcing such as temperature, mixing, and biological activity, we do not provide a separate analysis of controlling factors on pH at each location. Each time series was accompanied by a different set of ancillary data, some rich with several co-located sensors, others devoid of co-located sensors. Given these differences in data collection across sites, here we focus on the comparative pH sensor data as a means to highlight observed pH variability and ecosystem-level differences between sites. For purposes of comparison, the metrics of variability presented here are pH minima, maxima, range, standard deviation, and rate of change (see Table 2). The rate presented in Table 2 and Figure 3 represents a mean instantaneous rate of change in pH hr−1, where a rate was calculated for each discrete time step as the absolute value of pH difference divided by the length of time between two adjacent data points.

In terms of general patterns amongst the comparative datasets, the open ocean sites (CCE1 and Kingman Reef) and the Antarctic sites (Cape Evans and Cindercones) displayed the least variation in pH over the 30-day deployment period. For example, pH range fluctuated between 0.024 to 0.096 at CCE1, Kingman Reef, Cape Evans, and Cindercones (Figure 2A, B and Table 2). In distinct contrast to the stability of the open ocean and Antarctic sites, sensors at the other five site classifications (upwelling, estuarine/near-shore, coral reef, kelp forest, and extreme) captured much greater variability (pH fluctuations ranging between 0.121 to 1.430) and may provide insight towards ecosystem-specific patterns. The sites in upwelling regions (Pt. Conception and Pt. Ano Nuevo, Figure 2C), the two locations in Monterey Bay, CA (Figure 2D), and the kelp forest sites (La Jolla and Santa Barbara Mohawk Reef, Figure 2F) all exhibited large fluctuations in pH conditions (pH changes>0.25). Additionally, at these 6 sites, pH oscillated in semi-diurnal patterns, the most apparent at the estuarine sites. The pH recorded in coral reef ecosystems exhibited a distinct diel pattern characterized by relatively consistent, moderate fluctuations (0.1<pH change<0.25; Figure 2E). At the Palmyra fore reef site, pH maxima occurred in the early evening (~5:00 pm), and pH minima were recorded immediately pre-dawn (~6:30 am). On a fringing reef site in Moorea, French Polynesia, a similar diel pattern was observed, with pH maxima occurring shortly after sunset (~7:30 pm) and pH minima several hours after dawn (~10:00 am). Finally, the greatest transitions in pH over time were observed at locations termed our “Extreme” sites - a CO2 venting site in Italy (site S2 in ref. [36]) and a submarine spring site in Mexico. For these sites, the patterns were extremely variable and lacked a detectable periodicity (Figure 2G).

The sites examined in this study do not comprehensively represent pH variability in coastal ecosystems, partly because we focused on surface epipelagic and shallow benthic pH variability. Many organisms that may be impacted by pH variability and ocean acidification reside at intermediate (>10 m) to abyssal depths. Notable regimes missing from Figure 2 include seasonally stratified open ocean locations that exhibit intense spring blooms; the equatorial upwelling zone; other temperate (and highly productive) Eastern Continental Boundary upwelling areas; subsurface oxygen minimum zones and seasonal dead zones; and a wide variety of unique estuarine, salt marsh, and tide pool environments. Spring bloom locations exhibit a marked increase in diel pCO2 variability during the peak bloom with a coincident drawdown similar in magnitude but opposite in sign to the upwelling signals shown in Figure 2 [39]. Equatorial upwelling locations undergo significant stochastic variability, as observed by pCO2 sensors in the TAO array (data viewable at http://www.pmel.noaa.gov/). Intertidal vegetated and tide pool habitats may exhibit major pH fluctuations due to macrophyte or animal respiratory cycles [15], while CO2 production in oxygen minimum zones can reduce pH to a limit of about 7.4 [40].

Due to local temperature differences, variable total alkalinity, and seasonal differences between deployment dates at each site, a comparison of average pH across the datasets would be somewhat misleading. However, some information can be gleaned from an examination of the averages: the overall binned average of all 15 mean values in Table 1 is 8.02±0.1. This pH value is generally in agreement with the global open ocean mean for 2010 of 8.07, a value generated by combining climatology data for temperature, salinity, phosphate, silicate [41]–[43], total alkalinity [44], and pCO2 [45] for the year 2000, corrected to 2010 using the average global rise of 1.5 µatm pCO2 yr−1. Rather than make a point-by-point comparison of the mean pH of each dataset, we focus instead on the differences in observed variability amongst the sites. For this analysis, summary statistics of the comparative datasets were ranked in order to examine the range of variability across all 15 sites (Fig. 3).

Discussion

Collected by 15 individual SeaFET sensors in seven types of marine habitats, data presented here highlight natural variability in seawater pH. Based on Figure 3, it is evident that regions of the ocean exhibit a continuum of pH variability. At sites in the open ocean (CCE-1), Antarctica, and Kingman reef (a coastal region in the permanently stratified open Pacific Ocean with very low residence times, and thus representative of the surrounding open ocean water), pH was very stable (SD<0.01 pH over 30 days). Elsewhere, pH was highly variable across a range of ecosystems where sensors were deployed. The salient conclusions from this comparative dataset are two-fold: (1) most non-open ocean sites are indeed characterized by natural variation in seawater chemistry that can now be revealed through continuous monitoring by autonomous instrumentation, and (2) in some cases, seawater in these sites reaches extremes in pH, sometimes daily, that are often considered to only occur in open ocean systems well into the future [46]. Admittedly, pH is only part of the story with regard to the biological impacts of OA on marine organisms. However, continuous long-term observations provided by sensors such as the SeaFET are a great first step in elucidating the biophysical link between natural variation and physiological capacity in resident marine organisms.

In the end, knowledge of spatial and temporal variation in seawater chemistry is a critical resource for biological research, for aquaculture, and for management efforts. From a biological perspective, the evolutionary history of the resident organisms will greatly influence the adaptation potential of organisms in marine populations. Thus, present-day natural variation will likely shape capacity for adaptation of resident organisms, influencing the resilience of critical marine ecosystems to future anthropogenic acidification. Below we discuss the comparative SeaFET-collected data and, where applicable, the biological consequences of the temporal heterogeneity that we found in each of the marine ecosystems where sensors were deployed.

As the most stable area, the open ocean behaves in a predictable way and generally adheres to global models attempting to predict future CO2 conditions based on equilibration of the surface ocean with a given atmospheric pCO2 (e.g. [47]). This can be shown with longer-term pH records obtained with SeaFET sensors, which are available at the CCE-1 mooring (Fig. 4). The ambient pH values for this open ocean location can be predicted to better than ±0.02 from the CO2-corrected climatology mentioned above; pH has dropped by about 0.015 units since 2000. At CCE-1, the annual carbonate cycle followed the sea surface temperature cycle, and pH was driven mostly by changes in the temperature dependence of CO2 system thermodynamics (Figure 4). SeaFET observations at CCE-1 agree with the climatology to +0.017±0.014 pH units, with episodic excursions from the climatology but a general return to the climatological mean. Although the annual cycle in the open ocean is somewhat predictable, it is notable that even at these seemingly stable locations, climatology-based forecasts consistently underestimate natural variability. Our observations confirm an annual mean variability in pH at CCE-1 of nearly 0.1, suggest an inter-annual variability of ~0.02 pH, and capture episodic changes that deviate from the climatology (Figure 4). Similar underestimates of CO2 variability were observed at nine other open ocean locations, where the Takahashi pCO2 climatology overlaps PMEL moorings with pCO2 sensors (not shown). Thus, on both a monthly (Fig. 2) and annual scale (Fig. 4), even the most stable open ocean sites see pH changes many times larger than the annual rate of acidification. This natural variability has prompted the suggestion that “an appropriate null hypothesis may be, until evidence is obtained to the contrary, that major biogeochemical processes in the oceans other than calcification will not be fundamentally different under future higher CO2/lower pH conditions” [24].

Similarly, the sensors deployed on the benthos in the Antarctic (Cindercones and Cape Evans, Figure 2B) recorded relatively stable pH conditions when compared to other sites in the study. Very few data exist for the Southern Ocean; however, open-water areas in this region experience a strong seasonal shift in seawater pH (~0.3–0.5 units) between austral summer and winter [48], [49] due to a decline in photosynthesis during winter and a disequilibrium of air-sea CO2 exchange due to annual surface sea ice and deep water entrainment [50]. Given the timing of deployment of our sensor in McMurdo Sound (austral spring: October–November), the sensor did not capture the change in seawater chemistry that might have occurred in the austral winter [49]. In general, due to sea ice conditions, observations from the Southern Ocean are limited, with water chemistry data falling into two categories: (1) discrete sampling events during oceanographic cruises (e.g. US Joint Global Ocean Flux Study, http://www1.whoi.edu/) and (2) single-point measurements from locations under sea ice [49], [51], [52]. Biologically speaking, the Southern Ocean is a region expected to experience acidification and undersaturated conditions earlier in time than other parts of the ocean [47], and calcifying Antarctic organisms are thought to be quite vulnerable to anthropogenic OA given the already challenging saturation states that are characteristic of cold polar waters [53]–[56]. Short-term CO2 perturbation experiments have shown that Antarctic calcifying marine invertebrates are sensitive to decreased saturation states [51], [57], although the number of species-level studies and community-level studies are very limited. The Western Antarctic Peninsula and the sub-Antarctic islands will experience pronounced increases in temperature [54] and could consequently undergo more variation and/or undersaturation given the increased potential for biological activity. Importantly, depending on the patterns of seasonally-dependent saturation state that will be revealed with improved observations [58], Antarctic organisms may experience more variation than might be expected, a situation that will influence their resilience to future acidification.

Three other types of study sites – the coastal upwelling, kelp forest and estuarine/near-shore sites – all exhibited variability due to a combination of mixing, tidal excursions, biological activity, and variable residence time (Fig. 2). Although these sites are all united by fairly obvious heterogeneity in pH, organisms living in these areas encounter unique complexities in seawater chemistry that will influence their physiological response, resilience, and potential for adaptation.

Typically, estuarine environments have riverine input that naturally creates very low saturation states [59]–[61]. Seawater chemistry conditions in these areas often shift dramatically, challenging biogenic calcification by resident organisms. Additionally, these species must also tolerate abiotic factors that interact with pH, such as temperature [62]. Two sensors in the Monterey Bay region, L1 (at the mouth of Elkhorn Slough) and L20 (~2 km seaward and north of L1), recorded rapid changes in pH. However, as opposed to riverine input, the low pH fluctuations observed here are likely due to isopycnal shoaling or low CO2 water that is pulsing up to the near shore on internal tides. These locations may also experience high river run-off in the rainy season, but such conditions were not reflected in the time series shown in Fig. 2.

Organisms living in upwelling regions may be acclimatized and adapted to extremes in seawater chemistry; here, deep CO2-enriched waters reach the surface and may shoal onto the benthos on the continental shelf [31], [32]. Data collected from our upwelling sites support the patterns found by cruise-based investigations; pH fluctuations were often sharp, and large transitions of up to ~0.35 pH units occurred over the course of days (Fig. 2). Laboratory studies on calcifying marine invertebrates living in upwelling regions suggest that these organisms maintain function under such stochastic conditions. However, overall performance may be reduced, suggesting that these species are indeed threatened by future acidification [17], [18], [63].

For kelp forests, although there is less influence from riverine inputs, pH variation is quite dynamic at these sites in the coastal California region (Fig 2; [18]). Patterns here are likely driven by fluctuations in coastal upwelling, biological activity, currents, internal tides, seasonally shoaling isopleths, as well as the size of the kelp forest, which may influence residence times via reduced flow. Kelps may respond positively to increased availability of CO2 and HCO3−, which may allow for reduced metabolic costs and increased productivity [64]. Increased kelp production may elevate pH within the forest during periods of photosynthesis, causing wider daily fluctuations in pH, though this is speculative at this time. As a result, kelp forests, particularly those of surface canopy forming species such as Macrocystis pyrifera, may contain a greater level of spatial heterogeneity in terms of the pH environment; vertical gradients in pH may form due to enhanced levels of photosynthesis at shallower depths. Such gradients may increase the risk of low pH exposure for benthic species while buffering those found within the surface canopy. Kelp forests provide habitat to a rich diversity of organisms from a wide range of calcifying and non-calcifying taxa [65]. As with organisms from the other coastal locations (estuarine and upwelling), the biota living within kelp forest environments are most likely acclimatized to this degree of natural variation. However, continued declines in oxygenation and shoaling of hypoxic boundaries observed in recent decades in the southern California bight [66], [67] are likely accompanied by a reduction in pH and saturation state. Thus, pH exposure regimes for the coastal California region's kelp forest biota may be changing over relatively short time scales. Over longer temporal scales as pH and carbonate saturation levels decrease, the relative abundances of these species may change, with community shifts favoring non-calcified species, as exemplified by long-term studies in intertidal communities by Wootton et al. [15].

For all the marine habitats described above, one very important consideration is that the extreme range of environmental variability does not necessarily translate to extreme resistance to future OA. Instead, such a range of variation may mean that the organisms resident in tidal, estuarine, and upwelling regions are already operating at the limits of their physiological tolerances (a la the classic tolerance windows of Fox – see [68]). Thus, future acidification, whether it be atmospheric or from other sources, may drive the physiology of these organisms closer to the edges of their tolerance windows. When environmental change is layered upon their present-day range of environmental exposures, they may thereby be pushed to the “guardrails” of their tolerance [20], [68].

In contrast to more stochastic changes in pH that were observed in some sites, our coral reef locations displayed a strikingly consistent pattern of diel fluctuations over the 30-day recording period. Similar short-term pH time series with lower daily resolution [69], [70] have reported regular diel pH fluctuation correlated to changes in total alkalinity and oxygen levels. These environmental patterns of pH suggest that reef organisms may be acclimatized to consistent but moderate changes in the carbonate system. Coral reefs have been at the center of research regarding the effects of OA on marine ecosystems [71]–[73]. Along with the calcification biology of the dominant scleractinian corals and coralline algae, the biodiversity on coral reefs includes many other calcifying species that will likely be affected [74]–[77]. Across the existing datasets in tropical reef ecosystems, the biological response of calcifying species to variation in seawater chemistry is complex (see [78]) –all corals or calcifying algal species will not respond similarly, in part because these calcifying reef-builders are photo-autotrophs (or mixotrophs), with algal symbionts that complicate the physiological response of the animal to changes in seawater chemistry.

Finally, the “Extreme” sites in our comparative dataset are of interest in that the low pH levels observed here represent a natural analogue to OA conditions in the future, demonstrating how the abundance and distribution of calcifying benthic organisms, as well as multi-species assemblages, can vary as a function of seawater chemistry [16], [35], [36], [79]. The variability in seawater pH was higher at both the groundwater springs off the coast of Mexico and the natural CO2 vents off the coast of Italy than at any of the other sensor locations. Offshore of Puerto Morelos, Mexico (and at other sites along the Mesoamerican Reef), natural low-saturation (Ω~0.5, pH 6.70–7.30, due to non-ventilated, high CO2, high alkalinity groundwater) submarine springs have been discharging for millennia. Here, variability in pH is due to long-term respiration driving a low ratio of alkalinity to dissolved inorganic carbon in effluent ground water. These sites provide insight into potential long-term responses of coral backreef ecosystems to low saturation conditions [79]. Unlike Puerto Morelos, the variability of pH at volcanic CO2 vents at Ischia, Italy is almost purely abiotically derived, due entirely to CO2 venting and subsequent mixing. This site in the Mediterranean Sea hosts a benthic assemblage that reflects the impacts of OA on rocky reef communities [16], [36].

Overall, the ‘extreme’ systems provide an opportunity to examine how variability in pH and extreme events (sensu [80]) affects ecological processes. Knowledge of this biophysical link is essential for forecasting ecological responses to acidification in ecosystems with sharp fluctuations in pH, such as upwelling or estuarine environments. Despite reductions in species richness, several calcifying organisms are found in low pH conditions close to the vents [16] and the springs [79]. The persistence of calcifying organisms at these extreme sites, where mean pH values are comparable to those that have reduced organism performance in laboratory experiments (i.e., pHT 7.8; reviewed in [16]), suggest that long exposures to such variability in pH, versus a consistently low-pH environment, could play an important role in regulating organism performance. Variability in pH could potentially promote acclimatization or adaptation to acidification through repeated exposure to low pH conditions [24]; alternatively, transient exposures to high pH conditions could buffer the effects of acidification by relieving physiological stress. Thus, the ecological patterns coupled with the high fluctuations in pH at the extreme sites highlight the need to consider carbonate chemistry variability in experiments and models aimed at understanding the impacts of acidification.
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Regarding the first of these requirements, Tilman et al. note that in many parts of the world the historical rate of increase in crop yields is declining, as the genetic ceiling for maximal yield potential is being approached. This observation, in their words, ―highlights the need for efforts to steadily increase the yield potential ceiling.‖ With respect to the second requirement, they indicate, ―without the use of synthetic fertilizers, world food production could not have increased at the rate it did [in the past] and more natural ecosystems would have been converted to agriculture.‖ Hence, they state the solution ―will require significant increases in nutrient use efficiency, that is, in cereal production per unit of added nitrogen, phosphorus,‖ and so forth. Finally, as to the third requirement, Tilman et al. remind us ―water is regionally scarce,‖ and ―many countries in a band from China through India and Pakistan, and the Middle East to North Africa either currently or will soon fail to have adequate water to maintain per capita food production from irrigated land.‖ Increasing crop water use efficiency, therefore, is also a must. Although the impending biological crisis and several important elements of its potential solution are thus well defined, Tilman et al. (2001) noted ―even the best available technologies, fully deployed, cannot prevent many of the forecasted problems.‖ This was also the conclusion of Idso and Idso (2000), who stated that although ―expected advances in agricultural technology and expertise will significantly increase the food production potential of many countries and regions,‖ these advances ―will not increase production fast enough to meet the demands of the even faster-growing human population of the planet.‖ Fortunately, we have a powerful ally in the ongoing rise in the air‘s CO2 content that can provide what we can‘t. Since atmospheric CO2 is the basic ―food of essentially all plants, the more of it there is in the air, the bigger and better they grow. For a nominal doubling of the air‘s CO2 concentration, for example, the productivity of Earth‘s herbaceous plants rises by 30 to 50 percent (Kimball, 1983; Idso and Idso, 1994), and the productivity of its woody plants rises by 50 to 80 percent or more (Saxe et al. 1998; Idso and Kimball, 2001). Hence, as the air‘s CO2 content continues to rise, the land use efficiency of the planet will rise right along with it. In addition, atmospheric CO2 enrichment typically increases plant nutrient use efficiency and plant water use efficiency. Thus, with respect to all three of the major needs identified by Tilman et al. (2002), increases in the air‘s CO2 content pay huge dividends, helping to increase agricultural output without the taking of new land and water from nature. Many other researchers have broached this subject. In a paper recently published in the Annual Review of Plant Biology, three scientists associated with the Institute of Genomic Biology at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (USA) write that meeting the global increase in agricultural demand during this century ―is predicted to require a doubling of global production,‖ but ―the world has limited capacity to sustainably expand cropland,‖ and this capacity is actually ―shrinking in many developed countries.‖ Thus, Zhu et al. (2010) state, ―meeting future increases in demand will have to come from a near doubling of productivity on a land area basis,‖ and they conclude ―a large contribution will have to come from improved photosynthetic conversion efficiency,‖ estimating ―at least a 50% improvement will be required to double global production.‖ The researchers‘ reason for focusing on photosynthetic conversion efficiency derives from the experimentally observed facts that increases in the atmosphere‘s CO2 concentration increase the photosynthetic rates of nearly all plants, and those rate increases generally lead to equivalent—or only slightly smaller—increases in plant productivity on a land area basis. That provides a solid foundation for their enthusiasm in this regard. In their review of the matter, however, they examine the prospects for boosting photosynthetic conversion efficiency in an entirely different way: genetically, without increasing the air‘s CO2 content. ―Improving photosynthetic conversion efficiency will require,‖ the three scientists state, ―a full suite of tools including breeding, gene transfer, and synthetic biology in bringing about the designed alteration to photosynthesis.‖ For some of these ―near-term‖ endeavors, they indicate ―implementation is limited by technical issues that can be overcome by sufficient investment,‖ meaning they can ―be bought.‖ But several ―mid-term‖ goals could take 20 years or more to achieve; and they state ―even when these improvements are achieved, it may take an additional 10–20 years to bring such innovations to farms in commercial cultivars at adequate scale.‖ And if that is not bad enough, they say of still longer-term goals that ―too little of the science has been undertaken to identify what needs to be altered to effect an increase in yield,‖ while in some cases they acknowledge that what they envision may not even be possible, as in developing a form of RuBisCO that exhibits a significant decrease in oxygenation activity, or in designing C3 crops to utilize the C4 form of photosynthetic metabolism. Clearly, we do not have the time to gamble on our ability to accomplish what needs to be done in order to forestall massive human starvation of global dimensions within the current century. Therefore—in addition to trying what Zhu et al. suggest—we must rely on the ―tested and true: the CO2-induced stimulation of plant photosynthesis and crop yield production. And all we need to do in this regard is to refrain from interfering with the natural evolution of the Industrial Revolution, which is destined to be carried for some time yet on the backs of fossil-fuel-driven enterprises that can provide the atmosphere with the extra carbon dioxide that will be needed to provide the extra increase in crop growth that may mean the difference between global food sufficiency and human starvation on a massive scale a mere few decades from now. Another take on the matter has been provided by Hanjra and Qureshi (2010). They begin their treatment of the subject by quoting Benjamin Franklin‘s well-known homily, ―When the well is dry, we know the worth of water,‖ and they write we ―must not lose sight of surging water scarcity.‖ Noting ―population and income growth will increase the demand for food and water,‖ they contend ―irrigation will be the first sector to lose water, as water competition by non-agricultural uses increases and water scarcity intensifies.‖ As ―increasing water scarcity will have implications for food security, hunger, poverty, and ecosystem health and services,‖ they report ―feeding the 2050 population will require some 12,400 km3 of water, up from 6800 km3 used today.‖ This huge increase, they continue, ―will leave a water gap of about 3300 km3 even after improving efficiency in irrigated agriculture, improving water management, and upgrading of rainfed agriculture,‖ as per the findings of de Fraiture et al. (2007), Molden (2007), and Molden et al. (2010). This water deficiency, according to Hanjra and Qureshi, ―will lead to a food gap unless concerted actions are taken today.‖ Some of the measures they propose are to conserve water and energy resources, develop and adopt climate-resilient crop varieties, modernize irrigation, shore up domestic food supplies, reengage in agriculture for further development, and reform the global food and trade markets. To achieve these goals, they write, ―unprecedented global cooperation is required,‖ which by the looks of today‘s world is an exceedingly remote possibility. What, then, can we do to defuse the ticking time-bomb of this looming food and water crisis? One option is to do nothing: don‘t mess with the normal, unforced evolution of civilization‘s means of acquiring energy. This is because on top of everything else we may try to do to conserve both land and freshwater resources, we will still fall short of what is needed to be achieved unless the air‘s CO2 content rises significantly and thereby boosts the water use efficiency of Earth‘s crop plants and that of the plants that provide food and habitat for what could be called ―wild nature,‖ enabling both sets of plants to produce more biomass per unit of water used. To ensure this happens, we will need all of the CO2 that will be produced by the burning of fossil fuels, until other forms of energy truly become more cost-efficient than coal, gas, and oil. In fact, these other energy sources will have to become much more cost-efficient before fossil fuels are phased out, because the positive externality of the CO2-induced increase in plant water use efficiency provided by the steady rise in the atmosphere‘s CO2 concentration due to the burning of fossil fuels will be providing a most important service in helping us feed and sustain our own species without totally decimating what yet remains of wild nature. In yet another paper to address this important issue—this one published in the Journal of Proteome Research—Sarkar et al. (2010) write, ―increasing population and unsustainable exploitation of nature and natural resources have made ‗food security‘ a burning issue in the 21st century,‖ echoing the sentiments expressed by Farrell (2009), who noted ―the alarming increase in biofuel production, the projected demand for livestock products, and the estimated food to feed the additional 700 million people who will arrive here by 2016, will have unprecedented consequences,‖ among which are likely to be that ―arable land, the environment, water supply and sustainability of the agricultural system will all be affected,‖ and not in a positive way. Furthermore, when the human population of the globe reaches 8.7–11.3 billion by the year 2050 (Bengtsson et al., 2006), the situation will become truly intolerable, unless something is done, far in advance of that date, to mitigate the situation dramatically. Thus, as Sarkar et al. suggest, ―a normal approach for any nation/region is to strengthen its agricultural production for meeting future demands and provide food security.‖ But a major difficulty, which could spoil mankind‘s ability to do so, is the ongoing rise in the atmosphere‘s ozone concentration. This is the subject of Sarkar et al.‘s new paper. In a study designed to elucidate the many ways in which ozone (O3) is harmful to plants, the eight researchers grew two high-yielding cultivars (Sonalika and HUW 510) of wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) outdoors at the Agriculture Research Farm of India‘s Banaras Hindu University. This was done within open-top chambers maintained at the ambient O3 concentration and at elevated O3 concentrations of 25 percent and 50 percent above ambient during the peak O3 period of the day (10:00 to 15:00 hours local time) for a total of 50 days, during which time they measured numerous responses of the plants to the two levels of ozone enrichment. Sarkar et al. determined, among several other things, that the moderate increases in the air‘s O3 concentration resulted in higher foliar injury, a reduction in photosynthetic efficiency, induced inhibition in photochemical efficacy of photosystem II, lowered concentrations of photosynthetic pigments and proteins, and what they describe as ―drastic reductions‖ in RuBisCO large and small subunits, while noting major leaf photosynthetic proteins and important energy metabolism proteins were also ―drastically reduced.‖ Discussing the results, the scientists from India, Japan, and Nepal remark that anthropogenic activities have made ozone a ―major environmental pollutant of our time,‖ while noting some are predicting it to be an even ―greater problem for the future.‖ Adding this dilemma to the problem of feeding the world over the next few decades and beyond makes humanity‘s future look incredibly bleak. Thus, Sarkar et al. suggest we focus on ―engineering crops for future high O3,‖ concentrating on maintaining ―effective stomatal conductance of plants which can avoid O3 entry but not hamper their productivity.‖ We agree. But not knowing to what extent we will be successful in this endeavor, we also need to do something we know will work: allowing the air‘s CO2 content to rise, unimpeded by the misguided efforts of those who would curtail anthropogenic CO2 emissions in the guise of fighting what they claim is anthropogenic-induced global warming. This contention is largely theoretical and wholly unproven, but we know, as a result of literally hundreds, if not thousands, of real-world experiments, that atmospheric CO2 enrichment increases both the productivity and water-use efficiency of nearly all plants, and that it often more than compensates for the negative effects of O3 pollution. Introducing another review of food security studies pertinent to the challenge of feeding 9 billion people just four decades from now, Godfray et al. (2010) note ―more than one in seven people today still do not have access to sufficient protein and energy from their diet and even more suffer some form of micronutrient malnourishment,‖ citing the FAO (2009). Although ―increases in production will have an important part to play‖ in correcting this problem and keeping it from worsening in the future, mankind ―will be constrained by the finite resources provided by the earth‘s lands, oceans and atmosphere,‖ This set of difficulties they describe at the end of their review as constituting a ―perfect storm.‖ In considering ways to mitigate these problems, the first question they ask is: ―How can more food be produced sustainably?‖ They state the primary solution to food shortages of the past was ―to bring more land into agriculture and to exploit new fish stocks,‖ but they note there is precious little remaining of either of these pristine resources. Thus, they conclude ―the most likely scenario is that more food will need to be produced from the same or less land.‖ As they suggest, ―we must avoid the temptation to sacrifice further the earth‘s already hugely depleted biodiversity for easy gains in food production, not only because biodiversity provides many of the public goods upon which mankind relies, but also because we do not have the right to deprive future generations of its economic and cultural benefits.‖ And, we might add, because we should be enlightened enough to realize we have a moral responsibility to drive no more species to extinction than we already have sent to that sorry state. So how can these diverse requirements all be met simultaneously? A clue comes from Godfray et al.‘s statement that ―greater water and nutrient use efficiency, as well as tolerance of abiotic stress, are likely to become of increasing importance.‖ And what is there that can bring about these changes in mankind‘s crops? You guessed it: carbon dioxide. Rising concentrations of atmospheric CO2 increase the photosynthetic prowess of essentially all of the Earth‘s plants, while generally reducing the rate at which they transfer water from the soil to the air. In addition, more CO2 in the air tends to enhance the efficiency with which plants utilize nutrients in constructing their tissues and producing the edible portions that we and all of Earth‘s animals depend upon for our very existence. Focusing on the water scarcity aspect of the food shortage problem, Kummu et al. (2010) write, ―due to the rapidly increasing population and water use per capita in many areas of the world, around one third of the world‘s population currently lives under physical water scarcity (e.g. Vorosmarty et al., 2000; Alcamo et al., 2003; Oki and Kanae, 2006).‖ But despite the large number of water scarcity studies conducted over the years, ―no global assessment is available of how this trend has evolved over the past several centuries to millennia.‖ Thus they conducted a study covering AD 0 to 2005. This analysis was carried out for ten different time slices, defined as those times at which the human population of the globe was approximately double the population of the previous time slice. Global population data for these analyses were derived from the 5‘ latitude x 5‘ longitude-resolution global HYDE dataset of Klein Goldewijk (2005) and Klein Goldewijk et al. (2010), while evaluation of water resources availability over the same period was based on monthly temperature and precipitation output from the climate model ECBilt-CLIO-VECODE, as calculated by Renssen et al. (2005). After completing these assessments, the four researchers found ―moderate water shortage first appeared around 1800, but it commenced in earnest from about 1900, when 9% of the world population experienced water shortage, of which 2% was under chronic water shortage (<1000 m3/capita/year).‖ Thereafter, from 1960 onwards, they write, ―water shortage increased extremely rapidly, with the proportion of global population living under chronic water shortage increasing from 9% (280 million people) in 1960 to 35% (2300 million) in 2005.‖ And currently, they continue, ―the most widespread water shortage is in South Asia, where 91% of the population experiences some form of water shortage,‖ while ―the most severe shortage is in North Africa and the Middle East, where 77% and 52% of the total population lives under extreme water shortage (<500 m3/capita/year), respectively.‖ To alleviate these freshwater shortages, Kummu et al. state measures generally have been taken to increase water availability, such as building dams and extracting groundwater. But they note ―there are already several regions in which such measures are no longer sufficient, as there is simply not enough water available in some regions.‖ In addition, they observe, ―this problem is expected to increase in the future due to increasing population pressure (e.g. United Nations, 2009), higher welfare (e.g. Grubler et al., 2007) [and] production of water intensive biofuels (e.g. Varis, 2007, Berndes, 2008).‖ Hence, they conclude there will be an increasing need for many nonstructural measures, the first and foremost of which they indicate to be ―increasing the efficiency of water use.‖ This characteristic of nearly all of Earth‘s plants is almost universally promoted by atmospheric CO2 enrichment.

#### No CCP collapse—the government represses instability

Pei 9(Minxin, Senior Associate in the China Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 3/12. “Will the Chinese Communist Party Survive the Crisis?” Foreign Affairs. http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/64862/minxin-pei/will-the-chinese-communist-party-survive-the-crisis)

It might seem reasonable to expect that challenges from the disaffected urban middle class, frustrated college graduates, and unemployed migrants will constitute the principal threat to the party's rule. If those groups were in fact to band together in a powerful coalition, then the world's longest-ruling party would indeed be in deep trouble. But that is not going to happen. Such a revolutionary scenario overlooks two critical forces blocking political change in China and similar authoritarian political systems: the regime's capacity for repression and the unity among the elite. Economic crisis and social unrest may make it tougher for the CCP to govern, but they will not loosen the party's hold on power. A glance at countries such as Zimbabwe, North Korea, Cuba, and Burma shows that a relatively unified elite in control of the military and police can cling to power through brutal force, even in the face of abysmal economic failure. Disunity within the ruling elite, on the other hand, weakens the regime's repressive capacity and usually spells the rulers' doom. The CCP has already demonstrated its remarkable ability to contain and suppress chronic social protest and small-scale dissident movements. The regime maintains the People's Armed Police, a well-trained and well-equipped anti-riot force of 250,000. In addition, China's secret police are among the most capable in the world and are augmented by a vast network of informers. And although the Internet may have made control of information more difficult, Chinese censors can still react quickly and thoroughly to end the dissemination of dangerous news. Since the Tiananmen crackdown, the Chinese government has greatly refined its repressive capabilities. Responding to tens of thousands of riots each year has made Chinese law enforcement the most experienced in the world at crowd control and dispersion. Chinese state security services have applied the tactic of "political decapitation" to great effect, quickly arresting protest leaders and leaving their followers disorganized, demoralized, and impotent. If worsening economic conditions lead to a potentially explosive political situation, the party will stick to these tried-and-true practices to ward off any organized movement against the regime.

## econ

EPA regs don’t kill jobs

Washington Post 11

Washington Post, Editors, September 2, 2011, "The EPA’s costs and benefits", http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-epas-costs-and-benefits/2011/09/01/gIQAP3uhxJ\_story.html

What is clear is that the “job-destroying regulation” line is a better slogan than it is an expression of the real trade-offs involved in EPA regulation. Aside from ozone pollution, EPA rules under development would restrict the emission of mercury, acid gases, dangerous fine particles and other pollutants from power plants and other sources. These regulations have costs that can be predicted and measured, in jobs and dollars. They also have measurable benefits — lives saved, chronic illnesses prevented, hospital visits avoided and sick days not taken, which in turn have economic effects. Yet, in reading Mr. Cantor’s indictment of the EPA’s efforts, you wouldn’t know that the agency subjects its regulations to cost-benefit analysis at all. True, such analysis contains uncertainties, but those affect the claims of critics as well as backers. In many cases, the EPA’s margin for error is large, with benefits exceeding costs many times over. The ozone rule was iffier in this respect, with a smaller projected net economic benefit.

#### Status quo solves – no threats to economy other than fiscal cliff (and housing market is a natural stimulus)

CNBC 11/9/2012

(http://www.cnbc.com/id/49762930)

Fixing the "fiscal cliff" and the country’s long-term fiscal problems could lead to an economic boom, JPMorgan Chase CEO Jamie Dimon told CNBC’s "Closing Bell" on Friday.

“**The foundation of business is pretty strong**, **housing looks like it is turning**, **household formation is going up**, **and consumers are** still **spending**,” the JPMorgan [JPM 40.62 0.22 (+0.54%) ] chief said. “If we solve the short-term 'fiscal cliff' and the longer-run fiscal issues, the economy can boom.” (Read More: Jamie Dimon: CEOs Already Cutting Back Due to ‘Fiscal Cliff’.)

Everything about the housing market is **flashing green**, Dimon said, noting strong household formation, inventory levels, affordability and rebounding home prices in some of the worst hit markets. **Housing could become a strong economic driver and job creator**, he added.

#### CCS won’t scale up

Dr Nils Markusson, researcher sssociate in CO2 storage technology and social learning at the University of Edinburgh, UK, 12 [“Carbon Capture’s days may be limited,” ABC News, July 26 http://www.abc.net.au/environment/articles/2012/07/26/3553255.htm]

Carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS) - a technology that promises to reduce atmospheric emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) from power plants and carbon-intensive industries - has been faced with a number of challenges in recent years. Several setbacks to planned demonstration projects, protests from local communities and other stakeholders, and a dearth of financing from industry and national governments have meant that the pace of deployment has fallen short of expectations. CCS is thus facing a crisis, and it is important to consider what its future may be.¶ CCS is a technical system that aims to capture CO2 from large industrial sources and store it deep underground in rock formations for long periods of time. It is the only technology with the potential to clean up CO2 emissions from coal- and gas-fired power plants. The technological components that are needed to develop CCS systems are all known and tested in other industrial applications, but it is still necessary to adapt and integrate them for use in CCS systems. Hence the need to demonstrate the system in operation before it can be routinely deployed.¶ The technology would allow continued reliance on fossil fuels, whilst simultaneously mitigating CO2 emissions. CCS has therefore proven irresistible to policymakers by promising to square the circle of these otherwise apparently irreconcilable objectives. CCS has risen meteorically on policy agendas over the last decade and is now a lynch pin of the energy and climate policies of many industrialised countries.¶ Until now, policies in support of CCS have been dominated by a technocratic, expert-driven push, moderated by the dominant neo-liberal economic ideology of the last three decades. Reliance on market financing has proven increasingly challenging as CCS is viewed as a risky bet. And policy makers have not appreciated the gravity of public opposition or quite how unpalatable the technology is for investors. The urgency of climate change mitigation has put the faith in bottom-up processes - where development is left up to private actors - under considerable stress. Calls are increasing for stronger government involvement to accelerate development through top-down planning.¶ But this policy trend runs counter to simultaneous calls for policy changes from the public protests against CCS - and those against other low-carbon technologies such as wind turbines. Protests have contributed to high profile cancellations of CCS demonstration projects, for example Barendrecht in the Netherlands, and the support of planning regulations hostile to CCS, e.g. in Germany. Top-down, technocratic policy making on CCS might seem like an shortcut to deployment, but it is a politically brave strategy that in fact may cost politicians many votes. And it is not clear that technology development lets itself be accelerated anyway; technical problem-solving takes time.¶ CCS now hangs in the balance. There is progress being made with the first large-scale demonstration plants abating power plant emissions currently being built, but support from both publics and politicians appears to be unreliable. One possible response to this is to wait and see. Other low-carbon technologies, like wave power, had to 'hibernate' after early progress was made in the 1970s driven by reactions to the oil crises was halted in the 1980s by changes of policy, until the urgency surrounding climate change renewed the interest in the 1990s and 2000s. Perhaps the CCS community has a similar fight for survival ahead of itself.¶ If so, it may become too late for CCS to contribute significantly to climate change mitigation. Some critics would say 'we told you so' and argue that the resources should have been spent on renewables instead. Others may point to the difficulty in making any headway with climate change mitigation without CCS, and the threat of sci-fi like geoengineering options to counter global warming - for example, injection of sulphate particles into the atmosphere to reflect solar radiation back into space - looming on the horizon. Ultimately, CCS might not survive a winter of low interest.¶ Another strategy is to re-think the case for the technology, and see if it can be made to connect with policy agendas other than climate change and become attractive to new social groups. The position of CCS in relation to key societal agendas, including sustainability, energy security, global governance and democracy itself may therefore have to evolve, to create wider support for the technology. However, it is too early to say in more concrete terms what this would imply. Short of credible policy signals to ensure its development, the next best thing is to keep the conversation going and look out for new social groups engaging with the technology in new ways.

#### CCS fails without a climate policy – no incentive

Brian Handwerk, Energy Expert – National Geographic, 12 [“Amid Economic Concerns, Carbon Capture Faces a Hazy Future,” National Geographic, May 22, pdf]

Carbon capture and storage could reduce greenhouse gas emissions by capturing CO2 where it's produced and storing it permanently in various types of underground geological reservoirs. The International Energy Agency (IEA) believes CCS technology can dramatically reduce greenhouse gas emissions when implemented at dirty fossil fuel power plants and other industrial facilities that enlarge the world's CO2 footprint. The IEA would like to see more than 3,000 CCS-equipped plants come online by mid-century to achieve 20 percent of planned reductions in CO2 emissions. But no large-scale projects currently operate at power plants, and Howard Herzog, a CCS expert at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), said efforts to scale up the industry are largely on hold. "I'd say the biggest problem we have right now is that there is not a market for CCS because there is no climate policy," Herzog said. "This technology can effectively help lower CO2 emissions in the atmosphere but that will always cost more than letting business as usual go on. So as long as there is no policy to stop business as usual, it will go on." The United States has failed to enact a climate policy. And other nations, in turn, have not reached a strong international agreement on mandatory carbon emissions reductions without the largest historic polluter at the negotiating table. As a result, the envisioned market-based solution, where companies could gain valuable "credits" for steps they would take to reduce emissions while others would face new costs for failure to act, has never gained traction. CCS is so costly that such an incentive system is necessary for its development. Herzog pointed to the American Electric Power Mountaineer coal power plantproject in New Haven, West Virginia, where carbon produced at a coal plant was to be sequestered deep in Mount Simon sandstone. The U.S. Department of Energy was slated to fund half of the project's costs, up to $334 million, but after a successful pilot project, AEP canceled Phase 2 CCS at the site last summer. The decision was attributed to a weak economy and an uncertain U.S. policy on climate and carbon. "They got half of the money from government stimulus and the other half had to come from somewhere," Herzog explained. In Virginia, which receives power generated by Mountaineer, the State Corporation Commission declined requests to pass costs on to consumers through rate hikes. "The utility said, 'Why should our rate payers pay for a technology that we may not even use?' There's no climate policy. If there was going to be a (carbon) market in the future you could make the case that you pay more now so that it's cheaper in the future. But with no clear indication of a future market, people don't want to pay more. The story is similar in Europe, which launched its own carbon market in 2005 under the international agreement known as the Kyoto Protocol. That effort has been hampered because the United States never signed on to the protocol, and today's largest carbon emitter, China, like other developing nations, faces no mandatory reductions. The EU system isn't succeeding in spurring CCS projects because the permits, which have fallen to prices around $8 (6 euros) a ton, simply don't have enough value cover the high cost of CCS. China isinitiating several pilot carbon trading schemes next year, and the outcome of that trial will have a large impact on other carbon markets worldwide. MIT's Herzog still believes the technology could someday compete with low-cost alternatives. "It can have a reasonable market share and bring down the overall cost of meeting carbon reduction targets," he said. "But when there are no carbon reduction targets, there is nothing to bring down the cost of."

#### Impact is long term and tiny at best

Ozzie Zehner, visiting scholar at Berkeley, Energy policy analayst on issues of social, political and economic conditions, PhD, Science and Technology studies, 12 [“Green illusions” Non-Profit book]

Scientists and legislators may ultimately decide that the risks and costs of carbon sequestration are worth it to reduce carbon dioxide buildup in the atmosphere. Even then, optimists suggest that carbon sequestration technologies won't be ready for mainstream deployment for at least another twenty years. A lot of coal will have been burned by then. Assuming that nations could muster the political will, technologies, and funding to develop carbon capture and storage, how effective would it be? A study group in Australia, one of the largest coal-producing nations, set out to answer this question. Their findings are humbling. They determined that the cumulative co2 emissions reduction over the first thirty years of a sequestration program would be just 2.4 percent—not terribly impressive given the costs and risks that such an undertaking would involve.24

#### Jobs up now

CNN Money 11-1-12

http://money.cnn.com/2012/11/01/news/economy/wages-jobs/index.html

Don't just call it a low-wage recovery. It's true that the economy has added a lot of low-paying jobs over the last two years. Restaurants and bars, which pay a median wage of just $9 an hour, have accounted for 15% of all the jobs created in the recovery. Retailers, which pay a median $11 an hour, make up another 9%. But it's not as if fast food joints and shopping centers are the only places adding jobs. Plenty of well-paying industries are hiring too. Factories that make aircraft, cars and machinery have made up a good chunk of the job gains over the last two years, as have hospitals and doctors' offices. So too have professional fields -- particularly those that specialize in computer services or technology. And wages in these industries are hardly low. All of them typically pay well above the median hourly wage of $16.57 an hour. Related: U.S. wages climb Since the bottom of the job market in February 2010, health care alone has accounted for 17% of the 4 million jobs added back into the U.S. economy. While wages in the field vary, many health care positions pay high wages. People working in ambulatory care -- such as medical and dental offices -- earn a median wage of $18 an hour, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. For those working at hospitals, it's $23 an hour. Registered nurses earn around $32 an hour. Related: Jobs that make the world a worse place Another hot sector for job growth has been professional and technical services, a broad category that includes accountants, lawyers, architects and computer engineers. This industry, which boasts a median wage of $28 an hour, has accounted for 13% of all U.S. jobs added since the recovery began in early 2010. Software developers are especially high in demand. The job pays a median $43 an hour, and that's likely to rise further as employers say they can't find enough workers with the right science, math and business skills to fill these tech jobs. "Even though we know that the unemployment situation has obviously been pretty grim and difficult, in the technology sector the unemployment rate is much lower," said Shami Khorana, president of HCL Technologies' America division. The global IT and software company hired about 2,000 people in the U.S. last year and is planning to hire another 10,000 employees in both the U.S. and Europe by 2015. Khorana said he's looking for employees ranging from business analysts and software programmers, to senior-level managers. Many of these positions offer six-figure salaries to candidates who bring the right mix of experience and education. "It is quite difficult and requires a lot of energy to find the right folks," he said. "The skill sets are somewhat scarce." So what about blue collar jobs? While surely there are fewer, high-paying opportunities for the 4.4 million unemployed Americans who do not have a college education, some manufacturing jobs have started to come back. These jobs often require advanced technical training, but not necessarily a four-year degree. "When you look since the end of the recession, we've had almost 500,000 jobs created in manufacturing, and almost all of those jobs have come from the durable goods sector -- primarily aerospace, motor vehicles, metals, computers, and machinery," said Chad Moutray, chief economist for the National Association of Manufacturers. "Those are high-wage jobs." Durable goods manufacturing jobs have accounted for 11% of the jobs gained in the recovery. The median wage for assembly workers at auto factories, for example, is $25 an hour

Manufacturing solves

Perry 10-9-12

Mark, U.S. manufacturing is alive and well, and with new training programs is poised to create millions of high-paying jobs, U.S. manufacturing is alive and well, and with new training programs is poised to create millions of high-paying jobs.

http://www.aei-ideas.org/2012/10/u-s-manufacturing-is-alive-and-well-and-with-new-training-programs-is-poised-to-create-millions-of-high-paying-jobs/

U.S. manufacturing is alive and well, and with new training programs is poised to create millions of high-paying jobs In October 2011, The Manufacturing Institute and Deloitte released a report that highlighted a very serious skills gap facing U.S. manufacturers. More than 80 percent of U.S. manufacturing companies reported that they are experiencing a shortage of skilled factory workers, and that translates into as many as 600,000 skilled manufacturing positions that are going unfilled. So at time when the overall U.S. economy is struggling to create jobs during the third year of a “jobless recovery,” the manufacturing sector can’t find enough qualified, skilled workers to fill more than half a million current job openings! And the manufacturing skills gap is likely to get much worse if it isn’t addressed quickly. The Society of Manufacturing Engineers predicts that the shortfall of skilled factory workers might increase to three million unfilled jobs in the next three years due a pending wave of Baby Boom-age retirements and a strong rebound in U.S. manufacturing, according to a recent Bloomberg article. What’s causing the skills gap and what’s being done about it? Part of the skilled-worker shortage is being driven by the ongoing push from parents, teachers and high school counselors for high school graduates to attend four-year colleges, even though many college students are graduating with $20,000 or more in student loan debt and are unable to find full-time employment. Call it the “obsession with college education” or the “overselling” of college education that has perhaps unfairly influenced an entire generation of young Americans. Here’s how the Bloomberg article explains the situation: Industrial companies in search of skilled workers cite a common refrain: reluctance by parents and teachers to steer young people to factory jobs. In a 2011 Deloitte survey, only 33 percent of respondents said they would recommend manufacturing as a career for their children, and 19 percent agreed with the premise that “our school system encourages students to pursue careers in manufacturing.” The article also mentions that the shortage of factory workers can be partly explained by the common misperception held by many Americans that our manufacturing sector is disappearing, despite the fact that we are producing more manufacturing output today than at almost any time in U.S. history, and the fact that manufacturing employment has increased by more than 500,000 jobs since 2010. Therefore, many Americans falsely think of U.S. manufacturing as a contracting sector with reduced output and fewer career opportunities, when the reality is exactly the opposite. What’s being done to address the skills gap? One approach to address the skilled factory worker shortage is a new program called “Right Skills Now,” introduced a year ago by The Manufacturing Institute as a fast-track solution to provide focused, accelerated training for some of the skills most needed by industry, like running computer numerical control (CNC) machinery. An article in yesterday’s USA Today titled “Teaching for the Future: Closing jobs skills gap” featured one of the nation’s first “Right Skills Now” programs at Dunwoody College of Technology in Minneapolis, here’s an excerpt:
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Government definitions agree and obviously guide research

EIA, US Energy Information Administration, ‘8

(Annual Energy Review, 2008, p. 344)

Note 1. World Primary Energy Production. World primary energy production includes production of crude oil (including lease condensate), natural gas plant liquids, dry natural gas, and coal; and net electricity generation from nuclear electric power, hydroelectric power, wood, waste, geothermal, solar, and wind. Data for the United States also include other renewable energy. Crude oil production is measured at the wellhead and includes lease condensate. Natural gas plant liquids are products obtained from processing natural gas at natural gas processing plants, including natural gas plants, cycling plants, and fractionators. Dry natural gas production is that amount of natural gas produced that is available to be marketed and consumed as a gas. Coal (anthracite, bituminous coal, subbituminous coal, and lignite) production is the sum of sales, mine consumption, issue to miners, and issues to coking, briquetting, and other ancillary plants at mines. Coal production data include quantities extracted from surface and underground mines and normally exclude wastes removed at mines or associated preparation plants. The data on generation of electricity from nuclear electric power, hydroelectric power, wood, waste, geothermal, solar, and wind include data reported on a net basis, thus excluding electricity that is generally used by the electric power plant for its own operating purposes or electricity losses in the transformers that are considered integral parts of the station.

Most precise in every way

Cire 76

Associate Justice , majority opinion

Court of Civil Appeals of Texas, Fourteenth District, Houston 537 S.W.2d 135; 1976 Tex. App. LEXIS 2774; 55 Oil & Gas Rep. 219 May 12, 1976

Monsanto Company, Appellant v. Harry F. Tyrrell et al., Appellees No. 1397

 This contention is based on the proposition that HN1Go to this Headnote in the case.under Texas oil and gas law the clear, well-established, and unambiguous meaning of the term "production" is "actual production" or the actual physical extraction of the mineral from the soil. Texas case law has established this as the correct interpretation of the term "production" when it appears in a royalty deed or in the habendum clause of a mineral [\*\*5] lease. Gulf Oil Corporation v. Reid, 161 Tex. 51, 337 S.W.2d 267 (Tex.Sup. 1960); Rogers v. Osborn, 152 Tex. 540, 261 S.W.2d 311 (Tex.Sup. 1953); Campbell v. Dreier, 382 S.W.2d 179 (Tex.Civ.App.-San Antonio 1960, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Sellers v. Breidenbach, 300 S.W.2d 178 (Tex.Civ.App.-San Antonio 1957, writ ref'd n.r.e.). HN2Go to this Headnote in the case.In construing the terms used in a written instrument the court is to give to such terms their usual and accepted meaning, unless it is clearly shown the parties intended a different meaning. Pan American Insurance Co. v. Cooper Butane Co., 157 Tex. 102, 300 S.W.2d 651, 654 (Tex.Sup. 1957). Moreover, if the language used in a written contract is such as conveys a definite legal meaning, such language is not ambiguous and is not subject to further judicial interpretation. Wynnewood State Bank v. Embrey, 451 S.W.2d 930 (Tex.Civ.App.-Dallas 1970, writ ref'd n.r.e.). We think the term "production" as used in this lease has a definite legal meaning, namely, the actual physical severance of the mineral from the soil. No ambiguity of meaning appears on the face of the lease; therefore, it was error for the court to substitute the term "marketing [\*\*6] from production" for the plain term "production" used in the instrument.

## at: USFG definitions

The EIA votes neg

EIA, US Energy Information Administration, no date

(“Glossary,” <http://www.eia.gov/tools/glossary/index.cfm>)

Production, oil and gas: The lifting of oil and gas to the surface and gathering, treating, field processing (as in the case of processing gas to extract liquid hydrocarbons), and field storage. The production function shall normally be regarded as terminating at the outlet valve on the lease or field production storage tank. If unusual physical or operational circumstances exist, it may be more appropriate to regard the production function as terminating at the first point at which oil, gas, or gas liquids are delivered to a main pipeline, a common carrier, a refinery, or a marine terminal.

The government follows our definition

Rogers 96

Circuit judge, writing dissent

 INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, ET AL., APPELLANTS v. BRUCE BABBITT, ET AL., APPELLEES No. 95-5210, Consolidated with No. 95-5245 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT 92 F.3d 1248; 320 U.S. App. D.C. 107; 1996 U.S. App. LEXIS 21974 April 16, 1996, Argued August 27, 1996, Decided

 As a necessary adjunct to his reliance on arm's-length contracts as indicators of gas value, the Secretary required producers to be reasonably diligent in enforcing their contractual rights against purchasers. On an issue that generated considerable comment during the rulemaking, Gas Royalty Revision, 53 Fed. Reg. at 1240-41, the Secretary concluded: "Monies and other consideration … to which a lessee [\*\*50] is contractually or legally entitled but which it does not seek to collect through reasonable efforts are also part of gross proceeds." 30 C.F.R. § 206.151 (1988); see also id. § 206.152(j). Thus, producers who failed to enforce their rights under lucrative take-or-pay contracts were on notice that they could be liable for royalties on the contract price. Shortly after the revised regulations were promulgated, the Fifth Circuit decided Diamond Shamrock. The Secretary's reaction to that case was brief and quite clear. Diamond Shamrock, said the Secretary, interpreted the phrase "value of production" to require that actual severance of gas from the earth must occur before any royalty could be due. The crux of the decision, to which the Secretary announced his acquiescence, was that the Court adopted as the legal definition of the word "production," as used in the context of calculating royalty payments, the actual physical severance of minerals from the formation. Accordingly, the Court concluded that "royalty payments are due only on the value of minerals actually produced, i.e., physically severed from the ground. No royalty is due on take-or-pay payments unless [\*\*51] and until gas [namely, make-up gas] is actually produced and taken." Gross Proceeds Revision, 53 Fed. Reg. at 45,082-083 (quoting Diamond Shamrock, 853 F.2d at 1168). Although the court is not reviewing the merits of the Secretary's reading of Diamond Shamrock, his view was reasonable; the Fifth Circuit itself has twice distinguished Diamond Shamrock by characterizing its ratio decidendi as depending on the definition of "production." Frey v. Amoco Prod. Co., 943 F.2d 578, 581-82, 584 & n.5 (5th Cir. 1991) (Frey I), vacated in part, 951 F.2d 67, 68 (5th Cir. 1992), reinstated, 976 F.2d 242 (5th Cir. 1992); Mesa Operating Ltd. Partnership v. Department of Interior, 931 F.2d 318, 326 (5th Cir. 1991) (Brown, J.), cert. denied, 502 U.S. 1058, 117 L. Ed. 2d 106, 112 S. Ct. 934 (1992). More important in light of the court's reading of the Secretary's reading of Diamond Shamrock, no reported decision has described that case's reasoning as depending at all on the recoupability of take-or-pay payments. Out of the major regulatory revisions adopted earlier that year following a lengthy rulemaking, the Secretary identified the only two provisions that were incompatible [\*\*52] with the newly accepted definition of "production," and he excised those provisions from the regulations. Gross Proceeds Revision, 53 Fed. Reg. at 45,083.

## at: overlimiting

Overlimiting better:

The restrictions part of the topic is huge

Hagerty and Ramseur 10

 Curry L. Hagerty, Coordinator

Specialist in Energy and Natural Resources Policy

Jonathan L. Ramseur, Coordinator

Specialist in Environmental Policy

CRS

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/143909.pdf>

 Regulations to implement federal statutes are promulgated by numerous federal authorities and vastly outnumber federal statutes. The bases for relevant federal regulation in this instance are,among other statutes, OCSLA48and the OPA.49The sheer number of regulations from these statutes and from other federal laws complicates the description of the regulatory framework. Frequently, case law, international measures, or other legal actions define the regulatory parameters that apply to the Deepwater Horizon events. The roles of the lead federal regulators, MMS and the U.S. Coast Guard, are outlined below.

So is incentives—just has to make energy cheaper

Strange, Justice – Eleventh Court of Appeals of the State of Texas, JD – U Texas Law, ‘9

(Rick, 5 Tex. J. Oil Gas & Energy L. 1)

Ultimately, economics is the single most important variable. Even though mandates are effective, in the long-term renewable energy production must be cost-effective. This can happen naturally if fossil fuel costs increase or technology advances make renewable energy production less expensive. Alternatively, government action could make fossil fuels more expensive through taxes or alternative energy less expensive with financial incentives. To date, the U.S. has pursued subsidy policies. For example, the federal government provides a production tax credit of 2.1 [cent] per kWh for wind and solar energy projects. n102 Because a tax credit has value only if the business earns a profit, and because the current economic situation has created significant financial uncertainties, the federal government also has a grant program. The Treasury Department can give wind, biomass, geothermal, and solar projects a grant of up to 30% of the property's value in lieu of tax credits. n103 For consumers, "a federal-level investment tax credit is available [for the] purchase [of] small wind turbines for home, farm, or business use. Owners of small [\*21] wind systems with 100 kilowatts of capacity or less can receive a credit for 30% of the total installed cost of the system." n104

Production tax credits are not the only vehicle for making alternative energy sources price-competitive. During the most recent Texas legislative session, Senator Kirk Watson introduced a measure that would have provided tax incentives to manufacturers of renewable energy equipment in Texas. n105 The advantage of this approach is two-fold. First, it encourages incipient activity. Production tax credits benefit generators that would otherwise realize taxable income. This can occur only after an alternative energy program is designed, constructed, and successfully operated. Equipment manufacturing, on the other hand, is an initial activity and a tax incentive for manufacturers is not subject to the same financial preconditions as a production tax credit. Second, by incentivizing manufacturing it encourages more complete development of the alternative energy sector in Texas and it provides a potential benefit to Texas even for projects ultimately located in other states. Moreover, even though Senator Watson's proposal would not have provided a direct financial incentive to electricity generators, presumably they would have enjoyed an indirect benefit in the form of lower equipment costs.

The government can also assist alternative energy development by funding research. The University of Texas recently received two research grants from the U.S. Department of Energy ("DOE") to study energy-related issues. n106 One team will study materials that have the potential to revolutionize the capture and storage of solar energy. n107 The other will study ways to contain greenhouse gases. n108 Government-funded research can not only assist private industry with new discoveries that will make alternative energy more practical and cost-effective but also provide practical training to tomorrow's engineers and scientists. For example, the students participating in the solar panel study will acquire hands-on training in the solar energy industry. Additionally, because the research is government-funded, and teaching is one of its goals, researchers can take more risks in their study and not limit themselves to projects with a high probability of returning a profit in the near-term. Start-up alternative energy producers simply cannot afford this luxury. Hopefully, broader areas of inquiry will lead to new technology breakthroughs.

## at: reasonability

#### Reasonability is impossible – it’s arbitrary and undermines research and preparation

Resnick, assistant professor of political science – Yeshiva University, ‘1

(Evan, “Defining Engagement,” Journal of International Affairs, Vol. 54, Iss. 2)

In matters of national security, establishing a clear definition of terms is a precondition for effective policymaking. Decisionmakers who invoke critical terms in an erratic, ad hoc fashion risk alienating their constituencies. They also risk exacerbating misperceptions and hostility among those the policies target. Scholars who commit the same error undercut their ability to conduct valuable empirical research. Hence, if scholars and policymakers fail rigorously to define "engagement," they undermine the ability to build an effective foreign policy.

## CP

## AT: International Signal

State action solves environmental leadership

Northrop, 8

(Program Director for Sustainable Development-Rockefeller Brothers Fund, 6/3, “States Take the Lead on Climate” http://e360.yale.edu/content/feature.msp?id=2015)

The leadership of states such as California, Arizona, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Florida is crucial not only because it provides a template for federal climate legislation that will no doubt be adopted under the next presidential administration. State action is also vital because among the top 75 emitters of greenhouse gases worldwide, half are U.S. states. Individually, the size of many of these state economies rivals those of most countries. State climate policy initiatives — though not yet implemented on a national scale — are collectively among the most advanced anywhere in the world. They provide a profound but largely unrecognized platform for national action, and for a potential reassertion of global environmental leadership by the United States. Indeed, state climate initiatives have provided hope to those in the global community who have waited patiently for the United States to engage meaningfully in international climate efforts.

State support has a much larger and sustainable impact than high-profile national efforts

Rabe, 7

(Prof of Public Policy-Ford School at Michigan, “Beyond Kyoto: Climate Change Policy in Multilevel Governance Systems,” Governance, Vol. 20, Issue 3, July)

The translation of international agreements on climate change into domestic policy remains at a very early stage. But recent experience in multilevel governance systems, including the United States, Canada, and even the EU, suggests that greenhouse gas emission reduction does not automatically follow the ratification of an international accord. American states, Canadian provinces, and European nations continue **to play central roles** in policy development, raising enormous governance challenges for a policy problem that cuts across conventional policy and agency lines. In the American case, an unexpectedly robust body of state policy development has taken advantage of “policy room” created by federal government disengagement from Kyoto. States have clearly drawn from prior experience in related policy areas, utilized available resources, and secured supportive coalitions that cut across traditional party divides. They provide a surprisingly diverse and continually expanding set of policy innovations that appear, in many respects, consistent with the tenets of smart practices, although many uncertainties remain concerning their implementation and further diffusion to other states. Clearly, certain states such as California have assumed leadership roles on climate policy development, offering a distinct contrast to continuing federal government inertia. In the Canadian case, the prolonged debate over Kyoto ratification has coincided with paralysis in provincial policy development. Canadian greenhouse gas emissions have grown at a significantly greater rate than in the United States and no provinces begin to approach the more active states in terms of enacting and implementing policies that promise significant emission reduction. Neither federal nor provincial governments have devoted resources necessary to establish the kinds of policy analysis and development infrastructures so influential in the most active American cases. The province that has been most engaged on climate policy has been motivated principally by fervent opposition to Kyoto. In response, Alberta has promoted an alternative, a homegrown initiative that emphasizes voluntary programs and a focus on carbon intensity as opposed to outright emission stabilization or reduction. In turn, a prolonged process of intergovernmental haggling continues with no clear policy outcomes in sight. In the EU case, one sees differential national policy responses, somewhat comparable to the range of states, despite the existence of steadfast and vocal support for the united stance suggested by Kyoto ratification. These varied responses from diverse multilevel systems suggest that the next challenge for climate policy may be to move beyond the continuing focus on international compacts that may be largely meaningless in such a new and complex policy arena. The American states, Canadian provinces, and (now 25) EU nations provide intriguing testing grounds for what does—and does not—work to stabilize and reduce greenhouse gases. The prolonged quest for the best practice in international climate policy has long crowded out serious analysis of what constitutes politically, economically, and managerially viable climate governance at the national or subnational levels. Looking ahead, these 85 jurisdictions offer an extraordinary laboratory for beginning to consider the policy architecture of the next generation of climate policy. Systematic study of actual experience in policy development and implementation might help move the debate from a feckless quest for the optimal toward a more realistic exploration of what policy tools do—and do not—hold considerable promise. In turn, there may also be growing opportunities for cross-jurisdictional policy learning and formal collaboration. This is clearly evident in the growing American pattern whereby multiple states have begun to work together and is reflected in a few initial forays whereby **neighboring states and provinces have entered into serious discussion over collaborative opportunities.** In North America, these range from exploration of common policies among New England states and eastern Canadian provinces to improving east–west and north–south infrastructure for moving renewable electricity from its point of generation to areas of high demand. The continuing expansion and diversification of these kinds of cases **move us closer to the nitty-gritty of policy development and implementation, processes that are far less glamorous than all-night binges of international diplomacy but ones that are fundamental to setting the stage for expanded development of smart practices** to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the coming decades.

## AT: Climate Negotiations

State policies solve

Dutzik, 9

(Sr. Policy Analyst-The Frontier Group, “America on the Move State Leadership in the Fight Against Global Warming, and What it Means for the World,” December, http://www.stateinnovation.org/Publications/All-Publications/2009-10-EnvironmentAmerica-AmericaontheMove.aspx)

But in America’s 50 states, where the “rubber meets the road” on many areas of energy policy in our federal system – from utility regulation to transportation to home energy efficiency – a different story was being written. There, building on a legacy of state energy policy innovation dating back to the mid-1970s, states began to devise and implement strategies to shift to cleaner sources of energy and reduce global warming pollution. While leading-edge states – particularly on the East and West coasts – moved first, the clean energy revolution has spread rapidly into America’s heartland. Today, most states have taken at least the first steps to encourage improved energy efficiency in homes and businesses, spur the use of renewable energy, curb emissions from automobiles, and plan for future reductions in global warming pollution. States had once been forced to steer their clean energy efforts into the headwind created by the pro-fossil fuel policies of the Bush administration. But with the arrival of the Obama administration, state clean energy innovators now have the wind at their backs. The first year of the new administration has seen the lifting of federal policies that once impeded state action, as well as the nationwide adoption of key clean energy policies initially developed in the states. States also have been given a key role in implementing the specifics of President Obama’s economic recovery strategy, which is built around the promise of enduring prosperity achieved through a transition to a clean energy economy. Taken together, the actions initiated by the states, coupled with the clean energy policies and programs implemented thus far by the Obama administration, rival the scope and ambition of the actions taken to address global warming anywhere in the world. Of course, there is far more work to be done. To date, the actions taken by the United States and the rest of the world pale in comparison to the challenge posed by global warming. The United States must implement mandatory emission reductions at the pace and scale science tells us are necessary to prevent the most dangerous impacts of global warming. The rest of the world must do the same. But make no mistake: it is the record of widespread state innovation and leadership on global warming over the past decade – not the recalcitrance of the Bush administration, nor even the slow legislative pace of a U.S. Senate that, in the American system of government, is uniquely sensitive to regional interests – that should characterize America’s reputation before the world as the crucial negotiations begin in Copenhagen.

## Compliance Fees 1NC

States have cash

Milford, 12

(Sr. Fellow-Brookings & President-Clean Energy Group, “Leveraging State Clean Energy Funds for Economic Development,”

http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/1/11%20states%20energy%20funds/0111\_states\_energy\_funds)

In sum, the need of the hour is for smarter strategies and greater funding for clean energy economic development that will enable states to innovate, manufacture, and export in the clean energy space. Too few states are engaged in rigorous and robust efforts to bolster this dynamic source of growth. And yet, state clean energy funds—by redirecting portions of their funds towards economic development activities—can play an important role in filling this gap and contributing to economic transformation and job-creation in U.S. states and metropolitan areas. III. Toward A New State Approach

And so U.S. states, as classic “laboratories of experimentation,” should build on leading-edge CEFs’ recent experiments with economic development and move more expansively to spur economic growth in clean energy. To that end, this paper suggests a number of strategies for best utilizing CEFs that states can explore in pursuit of clean energy economic development. In this regard, it is worth noting that state CEFs are public entities with a unique history of success in financing clean energy projects that can now be brought to bear on the need in many states for more aggressive clean energy economic development. In a time of tough fiscal austerity and reluctance to dedicate new funds, then, state public CEFs are in **a perfect position to institute** a new set of economic development **strategies to create thriving clean energy industries**. To act on this promise, states without clean energy funds should consider establishing dedicated clean energy revenue streams to engage in project finance and smart industry support. These states typically do not have dedicated support for either clean energy projects or clean energy-related economic development activities. **A range of sources for these funds exists** and includes general revenue bonds, tax or lottery revenues, pollution charges, and renewable portfolio standard (**RPS) compliance fees.** However, experience has shown that electricity surcharges set on electricity consumption or “wires charges” tend to be the most stable and reliable revenue source, as well as the most fair as they internalize the environmental consequences of electricity purchases. States should examine these sources as potential bases for the establishment of new clean energy funds. In those states where CEFs already exist, fund administrators should seek to expand the funds’ economic development role. Specifically, states with funds should pursue four major agendas:

➤ Reorient a significant portion of state CEF money to clean energy-related economic development

➤ Develop detailed state-specific clean energy market data

➤ Link clean energy funds with economic development entities, development finance organizations and other stakeholders in the emerging industry

➤ Collaborate with other state, regional, and federal efforts to best leverage public and private dollars and to learn from each other’s experiences

Along these lines state clean energy leaders should: Reorient a significant portion (at least 10 percent of the total portfolio) of state CEF money to clean energy-related economic development. Over the last decade, states with clean energy funds have dedicated almost $3 billion to individual project support. That has made it possible to create thousands of clean energy projects across the country. But only a small fraction of this funding has been dedicated to activities and investments aimed at bolstering clean energy economic development. Given that, it is time to increase state budgets for economic development activities. For that reason, state clean energy fund administrators should consider reorienting a portion of their existing program funding to economic development programs. In addition, this expansion of funding sources should also tap financing from existing economic development and CDFI resources as well as matching funding from federal programs to incentivize states to invest more in clean energy-related economic development strategies. What is required from a technical perspective to enable this transition? In most cases, existing enabling legislation or regulatory authority will allow states to reorient their CEFs to include a significant economic development agenda. For states that have existing CEF legislative authorization, those laws generally give the agencies managing the funds the authority to not only fund clean energy projects but also related economic development and innovation activities. In these cases, an internal administrative decision should allow CEF administrators to develop and fund clean energy-related economic development programs. In fact, many of the CEFs mentioned in this report have already made this turn and are already engaged in some sort of economic development activities.

## AT: State Fiat Bad

The States CP is the topic---jurisdictional questions are key to energy production debates

Kay, 12

(Senior Extension Associate with the Community & Regional Development Institute-Cornell Dept. of Sociology, “Energy Federalism: Who Decides?,” http://devsoc.cals.cornell.edu/cals/devsoc/outreach/cardi/programs/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&PageID=1071714)

**Questions about energy production** and consumption are acquiring renewed urgency in the 21st Century. Some **go to the heart of our nation’s system of federalism,** as an underlying but ever-present friction mounts over the way in which decision making power has been divided between central and more locally distributed political units. What is at stake? According to one author, “**the choice of regulatory forum often seems to determine the outcome of the controversy**. That may explain why Americans have traditionally **shed so much** metaphorical and genuine **blood deciding what are essentially jurisdictional disputes between governmental institutions.”**

A number of factors have raised these issues into greater prominence. Energy specific influences include the depletion of low cost oil, advances in energy extraction technology, and increased awareness of the link between climate change and energy consumption and production. Another element is the long standing but increasingly hardened absence of a broad based consensus over energy policy at the federal level, despite calls for such a policy that date back to at least the Nixon administration. These have been superimposed on shifting political trends in other areas, including the expanding national political divide. After the crest of federal adoption of new environmental legislation in the 1960’s and 1970’s, powerful and complex cross currents arose. Mostly “conservative” and anti- (or anti-“big”) government forces mobilized in the devolution, deregulation, privatization, and property rights movements.

In contrast, “progressive” movements evolved in response to increased globalization (of economic and environmental issues) and personalization (eg. of communications/information technology) by promoting global governance in some arenas and relocalization or local empowerment in others. Several energy examples being played out in New York State, as well as in other states and on the national stage, serve as useful and representative illustrations of the fundamental but insufficiently appreciated tensions raised. The first involves the spread of the controversial hydraulic fracturing technology that is used to extract oil and gas from “unconventional” reserves of shale and other rocks. The second and third involve the generation and distribution of electricity: where the authority to site electricity generating stations is vested, and who has the authority to site transmission lines that move electricity from their mostly rural points of extraction or generation to their mostly urban points of consumption. These are but a few among many examples that highlight the extent to which the proliferating threads of debate about energy federalism are being cinched into an increasingly dense tangle.

The judge should be an independent policy analyst.

Their interpretation is incoherent – no one person is the federal government.

Sole decision maker is wrong and kills education

Rabe, 8

(Prof of Public Policy-Ford School at Michigan, “States on Steroids: The Intergovernmental Odyssey of American Climate Policy,” Review of Policy Research, Vol. 25, Issue 2, March)

Climate change has conventionally been framed as an issue that would be addressed by an international regime established through negotiation among nation-states. The experience of policy development in the decade following the signing of the Kyoto Protocol indicates that climate change also **needs to be examined as a challenge of multilevel governance. The increasingly central role of state governments** in American climate policy formation squares with recent experience in other Western democracies that share authority across governmental levels. This paper examines the American experience, considering factors that have contributed to a state-centric policy process and using that body of experience to assess competing strategic choices faced by individual states based on their mix of emission trends and policy adoption rates. In turn, the collective state experience allows for consideration of the varied political feasibility of competing climate policy tools that remain under active review in subnational, national, and international contexts. The paper concludes with a set of scenarios that explore different ways in which a state-centric system may be integrated with expanding involvement at the national level. Most scholarly and journalistic analysis presents the odyssey of climate change policy in the United States as if America was a unitary system of government. This leads to a familiar tale, whereby the federal government signed the Kyoto Protocol in 1997, spurned ratification four years later, and neither the Clinton nor subsequent Bush Administration and respective Congresses have been able to agree to anything beyond climate research funding and voluntary reduction programs. At the same time, conventional analysis has assumed that climate policy would entail bargaining and implementation among nations, culminating in a world climate regime. More than a decade after the signing of Kyoto, it is increasingly evident that climate policy is proving far messier than prevailing depictions had anticipated. The Kyoto process is in tatters, attributable not only to American disengagement but also to an inability of many ratifying nations to honor their commitments. This is reflected in numerous failures to approach pledged emissions reductions, as in the Canadian and Japanese cases, or to successfully implement national or multinational policies, as in the stumbles of the Emissions Trading Scheme in the European Union. There also continues to be enormous uncertainty about engagement by developing nations, at the very point where China is primed to eclipse the United States as the world's leading national source of greenhouse gases. But perhaps the biggest single surprise as climate policy continues to evolve is that in the American case and many others, it is becoming increasingly evident that **climate policy constitutes an issue of federalism** or multilevel governance. As the recent emergence of California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger as a claimant to the title of “world leader” in the development of far-reaching climate policy attests, individual units across different federal or multilevel governance systems may have more in common with one another in climate policy than they have with the neighboring units of their overall federation. Indeed, one can see stronger parallels between such jurisdictions as Connecticut and Sweden, Pennsylvania and Germany, New York and New South Wales, and North Carolina and Ontario than exists across many members of the same federation. This paper will focus primarily on the American case, considering more than a decade of state and federal policy experience and attempting to distill lessons that could guide future policy development. First, it will offer an overview of American subnational policy development, attempting to provide a review of the tapestry of policies that have been enacted over the past decade and some of the key factors that have led to such a robust state response in the absence of federal mandates or incentives. Second, this will lead to a consideration of the divergent paths taken by the 50 states, reflected in their carbon dioxide emission trends since 1990 and varied levels of climate policy development. This section will explore the unique contexts facing various states, particularly the differing strategic considerations for them (and for their representatives in Congress) as they consider unilateral policy steps or the possibility of federal policy in the 110th Congress and beyond. Third, the collective state experience offers some possible lessons for future policy development at either subnational or national levels. In particular, we will see that there appears to be a nearly inverse relationship between those policies that policy analysts tend to endorse as holding the greatest promise to reduce emissions in a cost-effective manner and the political feasibility of respective policy options. These patterns could offer significant lessons for the future of climate policy development, outlining both challenges and opportunities for future policy whether enacted at the single-state, multistate, or federal levels. Finally, we look ahead and consider alternative scenarios for future development of American climate policy, building on recent experience to anticipate possible next directions (Selin & VanDeveer, 2007).

CP key to neg strategy—prevents small sector affs.

CP is real world---NGA acts together on energy issues

ENN, 1

(Environmental News Network, 8/17, Governors Want State, Local Input into National Energy Plans, Lexis)

The governors of the 50 states, 3 territories, and 2 commonwealths have adopted a comprehensive national energy policy emphasizing conservation.

At the closing session of the 93rd Annual Meeting of the National Governors Association last week in Providence, R.I., the governors sent a message to the White House that state and local authorities must have input into the nation's energy plans. "The policy sends a clear message that solving our nation's energy problems demand more conservation, especially utilizing renewable fuels like ethanol," said Iowa Gov. Thomas Vilsack, chairman of the association's Committee on Natural Resources. Ensuring "environmental quality" comes second in the list of 10 principles.

## AT: Links to Politics

States avoid politics

Rabe, 7

(Prof of Public Policy-Ford School at Michigan, “Beyond Kyoto: Climate Change Policy in Multilevel Governance Systems,” Governance, Vol. 20, Issue 3, July)

Those more active states include many that have conventionally been among the most innovative in environmental and energy policy, particularly those lodged along the respective national coasts, but they increasingly include a diverse set from other regions such as the Southwest and Midwest (Rabe 2006). Most of the initiatives have been enacted with **minimal partisan rancor** and have not been dominated by a single political party. Most of these also appear quite **capable of enduring once partisan control of a state government**, including the governorship, **changes hands, and have not proven very controversial to enact** or implement. Clearly, state agencies have played a central role in policy development, building coalitions rather quietly around policies that are tailored around relatively inexpensive reduction opportunities. This is entirely consistent with a pattern of “bureaucratic autonomy” and agency-based entrepreneurship that has been established in other American policy contexts (Carpenter 2001; Mintrom 2002).

These steps have often been linked to early signs of climate change as manifest in a particular state, thereby framed as a response to a specific environmental problem facing the state. A further source of bipartisan appeal for these initiatives has been the promise of multiple benefits, whereby agency advocates demonstrate the potential of a program not only to reduce greenhouse gases but also to achieve other goals, such as reduction of conventional air pollutants, reduced reliance on imported fossil fuels, and longer term regulatory predictability to electrical utilities and other regulated entities, as well as economic development opportunities (Rabe 2004). Hence, a considerable part of the appeal of state-based climate policy initiatives has been the simultaneous pursuit of environmental protection and potential contribution to economic growth or stability. Indeed, much of this comports with Eugene Bardach's definition of smart practice: “What makes a practice smart is that the method also involves taking advantage of some latent opportunity for creating value on the cheap” (Bardach 1998, 36). In contrast, climate policy initiatives, whether or not they meet the definition of smart practices, are simply much harder to find at the Canadian provincial level. Only one of the 10 provinces, Manitoba, begins to approach the 15 most active American states in terms of the breadth and rigor of its greenhouse gas reduction strategy. Instead, most provinces remain focused on preliminary study of the issue and consideration of alternative policies that might be established at some future point. Among the three or four more active provinces, climate policy is almost exclusively confined to nonbinding “goals” and voluntary efforts. Any regulatory provisions, or exact rules to guide reduction, are focused narrowly on provincially funded activity, such as a mandate in Alberta to purchase a set of hybrid vehicles for government use. Fifteen years after Rio and nearly a decade after the signing of Kyoto, it remains very difficult to discern much of a pulse on serious climate policy development in most provinces, quite contrary to the experience of a growing and diverse set of American states. American state engagement on climate policy may be every bit as surprising as Canadian provincial disengagement. Given conventional depictions of the United States as a North American climate policy laggard and Canada as a devoted adherent to Kyoto, why are so many—and such diverse—states apparently taking the lead in devising policies to reduce greenhouse gases? Why do the American states offer an increasingly large and robust set of policy initiatives where there is no evidence of a comparable trend in Canada? Subsequent discussion will explore three distinct factors that emerged through the comparative case analysis to explain this variability. Differing Intergovernmental Context The divergent paths of the respective federal governments on Kyoto served to create very distinct contexts for states and provinces to consider their own policy development options. These differing contexts were clearly unintended by-products of the very different ways in which the debate over Kyoto, involving both those steps leading toward final negotiations and consideration of possible ratification, played out in Washington and Ottawa. In turn, they illustrate the very differing roles that subnational units—states and provinces—played in these processes, with attendant impacts on their own involvement in climate policy development. A hallmark of the American federal government through the two Clinton administrations and the second Bush presidency has been **a consistent inability to reach agreement** on legislation related to environmental protection, energy, and other areas vitally important to climate change. During this period, every possible partisan configuration within the American two-party system has existed for at least some period of time and yet a consistent outcome has been lack of domestic policy consensus, even in terms of needed updating of established legislation such as air quality (Binder 2003). This divide is equally evident in the international climate realm, as the Clinton administration agreed to Kyoto in December 1997 even though a number of its key provisions directly contradicted a Senate resolution that passed by a 95–0 vote six months earlier. A few states sent representatives to Kyoto and earlier rounds of negotiation but they were not formally consulted either in developing the treaty or in examining ways in which the Senate might be persuaded to ratify it. Instead, Kyoto was widely recognized through the remaining three years of the Clinton administration as doomed politically, so much so that the administration never submitted it to the Senate for ratification nor actively developed a strategy seeking ratification. In many respects, the 2001 actions by the Bush administration were anticlimactic and neither the 2000 nor 2004 Democratic presidential nominees offered any blueprint for jump-starting Kyoto. In many respects, Kyoto was politically “dead on arrival” but nonetheless attracted tremendous division and controversy in Washington during subsequent years. As states were essentially excluded from this process, they had a relatively quiet decade in which to think about climate change, in terms of both how it might affect them in distinct ways and how they might fashion their own policies to reduce greenhouse gases and simultaneously promote economic development. In some instances, states have clearly responded to a perception that climate change poses serious threats to their residents—such as sea-level rise in coastal states and severe droughts in agricultural states—and that there is a significant environmental need to craft responsive policies as soon as possible. But these responses have also been coupled with efforts to design policy that “fits” the economic and political realities of a particular state. These are intended to minimize any economic disruptions that might occur during implementation and to take maximum advantage of economic development opportunities that may stem from early action on climate change. What has been missing in these state policy processes is the kind of anguished, often moralistic, rhetoric that has polarized national debate and made any semblance of consensus at that level so elusive. Instead, state policy deliberations over climate change have benefited from a kind of **“political cover”** provided by the widely held presumption that states lacked the incentives, resources, or authority necessary to play any serious role. Many states used this extended period to reflect seriously about the issue of climate change and how they might begin to respond to it. Many began with symbolic initiatives and analytical exercises, gradually moving toward policy development as ideas converged and opportunities arose. At various points, these efforts took institutional form, such as creation of a cross-agency task force or designation of a unit with a lead role in policy development. All of this continued apace, receiving surprisingly little attention from environmental groups, the media, or federal policymakers, while the latter continued to dominate public attention by thrashing over the details of Kyoto and its aftermath. This served to give state officials considerable time to contemplate climate policy options, including the forging of policies that made considerable political, economic, and environmental sense for them to pursue unilaterally, with the reasonable expectation that no federal action of any consequence was in the offing.

## Econ

## ccs solvency

#### No storage makes CCS impossible

Ozzie Zehner, visiting scholar at Berkeley, Energy policy analayst on issues of social, political and economic conditions, PhD, Science and Technology studies, 12 [“Green illusions” Non-Profit book]

Second, after the industry captures and compresses the carbon dioxide, it must store the liquid or gaseous co2. Ubiquitous saline aquifers are one storage option, but these are prone to seismic instability and uncertainties of storage life.17 Depleted oil and gas fields are obvious storage sites, but many of these deep underground crypts are structurally compromised after having been drained of their pressurized oil or inundated by multiple well piercings.18 If the U.S. coal industry captured and liquefied just 60 percent of its annual co2 emissions, the effluent's volume would equal the volume of oil that Americans consume over the same period.19 Geologists will be hard pressed to locate favorable storage sites on such a monumental scale. This may force the industry to risk even less secure formations.

#### Prefer our ev—their’s is paid off—proven by their stimulus internal link from the American Coalition for Clean Coal Energy

Ozzie Zehner, visiting scholar at Berkeley, Energy policy analayst on issues of social, political and economic conditions, PhD, Science and Technology studies, 12 [“Green illusions” Non-Profit book]

If the process of carbon capture and storage will require decades of research, billions of dollars, risky uncertainties, and meager paybacks, why has it become such a central focus of energy policy today? One needn't follow the path of money too far to discover the answer. During the 2008 U.S. election cycle, the coal industry increased its budget for the National Mining Association, an industry lobbying group, by 20 percent, to $19.7 million.27 The industry maintained this pressure during the 2010 and 2012 election cycles.28 Candidates quickly lined up to accept their donations. Barack Obama's election campaign in 2008 released the following pronouncement: "Carbon capture and storage technologies hold enormous potential to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions as we power our economy with domestically produced and secure energy.

#### Their ev just pretends that hurdles don’t exist

Ozzie Zehner, visiting scholar at Berkeley, Energy policy analayst on issues of social, political and economic conditions, PhD, Science and Technology studies, 12 [“Green illusions” Non-Profit book]

Why would the impact be so small? The decades-long wait for commercial viability is just part of the problem. The larger problem is regulatory. Coal firms aren't proposing to close down heavily polluting plants in order to build ones that capture carbon dioxide, but rather to add new plants to existing capacity.25 In fact, the industry is using the very promise of carbon capture and sequestration to deflect calls to clean up their industry. For instance, Arch Coal chief Steven Leer touted carbon capture and sequestration over regulation in a recent St. Louis Post-Dispatch interview. When the journalist pointed out that these processes are twenty years away from becoming a reality, Leer conceded, "Probably." He swiftly translated this twenty-year lag into something much less foreboding by dismissively stating, "Twenty years in the energy world is right now. If you think about the infrastructure needed for carbon capture and sequestration, twenty years is a very short period of time."26 Yes, a short period of time considering the obstacles, but nevertheless a very long time to wait for a modest improvement in co2 releases, especially, as we shall explore later, when there are far better options that we can deploy much sooner.

## electricity prices

No electricity price shock

EIA 8/12, Energy Information Administration, “Energy Outlook: U.S. Coal & Electricity Prices”, <http://wherefoodcomesfrom.com/article/5739/Energy-Outlook-U-S-Coal-Electricity-Prices>

EIA expects the average U.S. residential electricity price will rise by 1.6 percent during 2012 to an average of 11.99 cents per kilowatthour. The forecast cost of natural gas delivered to the electric power sector is about 28 percent lower in 2012 compared with the previous year, which should slow the growth in retail electricity rates. EIA projects U.S. residential retail electricity prices to rise by 0.9 percent in 2013. When measured in real terms, the average 2013 residential electricity price is 2.9 percent less than the price in 2009.

Price hikes barely impact growth

John Garen et al 11, econ department at Kentucky, The Relationship between Electricity Prices and Electricity Demand, Economic Growth, and Employment”, October 19, <http://energy.ky.gov/Programs/Data%20Analysis%20%20Electricity%20Model/Gatton%20CBER%20Final%20Report%2010302011.pdf>

Energy prices have the expected negative relationship with GSP growth and GSP levels. However, crude oil prices appear to have more of an effect on production growth compared to electricity prices and natural gas prices. Similarly, energy prices have a negative relationship with employment growth and employment levels. The effect of energy prices on employment is similar for electricity, natural gas, and crude oil. • We illustrate our findings through a set of policy scenarios of assumed 10% and 25% increases in electricity prices for energy-intensive states such as Kentucky. We consider both short-run and long-effects of these price increases. For each scenario, we assume that the price increase is permanent but is not accompanied by any other notable changes such as technological advancement or the discovery of new energy supplies. We assume that, in the absence of the price shock, economic growth consists of 3% annual growth in GSP and 1% annual growth in employment, the historical averages for each. • A 25% electricity price increase is estimated to reduce the GSP growth rate from 3% to 2.30% in the long run. The price increase is estimated to reduce employment growth from 1% to 0.61% in the long run.

## Warming

## 2nc no extinction

Warming won’t cause extinction—adaptative measures and slow rate means humanity won’t just let itself die—that’s Barrett.

#### Flournoy’s got no scenario

Experts agree

Hsu 10 (Jeremy, Live Science Staff, July 19, pg. <http://www.livescience.com/culture/can-humans-survive-extinction-doomsday-100719.html>)

His views deviate sharply from those of most experts, who don't view climate change as the end for humans. Even the worst-case scenarios discussed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change don't foresee human extinction. "The scenarios that the mainstream climate community are advancing are not end-of-humanity, catastrophic scenarios," said Roger Pielke Jr., a climate policy analyst at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Humans have the technological tools to begin tackling climate change, if not quite enough yet to solve the problem, Pielke said. He added that doom-mongering did little to encourage people to take action. "My view of politics is that the long-term, high-risk scenarios are really difficult to use to motivate short-term, incremental action," Pielke explained. "The rhetoric of fear and alarm that some people tend toward is counterproductive." Searching for solutions One technological solution to climate change already exists through carbon capture and storage, according to Wallace Broecker, a geochemist and renowned climate scientist at Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory in New York City. But Broecker remained skeptical that governments or industry would commit the resources needed to slow the rise of carbon dioxide (CO2) levels, and predicted that more drastic geoengineering might become necessary to stabilize the planet. "The rise in CO2 isn't going to kill many people, and it's not going to kill humanity," Broecker said. "But it's going to change the entire wild ecology of the planet, melt a lot of ice, acidify the ocean, change the availability of water and change crop yields, so we're essentially doing an experiment whose result remains uncertain."

Previous temperature spikes disprove the impact

Singer, PhD physics – Princeton University and professor of environmental science – UVA, consultant – NASA, GAO, DOE, NASA, Carter, PhD paleontology – University of Cambridge, adjunct research professor – Marine Geophysical Laboratory @ James Cook University, and Idso, PhD Geography – ASU, ‘11

(S. Fred, Robert M. and Craig, “Climate Change Reconsidered,” 2011 Interim Report of the Nongovernmental Panel on Climate Change)

Research from locations around the world reveal a significant period of elevated air temperatures that immediately preceded the Little Ice Age, during a time that has come to be known as the Little Medieval Warm Period. A discussion of this topic was not included in the 2009 NIPCC report, but we include it here to demonstrate the existence of another set of real-world data that do not support the IPCC‘s claim that temperatures of the past couple of decades have been the warmest of the past one to two millennia. In one of the more intriguing aspects of his study of global climate change over the past three millennia, Loehle (2004) presented a graph of the Sargasso Sea and South African temperature records of Keigwin (1996) and Holmgren et al. (1999, 2001) that reveals the existence of a major spike in surface air temperature that began sometime in the early 1400s. This abrupt and anomalous warming pushed the air temperatures of these two records considerably above their representations of the peak warmth of the twentieth century, after which they fell back to pre-spike levels in the mid-1500s, in harmony with the work of McIntyre and McKitrick (2003), who found a similar period of higher-than-current temperatures in their reanalysis of the data employed by Mann et al. (1998, 1999).

## asia

#### No escalate

Alagappa 8 (Muthia, Distinguished Senior Fellow, East-West Center PhD, International Affairs, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, 2008. “The Long Shadow,” p. 512)

International political interaction among Asian states is for the most part rule governed, predictable, and stable. The security order that has developed in Asia is largely of the instrumental type, with certain normative contractual features (Alagappa 2003b). It rests on several pillars. These include the consolidation of Asian countries as modern nation-states with rule-governed interactions, wide- spread acceptance of the territorial and political status quo (with the exception of certain boundary disputes and a few survival concerns that still linger), a regional normative structure that ensures survival of even weak states and supports inter- national coordination and cooperation, the high priority in Asian countries given to economic growth and development, the pursuit of that goal through partici- pation in regional and global capitalist economies, the declining salience of force in Asian international politics, the largely status quo orientation of Asia's major powers, and the key role of the United States and of regional institutions in pre- serving and enhancing security and stability in Asia.

## 2nc china outweighs

And every other country

Koetzle, 8 - Ph.D. and Senior Vice President of Public Policy at the Institute for Energy Research

(William, "IER Rebuttal to Boucher White Paper", <http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2008/04/13/ier-rebuttal-to-boucher-white-paper/>

Take for example the following chart from the Energy Information Agency (EIA).[[6]](http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2008/04/13/ier-rebuttal-to-boucher-white-paper/%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn6%22%20%5Co%20%22_ftnref6) This chart presents a detailed view of current and projected world energy-related CO2 emissions (1990 to 2030). This chart shows that in 2004, the United States accounted for approximately 22% of world CO2 emissions. By 2030, the EIA estimates that the United States’ share of these emissions will fall to about 18.5%. It also shows where the increases in CO2 emissions will occur over the next two decades: in the developing (i.e. non-OECD) countries. Currently energy-related CO2 emissions are roughly equivalent between OECD (developed) and non-OECD countries; by 2030 this ratio will change: Developed countries will be responsible for less than 40% of emissions. Notice specifically that China’s and India’s CO2 emissions are estimated to increase by 139% and 94% respectively. As the Committee White Paper notes, several states and regions have acted in the absence of federal legislation to enact GHG reduction programs. California, for example, passed AB 32 which establishes a goal of reducing emissions to 25% below 1990 levels by 2020. California currently accounts for about 6.7% of total United States emissions[[7]](http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2008/04/13/ier-rebuttal-to-boucher-white-paper/%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn7%22%20%5Co%20%22_ftnref7); and about 1.5% of world-wide energy-related CO2 emissions. If California were successful in achieving this very significant reduction in emissions, how would this impact net global CO2 emissions? The answer is not much. California’s reduction by 2030 would reduce the growth in United States emissions by about 13%; and the reduction would only offset about 4% of China’s increase in emissions over the same period. This table also helps to illustrate what happens to global net CO2 emissions, given reduction scenarios undertaken by an individual nation or a group of nations. For example, if the United States were to unilaterally reduced emissions by 30% or 40% below 2004 levels[[8]](http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2008/04/13/ier-rebuttal-to-boucher-white-paper/%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn8%22%20%5Co%20%22_ftnref8) by 2030; net global CO2 emissions would still increase by more than 40%. The reason is straightforward: either of these reduction levels is offset by the increases in CO2 emissions in developing countries. For example, a 30% cut below 2004 levels by 2030 by the United States offsets less than 60% of China’s increase in emissions during the same period. In fact, even if the United States were to eliminate all CO2 emissions by 2030, without any corresponding actions by other countries, world-wide emissions would still increase by 30%. If the United States were joined by the other OECD countries in a CO2 reduction effort, net emissions would still significantly increase. In the event of an OCED-wide reduction of 30%, global emissions increase by 33%; a reduction of 40% still leads to a net increase of just under 30%. Simply put, in order to hold CO2 emissions at 2004 levels, absent any reductions by developing nations like China and India, all OECD emissions would have to cease.[[9]](http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2008/04/13/ier-rebuttal-to-boucher-white-paper/%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn9%22%20%5Co%20%22_ftnref9)

## at: tech transfers

Tech strategies insufficient

Revkin, environment and energy blogger – NYT, 7/4/’12

(Andrew C., “Can China Follow U.S. Shift from Coal to Gas?” NYT)

Fourth, there is growing interest in so-called “technology strategies” to address climate change.  The gas revolution is a good poster child for the importance of technological innovation.  Most of the key advances that make today’s gas revolution possible—not just fracking but across the production and transmission of gas as well as in the ultra-efficient turbines that are today’s best way to make electricity from gas—trace their origins back to publicly funded R&D in tandem with lots of private sector investment.  Some people have unwisely taken that logic to the extreme and suggested that if the US and other innovating nations just pushed hard on technology that there wouldn’t be much need for emission limits, cap and trade or carbon taxes.

That’s too simplistic.  There’s no question that we need a big push on technology and that all nations, collectively, massively under-invest in energy R&D.  But a technology push with no pull from the market’s a recipe for waste.  I like the carbon tax like the one Australia introduced this week to create an incentive not just to invent new low-carbon technologies but also to deploy them.

One implication for technology R&D policy is that in a world of cheap gas there’s probably a lot of value in looking carbon capture and storage (CCS) technologies for use on gas-fired power plants. To date, most CCS investment has focused on coal on the assumption that coal is cheap and that the technologies needed for CCS on gas are too expensive. That conventional view could change in a world where the full cost of burning coal is high and gas is cheap. Some of the technologies for CCS are generic—they work whether the original fuel is coal or gas—but others (including the costliest parts of CCS systems) must be tailored to the fuel. I’ve always thought that CCS was an inelegant way to lick the carbon problem—because it involves burning fuels and then corralling a huge mass of pollution rather than avoiding the pollution in the first place—but if gas is to be a real “bridge” to a low emission future rather than a nice-looking dead end then we must seriously explore ways to further cut emissions from gas plants. [Here's a link to an article by Jesse Ausubel on one such technology.].

Fifth, all these surprises are a reminder of how much we don’t know about how technology and markets will unfold. Earlier this year the Energy Information Administration published a rather brave study: a retrospective on how well its forecasters have done predicting things like demand for energy, the cost of oil and such. One lesson from that study is that a lot of forecasting is done by looking in the rear view mirror—forecasts typically start with current conditions, and as facts on the ground change radically so do the forecasts. Another lesson from that study is that the record of forecasting energy prices—gas in particular but also oil—is pretty abysmal. Since so much, even CO2, depends on relative energy prices we should be sober about what we can realistically predict for the future.

¶Sixth, I see the gas revolution as just one of a large class of strategies for getting serious about climate change in ways that are politically expedient. In a few countries and jurisdictions—such as Europe, California, and Vermont—people will invest lots of their own money to control emissions in an effort to slow global warming. But most of the world isn’t so keen, yet, to spend handsomely on this global goal. I’ve always thought that the way to make progress on climate change, especially in “reluctant” countries like China and even the U.S., is to start by focusing on places where climate goals overlap with other national priorities—like clearing the air or making energy supplies more reliable. (For another example, focused on the tremendous potential for slowing climate change through action on soot, see the last issue of foreign affairs for an article co-authored with two colleagues here in La Jolla, V. Ramanathan and C. Kennel.) We probably can’t lick global warming with self-interested actions alone, but at least we can point countries in the right direction and build political support for the deeper and more expensive cuts that will be essential.

¶As Victor notes, simply moving from coal to gas is hardly a climate solution on its own, and others challenge the idea that natural gas can serve as a bridge along the road to a post-fossil energy future.

¶And certainly if China’s gas push comes with the same wasteful, leaky practices that American oil and gas companies have only slowly abandoned (and that still abound in Russia and elsewhere), that’s not a reasonable bridge at all.

¶Nothing I, or anyone else writes, will change the reality that the gas age is here for many years to come. But my hope is that progress in avoiding environmental regrets can come through constructive discussion of ways to cut risks and waste and to sustain a long-term energy quest that extends beyond fossil fuels even while they remain abundant and cheap. That’s no easy task.

Doesn’t solve China—

A) export controls

Xilin **Zheng**, Staff Wrtier @ Xinjing News, 1/16/**’8**

(<http://climateintel.com/2008/01/16/impressions-from-the-chinese-media-on-the-clean-energy-trade-mission/>)

The Chinese media emphasized the enormous opportunities on clean energy cooperation for both China and the United States, and quoted Chinese government experts and business community leaders who indicated that the Mission underscores the Chinese government’s sincere commitment to strengthening cooperation with the United States on clean energy.Mr. Xu Dianming, Vice Director of the National Energy Office of the State Council, said that the Chinese government will continue to take robust measures to save energy and reduce emissions in 2008 and encourage the development of clean energy and renewable energy. There will be more and more business opportunities in the area of clean energy. Similarly, Ms. Yao Wenping, the Vice President of the China Chamber of Commerce for Import and Export of Machinery and Electronic Products (”CCCME”), estimated that the value of clean energy technology procurement and cooperation between Chinese and U.S. firms could exceed $10 billion during 2008. She said China is ready to introduce more clean energy technologies and products from the United States. Indeed, the organizers of the upcoming China Import and Export Fair, to be held in April 2008, are planning to open a special area for exhibiting new clean energy technologies and equipment from the United States. Political and Policy Barriers Officials from two countries aren’t entirely satisfied with the current situation, and have expressed concerns about persistent trade barriers to clean energy products and technologies. The Chinese media have also commented that the United States has been insufficiently honest and cooperative and addressing these trade impediments. For example, Mr. Wang Chao, Assistant Minister of China’s Ministry of Commerce, said that the U.S. government’s strict controls on high technology exports to China have limited the export of advanced technology and equipment to China, which in turn has worsened the trade imbalance between the two countries. In fact, because of the U.S. government’s excessive export controls, U.S. high technology exports to China are declining, and lower than those from the EU and Japan. According to Mr. Wang, it is in the common interests of the two countries to increase the export of high technology goods to China, and he urged U.S. high technology exporters to take this message to the U.S. government. Ms. Yao of the CCCME explained that most of the new energy enterprises in China are private companies. They are experiencing difficulties in finding U.S. partners to acquire the advanced technologies they are seeking**.** She also echoed the concerns expressed by other government officials about overly restrictive U.S. export controls, explaining that products in the clean energy sector are purely for civilian rather than military use.

# 1NR

## impact

#### Deal key to avoid collapsing the economy—delaying the deal causes market freakout

Cox 11/8

Jeff, senior writer for CNBC, “Why US Economy May Be Headed for Another Recession,” http://www.cnbc.com/id/49745604, AM

All the problems investors face—from a fiscal meltdown to the various economic woes around the world—add up to one daunting prospect: Another possible recession just over the horizon. As the financial world puts Tuesday's presidential election behind it, the light in the tunnel could be an economic freight train. Slowing corporate profits, the remnants of Superstorm Sandy and the ramifications of the "fiscal cliff" in Washington are expected to result in at least two quarters of slow or no growth that could make investing even trickier than it was during the ups and downs of 2012. "The other overriding problem is we never really gained true escape velocity this cycle," David Rosenberg, economist and strategist at Gluskin Sheff in Toronto, told CNBC. (Read More: CEOs to Washington: Get a 'Fiscal Cliff' Deal Done) That "escape velocity" refers to the strength an economy shows in which it catapults itself out of a tight range of growth and can withstand shocks such as those posed in the U.S. As Rosenberg pointed out, the economy in the late 1980s was able to tolerate the Black Monday stock market crash, while the late 1990s strength was enough to fend off the Asian crisis. With current U.S. gross domestic product growth at just 2 percent, that's not enough to battle through problems as steep as the fiscal cliff of tax increases and spending cuts, as well as storm damage and weakness in global markets. "There's no question that if we get the fiscal cliff that we're going to get recession next year," Rosenberg said. "The only question is how deep." Rosenberg is not alone: Strategas earlier this week said it expects a recession early in 2013, and University of Maryland economist Peter Morici said that "the President and Congress will not be able to raise taxes — be those on the wealthiest of the wealthy or anyone else — and cut spending without risking a second recession, deeper and more painful than the Great Recession." Even if the cliff gets fixed, that in itself will mean the economy will slow even further. Any remedies indeed will include higher taxes and spending cuts, though likely less than those prescribed by law if Congress fails to act on the current menu that will take place automatically unless deficit-reduction targets are hit. The best hope is that the warring Washington factions can come up with something at least somewhat palatable to investors. (Read More: Fixing 'Fiscal Cliff' Will Mean 'High, Higher' Taxes: Gross) "There's something to be said about getting ahead of the problem and preventing the fiscal side from being increasingly structural over time," Rosenberg said. "It's going to make the painful resolution that much more painful down the road." From the market's standpoint, investors are likely to weather a recession by moving to more basic strategies and perhaps taking some money off the table. "As far as people I talk to in the real world, they want to let the dust settle just to see what's going to happen," said Nadav Baum, executive vice president at BPU Investment Management in Pittsburgh. "There's a little trepidation of where we are headed, what the tax structure's going to be." Wall Street has recoiled since President Barack Obama won a second term following the hotly contested election in which Republican Mitt Romney painted the incumbent as anti-business. Stocks plunged more than 2 percent Wednesday and were off again Thursday afternoon, though not as steeply. (Read More: Stocks Fall as Fiscal Cliff Worries Linger) Interestingly, one of the areas thought most vulnerable to an impending tax hike was outperforming the broader market. Taxes on dividends are almost certain to increase from their current 15 percent level, but an exchange-traded fund that tracks the group, the iShares Dow Jones Select Dividend Index Fund [DVY 56.12 -0.48 (-0.85%) ], was off only narrowly. "The reality is that 60 percent of market return is dividend," Baum said. "So I'm a dividend buyer. If it means taxes are going higher, so be it." Investors overall have taken a cautious approach to the market, and a looming recession likely will only exacerbate an unwillingness to commit money. In the week prior to the election, investors pulled cash both from stocks and bonds. Equity-based mutual funds lost $1.4 billion while bond funds saw outflows of $895 million, according to Lipper fund flow data. Continued accommodation from Federal Reserve monetary policy has been the antidote to fear of risk. This week's market drop "does reflect real worry about the fiscal cliff" but "we view this as anxiety as an opportunity to buy, not sell," said Bernard Baumohl, chief global economist at the Economic Outlook Group. "Both the real economy and the stock market will be comforted by a continuation of current monetary policy as well as credible signs in the days ahead that the White House and Congress are making progress to avoid a fiscal cliff dive," he added. Tony Dwyer, equity strategist at Canaccord Genuity, reiterated a 1,650 price target for the Standard & Poor's 500 [.SPX 1377.51 -17.02 (-1.22%) ] for 2013, advising investors to "use any weakness, or strength, to add to our favored sectors." They include consumer discretionary, information tech, financials and industrials. Rosenberg, of Gluskin Sheff, warned investors not to get too daring in their choices, Fed policy or not. "We have a situation where the range of outcomes is extremely wide," he said. "What that tells me from an investing standpoint is that we have to be fully diversified right now. I would not be taking concentrated bets across any asset class." For Baum, the most important thing for investors to watch is not letting their emotions overcome their choices. He thinks Washington will come to a resolution that, at some point, will placate markets. "You can't keep kicking things down the road," he said. "Once you get more certainty you get markets that will react and act more like markets, as opposed to emotional roller coasters."

#### **They don’t access Stone—says we need a short-term stimulus**

Stone ‘12

Chad, Chief Economist at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, where he specializes in the economic analysis of budget and policy issues. He was the acting executive director of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress in 2007 and before that staff director and chief economist for the Democratic staff of the committee from 2002 to 2006. He was chief economist for the Senate Budget Committee in 2001-02 and a senior economist and then chief economist at the President’s Council of Economic Advisers from 1996 to 2001. http://www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa=view&id=3788 Center on Budget Policy and Priorities, “MISGUIDED “FISCAL CLIFF” FEARS POSE CHALLENGES TO PRODUCTIVE BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS,” <http://www.cbpp.org/files/6-4-12bud.pdf>, AM

To be clear, the issue of what policymakers should do later this year or early next on long-term deficit reduction is distinct from whether they should act much sooner — in fact, immediately — to provide a further stimulus to an economy that shows increasing signs of weakness. Last week’s disappointing reports on economic growth and job creation, as well as growing concerns about Europe’s debt crisis and an economic slowdown in China, suggest that U.S. policymakers should act through both fiscal and monetary policy to strengthen the U.S. recovery. On the fiscal front, however, they should be careful to choose policies that will be most cost effective in boosting demand for goods and services while the economy is weak without making the nation’s long-term fiscal problem worse.

#### Perception triggers the impact even if their impact defense is true

Brown, financial manager and writer for the Christian Science Monitor, 11/9/2012

(Joshua, “The fiscal cliff isn't gradual, and it will matter,” http://www.csmonitor.com/Business/The-Reformed-Broker/2012/1109/The-fiscal-cliff-isn-t-gradual-and-it-will-matter)

Now there is a new meme going around that some of the more prominent bloggers have repeated, wherein we hear about how "the changes don't all take effect at once" and "this whole thing is just like Y2K" and "actually, it will probably have very little effect on the economy at all."

The bloggers who are repeating this are technically correct. But they tend to be either journalists or economists, and not market people necessarily.

And so I think that here's what they miss:

1. What the fiscal cliff's actual impact on the economy will ultimately be is not the point, **it is the perception**.

2. In the short-term, **stocks trade on psychology and sentiment**. This happens en masse and things change quickly. Fear over increased taxes, lower government spending and a further contraction of economic growth will not lead to a gradual adjustment of risk asset prices. Rather, **it will mean a fear-driven race to the exits all at once**. I don't care what your surveys say, deep down everyone who is in the stock market right now is operating under the assumption that a compromise will occur, on time, and one that kicks the can on all of the big issues. **Any hint that we're deviating from this script will show up in the tape**.

3. Economists and journalists who do fact-based empirical work sometimes forget that most people, including investors, do not behave rationality or react to the data in proportion with its actual meaning. Many people in this world, even some successful ones, can turn from reasonable human beings into hysterical monkeys when their fight-or-flight instinct is triggered. **And nothing triggers it like a whiff of panic in the air and the threat of the unknown**, in this case the question of how the economy will weather the effects of the Cliff.

#### No guarantee of a punt – only tough negotiations will avoid the cliff

Conrad, Chief Investment Strategist of Investing Daily, 11/9/2012

(Roger, “Seeking a Beacon Through the Fog,” http://www.investingdaily.com/15897/seeking-a-beacon-through-the-fog)

Then just when hope seems to be lost, negotiators will discover some number they can live with and **the action will turn to nervy votes** in the House of Representatives and Senate. Assuming that’s successful, the two chambers will caucus, arrive at a deal again after much hair pulling and gnashing of teeth. The bill will be voted on in both chambers and finally will hit the president’s desk, averting the crisis.

The whole proceeding is likely to prove too much for credit raters to stomach and we could see yet another meaningless downgrade for US government debt. But with the cliff avoided, a massive cloud will lift off the economy and stock market. Stocks that were beaten down due to perceived risk of a fiscal cliff will recover.

Of course, **when raw politics dictate economic policy**, **there’s no guarantee the outcome will be rational**. And if our body politic collectively plunges off the fiscal cliff like mindless lemmings, not even a loose Federal Reserve policy would be able to fully offset the damage. But continuing to flood the system with money will keep interest rates low until economic growth really does ignite. As that keeps happening, recovery is inevitable.

#### Economic crisis turns warming and investment – increases fossil fuel use and outweighs short-term gains

Reuters, 3/20/’9

(http://www.reuters.com/article/GCA-GreenBusiness/idUSTRE52J1BV20090320)

ROME (Reuters) - The economic crisis may lower carbon emissions in the short term but will raise them over the long term by crimping investment in cleaner energy sources, the International Energy Agency's chief economist said on Thursday.

The impact of the financial crisis and the ensuing economic slump on energy investments had been "stronger than anyone expected" and significant enough to have an impact on climate change and the whole energy supply chain, warned Fatih Birol.

"To think that lower economic growth is good for the environment is completely wrong," Birol told Reuters.

"Because there are many investments that are good for the environment, like efficiency, renewables and nuclear, that are being postponed or canceled. One or two years of lower carbon emissions won't count for much at the end of the day."

A $100 a barrel price drop from a record high last year has hurt oil producers, but is a bigger threat to generators of more environmentally-friendly fuels, which are considered commercially viable only as alternatives to expensive oil.

## uq

#### Prefer our uniqueness—assumes Obama investing capital

Atkins, 11/8

(Columnist-Boston Herald, “Prez returns to D.C. with more clout,” http://bostonherald.com/news/columnists/view/20221108prez\_returns\_to\_dc\_with\_more\_clout)

WASHINGTON — When President Obama returned yesterday to the White House, he brought with him **political capital earned** in a tough re-election fight as well as a **mandate from voters** — which means bold changes and bruising fights could lie ahead. **The first agenda item is** already waiting for him: reaching an agreement with lawmakers to avert the looming fiscal cliff. GOP lawmakers have previously shot down any plan involving tax increases. Obama’s win — based in part on a message of making the wealthiest Americans pay more — may already be paying dividends. In remarks at the Capitol yesterday, House Speaker John Boehner seemed to acknowledge the GOP has to take a different tack than the obstructionism that has marred progress in the past. “The president has signaled a willingness to do tax reform with lower rates. Republicans have signaled a willingness to accept new revenue if it comes from growth and reform,” Boehner said. “Let’s start the discussion there.” **Obama’s fresh political clout** could extend to longer term fiscal policies beyond the fiscal cliff, though don’t expect GOP pushback to vanish. House Republicans still have plenty of fight in them. Comprehensive immigration reform — designed to smooth the path to citizenship while also strengthening the nation’s borders — also will be high on the president’s priority list. But unlike in his first term, when such a plan got little more than lip service in the face of staunch GOP opposition, Obama’s 3-to-1 support from Latinos on Election Day gives him the incentive to get it done. It also robs Republicans, who learned firsthand that dwindling support from Hispanics and other minority groups is costing them dearly, of any reason to stand in the way. An influx of new female voices in the Senate could also make Obama’s next four years the “Term of the Woman,” putting a new focus on equal pay and reproductive rights. U.S. Sen. Patty Murray of Washington state, who chairs the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, told reporters yesterday that having a historically high 20 women in the Senate in January won’t just mean more attention to women’s issues. She said the Senate will function better overall with “great women who have really strong voices” on board, such as U.S. Sen.-elect Elizabeth Warren. “There is no stronger advocate for middle-class Americans,” Murray said of Warren. None of this, of course, will be a cakewalk, but unlike his first term, Obama will have **more power to push back.**

#### Solves gridlock

Fraser, 11/8

(Master's degree in Political Economy from The New School for Social Research, He has worked with The Clinton Foundation, The Council on Foreign Relations, and written for publications mainly on finance, politics and music, “Should We Get Ready For 4 More Years of Ridiculous Obama vs GOP Obstructionism,” http://www.policymic.com/articles/18841/should-we-get-ready-for-4-more-years-of-ridiculous-obama-vs-gop-obstructionism

President **Obama** indeed **owns a great deal of political capital. He has that much more momentum than Bush** II, who famously said after his 2004 presidential win, “I have political capital. I intend to spend it.” The strategic political reason behind this momentum is due, in large part, to the way the GOP framed the election as a battle between big government and small government. In the end, voters wanted a president and a party in power that was pragmatic and could get things done. But now that Obama has won, it is difficult to argue that Obama’s victory wasn’t also a referendum on liberal or left-leaning ideals that government can play a meaningful part in people’s lives. Elizabeth Warren went as far as to say that the reason she was elected was because she stood up for the “core of liberalism.” The president also has economic winds at his back as the job and housing markets have shown signs of continuing recovery. The fact that there is evidence that the president’s policies are actually improving things should create a greater political willingness for Republicans to join the winning team, if only to take some of the credit. If things continue to improve and the Republicans still choose to obstruct and sit on the sidelines, the Democrats will be able to tout success once again in the face of Republican intransigence. These factors, as well as the increased media and public attention in the afterglow of the election, **may provide an impetus for** a new jobs bill and perhaps **reaching a deal on raising new revenue**, two things that will be addressed at the end of this year and early next year. Moreover, the Democrats will certainly continue to pound the strong narrative that the election was a mandate on raising new revenue, as Joe Biden recently pointed out. Beyond jobs and revenue, the president will push for comprehensive immigration reform. Here it seems that political self-interest should coincide with some sense of moral rectitude, seeing as it is in both party’s interests to court the Hispanic vote. Passing immigration reform would certainly be more of a political victory for the president than for Republicans, as Obama could tout that both immigration reform and the DREAM Act occurred under his party’s watch. Despite this, the Republicans simply cannot afford to say no to immigration reform if they want to apart of the conversation in 2016. In addition to the above, here are some more promises that Obama will aim to keep: Cut tuition increases in half over 10 years. Cut oil imports in half by 2020. Campaign finance reform. Cars and trucks will go twice as far on a gallon of gas by the middle of the next decade. The implementation of Obamacare, costs go down. Lower Medicare health care costs. The implementation of Dodd-Frank. Cut deficits by $4 trillion over 10 years. Transition out of Afghanistan by the end of 2014. Iran will not get a nuclear weapon. Reintroduce an assault weapons ban. No doubt Obama has a tall order over the next four years, but **he has the momentum and a mandate**. Of course, the path will still have thorns, and Obama will not accomplish everything he sets out to accomplish, but the **political capital for the president is difficult to underestimate. In a system so fraught with political gridlock, this capital ought to lubricate things.** It should provide a more steady path for Obama than the previous four years, especially since much of the foundation has already been laid. Even if the president doesn’t accomplish all he sets out to, presiding over a recovering economy, successfully implementing Obamacare, and passing immigration reform would be enough to greatly improve the chances of a Democratic candidate in 2016.

#### Their ev is ok but assumes pre-election positions, those have softened

Bennet Goldberg, PolicyMic, MA from John Hopkins-SAIS, 11/9/12, Fiscal Cliff: Obama and Congress Will be Forced to Work Together to Fix the Debt, www.policymic.com/articles/18868/fiscal-cliff-obama-and-congress-will-be-forced-to-work-together-to-fix-the-debt

In the past couple of days, much has been written on why President Obama won, what the Republican Party needs to do differently going forward, and why Obama will still be hampered by a Tea Party-centric House, as the nation turns its attention to the "fiscal cliff," immigration reform, tax reform, and energy independence. Already one hears loud whispers that "nothing has really changed," that the situation is one of status quo, all at a cost of billions of dollars and many months of useless frustration. This is nonsense. President Obama's hand has been strengthened considerably. Numerous obstacles to tackling the nation's challenges were removed the moment Colorado put him over the top. What changed? First, the notion of President Obama as being some sort of "other" disappeared overnight. There will be little or no talk of "taking our country back," birther movements, Kenya fixations, being un-American, etc. When President Obama coined the 2008 campaign line "We're the change we've been waiting for," it had a very cool, maybe even profound-sounding ring to it. What we learned in 2012 is that he meant it literally. We. We the people have changed. In that sense, an attack on President Obama as somehow being un-American will now resonate as an attack on the majority of Americans. We the people. One can speculate whether Washington will address immigration reform, and whether the Republican Party will ultimately try to adjust to the new Obama ethnic coalition. But what we can count on, starting right now, is that the vast majority of the president's political opponents will no longer shoot themselves in the foot by attacking the leader of a majority coalition who reflects the demographic character of that coalition. Second, the electoral victory in Colorado came with its own special prize: a new game clock. No longer does President Obama have to parse the issue of whether progress in America's economic recovery should be measured from the day he took office in 2009 or from the day a year later when that recovery began. The debate about what the starting reference point was or should be became ancient history overnight. All that matters now is that the economy is likely to keep growing under his second term watch. Yes, the fiscal cliff could still send us back into recession, but addressing it will not be viewed by anybody as a burden to be borne by President Obama alone. Moreover, unlike the summer of 2011, when the old game clock only had 15 months left on it, the new one has 50 months left on it. Nobody opposing the president will dare try to run that clock out. Many house members know that their 2014 game clock may well run out before the president's does. Third, one cannot underestimate the stature that is inherent in being a two term president. So much goes into being re-elected, and a lot of power and political flows from it. This is somewhat of an intangible that many people don't recognize, even if it is a part of every American's political subconscious. But the politicians in Washington? They get that. Big time. In his election night speech, President Obama outlined four key objectives for his second term: addressing the fiscal cliff, tax reform, immigration reform, and energy independence. Lost in the political battles and cat fights of the past two years has been one simple truth: The resolution of all of these objectives is actually much further along than many realize. In addressing the intertwined issues of tax reform and the fiscal cliff, even last summer the two sides were only 10% apart. Both Obama and Boehner agreed on a $4 trillion deficit reduction target. President Obama and his Congressional allies were prepared to accept a deal involving $1.2 trillion in "revenue increases" and $2.8 trillion in spending cuts. Speaker Boehner and the Tea Party House members were only willing to agree to $800 billion in revenue increases. $400 billion is a lot of money, but it still only represented a 10% difference on the $4 trillion. Of course, that last 10% is not insignificant, but the point is that any political objective that starts with a ninety percent resolution can be addressed given a new reality. The argument that the president will benefit from a changing balance of power on immigration reform as a result of the election is self-evident. For obvious reasons, many Republicans started clamoring for it within 24 hours of Colorado being delivered to the president. Finally, on energy independence, President Obama had long made it clear that pending environmental due diligence that was expected to take months and not years, he was all for it. In short, with a new mandate of popular legitimacy rooted in today's American demographics, a new game clock, and the aura of being a two term president, Obama has significantly enhanced his ability to address all of these issues successfully. It is obviously in his interest to do so, but the same can be said for the Republicans in the House. Things have already changed since Tuesday. It is change that, finally, we can believe in.

#### Avoiding fights is key – low threshold because negotiations are delicate

Major Garrett, National Journal, 11/9/12, Obama Counters Boehner’s Opening Bid on Fiscal Cliff, www.nationaljournal.com/whitehouse/obama-counters-boehner-s-opening-bid-on-fiscal-cliff-20121109

Wedged between standing ovations from supporters fore and aft, President Obama on Friday steered the good ship reelection straight toward the rocks of Speaker John Boehner’s refusal to raise income-tax rates on wealthy Americans. “We have to combine spending cuts with revenue,” Obama said from the East Room in his first formal rejoinder to Boehner’s postelection openness to higher tax revenues but not higher marginal rates. “That means asking the wealthiest Americans to pay a little more in taxes.” Obama, the first Democrat in modern times to campaign and win reelection with a plan to raise income taxes, invited the bipartisan congressional leadership to the White House next Friday for the first of many meetings seeking to resolve fiscal-cliff issues. Obama said that his victory and the exit-poll data behind it prove the country is ready to raise taxes to Clinton-era levels for individuals with adjustable gross income above $200,000 and for families above $250,000. “I refuse to accept any approach that isn’t balanced,” Obama said. “I’m not going to ask students and seniors and middle-class families to pay down the entire deficit while people like me making over $250,000 aren’t asked to pay a dime more in taxes. I’m not going to do that.” After pausing for 13 seconds of sustained applause, Obama drove the message home. “I just want to point out this was a central question during the election,” the president said. “It was debated over and over again. On Tuesday night we found that the majority of Americans agree with my approach. Our job now is to get a majority in Congress to reflect the will of the American people. I believe we can get that majority.” While on the surface Obama’s rhetoric sounded confrontational, subtle changes in language may prove telling. During the ugly days of recrimination after the pursuit of a grand budget bargain failed in August of 2011, top White House aides spoke derisively of Boehner’s inability to find votes or seal a deal. The phrase “Boehner couldn’t deliver a pizza” became a clichéd West Wing summation of House GOP disorder. Obama could have said that it was up to Boehner to compromise or find the votes. Instead he said it was “our job” to find the votes in the House and that “we” can achieve a majority. That puts Obama and the persuasive powers of the presidency squarely in the legislative game. And even as he said he wouldn’t approve a deal that didn’t ask the wealthy to pay more in taxes, Obama didn’t explicitly call for higher rates as the only means of achieving the goal of higher revenue. That leaves both sides some room — though not a lot — to negotiate the details and semantics of higher revenue, tax reform, and deficit reduction. Obama and Boehner have now laid down their tax markers, which they contend reflect the will of the people. Each is half right. The question is can they meet half way. On spending cuts, Obama’s words carefully left wriggle room. Saying he would not ask students, seniors, and middle-income families to “pay down the entire deficit,” he left room for cuts affecting all three in the context of a “broader deficit-reduction package.” And because Boehner already has agreed to higher revenue along with spending cuts, shrinking government appears on something of a fast track. The remaining question is the depth and breadth of the cuts. Boehner has now said three times that he won’t support, and the House couldn’t pass, higher income-tax rates on the wealthy. That’s his marker. Everything else appears negotiable unless and until Obama can change votes within the House GOP conference or flexible definitions of higher tax revenue can be negotiated. When asked at his Friday press conference about whether he could provice details of a possible deal on taxes and spending, Boehner refused, saying he didn’t want to eliminate options for him or Obama. That signals seriousness and purposefulness that might reassure Wall Street and its downcast sell-off psyche in the wake of an election that reinforced the gridlocked power structure of old. Obama also called on the House to pass a pending Senate bill extending the Bush-era tax cuts for all taxpayers below the $200,000 and $250,000 adjusted gross income level. He said that would alleviate some of the uncertainty stalking financial markets and clouding consumer confidence. “Let’s not wait,” Obama said. “Let’s extend the middle-class tax cuts right now. I’ve got the pen ready to sign the bill right away. I’m ready to do it.” Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid echoed the call. But Boehner knows that the Bush tax rates are his one remaining lever. He’s holding firm with a House-passed bill that extends all Bush tax cuts for one year while negotiations proceed on tax reform and a big deficit-cutting deal. He appears disinclined to hand it over before negotiations get serious. “The increased tax rates that would be allowed under the Senate-passed bill are part of the fiscal cliff that economists are warning us to avoid. Those increased tax rates will destroy jobs in America by hurting small businesses across the country," Boehner said in a statement responding to the president. One note on the negotiations: Sen. Bob Corker, R-Tenn., a budget wonk who has developed deficit-cutting plans outside the so-called Gang of Eight, said on Friday that all ad hoc groups should remain on the sidelines. “Now is not the time for any of us — Republicans, Democrats, rump groups, or gangs — to be publicly promoting our own plans,” Corker said in a statement that landed strategically between Boehner’s press conference and Obama’s remarks. “Right now the only two people who are likely to get a result by year’s end are President Obama and Speaker Boehner.” Obama and Boehner said now was the time to get to work and minimize drama, conflict, and theatrics. At week’s end those ethos appeared to hold, the repeated East Room standing ovations for Obama notwithstanding. In the coming days, the most important audience reaction will be on Wall Street. Stocks gained slightly Friday morning but gave back those advances immediately after Obama spoke. The market shed 434 points the two days after Obama’s reelection and the retrenchment of Democratic power in the Senate and GOP clout in the House. Investors are beating a hasty retreat out of fear Washington won’t avert the fiscal cliff. Yes, Obama and Boehner are still weighing the voters’ verdict from Tuesday. But if appearances deepen initial impressions of more gridlock, the loudest and costliest verdicts may come from the stock exchanges. Real capital, not just political capital, is at stake.
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#### Says all of the above

Bloomberg 10/25

Romney, Obama Avoid Climate Change Stigma, Waste Air. 10/25/12. http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-10-25/romney-obama-avoid-climate-change-stigma-waste-air.

President Barack Obama pushes an “all of the above” strategy that includes increasing domestic extraction of oil, gas and coal, along with generous incentives for nuclear (tainted, thanks to the Fukushima disaster) and for renewables like wind and solar.

#### Coal lobby’s dead

RL Miller, attorney and environment writer with Climate Hawks, 12 [“The Rage Of A Dying Dinosaur: Coal’s Decline In The U.S.” Climate Progress, August 23, http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/06/23/504331/the-rage-of-a-dying-dinosaur-coals-decline-in-the-us/]

A dinosaur backed into a corner by a pack of smaller dinosaurs may be mortally wounded, but it’s big and angry enough to do some serious damage in its death throes. The coal industry, long accustomed to being the Tyrannosaurus Rex of American politics, is on the ropes, battered by forces outside its control, but angry enough to damage people while it searches for an escape route.¶ Long term use of coal in the US is declining: “The share of U.S. electricity that comes from coal is forecast to fall below 40% for the year, its lowest level since World War II. Four years ago, it was 50%. By the end of this decade, it is likely to be near 30%.”¶ Coal’s decline is widely attributed to three reasons, which I’ve cleverly named EPA — Environmental Protection Agency, Price, Activists. One is far less important than the other two.¶ Congressional Republicans blame the EPA, but every time I’ve looked at “EPA regulations force this coal plant shutdown” cries, I’ve found a decrepit old plant shut down most months because maintenance costs are too high. EPA regulations are a relatively minor factor in coal plant shutdowns.¶ Most business analysts attribute coal’s fall to price. Coal’s price in the United States has stayed fairly stable, but prices of alternatives have plummeted. Natgas is at $2.50/MBTU – it was $9-10 during Bush years. Utilities are actively planning to replace older coal fired plants to natural gas. Things are so bad for Old King Coal that it’s fighting with two of its usual strong allies.¶ The electric utilities, formerly joined at the hip with coal, are now bailing on coal:¶ many now recognize that expending the political capital to fight for plants built in the middle of last century is not worth it — especially when they can construct combined cycle natural gas facilities with relative regulatory ease while releasing roughly half of the emissions in the meantime.¶ A perfect storm is pulling the coal sector under:¶ For example, “American Electric Power, meanwhile, has been one of the most vocal critics of EPA regs. But at the same time, it has admitted — according to Tierney’s paper — that its coal plants are running much less than intended because it is cheaper to operate the natural gas facilities.”

Tady 7 - national political reporter

Megan, “Carbon Capture: Miracle Cure for Global Warming, or Deadly Liability?,” Alternet, http://www.alternet.org/environment/68490/?page=4

"We have to figure out a way to sequester the carbon emissions coming from those plants, or we need to close them down," Morris said. "While people are looking to have a moratorium on new coal-fired power plants, and I agree with that, it's the existing ones that one has to deal with in terms of sequestration." But to others, CCS is a bridge that should never be built because of where it could lead. Matt Leonard, a campaigner with the Rainforest Action Network, a group calling for a coal moratorium, said CCS is a public relations scheme to pave the way for new coal-fired power plants. "The coal industry is grasping at straws trying to find some way to convince the public that they have a place in our future energy policy," Leonard said. "And carbon sequestration is their attempt to brand some kind of PR campaign to have clean coal be a possibility."

#### Choma evidence is good that coal spends money but proceeds to take out the internal link

The correlation between lobbying expenditures and legislation, or lack thereof, is never clear

#### Can’t get a win

Matthew **Daly and** Dina **Cappiello 12**, AP, “Republicans, Democrats at odds on energy issues”, June 13, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/huff-wires/20120613/us-energy-poll-politics/

Republicans and Democrats seem to be living on different planets when it comes to how to meet U.S. energy needs. Republicans overwhelmingly push for more oil drilling. Democrats back conservation and new energy sources such as wind and solar power. A survey by The Associated Press-NORC Center for Public Affairs Research shows that the polarized positions on energy that have divided Congress and emerged in the presidential campaign also run deep among the public. While majorities in both parties say energy is an important issue, the poll shows that partisan identification is closely tied to people's perceptions of the causes of the country's energy problems and possible solutions. No other demographic factor – not race, age, gender or income level – is as consistently associated with opinions on energy as political party identification. For example: \_Three of four Democrats surveyed report that a major reason for the county's energy problems is that industry does not do enough to support clean energy. By comparison 43 percent of the Republicans questioned believe that. \_Three of four Republicans in the poll cite government limits on drilling as a major reason for energy problems, compared with 34 percent of Democrats. Also, 85 percent say it is a serious problem that the United States needs to buy energy from other countries, but there's disagreement about why. Among Republicans in the poll, 65 percent say the U.S. does not produce enough domestic energy to meet demand. Yet just over half the Democrats say people use too much energy. Even on areas where there's majority agreement, a partisan gap remains. For instance, there is broad backing for programs to help consumers learn to make more energy-efficient choices, but the support is 81 percent among Democrats and 57 percent among Republicans. Paul Bledsoe, a senior advisor with the Bipartisan Policy Center and a former Clinton White House aide, said the results provide an unsettling snapshot of a **partisan rift** that **affects every aspect of policy and politics**. He said the big question is whether parties and candidates will acknowledge that they agree on a range of energy solutions and try to make progress, or keep up attacks intended to appeal to their political bases. The poll, made possible by a grant to the AP-NORC Center from the Joyce Foundation, illuminates one driver of this campaign season's divisive political rhetoric: Both parties are playing to their bases. So it's no surprise that presidential candidate Mitt Romney and other Republicans push for more drilling for oil and natural gas, and President Barack Obama emphasizes renewable energy development as part of what he calls an "all-of-the-above" energy strategy. Republicans also are shining a spotlight on the failure of Solyndra, a California solar company that received a half-billion dollar loan from the Obama administration and later went out of business. Just 4 in 10 Republicans support government incentive programs that give money to energy companies to help them develop alternative energy sources. Two-thirds of Democrats support such programs. Overall, about six in 10 people questioned think the government should be deeply involved in finding solutions to the energy problems, with four in 10 saying the government should be "extremely" involved. By 79 percent to 42 percent, Democrats were nearly twice as likely as Republicans to think the government should be involved. About half of Democrats in the poll think government should be "extremely" involved, compared with just one-quarter of Republicans. The survey showed partisans hold different ideas on how the government should be involved. Democrats are more apt to favor incentive programs for consumers or energy companies. Republicans express support for education programs aimed at consumers and allowing more drilling for oil and gas.

#### Any spending outside the deal is a redline

Deidre Walsh, CNN, 9/11/12, Congress has little motivation for compromise before election, lexis

After a five-week summer recess, Congress returns to a long list of unfinished business, but with 57 left days before Election Day, it's likely it will tackle only the bare minimum in its short fall session. The one must-pass measure -- a short-term continuing resolution to fund federal agencies -- will avoid any pre-election talk of a government shutdown, with which neither party wants to be tagged. Republican and Democratic leaders struck a deal this summer on a six-month bill, but both chambers still need to pass the legislation before government funding expires at the end of this month. The House is expected vote on the bill Thursday, and two GOP leadership aides predict it will get a sizable bipartisan majority. A senior Senate Democratic aide tells CNN the Senate is expected to approve the measure next week. Rep. Kevin McCarthy, the third-ranking GOP leader in the House, did not directly answer whether a majority of House Republicans would vote for the stopgap spending bill, but said, "I expect that bill to be a bipartisan vote, and I expect the Senate to pass it as well and not add anything to it." What could move -- It's possible that GOP and Democratic leaders could work out a deal on a farm bill to reform agriculture programs and provide some relief to drought-stricken states -- or at least agree to another short-term extension of the current law, according to multiple congressional aides. If they can't reconcile differences between the two varying approaches taken by the House and Senate, some money for drought assistance, plus some money for states affected by recent natural disasters, could be tacked onto the spending bill. McCarthy, who represents some agricultural interests in his California district, told reporters Monday he's still pressing to pass a bill before the election. He acknowledged to reporters on Capitol Hill that "the time frame is tough," but "it's our intent to get it done." -- The Senate will return and work on a veterans jobs bill this week. Senate Democrats are also considering action this month on a housing bill that President Barack Obama included on his congressional "to do" list earlier this summer, but House Republicans haven't expressed any desire to act on it. -- Some key provisions of the federal wiretapping bill known as FISA that was created after the 9/11 terror attacks under President George W. Bush are due to expire at the end of the year, and Congress is expected to pass an extension of the current law. House Republicans have slated a vote this week to renew the current law for another five years. Likely to be punted **The** roughly eight-week **sprint to Election Day means** several **major measures** that lawmakers have failed to make any progress on over the summer **will continue to languish on Capitol Hill**. These include some issues that both parties say they want to address but will have little motivation to compromise on: The renewal of the Violence Against Women Act, a bill providing new cybersecurity protections and legislation to reform the postal service, which recently defaulted on payments to the Treasury Department for employee health plans. In each case, the proposal favored by the GOP-led House is at odds with the bills in the Democrat-controlled Senate. A divided Congress means these issues will be punted into the lame duck session after the election, or even postponed until next year. Less legislating and more campaign messaging While there won't be much legislating, congressional aides say the messages from leaders and rank-and-file members on Capitol Hill will echo the campaign themes of Obama and GOP presidential candidate Mitt Romney, particularly when it comes to the economy and jobs. On his first post-convention stop in New Hampshire on Friday, Obama prodded voters to urge Congress to pass his jobs legislation. "If the Republicans are serious about being concerned about joblessness, we could create a million new jobs right now if Congress would pass the jobs plan that I sent to them a year ago -- jobs for teachers, jobs for construction workers, jobs for folks who have been looking for work for a long time. We can do that," Obama said. Kevin Smith, a spokesman for House Speaker John Boehner, emphasized that the House GOP has already approved legislation aimed at helping the economy. "The House has done its job. We've passed more than 30 jobs bills." Noting that House Republicans have also passed a bill to undo the automatic spending cuts scheduled to go into effect in January and extend all the current tax rates, Smith added, "We are ready to act on all of those measures if the president and Senate Democrats would show some courage to work with on those things with us." Romney continues to highlight the Obama administration's failed loan to the now-bankrupt energy company Solyndra. House Republicans will keep the issue out front with a vote this week on a bill to eliminate the federal loan guarantee program that funded several energy start-ups. Dubbed the "No more Solyndras Act," the GOP bill is expected to pass mostly along party lines, but won't move in the Senate. One open question is whether GOP vice presidential nominee Rep. Paul Ryan of Wisconsin will return to the Capitol for any part of the September session. Under Wisconsin law, Ryan is allowed to also run for his House seat, so he may feel pressure to take a break from barnstorming battleground states to vote on the bipartisan deal to keep the government funded. McCarthy told reporters Monday that Ryan would be back in Washington on Thursday to vote on the continuing resolution, and a Romney campaign official confirmed that. The six-month spending bill keeps the government funded at the level agreed to in last summer's debt deal -- $1.047 trillion. But after criticism from a bloc of conservative House Republicans that the deal didn't cut spending fast enough, Ryan introduced a budget that moved the overall spending level about $20 billion lower to $1.028 trillion. **That budget** passed the House, but **was immediately rejected** by Senate Democrats **as violating the bipartisan** debt **deal**.

#### Obama focused on cliff—must prioritize it at the expense of everything else to get a deal

Calmes, 11/8

(NYT Columnist, Back to Work, Obama Is Greeted by Looming Crisis, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/08/us/politics/president-obama-begins-work-on-second-term.html?pagewanted=all&pagewanted=print)

Newly re-elected, President Obama moved quickly on Wednesday to open negotiations with Congressional Republican leaders over the main unfinished business of his term — a major deficit-reduction deal to avert a looming fiscal crisis — as he began preparing for a second term that will include significant cabinet changes. Mr. Obama, while still at home in Chicago at midday, called Speaker John A. Boehner in what was described as a brief and cordial exchange on the need to reach some budget compromise in the lame-duck session of Congress starting next week. Later at the Capitol, Mr. Boehner publicly responded before assembled reporters with his most explicit and conciliatory offer to date on Republicans’ willingness to raise tax revenues, but not top rates, together with a spending cut package. “Mr. President, this is your moment,” said Mr. Boehner, a day after Congressional Republicans suffered election losses but kept their House majority. “We’re ready to be led — not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans. We want you to lead, not as a liberal or a conservative, but as president of the United States of America.” His statement came a few hours after Senator Harry Reid, leader of a Democratic Senate majority that made unexpected gains, extended his own olive branch to the opposition. While saying that Democrats would not be pushed around, Mr. Reid, a former boxer, added, “It’s better to dance than to fight.” Both men’s remarks followed Mr. Obama’s own overture in his victory speech after midnight on Wednesday. “In the coming weeks and months,” he said, “I am looking forward to reaching out and working with leaders of both parties to meet the challenges we can only solve together: reducing our deficit, reforming our tax code, fixing our immigration system, freeing ourselves from foreign oil.” After his speech, Mr. Obama tried to call both Mr. Boehner and the Senate Republican leader, Mitch McConnell, but was told they were asleep. The efforts from both sides, after a long and exhausting campaign, suggested the urgency of acting in the few weeks before roughly $700 billion in automatic tax increases and across-the-board spending cuts take effect at year’s end — the “fiscal cliff.” A failure to reach agreement could arrest the economic recovery. Corporate America and financial markets for months have been dreading the prospect of a partisan impasse. Stocks fell on Wednesday, with the Standard & Poor’s 500 Index closing down 2.4 percent. The reasons for the drop were unclear, given that stock futures did not drop significantly on Tuesday night as the election results became clear. Analysts cited fears about the economic impact of such big federal spending cuts and tax increases, but also about new economic troubles in Europe. While Mr. Obama enters the next fray with heightened leverage, both sides agree, the coming negotiations hold big risks for both parties and for **the president’s ability to pursue other priorities in a new term**, like investments in education and research, and an overhaul of immigration law. The president flew back to Washington from Chicago late on Wednesday, his post-election relief reflected in a playful race up the steps of Air Force One with his younger daughter, Sasha. At the White House, he prepared to shake up his staff to help him tackle daunting economic and international challenges. He will study lists of candidates for various positions that a senior adviser, Pete Rouse, assembled in recent weeks as Mr. Obama crisscrossed the country campaigning. The most prominent members of his cabinet will leave soon. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton and Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner long ago said they would depart after the first term, and Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta, previously the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, has signaled that he wants to return to California in the coming year. Also expected to depart is David Plouffe, one of the president’s closest confidants. Mr. Obama is expected to reshuffle both his inner circle and his economic team as he accommodates the changes. For example, Jacob J. Lew, Mr. Obama’s current White House chief of staff and former budget director, is said to be a prime candidate to become Treasury secretary. For the foreseeable future, the holder of that job is likely to be at the center of budget negotiations, and Mr. Lew has experience in such bargaining dating to his work as a senior adviser to Congressional Democrats 30 years ago in bipartisan talks with President Ronald Reagan. “They’ve been thinking about this for some time and they’re going to have a lot of positions to fill at the highest levels,” said former Senator Tom Daschle, who has close ties to the White House. Both Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush ended up replacing about half of their cabinet members between terms, and Mr. Obama could end up doing about the same, especially since his team has served through wars and economic crisis. John D. Podesta, a chief of staff for Mr. Clinton and Mr. Obama’s transition adviser, said, “There’s a certain amount of new energy you want to inject into any team.” There is talk about bringing in Republicans and business executives to help rebuild bridges to both camps. The one Republican in the cabinet now, Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood, has said he will leave. One possible candidate, advisers say, could be Senator Olympia J. Snowe, a Republican moderate from Maine who is retiring. A front-runner for secretary of state appears to be Senator John Kerry, Democrat of Massachusetts, and Democrats said worries about losing his Senate seat to the Republicans in a special election had diminished with Tuesday’s victories. Another candidate has been Susan E. Rice, the ambassador to the United Nations, but she has been a target of Republicans since she provided the administration’s initial accounts, which proved to be wrong, of the September terrorist attack on the diplomatic outpost in Benghazi, Libya. While no one in the White House blames her, “she’s crippled,” said one adviser who asked not to be named discussing personnel matters. Another possible candidate, Thomas E. Donilon, the national security adviser, has told Mr. Obama he wants to stay in his current position, according to a White House official. Attorney General Eric H. Holder Jr., once expected to leave, now seems more likely to stay for a while. Janet Napolitano, the secretary of homeland security, would like to be attorney general and is widely respected in the White House. Among other cabinet officers who may leave are Ron Kirk, the trade representative; Steven Chu, the energy secretary; Ken Salazar, the interior secretary; Tom Vilsack, the agriculture secretary, and Lisa P. Jackson, the Environmental Protection Agency chief. But Valerie Jarrett, the president’s longtime friend and senior adviser, plans to stay, according to Democrats close to her. It may be weeks before Mr. Obama starts making personnel announcements. His first priority is policy, and its politics — positioning for the budget showdown in the lame-duck session, to try to avoid the fiscal cliff by agreeing with Republicans to alternative deficit-reduction measures.

# 2NR

#### Nothing before fiscal cliff

CSM, Christian Science Monitor, 11/8/12, Obama's new foreign and security team, Lexis

Barack Obama's reelection was barely sealed before some international voices began trumpeting how the president's victory would mean a renewed American focus on foreign policy issues that languished during the campaign. President Obama could now revive the search for a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, international Middle East envoy Tony Blair said. The US will be bolder now in pressing for a resolution of Syria's deadly and dangerous civil war, some US allies, including Turkish officials, predicted. Have these foreign friends heard of the "fiscal cliff"? Mr. Obama will no doubt be looking broadly to bolster his legacy, and that will include his stewardship of America's role in the world. But after an election in which - according to exit polls - foreign policy barely registered as a priority and a campaign in which Obama spoke frequently of a need for "nation-building here at home," it seems likely that domestic issues such as America's fiscal health, job creation, taxation, and even immigration reform will dominate the president's attention. "The president laid out his agenda in his victory speech, when he talked about priorities like continuing the economic recovery, avoiding the fiscal cliff, and getting people back to work, so he made it clear he'll be investing his political capital in those kinds of domestic battles," says Mark Siegel, a former deputy assistant to the president in the Carter White House who is now a partner at Locke Lord Strategies in Washington. "I just don't see him pushing any new initiative in terms of Middle East peace, not right away," he adds. "And he certainly won't be launching any kind of military involvement in Syria or Iran."

#### They’ll just punt it with no controversy

Their article 4 paragraphs later

But now re-authorization, without any call for amendment, is the Obama administration’s “top priority.” The House and a Senate committee (.pdf) have approved competing bills that renew the spy powers for between 3 and 5 years.

But on the Senate side, Sen. Ron Wyden (D-Oregon) has stepped in to stop the bill because the government refuses to say how often the spy powers are being used to spy on Americans. Wyden asked the Obama administration a year ago for that information.

The administration replied that it was “not reasonably possible to identify the number of people located in the United States whose communications may have been reviewed under the authority of the FAA.”

Kansas’ card ends

Wyden has barred the Senate from a routine vote using a little-used legislative power — called a hold — to block lawmakers from taking a procedural consent vote. Instead, he demands a floor debate that can draw out the approval process indefinitely via the filibuster.

But not even Wyden’s opposition will prevent renewal of the legislation.

A Wyden spokeswoman has said the senator would be willing to agree to a “short term” extension of the measure, instead of seeing the spy powers lapse, in a bid to give lawmakers more time to reach a deal.

So there you have it, the biggest opponent of the law is willing to reauthorize it rather than see it sunset.