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### 1

#### Interpretation – “financial incentive” is a distinct category that requires a cash transfer – tax incentives are not included.

Christiansen & Böhmer 5 (Hans, Senior Economist in the OECD Directorate for Financial, Fiscal and Enterprise Affairs, & Alexander, co-ordinator of the MENA-OECD Investment Programme in the OECD’s Directorate for Financial and Enterprise Affairs, Investment Division, “Incentives and Free Zones In The MENA Region: A Preliminary Stocktaking,” MENA-OECD Investment Programme, OECD, Working Group 2, p. 4-5, www.oecd.org/dataoecd/56/22/36086747.pdf)

I. Toward a common definition of incentives and FEZs¶ a) Investment incentives¶ 3. There is a grey area between, on the one hand, investment promotion and facilitation, and investment incentives on the other. Investment promoters may make information about their host location, relevant laws and administrative procedures available as a public good, but as soon as they offer facilitation and matchmaking tailored to the needs of individual investors then they are effectively subsidising these investors. The monetary value to investors of such assistance may in some cases exceed the value of outright investment incentives. Conversely, actual investment incentives are normally considered as falling into three categories, namely “regulatory”, “fiscal” and “financial” incentives1:¶ • Regulatory incentives are policies of attracting investment projects by offering derogations from national or sub-national rules and regulation. Where such derogations are offered on an economy-wide basis they tend to focus on the environmental, social and labour-market related requirements placed on investors. In the context of FEZs, they often consist in the relaxation of direct investment regulations (e.g. nationality requirements; screening and authorisation procedures) in place elsewhere in the host economy.¶ • Fiscal incentives consist of an easing of the tax burden on the investing companies or their employees. Unlike many other incentives they are most commonly rules-based as changes in taxation in most cases require legislative action. General fiscal incentives normally take the form of reduced corporate tax rates or tax holidays; encouragement of capital formation (e.g. investment tax credits and accelerated depreciation allowances); and preferential treatment of foreign operators (e.g. lower tax on remittances; reduced personal income tax rates on expatriates). In FEZs fiscal incentives, virtually by definition, also include lower import and export taxes and tariffs.¶ • Financial incentives consist of out of hand public spending to attract companies or induce them to invest. They are often formally justified by a need to compensate investors for the perceived disadvantages of a particular location (“site equalisation outlays”), or may take the form of tailoring the infrastructure of a prospective location to the needs of investors. Other financial incentives include subsidising the actual costs of relocating corporate units (e.g. job training cost; expatriation support; and temporary wage subsidies).

#### Violation – that excludes tax credits

Chi and Hoffman 2k (Keon S., Senior Fellow – CSG, and Daniel J., Research Associate, “State Business Incentives: Trends and Options for the Future,” The Council of State Governments, http://www.csg.org/knowledgecenter/docs/Misc00BusinessIncentives.pdf)

In this report, the term “business incentives” is broadly defined as public subsidies, including, but not limited to, tax abatement and financial assistance programs, designed to create, retain or lure businesses for job creation. The term is used interchangeably as “industrial” or “development incentives.” The term “tax incentives” broadly refers to any credits or abatements of corporate income, personal income, sales-and-use, property or other taxes to create, retain or lure business. **The term “financial incentives” broadly refers to any type of direct loan, loan guarantee grant, infrastructure development, or job training assistance** offered to help create, retain or lure businesses.

#### Voting issue –

#### A. Limits – each category is massive, they explode the topic by allowing hundreds of new, conceptually distinct incentives – makes neg research impossible.

#### B. Ground – different generics apply by category – forcing the aff to spend government money is the only stable mechanism for disad links and counterplan competition.

### 2

#### Energy production through modern technology places nature as a standing reserve – to be dominated and ordered by humanity

DeLuca 5 (Kevin Michael – Professor of Communications at University of Utah, “Thinking with Heidegger: Rethinking Environmental Theory and Practice”, 2005, Ethics and the Environment, Vol. 10, No. 1, JSTOR)

In addition to meditating on media and public relations practices, a careful reading of Heidegger would compel environmentalism to meditate on its relations to technology and to images. To address the issue of tech- nology first, environmental groups often rely on modern technology while writing off such use as a necessary cost of 'doing business' in a mod- ern, mass media public sphere. That may be true, but Heidegger's writings caution us against gliding over the writing off. What are the costs of using modern technology? Besides relying on the technological infrastructure of the communication industry (computers, telephones, video camcorders, etc. . . .) to appear on TV, issue press releases, maintain web sites, lobby politicians, and raise money, environmentalists in the course of working and living rely on cars, planes, air conditioning, highways, microwaves, electricity, and a plethora of plastic products. In short, environmentalists are implicated and imbricated in the technosphere. Now Heidegger's meditation on the essence of technology and the essence of humanity's relation to technology serves to displace the conventional questions concerning technology. Heidegger refuses the question of whether technology is good or bad or neutral. As he puts it, "Everywhere we remain unfree and chained to technology, whether we passionately affirm or deny it. But we are delivered over to it in the worst possible way when we regard it as something neutral; for this conception of it, to which today we particularly like to do homage, makes us utterly blind to the essence of technology" (1993, 311-12). Instead, Heidegger is asking after the essence of technology, which, he famously declares, "is by no means anything technological" (1993, 311). Rejecting the understand- ing of technology as a "mere means" that humans can master, what he terms the merely correct but not true "instrumental and anthropological definition of technology" (1993, 312), Heidegger proposes technology as "a way of revealing" (1993, 318). Avoiding the romanticism of a return to the Pleistocene or the utopi- anism of embracing a Star Trek futurism, from a Heideggerian perspective the question becomes, "What sort of revealing does a particular regime of technology make possible?" More prosaically, what sort of relationships to the earth and world does a technology enable? To this question, Heidegger provides a stinging critique of modern technology [albeit, admittedly, tempered by an ontological hope (see 1993, 333-41)]. The way of revealing of modern technology is Gestell or enframing: "The revealing that rules throughout modern technology has the character of a setting-upon, in the sense of a challenging-forth. ... a challenging, which **puts to nature** the unreasonable demand that it supply energy **which can be extracted and stored** as such" (1993, 321, 320). Nature, then, is reduced to a "standing-reserve ... a calculable coherence of forces" (1993, 322, 326),6 so that "nature reports itself in some way or other **that is identifiable through calculation and that it remains orderable** as a system of information" (1993, 328).7 Heidegger gives examples from the fields of agriculture and energy that ring even more true today (see 1993, 320-21). Of farming, Heidegger writes: The work of the peasant does not challenge the soil of the field. In sow- ing grain it places seed in the keeping of the forces of growth and watches over its increase. But meanwhile even the cultivation of the field has come under the grip of another kind of setting-in-order, which sets upon nature. It sets upon it in the sense of challenging it. Agricul- ture is now the mechanized food industry. (1993, 320) Of course, the all-too-immediate reaction to such an example is to charge Heidegger with a dangerous romanticism. With the benefit of a few decades experience around the world with the products of the mecha- nized food industry, from tasteless food, soil erosion, and ubiquitous pesticides to emptied communities, alienated consumers, and green impe- rialism, in retrospect Heidegger's critique seems understated. More significantly, though, the question is not a moral one of good or bad but an exploration of **what possible ways of relating to nature are opened and foreclosed** with different practices of revealing. Heidegger himself dis- misses the possibility of romanticism in response to the giganticism and the progress of science, "whose onset can neither be hindered nor even held up in any way, by any romantic remembering of what was earlier and different" (1999, 108). Indeed, Heidegger's fundamental critique of modern technology is not directed at the world it reveals **but the world it erases**: Where this ordering holds sway, it drives out every other possibility of revealing. Above all, enframing conceals that revealing which, in the ~~^ 79 sense of poiesis, lets what presences come forth into appearance. As compared with that other revealing, the setting-upon that challenges forth thrusts man into a relation to whatever is that is at once antithet- ical and rigorously ordered. Where enframing holds sway, **regulating and securing of the standing-reserve** mark all revealing. (1993, 332) The problem, then, is not that nature is seen as "standing-reserve," a "cal- culable coherence of forces," but that that is all it can be seen as.

#### This causes planetary extinction—it divorces our relationship with the natural world and makes ecocide inevitable

Gottlieb 94 (Roger S. Gottlieb – Professor of Humanities at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, holds a Ph.D. in Philosophy from Brandeis University, “Ethics and Trauma: Levinas, Feminism, and Deep Ecology,” Crosscurrents: A Journal of Religion and Intellectual Life, 1994, Summer, http://www.crosscurrents.org/feministecology.htm)

Here I will at least begin in agreement with Levinas. As he rejects an ethics proceeding on the basis of self-interest, so I believe the anthropocentric perspectives of conservation or liberal environmentalism cannot take us far enough. Our relations with nonhuman nature are poisoned and not just because we have set up feedback loops that already lead to mass starvations, skyrocketing environmental disease rates, and devastation of natural resources. The problem with ecocide is not just that it hurts human beings. Our uncaring violence also violates the very ground of our being, our natural body, our home. Such violence is done not simply to the other – as if the rainforest, the river, the atmosphere, the species made extinct are totally different from ourselves. Rather, we have crucified ourselves**-in-relation-to-the-other, fracturing a mode of being** in which self and other can no more be conceived as fully in isolation from each other than can a mother and a nursing child. We are that child, and nonhuman nature is that mother. If this image seems too maudlin, let us remember that other lactating women can feed an infant, but we have only one earth mother. What moral stance will be shaped by our personal sense that we are poisoning ourselves, our environment, and so many kindred spirits of the air, water, and forests? To begin, we may see this tragic situation as setting the limits to Levinas's perspective. The other which is nonhuman nature is not simply known by a "trace," nor is it something of which all knowledge is necessarily instrumental. This other is inside us as well as outside us. We prove it with every breath we take, every bit of food we eat, every glass of water we drink. We do not have to find shadowy traces on or in the faces of trees or lakes, topsoil or air: we are made from them. Levinas denies this sense of connection with nature. Our "natural" side represents for him a threat of simple consumption or use of the other, a spontaneous response which must be obliterated by the power of ethics in general (and, for him in particular, Jewish religious law(23) ). A "natural" response lacks discipline; without the capacity to heed the call of the other, unable to sublate the self's egoism. Worship of nature would ultimately result in an "everything-is-permitted" mentality, a close relative of Nazism itself. For Levinas, to think of people as "natural" beings is to assimilate them to a totality, a category or species which makes no room for the kind of individuality required by ethics.(24) He refers to the "elemental" or the "there is" as unmanaged, unaltered, "natural" conditions or forces that are essentially alien to the categories and conditions of moral life.(25) One can only lament that Levinas has read nature -- as to some extent (despite his intentions) he has read selfhood -- through the lens of masculine culture. It is precisely our sense of belonging to nature as system, as interaction, as interdependence, which can provide the basis for an ethics appropriate to the trauma of ecocide. As cultural feminism sought to expand our sense of personal identity to a sense of inter-identification with the human other, so this ecological ethics would expand our personal and species sense of identity into an inter-identification with the natural world. Such a realization can lead us to an ethics appropriate to our time, a dimension of which has come to be known as "deep ecology."(26) For this ethics, we do not begin from the uniqueness of our human selfhood, existing against a taken-for-granted background of earth and sky. Nor is our body somehow irrelevant to ethical relations, with knowledge of it reduced always to tactics of domination. Our knowledge does not assimilate the other to the same, but reveals and furthers the continuing dance of interdependence. And our ethical motivation is neither rationalist system nor individualistic self-interest, but a sense of connection to all of life. The deep ecology sense of self-realization goes beyond the modern Western sense of "self" as an isolated ego striving for hedonistic gratification. . . . . Self, in this sense, is experienced as integrated with the whole of nature.(27) Having gained distance and sophistication of perception [from the development of science and political freedoms] we can turn and recognize who we have been all along. . . . we are our world knowing itself. We can relinquish our separateness. We can come home again -- and participate in our world in a richer, more responsible and poignantly beautiful way.(28) Ecological ways of knowing nature are necessarily participatory. [This] knowledge is ecological and plural, reflecting both the diversity of natural ecosystems and the diversity in cultures that nature-based living gives rise to. The recovery of the feminine principle is based on inclusiveness. It is a recovery in nature, woman and man of creative forms of being and perceiving. In nature it implies seeing nature as a live organism. In woman it implies seeing women as productive and active. Finally, in men the recovery of the feminine principle implies a relocation of action and activity to create life-enhancing, not life-reducing and life-threatening societies.(29) In this context, the knowing ego is not set against a world it seeks to control, but one of which it is a part. To continue the feminist perspective, the mother knows or seeks to know the child's needs. Does it make sense to think of her answering the call of the child in abstraction from such knowledge? Is such knowledge necessarily domination? Or is it essential to a project of care, respect and love, precisely because the knower has an intimate, emotional connection with the known?(30) Our ecological vision locates us in such close relation with our natural home that knowledge of it is knowledge of ourselves. And this is not, contrary to Levinas's fear, reducing the other to the same, but a celebration of a larger, more inclusive, and still complex and articulated self.(31) The noble and terrible burden of Levinas's individuated responsibility for sheer existence gives way to a different dream, a different prayer: Being rock, being gas, being mist, being Mind, Being the mesons traveling among the galaxies with the speed of light, You have come here, my beloved one. . . . You have manifested yourself as trees, as grass, as butterflies, as single-celled beings, and as chrysanthemums; but the eyes with which you looked at me this morning tell me you have never died.(32) In this prayer, we are, quite simply, all in it together. And, although this new ecological Holocaust -- this creation of planet Auschwitz – is under way, it is not yet final. We have time to step back from the brink, to repair our world. But **only if we see that world not as an other** across an irreducible gap of loneliness and unchosen obligation, but as a part of ourselves as we are part of it, to be redeemed not out of duty, but out of love**; neither for our selves nor for the other, but for us all**.

#### Vote Neg to recognize humanity’s solidarity with nature – this can repair our relationship with both nature and our own being

**Best and Nocella 6** (Associate professor of philosophy at the University of Texas at El Paso, “Igniting a Revolution: Voices in Defense of the Earth”, p. 82-84)

 Yet, for both Heidegger and revolutionary environmentalists, **there exist possibilities for transformation despite the destructiveness of Enframing**. In the midst of technological peril – indeed, precisely because the peril strikes at and thus awakens us to the bond between human and nonhuman life – there emerges a sense of solidarity of human with nonhuman beings. Looking at the well-heeled, bureaucratic discourse of “human resource management” and “personnel resources,” the challenging forth of human beings into standing reserve is fairly evident. Factory-farmed cows, pigs, and chickens obviously have it far worse than people, but in both cases the purpose is to harness resources for maximum efficiency and profit. Ultimately human and nonhuman beings are similarly enframed within one giant “gasoline station.” It is precisely the experience of this solidarity which must be constantly rearticulated – in arts, poetry, ceremony, music, and especially in socioeconomic and political action – in order to provide a historically and ontologically authentic break with the metaphysics of technical control and capitalist exploitation. Action **will only be truly revolutionary if it revolves around engagement in solidarity with nature**, where liberation is always seen both as human liberation from the confines of Enframing and simultaneously as liberation of animal nations and eco-regions from human technics. **Anything less will always lapse back into the false and** oppressive hierarchy of “man” over “nature” and “man” over animals with attendant effects of technological, disciplinary control over humans, nonhumans, and the Earth. Using a familiar title from the anarchist Crimethinc collective, revolutionary environmentalism is truly an instance of “fighting for our lives” where the pronoun refers to all life not just human life. Heidegger describes the possibility of transformation through a return of Being as a re-figured humanism. It is the possibility of suspending the will and attaining a lucid sense of the free play of Being within which all of life emerges and is sustained. A human being, like any entity, *is* – s/he stands forth as present. But “his distinctive feature lies in [the fact] that he, as the being who thinks, is open to Being….Man is essentially this relationship of responding to Being. Such experience is the clearing of a space (symbolically represented, for example, in the building of an arbor for a ceremony or in the awesome silence created by the space within a cathedral or a grove of old-growth Redwoods), and the patient readiness for Being to be brought to language. Given the appropriate bearing and evocation through language, human beings can become aware of dwelling, along with all other existent beings, within Being – the open realm within which entities are “released” into presence (Gelassenhait – or “releasement”). What comes to the fore in suspension of willed manipulation is an embrace of other beings and the enduring process of evolution within which all beings emerge and develop. By reflecting on or experiencing oneself within the dimension of freedom that is the domain through which all beings pass, human beings can repair the willed manipulation **inherent in calculative thinking and realize a patient equanimity toward Life**. It is only in the context of this reawakened sense of the unity of life that revolutionary action gains an authentic basis. It is the engagement with “the Other” that shows the ELF actions are truly about defense of plant and animal life, and they demonstrate genuine liberation concerns that typically are trapped within Enframing. That is to say, ELF (and similar) actions, show themselves as part of a dynamic and necessary historical evolution and transformation process, not merely a gesture of opposition and negation, because of their profound solidarity with animals and the Earth. Such guidance solidarity thus serves as a general basis for a post-Enframing, post-capitalist order, an ecological, not a capitalist society. What will change is, first, the preeminence of Enframing as that which animates the epoch and, correspondingly, our relationship to technology. No longer will technical solutions be sought after in realms of activity where technique is not applicable. No longer will everyday activities be pervaded by the standardization and frenzied pace of technology. **No longer will nature be looked upon as a homogenous field of resources to be extracted and exploited**. No longer will resource-intensive and polluting technologies be utilized simply because they serve the blind interests of corporations over the needs of the Earth. No longer will human beings take from the Earth without thought of the far-reaching consequences of such actions on all present and future forms of life. Critics would wrongly denounce this position as atavistic, primitivist, or anti-science/technology. But as the turning toward the re-emergence of Being unfolds, both through revolutionary action rooted in solidarity with nature and through new, non-exploitative modes of acting in the world, technics will not disappear; instead, the limits of technology as a mode of revealing will begin to be discerned so that new forms and uses of technology can emerge. Questions about technology will center on whether a given technology can be developed and used so that plant and animal life can appear as it is and not be reduced to standing reserve. The question, for Heidegger, is not whether technology, in the sense of a set of tools, is done away with, but whether Enframing is surmounted. It is in this sense of releasement Heidegger writes, “Mortals dwell in that they save the earth….Saving does not only snatch something from a danger. To save really means to set something free intro its own presencing. I take this as the literal equivalent of the masked ALF activist reclaiming a puppy from a research lab so that it can become a dog rather than a unit of research, or an ELF activist who stops the destruction of an aquifer or forest so that it can remain an aquifer or forest rather than become a water or wood resource. It is just this new ethos which must guide a revolutionary reconstruction of society on grounds that preserve the openness to Being and the ability of each kind of being to become what it is in its essence. For those who charge Heidegger with merely recycling, and not transcending, Western anthropocentrism, it is important to note that there are possibilities here for an emerging post-humanism – a new orientation to nature beyond egocentric forms of human agency and **towards interrelation with other beings and Being itself**. Heidegger’s philosophy allows for multiple modes of engagement with others and nature as equals, all of them rooted in a relationship of solidarity, respect, and concern. I call this kind of pluralistic, egalitarian, and ecological outlook ontological anarchism. It begins with the rejection of illegitimate “rule” of metaphysical constructs that have served to justify unlimited technological appropriation of the world. In place of Enframing with its subjectivist metaphysical underpinnings, ontological anarchism proclaims a multiplicity of forms of experience in which a sense of revealing comes to the fore – such as in art, music, religion, and philosophy. One such experience, a pre-dominant theme of spiritual re-awakening in the ELF communiques, is found in Native American philosophy and practice.

### 3

#### Obama will win --- a consensus of polls and forecasts prove.

**Silver**, **9/20**/2012 (Nate, Sept. 19: A Wild Day in the Polls, but Obama Ends Up Ahead, Five Thirty Eight, New York Times, p. <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/20/sept-19-a-wild-day-in-the-polls-but-obama-ends-up-ahead/#h>[])

There are also going to be some outliers — sometimes because of unavoidable statistical variance, sometimes because the polling company has a partisan bias, sometimes because it just doesn’t know what it’s doing. (And sometimes: because of all of the above.) By the end of Wednesday, however, it was clear that the preponderance of the evidence favored Mr. Obama. He got strong polls in Ohio, Florida, Michigan, Wisconsin and Virginia, all from credible pollsters. Mr. Obama, who had been slipping in our forecast recently, rebounded to a 75.2 percent chance of winning the Electoral College, up from 72.9 percent on Tuesday. The most unambiguously bearish sign for Mr. Romney are the poor polls he has been getting in swing states from pollsters that use a thorough methodology and include cellphones in their samples. There have been 16 such polls published in the top 10 tipping point states since the Democratic convention ended, all conducted among likely voters. Mr. Obama has held the lead in all 16 of these polls. With the exception of two polls in Colorado — where Mr. Obama’s polling has been quite middling recently — all put him ahead by at least four points. On average, he led by 5.8 percentage points between these 16 surveys. If this is what the post-convention landscape looks like, then Mr. Romney is in a great deal of trouble. Perhaps these polls imply that Mr. Obama’s lead is somewhere in the range of five percentage points in the popular vote — national polls suggest that it’s a bit less than that, but state polls provide useful information about the national landscape. Or perhaps they imply that Mr. Obama is overperforming slightly in the swing states. Either way, that’s a pretty big deficit for Mr. Romney to overcome. What’s more, Mr. Obama was at 49.4 percent of the vote on average between these 16 surveys, meaning that he’d need to capture only a tiny sliver of the undecided vote to get to an outright majority. (If we’re being technical, 49.4 percent might be sufficient for him to win these states on its own, since perhaps 1 or 2 percent of the vote will go to third-party candidates.) To be clear: I do not recommend that this is the only data you look at. The forecast model also evaluates polls that exclude cellphones, although it gives them slightly less weight. Those have not necessarily shown a great deal of strength for Mr. Obama. And just as the model looks at state polls to infer the national trend, it also does the reverse, using the national polls (and essentially the assumption of ”uniform swing”) to infer where the states stand. The national polls show a spread right now from an effective tie to an eight-point lead for Mr. Obama. Taken as a whole, they seem to imply more like a three or four point lead for Mr. Obama rather than something in the range of five points. (These distinctions really do make a difference, especially with so few undecided voters left.) The other questions, of course, are whether Mr. Obama’s bounce is fading, and if it might fade further. His FiveThirtyEight forecast remains off its high of about an 80 percent chance of victory, that he achieved late last week.

#### Carbon Capture is a divisive issue

Pipeline & Gas Journal, 12 ("Natural gas credits for electric utilities at issue in new senate clean energy bill", Pg. 10 Vol. 239 No. 7, lexis)

Introduction of a new clean energy standard bill in the Senate has set off a debate on how to treat natural gas. The Clean Energy Standard Act (S. 2146) introduced in May by 11 Democrats, including Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D-NM), retiring chairman of the Senate Energy Committee, would require that, beginning in 2015, the nation's utilities sell a percentage of their electricity from clean energy sources--including renewable energy, nuclear power, biomass, coal with carbon capture and sequestration, and natural gas. The legislation gives "credit values" to various forms of non-coal inputs. Zero-carbon sources such as new nuclear and renewables would get a full credit per kilowatt-hour produced. Advanced coal technologies, such as oxyfuel combustion, will get partial credit. Natural gas would get about a half-credit. Utilities that sell electricity at retail will acquire and turn those credits in to meet a standard that, overall, will start off being fairly easy to meet. But at hearings in the Bingaman committee on May 17, Keith Trent, group executive and president of Duke Energy's commercial businesses, said, "We have concerns with the concept of including natural gas in the program since it could lead to an overreliance on this single fuel." Duke is the third-largest operator of coal-fueled and nuclear-powered generation in the country. Trent said it is projected that between 30,000 and 60,000 megawatts of the country's aging coal-fueled generation fleet will be retired by 2015 or shortly thereafter to meet existing and new environmental regulations. "Construction of new nuclear units--which we know are highly competitive in the long run--and zero-emission wind and solar power plants will suffer if Congress gives natural gas another leg up," Trent added. Duke is pursuing a license with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to build a new nuclear power plant in South Carolina. Short-term the Senate bill has **no chance of passage**. Long-term, the bill could have wings should Democrats reclaim the House in the 2012 elections and President Obama wins a second term. If Trent's position on natural gas characterizes the view of the entire electric utility industry, gas producers and pipelines will have a major political fight on their hands.

#### Support for Big Oil causes a populist backlash --- costs Obama the election.

**Cillizza**, 4/8/**2012** (Chris – reporter for the Washington Post, writer for The Fix, ‘Big’ is bad for politicians this election year as populist sentiment prevails, Washington Post, p. http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/in-politics-big-is-bad/2012/04/08/gIQAKE8q3S\_story.html)

Big is out. Big Oil. Big Government. Big Media. Put “Big” (the capitalization is key) in front of just about anything these days in politics and you can be certain that voters aren’t going to like it. We are in a populist time when distrust of institutions — banks, Congress — is at an all-time high and the chasm between the haves and the have-nots is growing wider. People believe the system is rigged — and they are angry. “A common thread that reflects this populism is the anger at out-of-control big government echoed by the tea party and the anger at out-of-control big business echoed by the Occupy movement,” said Dave Beattie, a Democratic pollster. “The commonality of ‘anti-big’ ties both together.” Channeling that populist ire is a political gold mine in 2012. Need evidence? The rise of former Pennsylvania senator Rick Santorum was built, in no small part, on a populist economic pitch centered on his upbringing in western Pennsylvania. “Santorum’s miner grandfather shtick has been the best stump material of the year,” said Rob Stutzman, a California-based Republican consultant. And yet, the two candidates likely to face off in the general election are decidedly awkward vessels for the sort of David-vs.-Goliath populism that the country is feeling. While President Obama’s personal story should have some appeal for voters looking for someone who understands their problems, he’s never worn the cloak of populism easily or well. Obama is, at heart, a college professor in his approach to politics — clinically, not emotionally, studying all sides of an issue. It’s no accident that when Obama is at his best, he’s personalizing his politics. His speech at the memorial service for victims of the Tucson shooting rampage and his remarks regarding Georgetown Law student Sandra Fluke, who was verbally attacked by Rush Limbaugh, are two good examples. Former Massachusetts governor Mitt Romney is the furthest thing from a populist the GOP could pick in this nomination process. Romney’s background (his father served as governor of Michigan), his personal wealth and his overall demeanor (businessman through and through) scream whatever the opposite of populism is. (Imagine, for a moment if former Arkansas governor Mike Huckabee ran for president in 2012. Huckabee, marinated in the tradition of Southern populism, would have been a remarkably good fit for the Republican primary electorate. Just saying.) Polling suggests that Obama starts with an edge over Romney when it comes to understanding the problems of average Americans — the closest measure we have to judge a politician’s populist connectivity. In a New York Times/CBS survey conducted last month, 55 percent of registered voters — including more than half of electorally critical independents — said that Obama understood their “needs” and “problems.” Just 31 percent said the same of Romney, the lowest of any of the four candidates remaining in the GOP presidential race. (Santorum led the Republican field with 40 percent saying he understood their needs and problems.) The challenge before Obama and especially Romney is to find ways to play into the populist sentiment coursing through the country, without appearing inauthentic. (The only thing worse than a politician who doesn’t understand “the little guy” is a politician who fakes like he understands the little guy.) Beattie said his party needs “to continue to make the election broadly about protecting and expanding the middle class.” “Many voters are angry that a handful of big companies and wealthy individuals seem to get special treatment or get bailed out while they struggle to get by,” Beattie said. Obama and his campaign team are following that advice. Ads launched in swing states last week attack Romney for siding with “Big Oil” — “Mitt Romney stood with Big Oil . . . for their tax breaks . . . attacking higher mileage standards and renewables,” says the ad’s narrator. The populist problem is more acute for Romney and, therefore, harder to solve. Ed Goeas, a Republican pollster, argued that Romney needs to show that Democratic solutions “are ideologically driven and our solutions are driven by results that will make voters’ lives better.” He added that Obama has more work to do on this front than Democrats like to believe. “Obama is working from the weaker position initially, because he originally touched those emotions with many voters and then lost that connection,” Goeas said. Dave Carney, who served as a senior adviser to Texas Gov. Rick Perry’s presidential campaign, is even more blunt about the contrast Romney needs to draw with Obama on matters of populism. Voters “want a leader who does not want farm dust to be regulated by the [Environmental Protection Agency] or one that does not wish gas were priced even higher at the pump,” he said. Neither Obama nor Romney is a natural populist. But both men will need to dig deep and find ways to connect with the anger and frustration of the electorate if they want to win. The 2012 election is a populist’s paradise.

#### Obama reelection maintains the US/Russian reset --- Romney will collapse relations

**Weir**, 3/27/**2012** (Fred, Obama asks Russia to cut him slack until reelection, Minnesota Post, p. <http://www.minnpost.com/christian-science-monitor/2012/03/obama-asks-russia-cut-him-slack-until-reelection>)

Russian experts say there's little doubt the Kremlin would like to see Obama re-elected. Official Moscow has been pleased by Obama's policy of "resetting" relations between Russia and the US, which resulted in the new START treaty and other cooperation breakthroughs after years of diplomatic chill while George W. Bush was president. The Russian media often covers Obama's lineup of Republican presidential challengers in tones of horror, and there seems to be a consensus among Russian pundits that a Republican president would put a quick end to the Obama-era thaw in relations. "The Republicans are active critics of Russia, and they are extremely negative toward Putin and his return to the presidency," says Dmitry Babich, a political columnist with the official RIA-Novosti news agency. "Democrats are perceived as more easygoing, more positive toward Russia and Putin." Speaking on the record in Seoul, Mr. Medvedev said the years since Obama came to power "were the best three years in the past decade of Russia-US relations.… I hope this mode of relations will maintain between the Russian Federation and the United States and between the leaders." During Putin's own election campaign, which produced a troubled victory earlier this month, he played heavily on anti-Western themes, including what he described as the US drive to attain "absolute invulnerability" at the expense of everyone else. But many Russian experts say that was mostly election rhetoric, and that in office Putin will seek greater cooperation and normal relations with the West. "Russian society is more anti-American than its leaders are," says Pavel Zolotaryov, deputy director of the official Institute of USA-Canada Studies in Moscow. "Leaders have to take popular moods into account. But it's an objective fact that the US and Russia have more points in common than they have serious differences. If Obama wins the election, it seems likely the reset will continue."

#### US/Russian relations prevent nuclear war

**Elliott**, 5/15/**1995** (Michael, Why Russia Still Matters to America, Newsweek, p. lexis)

"Russia," says Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, "is a big country." That it is; lop off the newly independent states born within the old Soviet husk and you've still got a lot left -- a highly educated work force sitting on top of some of the globe's most valuable resources. True, much of that vast territory has an awful climate (climate matters-for different reasons than Russia's, it explains why Australia will never be a great power). But unlike India and China, two other "giant" states, Russia will be able to husband its vast resources without the additional strain of feeding -- and employing-more than a billion souls. It also, of course, is the only country that can launch a **devastating nuclear attack** on the United States. That kind of power demands respect. And sensitive handling. Stephen Sestanovich, head Russia watcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, argues that present U.S. policy is geared too much to "dismantling Russian military might" -- a policy that, since it breeds Russian resentment of Western meddling, is self-defeating. "We have to reorient Russian power," says Sestanovich, "not eliminate it. Because we can't eliminate it." Indeed, Washington should prefer a strong Russia. A Russia so weak, for example, that it could not resist a Chinese land grab of its Far East **without resorting to nuclear weapons** is a 21st-century nightmare. **All this implies a close U.S. -- Russian relationship** stretching into the future. American officials say it will be a "pragmatic" one, recognizing that Russian and U.S. national interests will sometimes collide. The danger, for the United States, is that a pragmatic relationship could be dominated by security issues. In Western Europe, some futurists say that in the coming decades Russia will talk to the United States about nuclear weapons but to the European Union about everything else-trade, economic development and the rest.

### 4

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should grant authority for decision making over tertiary recovery tax credits to the states. The fifty state governments of the United States should provide a tax credit for tertiary recovery that uses industrial carbon dioxide. We’ll clarify.

#### Devolving control of regulating energy solves better and promotes more efficient production

Bryner 2 (Gary C. - Professor, Department of Political Science, Brigham Young University, and Research Associate, Natural Resources Law Center. University of Colorado School of Law., “ARTICLE: Policy Devolution and Environmental Law: Exploring the Transition to Sustainable Development”, Fall, 26 Environs Envtl. L. & Pol'y J. 1, lexis)

Devolution theory calls for increased policy authority and discretion to be delegated to state governments in order to improve the efficiency of public policies, ensure they effectively resolve specific problems, and foster political accountability. Devolution also gives different communities the opportunity to strike their own balance among the competing policy objectives of economic growth and reducing environmental risks. n10 Devolution to regulated industries promises **to reduce the cost of regulation**, **create incentives for sources of pollution** **to find** the most efficient and effective means **of reducing emissions**, encourage reductions that go beyond minimum mandates, and allow for flexibility in business decision making. Devolution to citizens is championed as a way to get the public involved in regulatory initiatives that will change the behavior of citizens. Reducing emissions through energy conservation and increased use of [\*5] mass transit, for example, require major commitments on the part of citizens to change their behavior, and that commitment **cannot simply be mandated from the top down**. Other forms of participatory policy making have been proposed to respond to the demands of citizens for a role in decisions that affect their health and quality of life.¶ Advocates of devolution argue that the current federal regulatory structure is plagued by burdensome procedures and a cumbersome chain of command. The combination of environmental statutes, EPA regulations, and guidance documents result in an impenetrable pyramid of paperwork, planning, and reports. A tremendous amount of effort at all levels of governments is required to manage this process. Compliance with these requirements often replaces energy and resources that could be used to actually reduce pollution and improve environmental quality. Accountability is difficult to identify since so many policy makers compete and jostle for influence, that citizens do not know who to hold accountable when environmental goals are not achieved. Federal officials lay claim to credit for issuing ambitious environmental goals, while state and local officials bear the brunt of criticism for imposing regulatory burdens. The EPA seeks vainly to develop and impose national requirements on conditions that vary widely throughout the nation. n11¶ Critics have identified a host of problems with centralized, command and control regulation: it has not only failed to remedy many environmental problems and threats, but **it has engendered** significant opposition because of the restraints on freedom it imposes, the costs and burdens of compliance, and the apparent ease by which some businesses are able to escape liability and responsibility for their actions. n12 There are real limits to the power of government to promote and ensure the preservation of air, water, land, and other resources. Government agencies alone cannot accomplish these environmental goals, but must be combined with clear and effective economic incentives and with a widely held ethic of care for the land and resources on which all life is so dependent. But the dominant role the federal government plays in environmental policy making focuses too much attention on Washington, and fails to encourage more local efforts. n13¶ Other critics of the current structure of regulatory federalism argue that some state and local governments had a long tradition of ambitious environmental regulation and enacted ambitious pollution control legislation well before Congress or the executive branch acted. The first clean air laws in the United States were enacted by cities in the 1880s, [\*6] some 75 years before the first federal program aimed at air pollution. n14 Many states passed water pollution laws in the 1920 and 30s, and by 1948, every state had an environmental protection agency. n15 While it is true that many federal initiatives for air and water pollution predated the 1970 Earth Day, when the modern era of environmental regulation began, states are not newcomers to environmental regulation. Nor is federal regulation a clear success story. Federal environmental policy has been, in many areas, problematic, and has threatened environmental quality. Federal subsidies for road building in national forests, grazing on public lands, the development of fossil fuels, and the emptying of rivers and streams into reservoirs for irrigation, for example, have taken a tremendous toll on natural systems and resources and have encouraged waste, unsustainable consumption, and pollution. n16 One of the consequences of environmental federalism has been to place limitations on more aggressive state regulations. A major impetus for federal air pollution regulation, for example, was a concern by the auto industry that states would impose different emission standards on new vehicles; this fear of having to meet a maze of state regulatory requirements prompted Detroit to lobby for federal regulation of new vehicle emissions. n17 Another example, from the mid-1990s, is the development of federal emission standards for hazardous emissions from coke ovens that were less stringent than those devised in some states, such as Pennsylvania, where environmental advocates had pushed for and won more ambitious limits. n18¶ One way of responding to this debate over policy devolution is to try to sort out federal/local roles in environmental policy on a statute-by-statute basis. In the case of air pollution, for example, some regulatory goals require efforts that go beyond the capacity of individual states. The Clean Air Act provides for regional efforts to deal with the long-range transport of ozone pollution from motor vehicles and with haze in national parks and wilderness areas. Pollution problems that cross state [\*7] boundaries and involve interstate transfers can be similarly addressed by several states working together, under the EPA's umbrella. The EPA can maintain responsibility for emission standards for products that are sold in national and international markets, such as motor vehicles. n19 In other areas of implementation, such as permitting, inspection, enforcement, and monitoring, however, the EPA could cut back significantly what it does and help direct political accountability to state and local governments for local environmental quality. It could provide technical assistance, draft model state environmental laws, and disseminate more information about environmental problems and conditions and about innovative policy efforts. n20 The EPA could take on fewer tasks, and then perform those functions more expeditiously.¶ The debate over policy devolution is difficult to resolve in ways that provide clear guidance for what specific policies should be pursued at what level of government. Devolution is not without risks. Political boundaries often conflict with the extension of ecosystems and environmental effects spill over political borders. Urban air pollution problems, for example, are a function of local sources as well as those that are transported long distances. Policy devolution in one area, such as the formulation of local air pollution clean up programs, as is currently provided for by law, must be combined with regional and national programs to deal with the transport of air pollution and emissions from motor vehicles. The goal of giving communities the choice of what mix of risk reduction and economic growth strategies to pursue conflicts with the expectations of a national commitment to protect the health of all Americans, regardless of where they live. There may be some backsliding in some states as more autonomy is delegated to them, and polluting industries may find ways to exercise their political clout more ambitiously in local governments in ways that reduce their regulatory obligations. Proponents of less environmental regulation, of unbridled economic growth and consumption may use devolution arguments to pursue their anti-government agenda. But, in the long run, a more ambitious, pollution-preventing approach to regulation requires more participation and involvement by those whose behaviors are targeted for change, and state and local-level government forums are required for citizens, industry officials, and policy makers to work closely together. Any losses in short-run regulatory stringency (if that is an accurate description of current regulatory efforts) will likely be offset by more fundamental, long-term gains.¶ Despite these problems there is significant support for devolution in environmental policy making. There is clearly some role in environmental [\*8] policy making for all levels of government. International commitments require national legislation, but state and local governments can also contribute to implementation of these agreements. Interstate commerce and pollution flows also require at least a multi-state response. Beyond that, there is a compelling case for allowing states to tailor the implementation of national goals to meet differing ecological, economic, social, and political differences. n21 Economic theories suggest that decentralization of decisionmaking "increases social well-being as compared with a centralized solution requiring more uniform level of public services across all jurisdictions" because of the resultant freedom of people to choose for themselves how to balance competing concerns. n22 Competition among businesses and among states is essential in encouraging innovation, experimentation, and improved policy making. Progressives have also joined the call for devolution, arguing that shifts in power to states can be harnessed to enact better public policies and also nourishes democracy and the opening up of politics to groups that have had little success, at least recently, in shaping national policies. n23¶ Nevertheless, Congressional leaders have largely abandoned, with a few exceptions such as in welfare reform, the promises made in 1994 and 1995 to deliver a smaller federal government and devolve more power to states. n24 Instead, legislation **to strengthen the federal role in** taxing Internet commerce, property rights, **electric industry** deregulation, telecommunications, and a host of other areas demonstrate strong Congressional interest in maintaining and even expanding federal power. n25 Members of Congress appear to be much more interested in responding to the demands of business that they be given one set of federal standards to meet, rather than 50 different state requirements. The globalization of the economy and the emphasis on uniform standards provides strong pressure for increased federal policy making rather than policy devolution. n26 The exception of welfare policy seems to prove the rule: in areas where there is strong industry interest in uniform standards, including environmental policy making, there is little devolution; in areas [\*9] where industry has little interest, like welfare, Congress has responded to state demands for more flexibility and discretion.¶ III. RETHINKING ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT¶ An alternative approach to sorting out the debate over policy devolution and national regulatory programs is to consider what kinds of changes are needed in environmental laws and policies in order to encourage the transition from the current command and control approach to the idea of sustainable development. However, the next generation of environmental laws and regulatory programs, if they are to be more efficient and effective than their predecessors in preventing pollution, integrating economic and environmental values, and promoting sustainability, **will still need to address the arguments made by proponents of devolution**. The balance of this paper examines the definition of sustainable development, reviews the case for reshaping environmental regulation toward that goal, and explores the implications of the theory of sustainable development for policy devolution.

#### State-level financial incentives for EOR solve – reduce capital costs, provide financial certainty, and incentivize tech investment and adoption

NEORI 12 (National Enhanced Oil Recovery Initiative along with Center for Climate and Energy Solutions and the Great Plains Initiative, "CARBON DIOXIDE ENHANCED OIL RECOVERY: A CRITICAL DOMESTIC ENERGY,

ECONOMIC, AND ENVIRONMENTAL OPPORTUNITY," February, http://www.neori.org/NEORI\_Report.pdf)

C. OVERVIEW OF MODEL STATE INCENTIVES FOR ¶ CO2¶ -EOR DEPLOYMENT TO COMPLEMENT FEDERAL ¶ SUPPORT¶ Several states have incentives to encourage CO2¶ capture ¶ and transport from power plants and industrial facilities, ¶ which complement federal grants, tax credits, and other support mechanisms. States with these incentives have ¶ provided critical support for projects to advance toward ¶ deployment. Furthermore, as with the new federal tax ¶ credit recommended in this report, state incentives for ¶ commercial CO2¶ capture and pipeline projects have the ¶ potential to be revenue positive, stimulate local oil production, and spur economic activity at a time when most ¶ states face profound fiscal challenges. ¶ NEORI recommends consideration, adoption or ¶ adaptation of the following state policies to complement ¶ federal policy and encourage commercial deployment of ¶ CO2¶ capture and transport technologies.¶ Severance tax reduction and/or extension of existing ¶ severance tax reduction for oil produced with CO2¶ from ¶ anthropogenic sources. This policy provides a percentage reduction in the severance tax for oil production, ¶ if the taxpayer uses CO2¶ -EOR techniques and/or uses ¶ anthropogenic CO2¶ for EOR. It creates an incentive to ¶ pursue CO2¶ -EOR and use CO2¶ from man-made sources, ¶ although it would only work for states with a production ¶ or severance tax. ¶ Cost recovery approval for regulated entities. This ¶ policy enables regulatory approval by public utility commissions for a utility to recover certain costs associated ¶ with CO2¶ capture through rates paid by customers. Cost ¶ recovery approval provides significant financial certainty ¶ to attract the private investment necessary for a project ¶ to proceed to construction and commercial operation.¶ Off-take agreements. This policy enables projects to ¶ enter into long-term contracts for supply of a project’s ¶ output (e.g., electricity). Long-term off-take agreements ¶ provide significant financial certainty, similar to regulatory cost recovery.¶ Tax credits, exemptions, or abatements. This policy ¶ provides credits, exemptions, and abatements for taxes ¶ that would otherwise be incurred, such as property tax ¶ abatement, franchise tax credits, and sales tax exemption ¶ for sale of captured CO2¶ . Such tax policies reduce the ¶ incremental capital cost of capture, compression, infrastructure, and purchase of manmade CO2¶ .¶ State-level bonding of CO2¶ pipeline projects and/or ¶ capture and compression facilities. This policy supports ¶ project financing, development, and planning of infrastructure or facilities deemed to be in the public interest. ¶ Public infrastructure authorities commonly may issue ¶ bonds, make grants/loans, plan/coordinate infrastructure, or participate in infrastructure build-out (e.g., own, ¶ construct, maintain, and operate a facility). ¶ Inclusion in Portfolio Standards. This policy requires ¶ that a certain percentage of all electricity generated in ¶ a state must come from specific sources, such as power ¶ plants with CCS. Portfolio standards that include CCS ¶ are an effective tool to establish financial certainty ¶ through state policy requirements, by allowing for regulatory cost recovery of investments made to meet statutory obligations.¶ A more detailed description of model state policies ¶ can be found in Appendix C, including state-by-state ¶ links to specific policies to serve as a resource to state ¶ policy-makers.

### Solvency

#### Reserves aren’t sufficient to alter prices or solve demand

**Baker 11**

[ Dean Baker, PhD, Co-Director of the Center for Economic and Policy Research , 3/23/11, [http://www.cepr.net/index.php/op-eds-&-columns/op-eds-&-columns/the-imaginary-world-in-which-washington-lives](http://www.cepr.net/index.php/op-eds-%26-columns/op-eds-%26-columns/the-imaginary-world-in-which-washington-lives)]

According to the Energy Information Agency, the United States has proven reserves of 22.3 billion barrels of oil. Given our current rate of consumption of 6.9 billion barrels a year, U.S. reserves could meet our demand for oil for less than 3.5 years. That means if we could somehow drill here, now, and everywhere, we could be energy independent until the middle of 2014 and then we would be 100 percent dependent on imported oil. Of course, we cannot suddenly suck all the oil out of the ground at once, it takes time to explore and drill wells and then the oil must be drilled out over time. If we decided that we want to destroy every last national park and coastal region, we may be able to increase production by 1.0-1.5 million barrels a day in 5-10 years. At the high end, this would be a bit less than 2 percent of world supply. Given normal assumptions about how demand responds to price, we would be very lucky to see a 6 percent decline in the price of oil. This means that in the most optimistic "drill everywhere" scenario we would save less than 20 cents from our $4 a gallon gas. More likely the savings would be less than half this size. In other words, when a politician says that they want to end environmental restrictions on drilling in order to end U.S. dependence on foreign oil or bring the price of gas down, they are speaking utter nonsense. The correct response of a reporter to such assertions would be to say something like: “Senator, you know that the United States does not have nearly enough oil to be energy independent or to substantially reduce the price of gas.”

#### Carbon capture isn’t commercialized in the squo – tech theoretically existing doesn’t make deployment possible – they can’t solve – this is cross-x

#### Saudi Oil imports now

IER 8/28

[Institute for Energy Research, 8/28/12, <http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2012/08/28/u-s-oil-imports-from-the-persian-gulf-and-saudi-arabia-grow-in-2012-and-administration-policies-may-be-to-blame/>]

The Obama Administration is touting that our “dependence on foreign oil has gone down every year during the Obama Administration, including a reduction in net oil imports by ten percent—or one million barrels a day—in the last year alone.”[i] While good news, this trend is happening not because of policies or actions taken by the Obama administration, but because of 1) a poor economy and high oil prices resulting in a lower demand for oil, 2) an increase in oil production on private and state lands (not federal lands) due to less bureaucratic red tape in leasing and permitting on private and state lands, and 3) an increase in biofuel (mainly ethanol) production due to the mandates from the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. The bad news is that while we have reduced our dependence on imports, we are getting more dependent on oil imports from the Persian Gulf, particularly Saudi Arabia. During the first five months of this year, oil imports from the Persian Gulf increased by 33 percent compared to the first five months of 2011. This was mainly due to an increase of oil imports from Saudi Arabia of 29 percent. At the same time, our total oil imports fell by 6 percent. Thus, the Persian Gulf’s share of U.S. oil imports is up 6 percentage points—from 15 percent for the first 5 months of last year to 21 percent for the first 5 months of this year—and the share of our oil imports from Saudi Arabia is up 4 percentage points, from 10 percent to 14 percent.[ii] According to data from the Energy Information Administration (EIA), the United States imported a daily average of almost 1.5 million barrels of Saudi Arabian crude over the first five months of this year, compared to a daily average of about 1.1 million barrels over the same period last year. The corresponding numbers for oil imports from the Persian Gulf oil are an average of 2.2 million barrels per day for the first 5 months of this year compared to 1.7 million barrels per day for the first 5 months of last year. The increase in oil exports from Saudi Arabia to the United States began slowly last summer and has increased this year. Even though domestic oil production is increasing, the Obama administration is finding it difficult to lower its dependence on Persian Gulf oil, especially the heavy grades of crude oil that Saudi Arabia exports and that our refineries in the Gulf of Mexico use. Some oil analysts indicate that this increasing dependency may only last a few years—until more Canadian and Gulf of Mexico production comes on line. These are issues that have been caused by the Obama administration. First, their moratorium and “permitorium” on offshore drilling after the Macondo accident resulted in 17 percent less oil production in offshore federal waters in fiscal year 2011 than the year before. Then, their failure to permit the Keystone XL pipeline that would bring heavy crude oil from Canada postponed new supplies from our Northern Ally. David L. Goldwyn, former State Department coordinator for international energy affairs in the Obama administration, stated “Until we have the ability to access more Canadian heavy oil through improved infrastructure, the vulnerability will remain.”[iii] But, the Obama Administration is not worried because it can tap into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in the event of a self-defined crisis, it sees domestic oil production continuing to grow, and it believes Gulf area refineries can adjust their equipment to use sweeter crude oil if need be. Most of our new domestic production comes from shale oil fields in North Dakota and Texas that produce high-quality sweet grades of oil while refineries on the Gulf of Mexico coast are designed to refine the heavier oils that the United States traditionally imports from Canada, Mexico and Venezuela. Refiners are importing more oil from the Persian Gulf to replace the declining production and imports from Mexico and Venezuela and the reduced production output from the Gulf of Mexico due to the moratorium and de facto moratorium on drilling. There is also insufficient pipeline capacity from Canada to replace those losses with Canadian crude, accentuating the need for the Keystone XL pipeline. In recent years, U.S. oil imports have been declining due to increased domestic production on private and state lands, production of shale oil using hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling technology, increased production of corn-based ethanol and government mandates requiring its increased usage by refineries, and lower oil demand due to high oil prices and a poor economy. Before the Macondo accident in the Gulf of Mexico, monthly oil production from the Gulf was as high as 1.71 million barrels a day and growing, but because of the moratorium on new drilling, monthly oil production from the Gulf after the accident was as low as 1.09 million barrels per day with much of that lower oil production being replaced by imports of Saudi crude oil. Oil production from the Gulf is not expected to regain its higher production levels through 2013, according to EIA, whose forecast for offshore Gulf of Mexico oil production for this year and next is averaging about 1.35 million barrels per day.

#### Lessening dependency causes Saudi backlash

**Hulbert 9/11**

[Matthew, Forbes Contributor, 9/11/12, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/09/11/saudi-oil-snub-dont-take-riyadh-for-granted-mr-president/>]

Admittedly, the independence line might win domestic votes, but it loses America international friends. OPEC – and especially Saudi Arabia – is painfully aware of the 22mb/d liquid potential North America holds over the next ten to fifteen years. They hardly need reminding of that when they’re being asked to dump more oil onto a well-supplied market for U.S. electoral gain. Just to rub it in, the unofficial architect of the Romney energy plan (Citigroup’s Ed Morse), noted in international media today that ‘the U.S. need no longer sacrifice a moral foreign policy based on human rights and democracy to secure co-operation from resource-rich despotic regimes’. Such hyperbole is neither constructive nor wise. The best revolutions are always the silent ones. The louder America shouts about its energy revolution, the bumpier any transition from a world of perceived scarcity to one of ‘total abundance’ will be. Saudi Arabia will make sure of it. America should see this Saudi snub as a warning shot; take Riyadh for granted at your peril. You won’t like the price, or indeed political implication that holds when the dream of U.S. energy independence is rudely awoken by the nightmare of on-going global energy realities.

#### Dependence on Saudi Oil key to relations

Lazazzero 08

[Joseph A. Lazazzero, Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress, 2008, <http://www.thepresidency.org/storage/documents/Fellows2008/Lazazzero.pdf>]

Just as the U.S.-Saudi alliance was important during World War I and the Cold War, this relationship is still of significant value in contemporary politics. As in previous years, the benefits of a strong U.S.-Saudi relationship affect everything from oil dependence to international conflicts. With a limited supply of oil and growing demands from an industrializing China, the United States needs to solidify its oil agreements with Saudi Arabia. An improved Saudi-American relationship would also help to resolve the United States’ failed efforts in resolving the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. More importantly, both the United States and Saudi Arabia have stakes in winning the War on Terrorism. Oil Dependence The United States’ demand for oil first initiated the U.S.-Saudi alliance, and it continues to be one of its most crucial components today. Roughly, 60 percent of the world’s oil supply is in the Gulf, and 25 percent of that is under Saudi soil (Cordesman, 28-42). Saudi Arabia is the world’s largest oil producer, and the United States is the largest oil consumer (Appendix 2-1). Both parties have stakes in a stable oil market (US House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs, 1981). Not only does Saudi Arabia have the most oil, it has also proven itself a reliable partner in the oil industry. Saudi Arabia’s spare production capacity has allowed it to answer oil production shortages in the past. Saudi Arabia enacted such policies in 1979 after the fall of the Shah, when the Gulf War decreased oil production in both Iraq and Kuwait, in 2003 on the verge of the second Iraq war and even today with instability in oil-producing countries like Venezuela and Nigeria (Bahgat, 115). These measures have shown that Saudi Arabia is committed to keeping oil costs low and production constant. In addition, Saudi Arabia has also proven itself a more stable oil partner for the United States than other oil-producing countries. Saudi Arabia has easily managed to nationalize foreign oil companies. Unlike the bitter dispute that existed between Iran and the British Petroleum Company in the 1950’s, Saudi Arabia has slowly acquired the American company Aramco, and U.S. investors and contractors still serve on the company’s board of directors (Bahgat, 115). Prince Abdullah visited Washington DC in 1998 to meet with U.S. oil companies and called for a greater strategic energy partnership (Bahagt, 115 & Ottaway & Hamilton, A1). Thus, not only is the United States in a unique position with access to the world’s largest oil producer, but it also has serious influence and economic footholds in Saudi Arabia’s oil companies. Oil dependence between the United States and Saudi Arabia benefits the Saudi government as well. Since the first discovery of oil in 1933, Saudi Arabia has changed itself into a regional superpower. Saudi Arabia has used much of its newfound wealth on military expenditures, but it has also utilized its money to make domestic improvements. For example, Saudi Arabia committed nearly $20.14 billion to local markets in an attempt to diversify its economy. Saudi Arabia has also debated entering the World Trade Organization, a move that would undoubtedly insert an Arab voice in the Westernized globalization of the international economy (Champion, 169-171). The money from oil production has allowed Saudi Arabia to become one of the wealthiest countries in the region. Such wealth has allowed Saudi Arabia to become a member of the modernized world, increasing everything from electrical output to mobile phones.(Appendix 1-1 & 12) (Al-Farsay, 31) The importance of a continued U.S.-Saudi economic partnership in oil investments is just as significant for Saudi Arabia’s development and power in the region as it is for the United States’ demand for foreign oil. Of course, there are other countries willing to buy Saudi oil, but here is where the significance of dual protection comes into play. Starting with the Eisenhower Doctrine of 1957, which declared that an attack on Saudi Arabia’s oil fields would be equivalent to an attack on the United States, the United States can make a promise no other nation can, of protection from the world’s most powerful military (Ashton, 103-113). Thus, even if there are other countries willing to purchase Saudi oil, Saudi Arabia is still gaining significant security from its alliance with the United States.

**Relations solve Saudi Prolif**

**Levi 03**, Michael, Science And Technology Fellow, Foreign Policy Studies Brookings Institution, 2003 [The New Republic , June 2 http://www.iranwatch.org/privateviews/Brookings/perspex-brookings-levi-060203.htm]

Realists counter that the United States needs Saudi oil and Saudi military bases. But there's a less obvious argument for making sure the long-standing Washington-Riyadh partnership doesn't fracture: If it does, the Saudis might well go nuclear. Saudi Arabia could develop a nuclear arsenal relatively quickly. In the late '80s, Riyadh secretly purchased between 50 and 60 CSS-2 missiles from China. The missiles were advanced, each with a range of up to 3,500 kilometers and a payload capacity of up to 2,500 kilograms. What concerned observers, though, was not so much these impressive capabilities but rather the missiles' dismal accuracy. Mated to a conventional warhead, with a destructive radius of at most tens of meters, these CSS-2 missiles would be useless—their explosives would miss the target. But the CSS-2 is perfect for delivering a nuclear weapon. The missile itself may miss by a couple of kilometers, but, if the bomb's destructive radius is roughly as large, it will still destroy the target. The CSS-2 purchase, analysts reasoned, was an indication that the Saudis were at least hedging in the nuclear direction. July 1994 brought more news of Saudi interest in nuclear weapons when defector Mohammed Al Khilewi, a former diplomat in the Saudi U.N. mission, told London's Sunday Times that, between 1985 and 1990, Saudi Arabia had actively aided Iraq's nuclear weapons program, both financially and technologically, in return for a share of the program's product. Though Khilewi produced letters supporting his claim, no one has publicly corroborated his accusations. Still, the episode was unsettling. Then, in July 1999, *The New York Times* reported that Saudi Defense Minister Prince Sultan bin Abdulaziz Al Saud had recently visited sensitive Pakistani nuclear weapons sites. Prince Sultan toured the Kahuta facility where Pakistan produced enriched uranium for nuclear bombs—and which, at the same time, was allegedly supplying materiel and expertise to the North Korean nuclear program. The Saudis refused to explain the prince's visit. If Saudi Arabia chose the nuclear path, it would most likely exploit this Pakistani connection. Alternatively, it could go to North Korea or even to China, which has sold the Saudis missiles in the past. Most likely, as Richard L. Russell, a Saudi specialist at National Defense University, argued two years ago in the journal *Survival*, the Saudis would attempt to purchase complete warheads rather than build an extensive weapons-production infrastructure. Saudi Arabia saw Israel destroy Iraq's Osirak reactor in 1981, and it is familiar with America's 1994 threat to bomb North Korea's reactor and reprocessing facility at Yongbyon. As a result, it would probably conclude that any large nuclear infrastructure might be preemptively destroyed. At the same time, Riyadh probably realizes that America's current hesitation to attack North Korea stems at least in part from the fact that North Korea likely already has one or two complete warheads, which American forces would have no hope of destroying in a precision strike. By buying ready-made warheads, Riyadh would make a preemptive attack less likely. And, unlike recent proliferators such as North Korea, the Saudis have the money to do so.

#### Goes Nuclear

**Haddick 11**

-- managing editor of Small Wars Journal (12/16/2011, Robert, “This Week at War: Arms Race on the Gulf; Will it take Saudi nukes to deter Iranian nukes?”<http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/12/16/this_week_at_war_arms_race_on_the_gulf>)

 Prince Turki seemed to suggest that Saudi Arabia requires its own nuclear force to, at a minimum, deter a classic and existential Cold War-style nuclear ballistic missile threat to the kingdom. The acquisition of a Saudi nuclear deterrent would be highly destabilizing. Very short missile flight times within the region, combined with fragile early-warning and command-and-control systems, would create an extremely dangerous hair-trigger posture on all sides. The Saudi acquisition of a nuclear deterrent would also be acrushing blow to the prestige of the **U**nited **S**tates as a military ally and to the diminishing role President Barack Obama has sought for nuclear weapons.

### Relations

#### Energy Independence is Impossible

**Levi 12**

[Michael Levi, senior fellow for energy and the environment at the Council on Foreign Relations and director of its Program on Energy Security and Climate Change, “Think Again: The American Energy Boom”, July 2012, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/18/think_again_the_american_energy_boom?page=0,0>]

In any case, energy independence requires more than impressive arithmetic. As long as the United States is fully integrated into the world oil market, U.S. fuel prices will rise and fall along with events on the other side of the globe -- say, a war with Iran. Greater domestic production will blunt the economic shock of rapidly rising prices -- better to suddenly be sending massive sums to North Dakota than to Saudi Arabia -- but because oil producers everywhere are relatively slow to spend their windfalls, skyrocketing prices could still knock the economy on its back.

#### Solar tariff tanks relations – massive alt cause

Solar Industry Magazine 12

[Solar Industry Magazine Staff, 7/20/12, <http://solarindustrymag.com/e107_plugins/content/content.php?content.10790>]

China has reportedly launched an investigation into whether exporters from the U.S. and South Korea illegally dumped solar-grade polysilicon, according to a report from Bloomberg, which cited China’s Ministry of Commerce (MOC). The probe was launched after four companies – GCL-Poly Energy Holdings Ltd., LDK Solar Co., Daqo New Energy Corp. and China Silicon Corp. – filed complaints with the MOC, the Bloomberg report states. These latest developments **intensify the ongoing** **trade disputes between China and the U.S.** following a ruling by the U.S. Department of Commerce that it would impose countervailing duties on Chinese solar cells and modules imported into the U.S. The Coalition for Affordable Solar Energy (CASE), which has opposed the anti-dumping and anti-subsidy complaints filed by the SolarWorld-led Coalition for American Solar Manufacturing (CASM), urged a peaceful resolution to the dispute. “Tariffs at any point in the global solar value chain **are counterproductive and make solar energy less competitive against fossil fuels,”** said CASE President Jigar Shah in a statement in response to the latest investigation. “Looking at the preliminary tariffs set in the U.S., it’s clear that the free flow of solar goods is already disrupted, prices are increasing, jobs are being eliminated and businesses are adversely impacted at every level of the global solar industry. We urge all countries to avoid unilateral actions that impede trade and resolve conflicts in a bilateral or multilateral context.” CASM did not comment on the MOC’s decision. Following the news, Solar Energy Industries Association President and CEO Rhone Resch reiterated his call for a collaborative dialogue. “We are disappointed by China’s decision to escalate the U.S.-China solar trade conflict,” he said in a statement. “Unfortunately, these investigations will have an immediate, adverse impact on U.S. polysilicon manufacturers, regardless of the investigations’ outcome. The investigations also threaten the Chinese solar industry’s access to the world’s most efficient and innovative polysilicon products. “Some have argued that it’s too soon to either start a collaborative dialogue or consider negotiations,” he added. “We disagree – **it’s never too soon to begin work on solutions and forward-thinking action. And we now have confirmation that disputes within one segment of the solar industry affect the entire supply chain. Let’s start the broader collaborative process now.”**

#### -- Security cooperation won’t break down

Taiwan News 4 (4-27, Lexis)

He also said Washington's renewed protests about Beijing's human rights, weapons proliferation and trade practices were **insufficient** to destabilize U.S.-China relations, because America's reliance on Beijing in diplomatic efforts toward North Korea, and Beijing's hopes for U.S. pressure to be used against Taiwan, are part of a **broad** set of **calculations keeping the relationship on track**.

#### -- Empirically denied

Shambaugh 5 (David, Professor of Political Science and International Affairs – George Washington University and Fellow – Brookings Institute, “The New Strategic Triangle: U.S. and European Reactions to China's Rise”, Washington Quarterly, Summer, Lexis)

Third, significant divergences exist along all the legs of the new strategic triangle as well. The United States and Europe have certainly had their fair share of recent disagreements about Iraq, a series of international treaties and regimes, the role of the United States in the world, and the China arms embargo. China and Europe have had a series of disputes over trade and MES classification as well as disagreements over human rights. Europe has concerns about China’s proliferation practices, as well as the arms embargo. More recently, China’s Europe specialists have begun to criticize the motives underlying EU programs to promote civil society in China as an ideological ruse to “Westernize and divide China” (Xi-hua, fen-Hua).12 The United States and China have also disputed human rights, trade, and proliferation, as well as Taiwan, missile defense, and regional security in East Asia. All these features add up to a very fluid and shifting set of relationships in which mutual positions sometimes converge and sometimes diverge. The EU and the United States sometimes side with each other, China and the EU sometimes find themselves in agreement, the United States and China sometimes work well together, and sometimes the interests and policies of all three intersect, all while each side simultaneously has disputes with the other two parties. What has not occurred, to date, is a situation where U.S. and Chinese perspectives converge against European interests.

#### -- No US/China war – economics checks

Sargent 8 (Sara, Business Reporter – Medill News Service, “China Space Launch Raises Fears”, UPI, 10-3, Lexis)

In January 2007 China conducted its first successful anti-satellite weapons test by destroying one of its own space weather satellites. The move angered the U.S. government, which accused the Chinese of making a move toward militarizing outer space. Despite the U.S. government's concerns, the only circumstance under which the United States and China would engage in space warfare is in the face of another conflict, suggests Dean Cheng, senior Asia analyst for Virginia-based think tank CNA. And given the current stability of U.S.-Chinese relations and the economic interdependence of the two nations, Cheng and other experts agree that war is an exceptionally unlikely scenario.

#### -- Conflict inevitable

Bremmer and Roubini 9 (Ian, President – Eurasia Group and Nouriel, Professor of Economics – New York University and Chari – RGE Monitor, “The Yin and Yang of U.S.-China Relations”, Wall Street Journal, 9-1, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204731804574384601554931882.html)

American and Chinese officials said all the right things during this summer's inaugural round of their Strategic and Economic Dialogue. President Barack Obama pledged to "forge a path to the future that we seek for our children." Chinese State Councilor Dai Bingguo wondered aloud whether America and China can "build better relations despite very different social systems, cultures and histories." He answered his own question, in English, with a "Yes we can." They can, but they probably won't. Yes, Mr. Obama will visit China in November. But when it comes to international burden-sharing, Washington is focused on geopolitical headaches while China confines its heavy-lifting to geoeconomic challenges. The two sides have good reason to cooperate, but there's a growing gap between what Washington expects from Beijing and what the Chinese can deliver. Many of the issues that create conflict in U.S.-Chinese relations are well known: an enormous bilateral trade deficit, disputes over the value of China's currency, protections for U.S. intellectual property, the dollar's role as international reserve currency, conflicts over human rights, naval altercations, protectionist threats from both sides, and disagreements over how best to handle North Korea's Kim Jong Il. But there are other, less obvious obstacles to partnership. First, both governments remain largely focused on formidable domestic challenges. Mr. Obama knows his political fortunes depend largely on the resilience of the U.S. economy and its ability to generate jobs. He's occupied for the moment with a high-stakes poker game with lawmakers in his own party over ambitious health-care and energy-reform plans. China's leadership faces competing internal demands from those who want to stimulate the economy toward another round of export-driven growth and others who want to shift quickly toward greater dependence on domestic consumption. Given the trade deficit, Washington would like Beijing to focus on the latter, but China won't move as fast as the U.S. would like, in part because the leadership recognizes that the loss of millions of manufacturing and construction jobs in recent months could fuel further turmoil in a country that already sees tens of thousands of large-scale protests each year. Second, there's the bureaucratic problem. For the past several years, former U.S. Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson chaired a strategic dialogue with Chinese Vice Premier Wang Qishan. Washington and Beijing have now expanded the scope of talks to include the State Department and China's foreign ministry. Leaving aside the difficulties in building trust between U.S. and Chinese negotiators, State and Treasury don't coordinate well on strategy, and there's no guarantee that China's foreign and finance ministries will work seamlessly together either. The new formula for talks is bureaucratic infighting squared. The third reason the U.S. and China won't build a durable strategic partnership is that Beijing has little appetite for the larger geopolitical role Washington would like it to play. Why should Beijing accept the risks that come with direct involvement in conflicts involving Iran and Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan, Israelis and Palestinians, Somalia and Sudan, and other sources of potential turmoil? It has more immediate problems at home.

#### High prices cause efficiency- solves the impact

AAP 12

[Australian Associated Press, 9/12/12, <http://www.perthnow.com.au/news/breaking-news/high-oil-prices-fuel-efficiency-drive-iea/story-e6frg133-1226473001539>]

These factors will also cap demand growth in 2013, the agency said on Wednesday. "The pace of oil demand growth is expected to remain relatively steady over the next 18 months, with annual gains of just 0.8 million barrels per day in both 2012 and 2013," the agency said in its latest Oil Market Report. "This modest growth rate reflects the combined effects of sluggish global economic activity, historically elevated oil prices and global improvements in energy efficiency," said IEA, an offshoot of the Paris-based Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. With Brent futures indicating prices will remain above $100 in 2012 before dipping to just below $99 in 2013, consumers are being given an incentive to cut consumption.

### Warming

#### Warming is irreversible

ANI 10 (“IPCC has underestimated climate-change impacts, say scientists”, 3-20, One India, http://news.oneindia.in/2010/03/20/ipcchas-underestimated-climate-change-impacts-sayscientis.html)

According to Charles H. Greene, Cornell professor of Earth and atmospheric science, "Even if all man-made greenhouse gas emissions were stopped tomorrow and carbon-dioxide levels stabilized at today's concentration, by the end of this century, the global average temperature would increase by about 4.3 degrees Fahrenheit, or about 2.4 degrees centigrade above pre-industrial levels, which is significantly above the level which scientists and policy makers agree is a threshold for dangerous climate change." "Of course, greenhouse gas emissions will not stop tomorrow, so the actual temperature increase will likely be significantly larger, resulting in potentially catastrophic impacts to society unless other steps are taken to reduce the Earth's temperature," he added. "Furthermore, while the oceans have slowed the amount of warming we would otherwise have seen for the level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, the ocean's thermal inertia will also slow the cooling we experience once we finally reduce our greenhouse gas emissions," he said. This means that the temperature rise we see this century will be largely irreversible for the next thousand years. "Reducing greenhouse gas emissions alone is unlikely to mitigate the risks of dangerous climate change," said Green.

#### Sequestration doesn’t change this – they read no evidence that they can sequestrate ENOUGh to solve – particularly since they cant prove in cross-x that the tech is commercial ready to be adopted globally now

#### CO2 is not the one cause for climate change – solar radiation and ocean interactions are ignored

Patterson 11 [Norman Paterson is a Professional Engineer and Consulting Geophysicist with 60 years’ experience in Mineral and Environmental Geophysics. He obtained his Ph. D in Geophysics at the University of Toronto in 1955, and was elected Fellow, Royal Society of Canada in 1977. “Global Warming: A Critique of the Anthropogenic Model and its Consequences”, Geoscience Canada - Volume 38, Number 1, March 2011, Chetan]

WHAT CAUSES WARMING? It is likely that the cyclical warming and cooling of the earth results from a number of different causes, none of which, taken alone, is dominant enough to be entirely responsible. The more important ones are solar changes (including both irradiance and magnetic field effects), atmosphere–ocean interaction (including both multidecadal climatic oscillations and unforced internal variability), and greenhouse gases. All of these factors have been discussed by IPCC, but the first two have been dismissed as negligible in comparison with the greenhouse-gas effect and man’s contribution to it through anthropogenic CO2 . It is claimed (e.g. Revelle and Suess 1957) that the particular infrared absorption bands of CO2 provide it with a special ability to absorb and reradiate the sun’s longer wavelength radiation, causing warming of the troposphere and an increase in high-altitude (cirrus) cloud, further amplifying the heating process. Detailed arguments against this conclusion can be found in Spencer et al. (2007) and Gerlich and Tscheuschner (2009). These scientists point out (among other arguments, which include the logarithmic decrease in absorptive power of CO2 at increasing concentrations), that clouds have poor ability to emit radiation and that the transfer of heat from the atmosphere to a warmer body (the earth) defies the Second Law of Thermodynamics. They argue that the Plank and Stefan-Boltzman equations used in calculations of radiative heat transfer cannot be applied to gases in the atmosphere because of the highly complex multi-body nature of the problem. Veizer (2005) explains that, to play a significant role, CO2 requires an amplifier, in this case water vapour. He concludes that water vapour plays the dominant role in global warming and that solar effects are the driver, rather than CO2 . A comprehensive critique of the greenhouse gas theory is provided by Hutton (2009).

#### Can’t solve globally – shift won’t happen fast enough

#### Renewables are competitive now

**Tickell, 8/20**/12 – British journalist, author and campaigner on health and environment issues, and author of the Kyoto2 climate initiative (Oliver, “Does the world need nuclear power to solve the climate crisis?” <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/aug/20/world-need-nuclear-power-climate-crisis>)

However, non-hydro renewables are growing very fast – up 15% in 2010. And within this figure just three power sources are responsible for most of the growth: wind power, solar PV and solar hot water. From 2005 to 2010, global solar hot water and wind power capacity both grew at 25% per year, while solar PV capacity grew at over 50% per year. If these growth rates were to be sustained for 35 years, wind capacity would rise 6,300-fold from 200 gigawatts (GW) in 2010 to about 1.25 million GW, solar hot water 6,300-fold from 185 GW to 1.15 million GW, and solar PV 40 million-fold from 40 GW to 1.6 billion GW. These figures are not predictions. Exponential growth will not continue for so long, as prime sites for wind turbines and solar panels get used up. Other technologies, such as concentrated solar power, will also become important. And there will be demand-side constraints: the projected 1.6 billion GW of solar PV capacity alone would produce over 3 billion billion kilowatt hours per year, equivalent to a primary energy burn of some 30 million Mtoe – over 1,000 times our projected world primary energy demand in 35 years. We would not even know what to do with so much energy. But while not predictive, the figures are highly indicative of the low-carbon energy choices the world should make. The one, nuclear power, is expensive and becoming more so. It will be a practical impossibility to increase its capacity to a scale big enough to make a real difference to global climate within a realistic time frame. Worse, if we were somehow to build our 11,000 nuclear reactors, we would face the certainty of repeated catastrophic accidents and the spread of nuclear weapons, not to mention unimaginable liabilities for decommissioning and long-term nuclear-waste management. We can fairly say that nuclear power is both repulsive and utterly wrong. The other choice, renewable power, already costs less than fossil fuels for many applications, thanks in large part to generous subsidies in Germany, Japan and other countries, which have had the effect of greatly reducing prices. Solar electricity is now cheaper than power from diesel generators in the tropics and subtropics – and so the rapid spread of solar power across China, India, Africa and Latin America is being driven not by subsidy but by the market. And it is getting cheaper all the time as increased demand, caused by its lower price, stimulates greater competition among manufacturers, technological advance, and even greater price falls, in a delightful virtuous circle. Moreover, renewable energy is free of catastrophic dangers and long- term liabilities. It is both romantic and right.

#### New oil supplies derail renewables

Styles 12 (Geoffrey, “Could Oil's Surge Sink Renewable Energy?,” The Energy Collective, 7-2-12, <http://theenergycollective.com/node/89161>)

A new forecast of global oil production by the end of the decade attracted a fair amount of attention this week. The study, from Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, indicates that oil production could expand by about 20% by 2020 from current levels. The Wall St. Journal's Heard on the Street column cited this in support of the view that the influence of "peak oil" on the market has itself peaked and fallen into decline. I was particularly intrigued by a scenario suggested in MIT's Technology Review that this wave of new oil supplies could trigger an oil price collapse similar to the one in the mid-1980s that helped roll back the renewable energy programs that were started during the oil crises of the 1970s. That's possible, though I'm not sure this should be the biggest worry that manufacturers of wind turbines and solar panels have today.

#### Renewables key to solve warming

**Jagger, 8** – Chair of the World Future Council (Bianca, 3/6. CQ Congressional Testimony, “RENEWABLE ENERGY,” Lexis.)

"If we go beyond the point where human intervention can no longer stabilise the system, then we precipitate unstoppable runaway climate change. That will set in motion a major extinction event comparable to the five other extinction crises that the earth has previously experienced." I find it deeply mystifying that the vast majority of the media are still not adequately expressing the scale of the danger we face. Professor John Holdren, President of the AAAS, said in August, "We have already passed the stage of dangerous climate change. The task now is to avoid catastrophic climate change." And as George Monbiot, in an article he wrote for the Guardian in July, said: "Unaware of the causes of our good fortune, blissfully detached from their likely termination, we drift into catastrophe." This clearly demonstrates what the World Future Council, the organisation I chair, is advocating. If we are serious about averting climate change catastrophe, we must think in revolutionary terms, and transform our way of life, restoring rather than destroying life on earth. We must embark upon a global renewable energy revolution: if we are to achieve the necessary carbon reduction by 2020, we must replace our carbon- driven economy with a renewable energy economy

#### Turn – CO2 increases marine calcification through symbiont photosynthesis

Idso et al 12 [Sherwood, Keith, Craig - Research Physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, Vice President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change with a PhD in Botany, former Director of Environmental Science at Peabody Energy in St. Louis, Missouri and is a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, Association of American Geographers, Ecological Society of America, “Algal Symbionts Appear to Determine Responses of Calcifying Organisms to Ocean Acidification”, Volume 15, Number 5: 1 February 2012, <http://www.co2science.org/articles/V15/N5/EDIT.php>, Chetan]

Many are the studies that claim that increasing atmospheric CO2 concentrations will lead to a condition described as ocean acidification, where the pH of seawater declines and it becomes ever more difficult for calcifying marine organisms to produce skeletal structures. However, in a culture experiment with two algal symbiont-bearing, reef-dwelling foraminifers (Amphisorus kudakajimensis and Calcarina gaudichaudii), which was conducted in seawater under five different pCO2 conditions - 245, 375, 588, 763 and 907 ppm, maintained with a precise pCO2-controlling technique - Hikami et al. (2011) found that net calcification of A. kudakajimensis was indeed reduced under higher pCO2, but that calcification of C. gaudichaudii did just the opposite and actually increased with increased pCO2. This latter result, although seemingly strange, is anything but unusual; for the nine researchers report that various taxa of coccolithophores and sea urchins "show enhanced calcification in environments with higher pCO2," citing the work of Iglesias-Rodriguez et al. (2008), Doney et al. (2009) and Ries et al. (2009). And they say that "different populations of Emiliania huxleyi have shown decreased, increased, or unchanged calcification in response to higher pCO2," citing Fabry (2008). In discussing the findings of their experiment, Hikami et al. say that the upward trend in the calcification of C. gaudichaudii in response to ocean acidification "can probably be attributed to the increase in CO2, possibly through enhancement of symbiont photosynthesis, a phenomenon known as the CO2-fertilizing effect," citing Ries et al. (2009), although the concept was first described several years earlier by Idso et al. (2000). And in discussing possible causes of the two contrasting types of calcification response to atmospheric CO2 enrichment (positive and negative), they speculate that "the type of symbiont influences the strength of the CO2-fertilizing effect."

#### Our understanding of the ocean is too small to make any sweeping conclusions – the ocean acidification theory ignores ocean carbonation and is based on short term experiments

Idso et al 12 [Sherwood, Keith, Craig - Research Physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, Vice President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change with a PhD in Botany, former Director of Environmental Science at Peabody Energy in St. Louis, Missouri and is a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, Association of American Geographers, Ecological Society of America, “The Unsettled Science of Ocean Warming and Acidification ”, Volume 15, Number 19: 9 May 2012, <http://www.co2science.org/articles/V15/N19/EDIT.php>, Chetan]

All of these phenomena, many of which are nonlinear and extremely complicated, are interlinked; and Riebesell and his colleagues thus conclude, from their objective review of the pertinent scientific literature, that the magnitude and even the sign of the global ocean's carbon cycle feedback to climate change are, in their words, "yet unknown." They note, for example, that "our understanding of biological responses to ocean change is still in its infancy." With respect to ocean acidification, in particular, they write that the impact it will have on marine life "is still uncertain," and that the phenomenon itself is but "one side of the story," the other side being what they call "ocean carbonation," which, as they describe it, "will likely be beneficial to some groups of photosynthetic organisms." Thus, they write that "our present understanding of biologically driven feedback mechanisms is still rudimentary," and that with respect to many of their magnitudes, "our understanding is too immature to even make a guess." What is more, they imply that even what we do think we know could well be wrong, because, as they elucidate, "our present knowledge of pH/CO2 sensitivities of marine organisms is based almost entirely on short-term perturbation experiments, neglecting the possibility of evolutionary adaptation."

#### Increased CO2 is key to crop fertilization that prevents famine and solves extinction

Idsos 10 [Sherwood, Keith, Craig - Research Physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, Vice President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change with a PhD in Botany, former Director of Environmental Science at Peabody Energy in St. Louis, Missouri and is a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, Association of American Geographers, Ecological Society of America, “Food Security: The Real Planetary Problem ”, Volume 13, Number 51: 22 December 2010, <http://www.co2science.org/articles/V13/N51/EDIT.php>, Chetan]

In a paper recently published in the Journal of Proteome Research, Sarkar et al. (2010) write that "increasing population and unsustainable exploitation of nature and natural resources have made 'food security' a burning issue in the 21st century," echoing sentiments much like those expressed by Farrell (2009), who has noted that "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 the unsavory facts that "arable land, the environment, water supply and sustainability of the agricultural system will all be affected," and not in a positive manner. 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 dramatically mitigate the situation. 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 well spoil mankind's ability to do so, is the ongoing rise in the atmosphere's ozone concentration, which 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.) out-of-doors at the Agriculture Research Farm of India's Banaras Hindu University. This was done within open-top chambers that they maintained at the ambient O3 concentration and at elevated O3 concentrations of 25% and 50% above ambient during the peak O3 period of the day (10:00 to 15:00 hours local time) for a total of fifty days, during which period they measured numerous responses of the plants to the two levels of ozone enrichment. So what did they find? 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, plus what they describe as "drastic reductions" in RuBisCO large and small subunits, while noting that major leaf photosynthetic proteins and important energy metabolism proteins were also "drastically reduced." In discussing the results of their study, the scientists from India, Japan and Nepal remark that anthropogenic activities have made ozone a "major environmental pollutant of our time," while noting that some are predicting it to be an even "greater problem for the future." And adding this dilemma to the problem of feeding the world over the next few decades and beyond, humanity's future is not looking good. In fact, it's incredibly bleak. So what can be done to help us weather this potentially devastating perfect storm? Sarkar et al. suggest that 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 need to do something else that we know will work; and that is to allow the air's CO2 content to rise, unimpeded by the misguided efforts of climate alarmists 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 that atmospheric CO2 enrichment nearly always acts to increase both the productivity and water use efficiency of nearly all plants, as a result of literally hundreds, if not thousands, of real-world experiments, while it often more than compensates for the negative effects of O3 pollution. Clearly, we are going to need all of the help we can possibly get to make it unscathed through even the first half of the 21st century; and we cannot afford to throw away any of the means we have at our disposal to help us in this great effort. We have got to see carbon dioxide for what it truly is -- the elixir of life: one of the two raw § Marked 11:30 § materials (the other being water) that combine during the process of photosynthesis to produce the substances of plant tissues that provide the food for nearly all human and animal life on the planet, either directly, in the case of herbivores, or indirectly in the case of other life forms. And that makes carbon dioxide just the opposite of what the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has recently declared it to be -- a dangerous air pollutant. Shame on them! ... and on all those who demonize this life-giving molecule that we expel to the air every time we exhale.

#### Famine sparks World War 3

Calvin 98 (William H. Calvin, Professor of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences at the University of Washington, January 1998, “The Great Climate Flip-Flop,” The Atlantic Monthly, Ebsco Host]

The population-crash scenario is surely the most appalling. Plummeting crop yields would cause some powerful countries to try to take over their neighbors or distant lands – if only because their armies, unpaid and lacking food, would go marauding, both at home and across the borders. The better-organized countries would attempt to use their armies, before they fell apart entirely, to take over countries with significant remaining resources, driving out or starving their inhabitants if not using modern weapons to accomplish the same end : eliminating competitors for the remaining food.      This would be a worldwide problem – and could lead to a Third World War – but Europe's vulnerability is particularly easy to analyze. The last abrupt cooling, the Younger Dryas, drastically altered Europe's climate as far east as Ukraine. Present-day Europe has more than 650 million people. It has excellent soils, and largely grows its own food. It could no longer do so if it lost the extra warming from the North Atlantic.

#### CO2 didn’t cause sea level rise

Carter et al 11 [Dr. Robert M. Carter is a stratigrapher and marine geologist with degrees from the University of Otago (New Zealand) and the University of Cambridge (England)., Dr. Craig D. Idso is the founder and chairman of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Dr. S. Fred Singer is one of the most distinguished atmospheric physicists in the U.S. He established and served as the first director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service, now part of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and earned a U.S. Department of Commerce Gold Medal Award for his technical leadership. “Climate Change Reconsidered – 2011 Interim Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change” <http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/2011NIPCCinterimreport.pdf>, Chetan]

If one splits the period of linear sea-level rise into two equal 57-year parts centered on the middle of the twentieth century—1893 to 1950 and 1950 to 2007— it can be determined from various atmospheric trace gas records that the air‘s CO2 concentration rose about 3.8 times faster over the last of these periods than it did over the first period. Since mean sea level rose at a constant rate over the entire 114 years, it is unlikely the historical increase in the atmosphere‘s CO2 content was the ultimate cause of the steady mean sea-level rise.

## 2NC vs Emory LS

### T

#### Financial incentives are distinct from tax incentives.

Hubert & Pain 2 (Florence, Senior Research Officer at the National Institute of Economic and Social Research, Economist in Monetary Analysis at the Bank of England, & Nigel, Senior Research Fellow at the National Institute of Economic and Social Research, “Fiscal Incentives, European Integration and the Location of Foreign Direct Investment,” March, p. 5, http://www.niesr.ac.uk/pubs/dps/dp195.PDF)

There are three broad categories of investment incentives which can be distinguished - tax incentives, financial incentives and other non-financial measures. Examples of tax incentives include preferential tax rates, and capital allowances. Even if production costs are equalised across locations, international differences in corporate taxes may affect the location decision if they affect post-tax returns. Financial incentives cover factors such as government grants and subsidies, loan guarantees, preferential loans and government equity participation in high-risk investments. These measures are often discretionary, with the size of payment depending upon the scale of investment and the activities that the inward investor plans to undertake. The third category, other non-financial measures, includes the provision of subsidised infrastructure, such as prepared industrial sites, free-trade zones and the use of preferential government contracts.

#### We allow a fair number of Affs: all the types of incentives above for each energy category. Also – allow for a topical version of their aff – they could do subsidized tax credits.

#### Limits outweigh – they’re the vital access point for any theory impact – its key to fairness – huge research burdens mean we can’t prepare to compete – and its key to education – big topics cause hyper-generics, lack of clash, and shallow debate – and it destroys participation

Rowland 84 (Robert C., Debate Coach – Baylor University, “Topic Selection in Debate”, American Forensics in Perspective, Ed. Parson, p. 53-54)

The first major problem identified by the work group as relating to topic selection is the decline in participation in the National Debate Tournament (NDT) policy debate. As Boman notes: There is a growing dissatisfaction with academic debate that utilizes a policy proposition. Programs which are oriented toward debating the national policy debate proposition, so-called “NDT” programs, are diminishing in scope and size.4 This decline in policy debate is tied, many in the work group believe, to excessively broad topics. The most obvious characteristic of some recent policy debate topics is extreme breath. A resolution calling for regulation of land use literally and figuratively covers a lot of ground. Naitonal debate topics have not always been so broad. Before the late 1960s the topic often specified a particular policy change.5 The move from narrow to broad topics has had, according to some, the effect of limiting the number of students who participate in policy debate. First, the breadth of the topics has all but destroyed novice debate. Paul Gaske argues that because the stock issues of policy debate are clearly defined, it is superior to value debate as a means of introducing students to the debate process.6 Despite this advantage of policy debate, Gaske belives that NDT debate is not the best vehicle for teaching beginners. The problem is that broad policy topics terrify novice debaters, especially those who lack high school debate experience. They are unable to cope with the breadth of the topic and experience “negophobia,”7 the fear of debating negative. As a consequence, the educational advantages associated with teaching novices through policy debate are lost: “Yet all of these benefits fly out the window as rookies in their formative stage quickly experience humiliation at being caugh without evidence or substantive awareness of the issues that confront them at a tournament.”8 The ultimate result is that fewer novices participate in NDT, thus lessening the educational value of the activity and limiting the number of debaters or eventually participate in more advanced divisions of policy debate. In addition to noting the effect on novices, participants argued that broad topics also discourage experienced debaters from continued participation in policy debate. Here, the claim is that it takes so much times and effort to be competitive on a broad topic that students who are concerned with doing more than just debate are forced out of the activity.9 Gaske notes, that “broad topics discourage participation because of insufficient time to do requisite research.”10 The final effect may be that entire programs either cease functioning or shift to value debate as a way to avoid unreasonable research burdens. Boman supports this point: “It is this expanding necessity of evidence, and thereby research, which has created a competitive imbalance between institutions that participate in academic debate.”11 In this view, it is the competitive imbalance resulting from the use of broad topics that has led some small schools to cancel their programs.

#### “Financial incentives” require cash transfer – their interpretation is too broad. Prefer federal definitions

Vaughn 8 (John R., Chairperson – National Council on Disability, “The State of 21st Century Financial Incentives for Americans with Disabilities,” National Council on Disability, 8-11, http://www.ncd.gov/publications/2008/Aug2008#\_Toc204703675)

Broadly, financial incentives are defined as benefits that confer economic well-being and opportunity. Webster's Unabridged Dictionary defines an incentive as something that promotes or incites greater productivity.[7] The economist Levitt describes incentives as "the cornerstone of modern life and that the ability to understand them is the key to solving just about any riddle."[8] Levitt and Dubner write that incentives come in "three flavors, economic, social and moral," but rarely does an incentive represent all three.[9] The most common definition of a financial incentive is a benefit that is intended to enhance profit. Financial incentives drive the marketplace for pharmaceuticals, insurance companies, health care, and technology industries. The other definition of financial incentives and the one used in this study is the intended benefit conferred by Federal Government programs that provide social transfers, usually of cash or in-kind services, designed to change behavior, increase cash flow, and supplement services and supports, but that rarely enhance or create assets.

#### Defining the word “incentive” generally is too broad and explodes the topic – narrow definitions of “financial incentive” sets a precise limit

Liska and Snell 92 (Roger W., Head and Professor of the Department of Construction Science and Management –Clemson University, and Bill, “Financial Incentive Programs for Average-size Construction Firm,” Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 118(4), p.1)

The term "incentive" implies a diverse set of meanings. The literal definition states that an incentive is something that inspires action. In terms of the construction industry this definition is translated into attempts to increase production or performance in return for increased psychological or material rewards. There are many types of incentives; **the major ones are financial and psychological**. Financial incentives use a monetary reward to stimulate increased performance or production. Employees are induced to work smarter and harder in the hopes of receiving financial compensation over and above their normal pay.

### CP Solvency

#### CP solves 100% of the case and the external net benefit –

#### State-level financial incentives for EOR solve – reduce capital costs, provide financial certainty, and incentivize tech investment and adoption

NEORI 12 (National Enhanced Oil Recovery Initiative along with Center for Climate and Energy Solutions and the Great Plains Initiative, "CARBON DIOXIDE ENHANCED OIL RECOVERY: A CRITICAL DOMESTIC ENERGY,

ECONOMIC, AND ENVIRONMENTAL OPPORTUNITY," February, http://www.neori.org/NEORI\_Report.pdf)

C. OVERVIEW OF MODEL STATE INCENTIVES FOR ¶ CO2¶ -EOR DEPLOYMENT TO COMPLEMENT FEDERAL ¶ SUPPORT¶ Several states have incentives to encourage CO2¶ capture ¶ and transport from power plants and industrial facilities, ¶ which complement federal grants, tax credits, and other support mechanisms. States with these incentives have ¶ provided critical support for projects to advance toward ¶ deployment. Furthermore, as with the new federal tax ¶ credit recommended in this report, state incentives for ¶ commercial CO2¶ capture and pipeline projects have the ¶ potential to be revenue positive, stimulate local oil production, and spur economic activity at a time when most ¶ states face profound fiscal challenges. ¶ NEORI recommends consideration, adoption or ¶ adaptation of the following state policies to complement ¶ federal policy and encourage commercial deployment of ¶ CO2¶ capture and transport technologies.¶ Severance tax reduction and/or extension of existing ¶ severance tax reduction for oil produced with CO2¶ from ¶ anthropogenic sources. This policy provides a percentage reduction in the severance tax for oil production, ¶ if the taxpayer uses CO2¶ -EOR techniques and/or uses ¶ anthropogenic CO2¶ for EOR. It creates an incentive to ¶ pursue CO2¶ -EOR and use CO2¶ from man-made sources, ¶ although it would only work for states with a production ¶ or severance tax. ¶ Cost recovery approval for regulated entities. This ¶ policy enables regulatory approval by public utility commissions for a utility to recover certain costs associated ¶ with CO2¶ capture through rates paid by customers. Cost ¶ recovery approval provides significant financial certainty ¶ to attract the private investment necessary for a project ¶ to proceed to construction and commercial operation.¶ Off-take agreements. This policy enables projects to ¶ enter into long-term contracts for supply of a project’s ¶ output (e.g., electricity). Long-term off-take agreements ¶ provide significant financial certainty, similar to regulatory cost recovery.¶ Tax credits, exemptions, or abatements. This policy ¶ provides credits, exemptions, and abatements for taxes ¶ that would otherwise be incurred, such as property tax ¶ abatement, franchise tax credits, and sales tax exemption ¶ for sale of captured CO2¶ . Such tax policies reduce the ¶ incremental capital cost of capture, compression, infrastructure, and purchase of manmade CO2¶ .¶ State-level bonding of CO2¶ pipeline projects and/or ¶ capture and compression facilities. This policy supports ¶ project financing, development, and planning of infrastructure or facilities deemed to be in the public interest. ¶ Public infrastructure authorities commonly may issue ¶ bonds, make grants/loans, plan/coordinate infrastructure, or participate in infrastructure build-out (e.g., own, ¶ construct, maintain, and operate a facility). ¶ Inclusion in Portfolio Standards. This policy requires ¶ that a certain percentage of all electricity generated in ¶ a state must come from specific sources, such as power ¶ plants with CCS. Portfolio standards that include CCS ¶ are an effective tool to establish financial certainty ¶ through state policy requirements, by allowing for regulatory cost recovery of investments made to meet statutory obligations.¶ A more detailed description of model state policies ¶ can be found in Appendix C, including state-by-state ¶ links to specific policies to serve as a resource to state ¶ policy-makers.

#### Extend the Byner 2 evidence – State action can take place within the realm devolution – this means that the entirety of the plan still happens, just under state control, states are still given the power of decision making.

#### State level incentives for EOR solve oil recovery and production

Center for Climate and Energy Solutions 12 ("PRESS RELEASE: ENHANCED OIL RECOVERY PLAN DRAWS BIPARTISAN WELCOME IN CONGRESS," http://www.c2es.org/newsroom/releases/eor-plan-draws-bipartisan-support)

WASHINGTON, D.C. – A coalition of industry, state, environmental and labor leaders called today for federal and state incentives to stimulate the expansion of enhanced oil recovery using carbon dioxide (CO2) from power plants and industrial facilities. The proposed measures would boost domestic U.S. oil production while reducing the nation’s CO2 emissions. ¶ The recommendations by the National Enhanced Oil Recovery Initiative (NEORI), convened by the Great Plains Institute (GPI) and the Center for Climate and Energy Solutions (C2ES), were released at an event on Capitol Hill. ¶ Senator Kent Conrad (D-ND) and Congressman Mike Conaway (R-TX) were on hand to welcome the recommendations, and Senator Max Baucus (D-MT), Senator John Hoeven (R-ND) and Senator Richard Lugar (R-IN), and Congressman Rick Berg (R-ND) offered written statements in support of the initiative.¶ In CO2-enhanced oil recovery (EOR), oil producers inject CO2 into wells to draw more oil to the surface. The practice, 6 percent of current U.S. domestic oil production, helps sustain production in otherwise declining oil fields, but limited supplies of CO2 constrain the expansion of EOR. NEORI’s recommendations would encourage the capture of CO2 from industrial and power facilities for use in EOR.¶ The centerpiece of the group’s recommendations is a proposed federal tax incentive focused on companies that capture and transport CO2, not oil companies. NEORI estimates that the tax credit would quadruple U.S. oil production from EOR, to 400 million barrels a year, while reducing CO2 emissions by 4 billion tons over the next 40 years. The U.S. Treasury Department would administer the competitively awarded tax credit. ¶ NEORI calculates that the program would pay for itself within 10 years through increased federal revenues generated by boosting domestic oil production, with an estimated net return of $100 billion over 40 years. The incentive would reduce the trade deficit by saving the United States about $610 billion in expenditures on imported oil over the same period. ¶ As an immediate measure, NEORI recommends that Congress or the Treasury Department modify the existing Section 45Q Tax Credit for Carbon Dioxide Sequestration to provide a more workable incentive to firms to capture and transport CO2.¶ At the state level, NEORI identified a range of existing state policies encouraging commercial deployment of CO2 capture technologies and projects and recommends that other states tailor and adopt them. The model state policies include tax credits, exemptions or abatements, and the inclusion of carbon capture-and-storage in electricity portfolio standards, among others.¶ “The EOR Initiative’s recommendations strike common ground among a diverse collection of interests and offer a realistic opportunity to increase U.S. oil supplies while reducing carbon emissions,” said C2ES President Eileen Claussen. “The proposal reflects practical solutions that deliver a win for our nation’s economic growth, energy security, and the climate.” ¶ “Implementing these recommendations for EOR can create a virtuous circle of increasing benefits to our nation over time,” said Brad Crabtree, policy director for GPI. “Congress and state policymakers can expand American oil production, spur jobs, increase revenues, reduce the trade deficit and store significant CO2, all with incentives that pay for themselves.”¶ In total, an estimated 26 billion to 61 billion barrels of economically recoverable oil could be produced in the United States using currently available CO2-EOR technologies and practices, or potentially more than twice the country’s proved reserves. Expanded use of CO2-EOR also can advance the development of infrastructure needed for long-term capture, transportation and storage of carbon emissions.¶ NEORI participants include state officials from Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Montana, New Mexico, Texas, West Virginia and representatives of:¶ Air Products, Inc. Natural Resources Defense Council¶ AFL-CIO Ohio Environmental Council¶ Arch Coal, Inc. Southern Company¶ Archer Daniels Midland Co. Summit Power ¶ Basin Electric Power Cooperative Tenaska Energy¶ Clean Air Task Force United Transportation Union ¶ Enhanced Oil Recovery Institute, University of Wyoming Wyoming Outdoor Council¶ GE Energy

####  AND – Counterplan is more efficient - Federal bureaucracy dooms the plan – institutional failures mean zero solvency

Bryner 2 (Gary C. - Professor, Department of Political Science, Brigham Young University, and Research Associate, Natural Resources Law Center. University of Colorado School of Law., “ARTICLE: Policy Devolution and Environmental Law: Exploring the Transition to Sustainable Development”, Fall, 26 Environs Envtl. L. & Pol'y J. 1, lexis)

Devolution theory calls for increased policy authority and discretion to be delegated to state governments in order to improve the efficiency of public policies, ensure they effectively resolve specific problems, and foster political accountability. Devolution also gives different communities the opportunity to strike their own balance among the competing policy objectives of economic growth and reducing environmental risks. n10 Devolution to regulated industries promises to reduce the cost of regulation, create incentives for sources of pollution to find the most efficient and effective means of reducing emissions, encourage reductions that go beyond minimum mandates, and allow for flexibility in business decision making. Devolution to citizens is championed as a way to get the public involved in regulatory initiatives that will change the behavior of citizens. Reducing emissions through energy conservation and increased use of [\*5] mass transit, for example, require major commitments on the part of citizens to change their behavior, and that commitment cannot simply be mandated from the top down. Other forms of participatory policy making have been proposed to respond to the demands of citizens for a role in decisions that affect their health and quality of life. Advocates of devolution argue that the current federal regulatory structure is **plagued by burdensome procedures and a cumbersome chain of command**. The combination of environmental statutes, EPA regulations, and guidance documents result in **an impenetrable pyramid of paperwork, planning, and reports**. A tremendous amount of effort at all levels of governments is required to manage this process. Compliance with these requirements often replaces energy and resources that could be used to actually reduce pollution and improve environmental quality. Accountability is difficult to identify since **so many policy makers compete and jostle for influence**, that citizens do not know who to hold accountable when environmental goals are not achieved. Federal officials lay claim to credit for issuing ambitious environmental goals, while state and local officials bear the brunt of criticism for imposing regulatory burdens. The EPA seeks vainly to develop and impose national requirements on conditions that vary widely throughout the nation. n11 Critics have identified a **host of problems with centralized, command and control regulation**: it has not only failed to remedy many environmental problems and threats, but it has engendered significant opposition because of the restraints on freedom it imposes, the costs and burdens of compliance, and **the apparent ease by which some businesses are able to escape** liability and responsibility for their actions. n12 There are real limits to the power of government to promote and ensure the preservation of air, water, land, and other resources. Government agencies alone cannot accomplish these environmental goals, but must be combined with clear and effective economic incentives and with a widely held ethic of care for the land and resources on which all life is so dependent. But the dominant role the federal government plays in environmental policy making focuses too much attention on Washington, and **fails to encourage more local efforts**. n13 Other critics of the current structure of regulatory federalism argue that some state and local governments had a long tradition of ambitious environmental regulation and enacted ambitious pollution control legislation well before Congress or the executive branch acted. The first clean air laws in the United States were enacted by cities in the 1880s, [\*6] some 75 years before the first federal program aimed at air pollution. n14 Many states passed water pollution laws in the 1920 and 30s, and by 1948, every state had an environmental protection agency. n15 While it is true that many federal initiatives for air and water pollution predated the 1970 Earth Day, when the modern era of environmental regulation began, states are not newcomers to environmental regulation. Nor is federal regulation a clear success story. Federal environmental policy has been, **in many areas, problematic**, and has threatened environmental quality. Federal subsidies for road building in national forests, grazing on public lands, the development of fossil fuels, and the emptying of rivers and streams into reservoirs for irrigation, for example, have taken a tremendous toll on natural systems and resources and have encouraged waste, unsustainable consumption, and pollution. n16 One of the consequences of environmental federalism has been to place limitations on more aggressive state regulations. A major impetus for federal air pollution regulation, for example, was a concern by the auto industry that states would impose different emission standards on new vehicles; this fear of having to meet a maze of state regulatory requirements prompted Detroit to lobby for federal regulation of new vehicle emissions. n17 Another example, from the mid-1990s, is the development of federal emission standards for hazardous emissions from coke ovens that were less stringent than those devised in some states, such as Pennsylvania, where environmental advocates had pushed for and won more ambitious limits. n18

### A2: Perm do both

#### -- Links to politics – includes immediate federal action. Perm doesn’t shield: state support is slow. Delay means it won’t take effect until after the vote.

#### -- Impossible – CP transfers authority to the states. The federal government can’t do it while transferring authority to the states – if they can – it’s intrinsic because it adds a new time element that is neither in the plan or counterplan – that’s a voting issue

#### Federal policies crowd out the states—reduces demand for state action

Adler 7 (Jonathan H – Professor of Law and Co-Director, Center for Business Law and Regulation, Case Western Reserve University School of Law, ., “WHEN IS TWO A CROWD? THE IMPACT OF

FEDERAL ACTION ON STATE ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION”, 31 Harv. Envtl. L. Rev. 67, Lexis)

A second potential negative indirect effect of federal regulation on state regulatory choices is crowding out. This occurs because federal regulation **may serve as a substitute for state-level regulation, thereby reducing the benefits of adopting or maintaining state-level protections**. Insofar as voters in a given state demand a certain level of environmental protection, there is no reason to expect states to duplicate federal efforts when a federal program satisfies that demand, particularly if a state has not already created such a program. If the federal floor is greater than or equal to the level of environmental protection demanded by a state's residents, **that state has no reason to adopt environmental regulations of its own** once the federal government has acted. To the extent that this effect occurs, it is separate from--perhaps even in addition to--the signaling effect described above. The claim here is not simply that states regulate less than they would absent federal regulation--although this claim is almost certainly true. Rather, the claim is that some states that would adopt regulations more protective than the federal floor, absent the imposition of federal regulation, have not done so due to federal regulation and may not do so in the future. If this hypothesis is correct, the net effect of federal environmental regulation in at least some states could be less environmental protection than would have been adopted had the federal government not intervened. To see how this could occur, recall that the demand for environmental regulation in any given jurisdiction tends to increase over time as wealth, [\*99] technical capability, scientific knowledge, and environmental impacts increase. n131 In any given state (as in the nation as a whole), there is an initial period ("Period A") during which the demand for a given type of environmental protection is relatively low. The costs of adopting environmental regulations in this period are greater than the benefits of adopting any such protections. These costs include the costs of developing, drafting, and passing legislation; the costs of creating a new policy program, drafting and implementing regulations, defending the regulations from any potential legal or administrative challenges, creating a means to monitor and enforce regulatory compliance; and so on. In addition, there are opportunity costs of devoting state resources and political capital to the cause of environmental protection as opposed to some other policy goal. As discussed earlier, the demand for environmental protection has tended to increase over time along with increases in living standards. n132 At the same time, increases in technical knowledge and administrative efficiency may lower the costs of a given regulatory program. Eventually, a state will enter a second period ("Period B") in which the benefits of a given environmental regulatory program are greater than the costs of initiating, implementing, and operating such a program. Absent any federal interference, the hypothetical state will not adopt environmental regulations in Period A, but will adopt such regulations in Period B. See Figure 3. This is the environmental transition discussed in Part I. In Period A, the demand for environmental protection is insufficient to justify the costs of implementing environmental protection measures. By Period B, however, the demand for environmental protection has risen due to increases in wealth and knowledge, among other factors. At the same time, increases in technical capacity and scientific understanding have reduced the cost of adopting environmental protections. As a result, in Period B a state will adopt Q[B] amount of environmental protection. n133 [\*100] The timing of Period A and Period B will vary from state to state. This is clearly the case as different states have enacted different environmental regulatory measures at different times--some before the adoption of federal environmental regulation, some after, and some not at all. Looking at the history of various environmental concerns, such as air quality, water quality, or wetlands, it is clear that many states moved from Period A to Period B for these environmental concerns at various times prior to the onset of federal regulations in the 1970s. In many other states, however, a federal regulatory floor was adopted before the onset of Period B. [\*101] For states that went through their environmental transition and entered Period B prior to the enactment of federal environmental protection, whether the adoption of a federal regulatory floor increased the aggregate level of environmental protection in that state depended upon whether preexisting state policies offered greater or lesser levels of protection than the relevant federal policies. For states in which the onset of Period B begins after the adoption of federal regulations, the enactment of a federal regulatory floor will, at the time of enactment, increase the aggregate level of environmental protection in that state. However, this may not be the case over time. In states that desire a greater level of protection than that provided by the relevant federal regulations, it is not clear that the existence of the federal regulatory floor will result in an equal or greater level of protection than would be adopted were it not for the federal regulations. This is because federal regulation will, **to some extent, act as a substitute for state regulation**. As a result, the adoption of federal regulation has the potential to reduce the demand for state regulation and, in some instances, even result in less aggregate regulation in a given state than would have been adopted absent federal intervention. In short, federal regulation can crowd out state regulation. **The potential for such a crowding-out effect is illustrated** in Figure 4. The existence of federal regulation will reduce the demand for state regulation by an amount equal to the extent to which federal regulation is a substitute for state regulation of the same environmental concern (Q[FReg]). This substitution effect will reduce the net benefit of adopting state-level environmental regulations from OCQ[B] to OC'Q'[B]. By reducing the net benefits of state-level environmental regulation in this manner, federal regulation has the potential to crowd out state-level environmental protections, even if the quantity of environmental protection demanded in the state is greater than that provided by the federal government. In such cases, the aggregate level of environmental protection will be lower with federal regulation than it would be without it. [\*102]

#### Perm fails – preemption means it’s net worse

Leshy 4 (John D., Distinguished Professor of Law – University of California Hastings College of the Law, “Natural Resources Policy in the Bush Administration: an Outsider's Somewhat Jaundiced Assessment,” Duke Environmental Law & Policy Forum, Spring, 14 Duke Envtl. L. & Pol'y F. 347, Lexis)

VI. Traditional conservative principles, like promoting free markets and **devolving governmental responsibilities to state and local governments**, have taken a back seat where they conflict with industry desires Perhaps the strongest indication of the administration's capture by industry is the manner in which it has kept the free-market ideologies of some of its key natural resource appointees firmly in check, readily sacrificing them where they conflict with industry demands. For example, in recent years, ideological conservatives, among others, have touted the resolution of longstanding conflicts over the environmental impacts of livestock grazing on arid federal lands by buying the ranches in consensual, market-based transactions, and retiring the federal lands their cattle has been grazing from livestock grazing in the future. n34 This has provided the administration with a great opportunity to put in place the principles of so-called "free-market environmentalism" favored by many of the Bush Administration's right-wing supporters. [\*356] But when the Grand Canyon Trust, a conservation group, went into the marketplace to purchase grazing permits on nearly a million acres of public lands in the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument in southern Utah, and sought to retire those lands from grazing, the Bush Administration balked. n35 The Interior Solicitor (a former official of the National Public Lands Council, a rancher trade association) issued legal opinions throwing up roadblocks to retirement, and the retirement proposal continues to languish inside the Department. n36 Even though Interior has acknowledged that retirement will improve the health of the land, n37 the administration is more concerned about placating the cattlemen's association and hard-bitten local opponents of the national monument who do not want to see even market-based land conservation. The unhappy result is that philanthropic money to invest in grazing retirements is harder to come by, much to the chagrin of free-market environmental groups, one of who recently gave the administration a "C-" in its report card on this point. n38 Another example is the administration's unwillingness to defer to state and local governments when their interests diverge from those of industry. Thus, the administration told a federal court in Nevada that federal mining law preempted efforts by a local county to regulate a proposed processing plant for federal minerals that would be located on private land. n39 The overriding federal interest here is somewhat mysterious, considering that the only use of the material being mined is to make kitty litter. n40 The administration has made a similar argument in opposing Los Angeles County's efforts to regulate a quarry on private land extracting sand and gravel owned by the federal government. n41 And it has aggressively (but so far unsuccessfully) [\*357] pushed the Congress to give it authority to preempt state regulation of rights-of-way for energy facilities. n42

#### Doesn’t solve

Zimmerman 1 (Joseph F., Professor of Political Science – State University of New York at Albany, Publius, Spring, p 16)

Examining this list, it becomes apparent that different institutional features of the federal structure are more or less important for securing these different values. Some of the values ‑ diversity, competition, and experimentalism ‑ appear to depend significantly on the existence of many states pursuing unique regulatory agendas. If all of the states pursued identical regulatory strategies, or were prevented from instituting meaningful agendas altogether, these values, as a logical matter, could not be promoted. Obviously there would be no regulatory diversity, because all of the states would structure the lives of their citizens in the same way. Moreover, this uniformity would prevent state competition and experimentation: people would have no incentive to "vote with their feet" if each state provided the same package of public goods, and experimentation by definition requires that different states attempt different solutions to the same social problems.

### Perm do CP

#### Clearly severs– the states reduce restrictions/increase incentives. The federal government only devolves authority.

#### They have to defend only federal action

Webster’s 76 (New International Dictionary Unabridged, p. 883)

Federal government. Of or relating to the central government of a nation, having the character of a federation as distinguished from the governments of the constituent unites (as states or provinces).

#### Perm severs immediacy -

#### 'Substantial' must be at the present time

Words and Phrases 64 (40W&P 759)

The words" outward, open, actual, visible, substantial, and exclusive," in connection with a change of possession, mean substantially the same thing. They mean not concealed; not hidden; exposed to view; free from concealment, dissimulation, reserve, or disguise; in full existence; denoting that which not merely can be, but is opposed to potential, apparent, constructive, and imaginary; veritable; genuine; certain: absolute: real at present time, as a matter of fact, not merely nominal; opposed to fonn; actually existing; true; not including, admitting, or pertaining to any others; undivided; sole; opposed to inclusive.

#### “Should” means immediate

Summer 94 (Justice, Oklahoma Supreme Court, “Kelsey v. Dollarsaver Food Warehouse of Durant”, http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14)

4 The legal question to be resolved by the court is whether the word "should"[13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13) in the May 18 order connotes futurity or may be deemed a ruling in praesenti.[14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14) The answer to this query is not to be divined from rules of grammar;[15](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn15) it must be governed by the age-old practice culture of legal professionals and its immemorial language usage. To determine if the omission (from the critical May 18 entry) of the turgid phrase, "and the same hereby is", (1) makes it an in futuro ruling - i.e., an expression of what the judge will or would do at a later stage - or (2) constitutes an in in praesenti resolution of a disputed law issue, the trial judge's intent must be garnered from the four corners of the entire record.[16](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn16)  ¶5 Nisi prius orders should be so construed as to give effect to every words and every part of the text, with a view to carrying out the evident intent of the judge's direction.[17](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn17) The order's language ought not to be considered abstractly. The actual meaning intended by the document's signatory should be derived from the context in which the phrase to be interpreted is used.[18](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn18) When applied to the May 18 memorial, these told canons impel my conclusion that the judge doubtless intended his ruling as an in praesenti resolution of Dollarsaver's quest for judgment n.o.v. Approval of all counsel plainly appears on the face of the critical May 18 entry which is [885 P.2d 1358] signed by the judge.[19](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn19) True minutes[20](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn20) of a court neither call for nor bear the approval of the parties' counsel nor the judge's signature. To reject out of hand the view that in this context "should" is impliedly followed by the customary, "and the same hereby is", makes the court once again revert to medieval notions of ritualistic formalism now so thoroughly condemned in national jurisprudence and long abandoned by the statutory policy of this State. **[Continues – To Footnote]** [14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn14) In praesenti means literally "at the present time." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 792 (6th Ed. 1990). In legal parlance the phrase denotes that which in law is presently or immediately effective, as opposed to something that will or would become effective in the future [in futurol]. See Van Wyck v. Knevals, [106 U.S. 360](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=106&box2=U.S.&box3=360), 365, 1 S.Ct. 336, 337, 27 L.Ed. 201 (1882).

#### Voting issue – stable agent is the locus of all ground

## 1NR vs Emory LS

### Impact Outweighs and Turns the Case

#### US/Russian nuclear war causes extinction – its categorically different than other impacts

Bostrom 2 (Nick, PhD Philosophy – Oxford University, “Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios”, Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, March, http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)

The unique challenge of existential risks Risks in this sixth category are a recent phenomenon. This is part of the reason why it is useful to distinguish them from other risks. We have not evolved mechanisms, either biologically or culturally, for managing such risks. Our intuitions and coping strategies have been shaped by our long experience with risks such as dangerous animals, hostile individuals or tribes, poisonous foods, automobile accidents, Chernobyl, Bhopal, volcano eruptions, earthquakes, draughts, World War I, World War II, epidemics of influenza, smallpox, black plague, and AIDS. These types of disasters have occurred many times and our cultural attitudes towards risk have been shaped by trial-and-error in managing such hazards. But tragic as such events are to the people immediately affected, in the big picture of things – from the perspective of humankind as a whole – even the worst of these catastrophes are **mere ripples** on the surface of the great sea of life. They haven’t significantly affected the total amount of human suffering or happiness or determined the long-term fate of our species. With the exception of a species-destroying comet or asteroid impact (an extremely rare occurrence), there were probably no significant existential risks in human history until the mid-twentieth century, and certainly none that it was within our power to do something about. The first manmade existential risk was the inaugural detonation of an atomic bomb. At the time, there was some concern that the explosion might start a runaway chain-reaction by “igniting” the atmosphere. Although we now know that such an outcome was physically impossible, it qualifies as an existential risk that was present at the time. For there to be a risk, given the knowledge and understanding available, it suffices that there is some subjective probability of an adverse outcome, even if it later turns out that objectively there was no chance of something bad happening. If we don’t know whether something is objectively risky or not, then it is risky in the subjective sense. The subjective sense is of course what we must base our decisions on.[[2]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn2%22%20%5Co%20%22) At any given time we must use our best current subjective estimate of what the objective risk factors are.[[3]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn3%22%20%5Co%20%22) A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as **global** and **terminal**. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[[4]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn4%22%20%5Co%20%22)  Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for § Marked 12:16 § instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

#### AND THIS TURNS CASE

#### Romney’s China policy will collapse relations.

**Sanger**, 5/12/**2012** (David – chief Washington correspondent for the New York Times, Is There a Romney Doctrine?, The New York Times, p. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/13/sunday-review/is-there-a-romney-doctrine.html?pagewanted=all)

More complicated for Mr. Romney, given his business credentials, is his position on China. He argues for more arms to Taiwan and much tougher use of trade sanctions to respond to China’s currency and market manipulations. In the past, such actions have frozen Chinese cooperation with the United States, but, the white paper insists, “Romney will work to persuade China to commit to North Korea’s disarmament,” as if the last three presidents have not.

#### GOP victory leads to China bashing over multiple issues – causes sanctions

Gerstein 11 (Josh – Politico, “The GOP's China syndrome”, 11/22, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1111/68952.html>)

Mitt Romney says America is at war with China — a “trade war” over its undervalued currency. “They’re stealing our jobs. And we’re gonna stand up to China,” the former Massachusetts governor declared in a recent Republican presidential debate, arguing that the United States should threaten to impose tariffs on Chinese imports. When Romney steps on stage tonight for another debate, this one devoted to foreign policy, that kind of China-bashing is likely to be a favorite theme. With a moribund economy and relatively little traction for other international issues, the threat posed by cheap Chinese imports and Chinese purchases of U.S. debt is an irresistible target. The problem, China experts are quick to point out, is that those attacks often fly in the face of the business interests Republicans have traditionally represented, not to mention the record many of the candidates have either supporting trade with China — or actively soliciting it. Just last year, for example, Romney slammed President Barack Obama for growth-killing protectionism after he put a 35 percent tariff on Chinese tires because of a surge of cheap imports. And, Romney wrote in his book, “No Apology: The Case for American Greatness,” “Protectionism stifles productivity.” And though Texas Gov. Rick Perry predicted at a debate this month that “the Chinese government will end up on the ash heap of history if they do not change their virtues,” a picture posted on the Internet shows a smiling Perry on a trade mission to Shanghai and Beijing posing with Chinese Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi after presenting him with a pair of cowboy boots. Nor has Perry been shy about encouraging Chinese investments in Texas: In October 2010, he appeared at the announcement of a new U.S. headquarters for Huawei Technologies to be located in Plano, Texas, despite lingering concerns among U.S. security officials that Huawei-made telecommunications equipment is designed to allow unauthorized access by the Chinese government. “There’s a certain pandering going on,” said Nicholas Lardy of the Peterson Institute for International Economics, who adds that the GOP rhetoric is squarely at odds with the views of the U.S. establishment, which believes a showdown with China over the trade issue “will make things worse, not better.” Not all of the 2012 GOP presidential hopefuls have taken to publicly pummeling Beijing. The only bona fide China expert in the group, former Ambassador to China Jon Huntsman, has criticized Romney for being cavalier and simplistic in his talk of tariffs. “You can give applause lines, and you can kind of pander here and there. You start a trade war if you start slapping tariffs randomly on Chinese products based on currency manipulation,” Huntsman said at a recent debate. “That doesn’t work.” Former Sen. Rick Santorum also rejected the idea of slapping tariffs on Beijing if it won’t buckle on the currency issue. “That just taxes you. I don’t want to tax you,” Santorum said. Newt Gingrich says he wants to bring a world of hurt down on Beijing for alleged Chinese cyberattacks on the U.S. and theft of intellectual property, though he’s vague about how. “We’re going to have to find ways to dramatically raise the pain level for the Chinese cheating,” the former house speaker declares. And Herman Cain talks of a threat from China, but says the answer is to promote growth in the U.S. “China’s economic dominance would represent a national security threat to the USA, and possibly to the rest of the world,” Cain wrote in May in the Daily Caller. “We can outgrow China because the USA is not a loser nation. We just need a winner in the White House.” Romney’s rhetoric has been particularly harsh. “It’s predatory pricing, it’s killing jobs in America,” he declared at the CNBC debate earlier this month, promising to make a formal complaint to the World Trade Organization about China’s currency manipulation. “I would apply, if necessary, tariffs to make sure that they understand we are willing to play at a level playing field.” The Romney campaign insists those tariffs are entirely distinguishable from the tire duties Obama imposed in 2009. “The distinction between Obama’s tire action and what Gov. Romney is proposing is simple,” said a Romney aide who did not want to be named. “President Obama is not getting tough with China or pushing them unilaterally, he is handing out political favors to union allies. [Romney’s] policy focuses on fostering competition by keeping markets open and the playing field level.” Romney, who helped set up investment bank Bain Capital, has long been a favorite of Wall Street, so his stridency on the China trade issue has taken some traditional conservatives — for whom free trade is a fundamental tenet — by surprise. National Review said Romney’s move “risk[ed] a trade war with China” and was “a remarkably bad idea.” In fact, many business leaders give Obama good marks for his China policy. “What the Obama administration has done in not labeling China as a ‘currency manipulator’ is correct,” said one U.S. business lobbyist who closely follows U.S.-China trade issues and asked not to be named. “We’re very leery of a tit-for-tat situation,” he added, while acknowledging that the anti-China rhetoric is “good politics.”

#### That causes a US-China trade war – escalates to conflict and collapses global trade

**Droke 10** (Clif, Editor – Momentum Strategies Report, “America and the Next Major War’, Green Faucet, 3-29, http://www.greenfaucet.com/technical-analysis/america-and-the-next-major-war/79314)

In the current phase of relative peace and stability we now enjoy, many are questioning when the next major war may occur and speculation is rampant as to major participants involved. Our concern here is strictly of a financial nature, however, and a discussion of the geopolitical and military variables involved in the escalation of war is beyond the scope of this commentary. But what we can divine from financial history is that "hot" wars in a military sense often emerge from trade wars. As we shall see, the elements for what could prove to be a trade war of epic proportions are already in place and the key figures are easily identifiable. Last Wednesday the lead headline in the Wall Street Journal stated, "Business Sours on China." It seems, according to WSJ, that Beijing is "reassessing China's long-standing emphasis on opening its economy to foreign business....and tilting toward promoting dominant state companies." Then there is Internet search giant Google's threat to pull out of China over concerns of censorship of its Internet search results in that country. The trouble started a few weeks ago Google announced that it no longer supports China's censoring of searches that take place on the Google platform. China has defended its extensive censorship after Google threatened to withdraw from the country. Additionally, the Obama Administration announced that it backs Google's decision to protest China's censorship efforts. In a Reuters report, Obama responded to a question as to whether the issue would cloud U.S.-China relations by saying that the human rights would not be "carved out" for certain countries. This marks at least the second time this year that the White House has taken a stand against China (the first conflict occurring over tire imports). Adding yet further fuel to the controversy, the U.S. Treasury Department is expected to issue a report in April that may formally label China as a "currency manipulator," according to the latest issue of Barron's. This would do nothing to ease tensions between the two nations and would probably lead one step closer to a trade war between China and the U.S. Then there was last week's Wall Street Journal report concerning authorities in a wealthy province near Shanghai criticizing the quality of luxury clothing brands from the West, including Hermes, Tommy Hilfiger and Versace. This represents quite a change from years past when the long-standing complaint from the U.S. over the inferior quality of Chinese made merchandise. On Monday the § Marked 12:16 § WSJ ran an article under the headline, "American Firms Feel Shut Out In China." The paper observed that so far there's little evidence that American companies are pulling out of China but adds a growing number of multinational firms are "starting to rethink their strategy." According to a poll conducted by the American Chamber of Commerce in China, 38% of U.S. companies reported feeling unwelcome in China compared to 26% in 2009 and 23% in 2008. As if to add insult to injury, the high profile trial of four Rio Tinto executives in China is another example of the tables being turned on the West. The executives are by Chinese authorities of stealing trade secrets and taking bribes. There's a touch of irony to this charge considering that much of China's technology was stolen from Western manufacturing firms which set up shop in that country. It seems China is flexing its economic and political muscle against the West in a show of bravado. Yet one can't help thinking that this is exactly the sort of arrogance that typically precedes a major downfall. As the Bible states, "Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall." In his book, "Jubilee on Wall Street," author David Knox Barker devotes a chapter to how trade wars tend to be common occurrences in the long wave economic cycle of developed nations. Barker explains his belief that the industrial nations of Brazil, Russia, India and China will play a major role in pulling the world of the long wave deflationary decline as their domestic economies begin to develop and grow. "They are and will demand more foreign goods produced in the United States and other markets," he writes. Barker believes this will help the U.S. rebalance from an over weighted consumption-oriented economy to a high-end producer economy. Barker adds a caveat, however: if protectionist policies are allowed to gain force in Washington, trade wars will almost certainly erupt and. If this happens, says Barker, "all bets are off." He adds, "The impact on global trade of increased protectionism and trade wars would be catastrophic, and what could prove to be a mild long wave [economic] winter season this time around could plunge into a global depression." Barker also observes that the storm clouds of trade wars are already forming on the horizon as we have moved further into the long wave economic "winter season." Writes Barker, "If trade wars are allowed to get under way in these final years of a long wave winter, this decline will be far deeper and darker than necessary, just as the Great Depression was far deeper and lengthier than it should have been, due to growing international trade isolationism. He further cautions that protectionism in Washington will certainly bring retaliation from the nations that bear the brunt of punitive U.S. trade policies. He observes that the reaction from one nation against the protectionist policies of another is typically far worse than the original action. He cites as an example the restriction by the U.S. of $55 million worth of cotton blouses from China in the 1980s. China retaliated by cancelling $500 million worth of orders for American rain. "As one nation blocks trade, the nation that is hurt will surely retaliate and the entire world will suffer," writes Barker.

### Climate Deal 2NC

#### Obama reelection is critical to a global climate deal

**Geman**, 1/5/**2012** (Ben, Report says global climate deal hinges on Obama reelection, The Hill, p. http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/202539-report-global-climate-deal-hinges-on-obama-reelection-)

Prospects for striking a binding global climate deal by 2015 are probably toast if President Obama loses in November. That’s among the conclusions in a wide-ranging, new climate and green energy outlook from banking giant HSBC’s research branch. A major outcome from the United Nations climate talks in December was a plan to craft a deal by 2015 — one that would include big, developing nations such as China — and have it come into force by 2020. But Obama’s main Republican White House rivals are critical of emissions limits and skeptical of climate science. HSBC predicts an international agreement by 2015 is highly unlikely if Obama loses the election. From their research note: [T]he prospects for a new global climate deal in 2015 depend considerably on the election of a pro-climate action president. The election of a President opposed to climate action will not only damage growth prospects for low-carbon solutions in the USA itself, but will make the hard task of negotiating a new global agreement by 2015 almost impossible.

#### Climate leadership is critical to solve warming – prevents extinction.

**Moon** 10/25/**2009** (Ban Ki – secretary general of the United Nations, We Can Do It, New York Times, p. http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/26/opinion/26iht-edban.html)

Every day, the critical December summit in Copenhagen grows closer. All agree that climate change is an existential threat to humankind. Yet agreement on what to do still eludes us. How can this be? The issues are complex, affecting everything from national economies to individual lifestyles. They involve political trade-offs and commitments of resources no leader can undertake lightly. We could see all that at recent climate negotiations in Bangkok. Where we needed progress, we saw gridlock. Yet the elements of a deal are on the table. All we require to put them in place is political will**.** We need to step back from narrow national interest and engage in frank and constructive discussion in a spirit of global common cause. In this, we can be optimistic. Meeting in London earlier this week, British Prime Minister Gordon Brown told the leaders of 17 major economies (responsible for some 80 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions) that success in Copenhagen is within reach—if they themselves engage, and especially if they themselves go to Copenhagen to push an agenda for change. U.S. leadership is crucial. That is why I am encouraged by the spirit of compromise shown in the bipartisan initiative announced last week by John Kerry and Lindsey Graham. Here was a pair of U.S. senators — one Republican, the other Democratic — coming together to bridge their parties’ differences to address climate change in a spirit of genuine give-and-take. We cannot afford another period where the United States stands on the sidelines. An engaged United States can lead the world to seal a deal to combat climate change in Copenhagen. An indecisive or insufficiently engaged United States will cause unnecessary — and ultimately unaffordable — delay in concrete strategies and policies to beat this looming challenge. Leaders across the globe are increasingly showing the engagement and leadership § Marked 12:17 § we need. Last month, President Barack Obama joined more than 100 others at a climate change summit at U.N. headquarters in New York — sending a clear message of solidarity and commitment. So did the leaders of China, Japan and South Korea, all of whom pledged to promote the development of clean energy technologies and ensure that Copenhagen is a success. Japan’s prime minister promised a 25 percent cut in greenhouse gas emissions from 1990 levels by 2020, laying down a marker for other industrialized nations. The European Union, too, has pledged to make a 30 percent reduction as part of a global agreement. Norway has announced its readiness for a 40 percent cut in emissions. Brazil has unveiled plans to substantially cut emissions from deforestation. India and China are implanting programs to curb emissions as well.

### Impact Wall

#### Romney’s policies would isolate Russia --- collapses relations

**Bandow**, 4/23/**2012** (Doug – senior fellow at the Cato Institute, Romney and Russia: Complicating American Relations, National Interest, p. <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-skeptics/romney-russia-complicating-american-relationships-6836>)

Mitt Romney has become the inevitable Republican presidential candidate. He’s hoping to paint Barack Obama as weak, but his attempt at a flanking maneuver on the right may complicate America’s relationship with Eastern Europe and beyond. Romney recently charged Russia with being America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” As Jacob Heilbrunn of National Interest pointed out, this claim embodies a monumental self-contradiction, attempting to claim “credit for the collapse of the Soviet Union, on the one hand [while] predicting dire threats from Russia on the other.” Thankfully, the U.S.S.R. really is gone, and neither all the king’s men nor Vladimir Putin can put it back together. It is important to separate behavior which is grating, even offensive, and that which is threatening. Putin is no friend of liberty, but his unwillingness to march lock-step with Washington does not mean that he wants conflict with America. Gordon Hahn of CSIS observes: Yet despite NATO expansion, U.S. missile defense, Jackson-Vanik and much else, Moscow has refused to become a U.S. foe, cooperating with the West on a host of issues from North Korea to the war against jihadism. Most recently, Moscow agreed to the establishment of a NATO base in Ulyanovsk. These are hardly the actions of America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” Romney’s charge is both silly and foolish. This doesn’t mean the U.S. should not confront Moscow when important differences arise. But treating Russia as an adversary risks encouraging it to act like one. Moreover, treating Moscow like a foe will make Russia more suspicious of America’s relationships with former members of the Warsaw Pact and republics of the Soviet Union—and especially Washington’s determination to continue expanding NATO. After all, if another country ostentatiously called the U.S. its chief geopolitical threat, ringed America with bases, and established military relationships with areas that had broken away from the U.S., Washington would not react well. It might react, well, a lot like Moscow has been reacting. Although it has established better relations with the West, Russia still might not get along with some of its neighbors, most notably Georgia, with its irresponsibly confrontational president. However, Washington should not give Moscow additional reasons to indulge its paranoia.

#### Only Obama can resolve the missile defense crisis --- collapses relations.

**Trenin et. al**, June **2012** (Dmitri – director of the Carnegie Moscow Center, Maria Lipman – editor-in-chief of Pro Et Contra, Alexey Malashenko – scholar-in-residence in Religion, Society and Security at the Moscow Center, Nikolay Petrov – scholar-in-residence in the Society and Regions Program at the Moscow Center, Russia on the Move, p. <http://carnegieeurope.eu/publications/?fa=48309>)

But strategically, the United States is still Russia’s de facto main potential adversary: Many influential Russians suspect that Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney, not Barack Obama, reflects the U.S. establishment’s real views on Russia. In their analysis, U.S. global missile defense efforts bespeak a consistent desire to neutralize Russia’s nuclear deterrent and make the country vulnerable to U.S. non-nuclear strategic weaponry. A U.S.-Russian agreement on missile defense, if it is reached in a second Obama term, could thus defuse a looming crisis in the relationship. However, a failure to agree could lead to deeper and more pronounced hostility. In today’s geopolitical context, that would probably mean Russia drawing further away from the West and closer to China, amounting to a major geostrategic shift on a global scale.

### Uniqueness Debate

They say Romney winning but that’s only one model – our Silver evidence is wholesome and predictive – the overwhelming consensus of evidence says Obama will win the election

#### Abramowitz prediction model proves. But dramatic events can still change the outcome.

**Ravi**, **9/13**/2012 (Anusha, Abramowitz Predicts 2012 Election Results, The Emory Wheel, p. http://www.emorywheel.com/abramowitz-predicts-2012-election-results/)

Alan Abramowitz, the Alben W. Barkley Professor of Political Science, has released his forecast for the outcome of the presidential election this November. Abramowitz, who has accurately predicted the popular vote winner of every presidential election since 1988, says incumbent President Barack Obama will win the election by a close margin of about 1.2 percent. Abramowitz based his forecast on statistical analysis composed of the candidate’s approval rating at the end of June, the growth of the economy and the value of the “incumbency factor,” which refers to the advantage a candidate will have simply for being the candidate that voters are familiar with. “The Democratic constituency is just larger than the Republicans’ and encompasses far more different types of people,” Abramowitz said. “Even if Romney receives the maximum turnout from white Republican voters, he won’t win.” In the past, the incumbency factor has meant more, according to Abramowitz. But more recently, the value of merely being the incumbent candidate has decreased because of the stark polarization — the division of voters into political extremes — of the American voting public. While Abramowitz has made his prediction about two months before the election takes place, he said that a very dramatic event would have to occur to change what he believes will be the outcome of the election.

b)

#### Obama will win – Romney is not exploiting white voters.

**Cohn**, **8/8**/2012 (Nate – former Whitman debater and author of the Electionate, 90 Days Until the Election – And Obama Has the Advantage, The New Republic, p. <http://www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/105912/obama-has-the-advantage-90-days-go>)

Barack Obama has the advantage with 90 days to go until November 6, and the Romney campaign mostly has itself to blame. Four years after Obama’s decisive victory in 2008, a poor economy, dissatisfaction with the direction of the country, and mediocre approval ratings have conspired to endanger the president’s reelection chances. But a close race, which is what the polls show, is not the same as a dead heat. Romney is an imperfect candidate who has been poorly served by a strategy that has failed to contest Obama’s predictable attacks, leaving him poorly positioned heading into the conventions. Over the last four years, Obama’s coalition suffered deep enough losses to give his challenger a legitimate path to victory. But those losses were narrow and concentrated among white voters without a college degree, as Obama retains near-2008 levels of support among minorities and college-educated whites. As a wealthy former CEO of a private equity firm with an awkward cadence who could never call himself a great politican, Romney has never naturally appealed to white working class voters, and, as a result, Romney’s ability to capitalize on Obama’s biggest weakness requires him to overcome his own. With three months to go, these weaknesses are as pronounced as ever. The Obama campaign adopted a strategy to remedy their weakness among white working class voters by defining Romney as an out-of-touch, outsourcing plutocrat willing to close factories, fire workers, and avoid taxes to advance his self-interest. If the Romney campaign possessed effective tools to blunt Obama’s offensive, they weren’t properly employed. Instead, the Romney campaign inexplicably focused on attacking a well-defined incumbent president, while permitting Obama and his allies to broadcast unflattering and uncontested tales about an undefined challenger. Boston’s ill-advised strategy has endangered Romney’s chances. Romney’s unfavorable ratings remain high and he hasn’t yet consolidated the disaffected white working class voters with reservations about Obama’s performance. In Ohio—ground zero for the Obama campaign’s efforts—Romney’s numbers have plummeted to the low forties, an extremely weak showing in a must win state. Undecided voters harbor particularly unfavorable impressions of the Republican nominee. According to recent surveys, Romney’s favorables are in the teens among undecided voters, while a majority has already formulated a negative impression.

They’re ev says economy but:

#### The economy will not hurt Obama --- it’s in political win territory.

**Drum**, 9/11/**2012** (Kevin, If Obama Wins, You Can thank the Economy, Not Blame It, Mother Jones, p. <http://www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2012/09/if-obama-wins-you-can-thank-economy-not-blame-it>)

Matt Yglesias picks up the baton with a series of charts showing that, in fact, the economy isn't in especially dire shape. I've compressed this all into one chart, and as Matt says, the difference is like night and day. In the year before the 2008 election, employment was dropping like a stone. Sure enough, the incumbent party lost. In the year before the 2010 election, employment was at rock bottom and going nowhere. Sure enough, the incumbent party lost. But in the year before the 2012 election, employment numbers have been on a steady upward trajectory. That suggests a modest win for the incumbent party. Obviously, Obama's chances are hurt by the fact that unemployment remains high, wages are stagnant, and we still haven't made up all the job losses from the recession. But politically speaking, the economy isn't in terrible shape. It's in OK-but-not-great shape. And that means the incumbent probably has a small advantage. If Obama wins by a couple of percentage points in November, he will have performed almost exactly as well as you'd expect given the state of the economy.

### Intrinsicness

-- Our disad is intrinsic – the link proves that the plan results in \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

-- Destroys all ground –

A) No disad is intrinsic – “make-up calls” can be crafted to solve any link or impact – even purely reaction-based DAs like Relations can be avoided by having the government cut the offended nation a big check

B) Fairness outweighs – logical debate is worthless if the Neg always loses. Fairness protects the forum that makes debate educational

-- Moving target – intrinsicness makes the plan conditional – destroys fairness because it's the locus of debate

-- Not logical: no single actor can do the plan and other actions. Even Congress is made up of many individual legislators.

-- Empirical intrinsicness checks – the Aff can read evidence that Congress will react to the plan by taking action – but not fiat that it occurs

### Link Wall

#### Supporting oil causes a populist backlash against Obama --- this will cause him to lose the election. That’s the 1NC Cillizza evidence.

#### Anti-oil attacks are part of Obama’s populist strategy --- key to his re-election.

**Hughes**, 3/29/**2012** (Brian – staff writer for the Washington Examiner, Obama seeks end to oil subsidies; Congress says no, The Washington Examiner, p. http://washingtonexaminer.com/article/1204111#.UDb7s91lSf4)

President Obama used the bully pulpit of the White House on Thursday to condemn lawmakers for supporting billions of dollars in subsidies to oil companies, seeking to tap Americans' frustration with gas prices in a populist pitch that has become a centerpiece of his re-election strategy. Obama implored Congress to either "stand with big oil companies or the American people," but just moments later, the Senate voted against ending tax breaks for the nation's five largest oil companies despite Democrats' attempts to paint the GOP as beholden to the petroleum industry.

#### Populism is key to get swing voters --- attacks on Big Oil are key.

**Lux**, 4/11/**2012** (Michael – CEO of Progressive Strategies, partner at Democracy Partners, That Old-Time Populism Debate, Daily Kos, p. http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/04/11/1082470/-That-Old-Time-Populism-Debate)

Tested beautifully with independents, swing voters, and in general, and tested far better than some less populist messages they have tested over the last year-plus. You do have to be thoughtful in your messaging to swing voters. A pure give ’em hell eat-the-rich stem-winder of a message may not appeal to them without some nuance in it. Making fighting for small business, cutting government waste, and rewarding hard work part of the message always helps with in-the-middle voters. A focus on opportunity and economic growth helps as well. But to say that you have to avoid economic populism when talking about those things is something that only a true blue Third Wayer would ever say with a straight face. Taking on Wall Street and Wall Street bailouts never hurts and always helps in all the polling I have seen. Going after big oil, big insurance companies, corporate special interests, and big business CEOs who outsource jobs never turns off very many swing voters, and helps you with a whole lot of other folks. Which brings me to my last, and perhaps most important, point: winning political messages can never work for just one slice of the electorate. Third Way may well have found that segment of swing independents who were less old, less blue collar, and less populist than any other group of voters in the potential Democratic electoral coalition. But your message has to appeal to all different kinds of folks. For a Democrat to win a national election, you need a message that inspires your volunteers and small contributors and fans who will talk to their neighbors about you; a message that generates enough excitement from blacks, Latinos, young people, and unmarried women to get them out to vote; a message that appeals to all those underwater homeowners and people without jobs that voted for Obama last time but may be leaning Republican or too discouraged to vote because of their own hard times; and a message that appeals to a wide array of different kinds of swing voters. If the message can’t do all those things at once, it will not get you 51 percent. That’s what makes economic populism so incredibly valuable: it is the message, if nuanced correctly per the paragraph above, which comes the closest to doing that. Even if I lost all my doubts about the Third Way analysis in terms of the small slice of the electorate they had identified, the message still wouldn’t work strategically because it would fail with all those other voters we Democrats need to have to win. A group like Third Way, with staffers who walk into their offices every day with a pre-determined mission of not wanting Democrats to be too economically populist, can easily design a sample and polling questions to reinforce the messages they want to work. But Democrats, especially Democratic incumbents, who are trying to win elections in times like these when the middle class is being squeezed so hard, need to be willing to take the populist torch and carry it proudly.

#### Big Oil is seen as part of the 1% ---- support kills any populist platform.

**Roberts**, 1/26/**2012** (David – staff writer for Grist, Clean energy is a wedge issue that favors Democrats, Grist, p. http://grist.org/politics/clean-energy-is-a-wedge-issue-that-favors-democrats/)

Americans know that clean energy is the future. They want to embrace the future. They want to, well, win it. They certainly don’t want to fend it off for the sake of oil companies. Americans hate oil companies! (Almost as much as they hate congressional Republicans.) They don’t want to subsidize oil companies any more. Even Republicans support ending oil subsidies by a 2-to-1 margin. On to the second significant finding: Americans want to tax the rich. These swing voters, even the Republicans, responded enthusiastically to [Obama's] call for a “Buffett Rule” that would require the wealthiest Americans to pay their fair share. As one participant put it, “I agree with his tax reform — the 1 percent should shoulder more of the burden than the other 99 percent. He [Obama] talked about being all for one, one for all — that really resonated for me.” These dial focus groups make it very clear that defending further tax cuts for those at the top of the economic spectrum puts Republicans in Congress and on the Presidential campaign trail well outside of the American mainstream. (See also this Sept. 2011 Gallup poll or this Oct. 2011 Bloomberg poll or this Oct. 2011 CBS News poll or many others). What this shows is that the Occupy movement has won. Americans across party lines increasingly see things in terms of the 1 percent and the 99 percent. A Pew survey earlier this month found that “conflict between rich and poor now eclipses racial strain and friction between immigrants and the native-born as the greatest source of tension in American society.” Two-thirds of Americans now see “strong conflicts” between the rich and poor. Even Mitt Romney is using Occupy’s language. These issues — clean energy and taxing the rich — are not unconnected. Properly done, clean energy is a populist issue. Big Oil perfectly symbolizes the 1 percent, and Americans are ready to redirect public resources away from oil and toward a wide network of home-grown cleantech innovators.

#### Financial incentives for oil spark massive opposition --- the link vastly outweighs any turn.

**Weiss**, 2/15/**2012** (Daniel – senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, Poll Finds Americans, Especially Independents, Overwhelmingly Oppose Subsidies to Fossil Fuels, Think Progress, p. http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/02/15/426014/poll-finds-americans-especially-independents-overwhelmingly-oppose-subsidies-to-fossil-fuels/)

As part of the FY 2013 budget released on February 13, President Obama proposed to eliminate $40 billion in tax breaks for oil and gas producers over the next ten years. Yesterday, the Yale Project on Climate Change reiterated its recent finding that Americans of all political stripes oppose subsidies for “coal, oil, and natural gas companies.” They oppose these subsidies by 70 percent to 30 percent – better than two to one. Republicans oppose these subsidies by 67 percent to 34 percent (reflects rounding of percentages). Intensity matters in public opinion. A determined, energetic minority can be quite powerful. The Yale poll shows that there is much more intensity against oil subsidies than in favor of them. Americans strongly opposed to the subsidies outnumber those who strongly support them by 31 percent to 3 percent – a 10 to 1 ratio. Independents – the voters who will likely determine the outcome of the 2012 election – strongly oppose these fossil fuel subsidies by 45 percent to 2 percent. This poll was conducted from October 20 to November 16, 2011, before respondents knew that the profits of the big five oil companies – BP, Chevron, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil and Shell – would be a record $137 billion in 2011. In addition, gasoline prices averaged $3.38 to $3.44 per gallon during the survey period. This week the average gasoline price was $3.52 and climbing. Imagine how the anticipated higher gasoline prices combined with big oil’s record 2011 profits will intensify opposition to big oil subsidies. It is said that elections are won in the middle. Politicians who want to appeal to these independent voters would do well to vocally oppose these big oil subsidies. Certainly President Obama understands that. Supporters of big oil tax breaks may learn this lesson the hard way.

#### The link is also perception based- arguments about the way the plan will be spun don’t matter, the initial reaction to the plan is that it is support of big oil

#### Pro-oil moves will not translate into votes for Obama --- it’s clearly just politics.

**Belogolova**, 5/17/**2012** (Olga – staff reporter for the National Journal, Insiders: Outreach to Oil Industry Won’t Help Obama, p. http://www.nationaljournal.com/energy/insiders-outreach-to-oil-industry-won-t-help-obama-20120517)

Better dialogue between the White House and the oil and gas industry has lobbyists and congressional Republicans screaming “politics,” arguing that both sides have something to gain from warmer relations in an election year. But National Journal’s Energy & Environment Insiders say that this ostensible “détente” won’t really do much for President Obama in November. Nearly 70 percent of Insiders polled said that improved relations with Big Oil won’t help the president at the polls, many pointing out that no one has noticed these developments outside the Beltway and that campaign donations from the industry will still mostly flow to Republicans. “Follow the money. When oil and gas trade associations shift PAC contributions away from Romney/GOP, then it will help the president,” said one Insider. “Until then, this is less détente than a cold peace.” Earlier this month, American Petroleum Institute President Jack Gerard told National Journal Daily that communications between the industry and the White House have improved “dramatically” in recent months. Congressional Republicans were already well aware of that and were not happy. In an April 23 e-mail obtained by NJD, a senior aide on energy issues to Senate Environment and Public Works ranking member James Inhofe, R-Okla., criticized oil and gas lobbyists for working closely with the White House. Despite the growing anxiety over the improved relations, Insiders argue that the whole food fight has likely gone unnoticed outside of Washington, where voters still see Republicans as aligned with the oil industry and the Obama administration aligned with the environmental movement. “Energy-industry leaders understand this is all about politics and that this administration’s heart is with the Sierra Club in stopping ALL fossil fuels.… American people don’t care,” said one Insider, arguing that the story is “too inside Beltway.”

#### Oil production drops the price, kills global renewables

Bullis 12 (Kevin, Senior Editor, Energy, “Could New Oil Production Cause Oil Prices—and Energy Innovation—to Collapse?,” 6-26-12, <http://www.technologyreview.com/view/428343/could-new-oil-production-cause-oil-pricesand/?nlid=nldly&nld=2012-06-27>)

A new report out of Harvard suggests that a boom in oil exploration and production—driven by a surge of investment starting in 2003—might lead to a sharp drop in oil prices. If that happens, could that kill development of alternatives to oil, as happened when oil prices hit bottom in the 1990s? Will solar panels, electric cars, and advanced biofuels fade from view? Three decades ago, high oil prices spurred investment in alternatives. But by the time oil prices had bottomed-out in the 1990s, much of that research had been abandoned, and promising technologies didn’t come to market or weren’t made cheap enough to catch on widely. With the surge in oil prices in recent years, much of that research has been taken up again, and the trends look good. Solar power is approaching the cost of conventional fossil-fuel power, and advanced biofuels seem on the cusp of becoming commercial reality. As new energy startups proliferated, many alternative energy researchers and companies waved away suggestions that oil might plummet again, causing these technologies to be abandoned once again. The conventional wisdom has been that high demand from fast-growing economies will keep oil prices high enough to drive innovation. And concern about climate change will lead to a price on carbon that will drive new technologies even if oil prices drop. But interest in climate change seems to have waned, and efforts to put a price on carbon dioxide emissions have failed in the U.S. and most of the rest of the world. If oil prices also drop due to overproduction, as the report suggests, what could that mean for technologies such as electric cars, advanced internal combustion engines, and renewable electricity sources, such as solar power? Taking solar power first, things are a bit different now than in the 1970s, at least in the United States. The oil crisis spurred investment in solar power in part because oil was used to generate a substantial amount of electricity in the United States. Now the U.S. hardly uses oil at all for generating electricity, and installing solar panels doesn’t do anything to decrease oil consumption. Some people don’t know that, and support solar as a way of reducing oil consumption—their support could fade with high oil prices. Such public support is critical for the solar industry now, since it relies heavily on subsidies. More importantly, while the U.S. doesn’t use oil for electricity, much of the rest of the world does. At current oil prices, solar power is cheaper than electricity from diesel generators, and that’s creating a new markets for solar panels. A drop in oil prices could hurt the solar industry. But solar panel prices have been dropping quickly, and some solar companies, such as First Solar, are staking their business on the prospect that they can soon be competitive in unsubsidized markets. There’s a race on. If the oil price drops within the next couple of years, that could be a bad sign for the solar industry. If it drops later, the solar industry may be able to survive on its own by then, even if it’s hurt some by lower prices. A drop in oil prices could really hurt advanced biofuels companies, which are struggling to get prices low enough to compete with even today’s relatively pricey oil. Low oil prices could further deteriorate already strained support for advanced biofuels. And low oil prices could also hurt attempts to sell electric cars, and cars with costly efficiency improvements. Automakers have struggled to sell electric cars even with relatively high gas prices. If oil prices drop, will new fuel economy standards that are driving automakers to sell more efficient vehicles hold up?

#### Lobbying – Oil companies oppose cleantech initiatives, kills renewables

Willis 12 (Paul, Earth Techling, “Is Big Oil really serious about renewables?,” 6-21-12,

<http://www.tgdaily.com/sustainability-features/64198-is-big-oil-really-serious-about-renewables>)

In truth, most of the impetus for clean energy development has come from other sources than Big Oil, which has rarely strayed much from the concerns of the balance sheet. For example, the large-scale push into biofuels by most of the major oil companies in recent years must be seen in the light of the Energy Independence and Security Act, which President Bush signed into law in 2007 and which requires the country to work toward the production of 36 billion gallons of renewable fuels by 2022. As well in the context of Obama's green energy push and commitments made by the U.S. military to get half of its power from clean energy sources by 2020. "All of our alternative energy businesses are businesses," Katrina Landis, the CEO of BP's alternative energy division, told Forbes recently. "We have to compete for investment dollars with all the hydrocarbon resources within BP." In fact, oil companies have not just remained passive observers to the renewables revolution, waiting to jump on the bandwagon when there's money to be made. At times they have actively tried to undermine efforts to deploy more cleantech. For example, Chevron's claims to be behind renewables are rather undermined by the fact that the company and its subsidiaries spent $2.1 million in lobbying the California state legislature last year over new laws requiring utilities to get a third of their power from alternative energy sources by the end of the decade.

### Oceans

They only read ev that ocean salinity is increasing, that’s not our argument:

#### Turn – CO2 increases marine calcification through symbiont photosynthesis

Idso et al 12 [Sherwood, Keith, Craig - Research Physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, Vice President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change with a PhD in Botany, former Director of Environmental Science at Peabody Energy in St. Louis, Missouri and is a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, Association of American Geographers, Ecological Society of America, “Algal Symbionts Appear to Determine Responses of Calcifying Organisms to Ocean Acidification”, Volume 15, Number 5: 1 February 2012, <http://www.co2science.org/articles/V15/N5/EDIT.php>, Chetan]

Many are the studies that claim that increasing atmospheric CO2 concentrations will lead to a condition described as ocean acidification, where the pH of seawater declines and it becomes ever more difficult for calcifying marine organisms to produce skeletal structures. However, in a culture experiment with two algal symbiont-bearing, reef-dwelling foraminifers (Amphisorus kudakajimensis and Calcarina gaudichaudii), which was conducted in seawater under five different pCO2 conditions - 245, 375, 588, 763 and 907 ppm, maintained with a precise pCO2-controlling technique - Hikami et al. (2011) found that net calcification of A. kudakajimensis was indeed reduced under higher pCO2, but that calcification of C. gaudichaudii did just the opposite and actually increased with increased pCO2. This latter result, although seemingly strange, is anything but unusual; for the nine researchers report that various taxa of coccolithophores and sea urchins "show enhanced calcification in environments with higher pCO2," citing the work of Iglesias-Rodriguez et al. (2008), Doney et al. (2009) and Ries et al. (2009). And they say that "different populations of Emiliania huxleyi have shown decreased, increased, or unchanged calcification in response to higher pCO2," citing Fabry (2008). In discussing the findings of their experiment, Hikami et al. say that the upward trend in the calcification of C. gaudichaudii in response to ocean acidification "can probably be attributed to the increase in CO2, possibly through enhancement of symbiont photosynthesis, a phenomenon known as the CO2-fertilizing effect," citing Ries et al. (2009), although the concept was first described several years earlier by Idso et al. (2000). And in discussing possible causes of the two contrasting types of calcification response to atmospheric CO2 enrichment (positive and negative), they speculate that "the type of symbiont influences the strength of the CO2-fertilizing effect."

#### Our understanding of the ocean is too small to make any sweeping conclusions – the ocean acidification theory ignores ocean carbonation and is based on short term experiments

Idso et al 12 [Sherwood, Keith, Craig - Research Physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, Vice President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change with a PhD in Botany, former Director of Environmental Science at Peabody Energy in St. Louis, Missouri and is a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, Association of American Geographers, Ecological Society of America, “The Unsettled Science of Ocean Warming and Acidification ”, Volume 15, Number 19: 9 May 2012, <http://www.co2science.org/articles/V15/N19/EDIT.php>, Chetan]

All of these phenomena, many of which are nonlinear and extremely complicated, are interlinked; and Riebesell and his colleagues thus conclude, from their objective review of the pertinent scientific literature, that the magnitude and even the sign of the global ocean's carbon cycle feedback to climate change are, in their words, "yet unknown." They note, for example, that "our understanding of biological responses to ocean change is still in its infancy." With respect to ocean acidification, in particular, they write that the impact it will have on marine life "is still uncertain," and that the phenomenon itself is but "one side of the story," the other side being what they call "ocean carbonation," which, as they describe it, "will likely be beneficial to some groups of photosynthetic organisms." Thus, they write that "our present understanding of biologically driven feedback mechanisms is still rudimentary," and that with respect to many of their magnitudes, "our understanding is too immature to even make a guess." What is more, they imply that even what we do think we know could well be wrong, because, as they elucidate, "our present knowledge of pH/CO2 sensitivities of marine organisms is based almost entirely on short-term perturbation experiments, neglecting the possibility of evolutionary adaptation."

#### No impact—negligible pH change and animal response

NIPCC 10 (Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, multi-national scientific coalition comprised of leading climate scientists, “Speculations beyond the Scope of Reality,” http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/may/05may2010a1.html, AM)

In the introductory material to their paper on potential effects of predicted near-future increases in CO2-driven ocean acidification on shell-producing calcification in a certain species of oyster, Watson et al. (2009) report that over the past two centuries, CO2 emissions from deforestation and the burning of fossil fuels have increased atmospheric CO2 concentrations from 280 to 380 ppm, citing NOAA/ESRL records produced and maintained by Pieter Tans. They additionally say that the portion of this extra CO2 that has been taken up by the planet's oceans has caused a 0.1 unit drop in the pH of their surface waters, which would appear to be correct. However, they predict there will be a further reduction in ocean pH of 0.3 to 0.5 units by 2100, citing the work of Haugan and Drange (1996), Orr et al. (2005) and Caldeira and Wickett (2005), while noting that these predicted changes in ocean pH "are not only greater but far more rapid than any experienced in the last 24 million years," citing Blackford and Gilbert (2007), or "possibly the last 300 million years," citing Caldeira and Wickett (2003). But how likely are such predictions? Consider the findings of Tans himself, who Watson et al. approvingly cite in regard to the CO2 history they mention. In a paper published inOceanography, Tans (2009) concluded that the future trajectory of oceanic pH will likely be significantly different from that suggested by the scientists cited by Watson et al., while at the same time bravely criticizing the IPCC reports that have also accepted the highly inflated acidification predictions of those scientists. Indeed, whereas Watson et al. and the IPCC accept the claims of those who project a decline in pH somewhere in the range of 0.3 to 0.5 between now and the end of the century, Tans' projections yield a pH decline somewhere in the range of 0.09 to 0.17, which is much smaller, and which would be expected to have significantly reduced biological impacts compared to those suggested by the experimental work of Watson et al. for that future point in time. Based on the results of their experiments and the maximum decline in ocean-water pH that they accept, for example, Watson et al. predict a significantdecline of 72% in Sydney rock oyster (Saccostrea glomerata) larval survival by the year 2100. However, utilizing Watson et al.'s data, but with the maximum ocean-water pH decline calculated by Tans, one obtains a non-significant larval survival decline of only 14%, based on interpolation of the graphical results portrayed in Watson et al.'s paper. In like manner, similar assessments of changes in antero-posterior measurement yield asignificant decline of 8.7% using Watson et al.'s assumptions about ocean pH, but a non-significant decline of only 1.8% according to Tans' pH calculations. Corresponding results for dorso-ventral measurement were a significant decline of 7.5% with Watson et al.'s pH values, but a non-significant decline of only 1.5% with Tans' values; while for larval dry mass there was a decline of 50% in Watson et al.'s analysis, but an actualincrease (albeit non-significant) of 6% using Tans' pH analysis. Last of all, for empty shells remaining there was a significant decline of 90% in the Watson et al. study, but a non-significant decline of only 6% when Tans' pH projections were used. In summation, based on their experimental data and the ocean pH projections for the end of the century that are promoted by them and the IPCC, Watson et al. find what they characterize as "a dramatic negative effect on the survival, growth, and shell formation of the early larval stages of the Sydney rock oyster." On the other hand, employing the pH values projected by Tans, there are no statistically significant reductions in any of the five biological parameters measured and evaluated by Watson et al., which is an amazingly benign response to an environmental threat that is being suggested by some to be more serious or extreme than it was at any other time that it may have reared its ugly head over the past 300 million years!

### C02

Her only answer to the C02 turn is that it doesn’t increase food yields – this is from 07, our Idso 10 evidence is best – idsos are some of the most trusted people on warming

#### Continued CO2 emissions are key to sustain all life on the planet and prevent the impending global famine. Increasing ozone concentrations is damaging crop production – only CO2 enrichment can offset it and provide enough food for ALL life on the planet

#### Absent CO2 – global famine will spark World War 3 – Calvin says plummeting crop yields would cause countries to invade different lands to take over resources – and these conflicts go nuclear

Klare 6 (Michael Klare, Professor of Peace and World Security Studies at Hampshire College, “The Coming Resource Wars,” 3/11/2006, <http://www.waterconserve.org/shared/reader/welcome.aspx?linkid=53710&keybold=water%20land%20conflict>)

"As famine, disease, and weather-related disasters strike due to abrupt climate change," the Pentagon report notes, "many countries' needs will exceed their carrying capacity" -- that is, their ability to provide the minimum requirements for human survival. This "will create a sense of desperation, which is likely to lead to offensive aggression" against countries with a greater stock of vital resources. "Imagine eastern European countries, struggling to feed their populations with a falling supply of food, water, and energy, eyeing Russia, whose population is already in decline, for access to its grain, minerals, and energy supply." Similar scenarios will be replicated all across the planet, as those without the means to survival invade or migrate to those with greater abundance -- producing endless struggles between resource "haves" and "have-nots." It is this prospect, more than anything, that worries John Reid. In particular, he expressed concern over the inadequate capacity of poor and unstable countries to cope with the effects of climate change, and the resulting risk of state collapse, civil war and mass migration. "More than 300 million people in Africa currently lack access to safe water," he observed, and "climate change will worsen this dire situation" -- provoking more wars like Darfur. And even if these social disasters will occur primarily in the developing world, the wealthier countries will also be caught up in them, whether by participating in peacekeeping and humanitarian aid operations, by fending off unwanted migrants or by fighting for access to overseas supplies of food, oil, and minerals. When reading of these nightmarish scenarios, it is easy to conjure up images of desperate, starving people killing one another with knives, staves and clubs -- as was certainly often the case in the past, and could easily prove to be so again. But these scenarios also envision the use of more deadly weapons. "In this world of warring states," the 2003 Pentagon report predicted, "nuclear arms proliferation is inevitable." As oil and natural gas disappears, more and more countries will rely on nuclear power to meet their energy needs -- and this "will accelerate nuclear proliferation as countries develop enrichment and reprocessing capabilities to ensure their national security." Although speculative, these reports make one thing clear: when thinking about the calamitous effects of global climate change, we must emphasize its social and political consequences as much as its purely environmental effects. Drought, flooding and storms can kill us, and surely will -- but so will wars among the survivors of these catastrophes over what remains of food, water and shelter. As Reid's comments indicate, no society, however affluent, will escape involvement in these forms of conflict.

## 1NC vs George Washington BS

### 1

#### -- Aff must specify which branch passes the plan – they don’t

#### -- Vote Neg –

#### 1. Ground – robs courts, congress, executive counterplans, agent specific disads and case arguments

#### 2. Conditionality – “resolved” means a “firm course of action” – not specifying allows them to shift and clarify in the 2AC

#### 3. No solvency – there’s no actor as the “Federal Government”, only specific branches

### 2

#### Energy production through modern technology places nature as a standing reserve – to be dominated and ordered by humanity

DeLuca 5 (Kevin Michael – Professor of Communications at University of Utah, “Thinking with Heidegger: Rethinking Environmental Theory and Practice”, 2005, Ethics and the Environment, Vol. 10, No. 1, JSTOR)

In addition to meditating on media and public relations practices, a careful reading of Heidegger would compel environmentalism to meditate on its relations to technology and to images. To address the issue of tech- nology first, environmental groups often rely on modern technology while writing off such use as a necessary cost of 'doing business' in a mod- ern, mass media public sphere. That may be true, but Heidegger's writings caution us against gliding over the writing off. What are the costs of using modern technology? Besides relying on the technological infrastructure of the communication industry (computers, telephones, video camcorders, etc. . . .) to appear on TV, issue press releases, maintain web sites, lobby politicians, and raise money, environmentalists in the course of working and living rely on cars, planes, air conditioning, highways, microwaves, electricity, and a plethora of plastic products. In short, environmentalists are implicated and imbricated in the technosphere. Now Heidegger's meditation on the essence of technology and the essence of humanity's relation to technology serves to displace the conventional questions concerning technology. Heidegger refuses the question of whether technology is good or bad or neutral. As he puts it, "Everywhere we remain unfree and chained to technology, whether we passionately affirm or deny it. But we are delivered over to it in the worst possible way when we regard it as something neutral; for this conception of it, to which today we particularly like to do homage, makes us utterly blind to the essence of technology" (1993, 311-12). Instead, Heidegger is asking after the essence of technology, which, he famously declares, "is by no means anything technological" (1993, 311). Rejecting the understand- ing of technology as a "mere means" that humans can master, what he terms the merely correct but not true "instrumental and anthropological definition of technology" (1993, 312), Heidegger proposes technology as "a way of revealing" (1993, 318). Avoiding the romanticism of a return to the Pleistocene or the utopi- anism of embracing a Star Trek futurism, from a Heideggerian perspective the question becomes, "What sort of revealing does a particular regime of technology make possible?" More prosaically, what sort of relationships to the earth and world does a technology enable? To this question, Heidegger provides a stinging critique of modern technology [albeit, admittedly, tempered by an ontological hope (see 1993, 333-41)]. The way of revealing of modern technology is Gestell or enframing: "The revealing that rules throughout modern technology has the character of a setting-upon, in the sense of a challenging-forth. ... a challenging, which **puts to nature** the unreasonable demand that it supply energy **which can be extracted and stored** as such" (1993, 321, 320). Nature, then, is reduced to a "standing-reserve ... a calculable coherence of forces" (1993, 322, 326),6 so that "nature reports itself in some way or other **that is identifiable through calculation and that it remains orderable** as a system of information" (1993, 328).7 Heidegger gives examples from the fields of agriculture and energy that ring even more true today (see 1993, 320-21). Of farming, Heidegger writes: The work of the peasant does not challenge the soil of the field. In sow- ing grain it places seed in the keeping of the forces of growth and watches over its increase. But meanwhile even the cultivation of the field has come under the grip of another kind of setting-in-order, which sets upon nature. It sets upon it in the sense of challenging it. Agricul- ture is now the mechanized food industry. (1993, 320) Of course, the all-too-immediate reaction to such an example is to charge Heidegger with a dangerous romanticism. With the benefit of a few decades experience around the world with the products of the mecha- nized food industry, from tasteless food, soil erosion, and ubiquitous pesticides to emptied communities, alienated consumers, and green impe- rialism, in retrospect Heidegger's critique seems understated. More significantly, though, the question is not a moral one of good or bad but an exploration of **what possible ways of relating to nature are opened and foreclosed** with different practices of revealing. Heidegger himself dis- misses the possibility of romanticism in response to the giganticism and the progress of science, "whose onset can neither be hindered nor even held up in any way, by any romantic remembering of what was earlier and different" (1999, 108). Indeed, Heidegger's fundamental critique of modern technology is not directed at the world it reveals **but the world it erases**: Where this ordering holds sway, it drives out every other possibility of revealing. Above all, enframing conceals that revealing which, in the ~~^ 79 sense of poiesis, lets what presences come forth into appearance. As compared with that other revealing, the setting-upon that challenges forth thrusts man into a relation to whatever is that is at once antithet- ical and rigorously ordered. Where enframing holds sway, **regulating and securing of the standing-reserve** mark all revealing. (1993, 332) The problem, then, is not that nature is seen as "standing-reserve," a "cal- culable coherence of forces," but that that is all it can be seen as.

#### This causes planetary extinction—it divorces our relationship with the natural world and makes ecocide inevitable

Gottlieb 94 (Roger S. Gottlieb – Professor of Humanities at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, holds a Ph.D. in Philosophy from Brandeis University, “Ethics and Trauma: Levinas, Feminism, and Deep Ecology,” Crosscurrents: A Journal of Religion and Intellectual Life, 1994, Summer, http://www.crosscurrents.org/feministecology.htm)

Here I will at least begin in agreement with Levinas. As he rejects an ethics proceeding on the basis of self-interest, so I believe the anthropocentric perspectives of conservation or liberal environmentalism cannot take us far enough. Our relations with nonhuman nature are poisoned and not just because we have set up feedback loops that already lead to mass starvations, skyrocketing environmental disease rates, and devastation of natural resources. The problem with ecocide is not just that it hurts human beings. Our uncaring violence also violates the very ground of our being, our natural body, our home. Such violence is done not simply to the other – as if the rainforest, the river, the atmosphere, the species made extinct are totally different from ourselves. Rather, we have crucified ourselves**-in-relation-to-the-other, fracturing a mode of being** in which self and other can no more be conceived as fully in isolation from each other than can a mother and a nursing child. We are that child, and nonhuman nature is that mother. If this image seems too maudlin, let us remember that other lactating women can feed an infant, but we have only one earth mother. What moral stance will be shaped by our personal sense that we are poisoning ourselves, our environment, and so many kindred spirits of the air, water, and forests? To begin, we may see this tragic situation as setting the limits to Levinas's perspective. The other which is nonhuman nature is not simply known by a "trace," nor is it something of which all knowledge is necessarily instrumental. This other is inside us as well as outside us. We prove it with every breath we take, every bit of food we eat, every glass of water we drink. We do not have to find shadowy traces on or in the faces of trees or lakes, topsoil or air: we are made from them. Levinas denies this sense of connection with nature. Our "natural" side represents for him a threat of simple consumption or use of the other, a spontaneous response which must be obliterated by the power of ethics in general (and, for him in particular, Jewish religious law(23) ). A "natural" response lacks discipline; without the capacity to heed the call of the other, unable to sublate the self's egoism. Worship of nature would ultimately result in an "everything-is-permitted" mentality, a close relative of Nazism itself. For Levinas, to think of people as "natural" beings is to assimilate them to a totality, a category or species which makes no room for the kind of individuality required by ethics.(24) He refers to the "elemental" or the "there is" as unmanaged, unaltered, "natural" conditions or forces that are essentially alien to the categories and conditions of moral life.(25) One can only lament that Levinas has read nature -- as to some extent (despite his intentions) he has read selfhood -- through the lens of masculine culture. It is precisely our sense of belonging to nature as system, as interaction, as interdependence, which can provide the basis for an ethics appropriate to the trauma of ecocide. As cultural feminism sought to expand our sense of personal identity to a sense of inter-identification with the human other, so this ecological ethics would expand our personal and species sense of identity into an inter-identification with the natural world. Such a realization can lead us to an ethics appropriate to our time, a dimension of which has come to be known as "deep ecology."(26) For this ethics, we do not begin from the uniqueness of our human selfhood, existing against a taken-for-granted background of earth and sky. Nor is our body somehow irrelevant to ethical relations, with knowledge of it reduced always to tactics of domination. Our knowledge does not assimilate the other to the same, but reveals and furthers the continuing dance of interdependence. And our ethical motivation is neither rationalist system nor individualistic self-interest, but a sense of connection to all of life. The deep ecology sense of self-realization goes beyond the modern Western sense of "self" as an isolated ego striving for hedonistic gratification. . . . . Self, in this sense, is experienced as integrated with the whole of nature.(27) Having gained distance and sophistication of perception [from the development of science and political freedoms] we can turn and recognize who we have been all along. . . . we are our world knowing itself. We can relinquish our separateness. We can come home again -- and participate in our world in a richer, more responsible and poignantly beautiful way.(28) Ecological ways of knowing nature are necessarily participatory. [This] knowledge is ecological and plural, reflecting both the diversity of natural ecosystems and the diversity in cultures that nature-based living gives rise to. The recovery of the feminine principle is based on inclusiveness. It is a recovery in nature, woman and man of creative forms of being and perceiving. In nature it implies seeing nature as a live organism. In woman it implies seeing women as productive and active. Finally, in men the recovery of the feminine principle implies a relocation of action and activity to create life-enhancing, not life-reducing and life-threatening societies.(29) In this context, the knowing ego is not set against a world it seeks to control, but one of which it is a part. To continue the feminist perspective, the mother knows or seeks to know the child's needs. Does it make sense to think of her answering the call of the child in abstraction from such knowledge? Is such knowledge necessarily domination? Or is it essential to a project of care, respect and love, precisely because the knower has an intimate, emotional connection with the known?(30) Our ecological vision locates us in such close relation with our natural home that knowledge of it is knowledge of ourselves. And this is not, contrary to Levinas's fear, reducing the other to the same, but a celebration of a larger, more inclusive, and still complex and articulated self.(31) The noble and terrible burden of Levinas's individuated responsibility for sheer existence gives way to a different dream, a different prayer: Being rock, being gas, being mist, being Mind, Being the mesons traveling among the galaxies with the speed of light, You have come here, my beloved one. . . . You have manifested yourself as trees, as grass, as butterflies, as single-celled beings, and as chrysanthemums; but the eyes with which you looked at me this morning tell me you have never died.(32) In this prayer, we are, quite simply, all in it together. And, although this new ecological Holocaust -- this creation of planet Auschwitz – is under way, it is not yet final. We have time to step back from the brink, to repair our world. But **only if we see that world not as an other** across an irreducible gap of loneliness and unchosen obligation, but as a part of ourselves as we are part of it, to be redeemed not out of duty, but out of love**; neither for our selves nor for the other, but for us all**.

#### Vote Neg to recognize humanity’s solidarity with nature – this can repair our relationship with both nature and our own being

**Best and Nocella 6** (Associate professor of philosophy at the University of Texas at El Paso, “Igniting a Revolution: Voices in Defense of the Earth”, p. 82-84)

 Yet, for both Heidegger and revolutionary environmentalists, **there exist possibilities for transformation despite the destructiveness of Enframing**. In the midst of technological peril – indeed, precisely because the peril strikes at and thus awakens us to the bond between human and nonhuman life – there emerges a sense of solidarity of human with nonhuman beings. Looking at the well-heeled, bureaucratic discourse of “human resource management” and “personnel resources,” the challenging forth of human beings into standing reserve is fairly evident. Factory-farmed cows, pigs, and chickens obviously have it far worse than people, but in both cases the purpose is to harness resources for maximum efficiency and profit. Ultimately human and nonhuman beings are similarly enframed within one giant “gasoline station.” It is precisely the experience of this solidarity which must be constantly rearticulated – in arts, poetry, ceremony, music, and especially in socioeconomic and political action – in order to provide a historically and ontologically authentic break with the metaphysics of technical control and capitalist exploitation. Action **will only be truly revolutionary if it revolves around engagement in solidarity with nature**, where liberation is always seen both as human liberation from the confines of Enframing and simultaneously as liberation of animal nations and eco-regions from human technics. **Anything less will always lapse back into the false and** oppressive hierarchy of “man” over “nature” and “man” over animals with attendant effects of technological, disciplinary control over humans, nonhumans, and the Earth. Using a familiar title from the anarchist Crimethinc collective, revolutionary environmentalism is truly an instance of “fighting for our lives” where the pronoun refers to all life not just human life. Heidegger describes the possibility of transformation through a return of Being as a re-figured humanism. It is the possibility of suspending the will and attaining a lucid sense of the free play of Being within which all of life emerges and is sustained. A human being, like any entity, *is* – s/he stands forth as present. But “his distinctive feature lies in [the fact] that he, as the being who thinks, is open to Being….Man is essentially this relationship of responding to Being. Such experience is the clearing of a space (symbolically represented, for example, in the building of an arbor for a ceremony or in the awesome silence created by the space within a cathedral or a grove of old-growth Redwoods), and the patient readiness for Being to be brought to language. Given the appropriate bearing and evocation through language, human beings can become aware of dwelling, along with all other existent beings, within Being – the open realm within which entities are “released” into presence (Gelassenhait – or “releasement”). What comes to the fore in suspension of willed manipulation is an embrace of other beings and the enduring process of evolution within which all beings emerge and develop. By reflecting on or experiencing oneself within the dimension of freedom that is the domain through which all beings pass, human beings can repair the willed manipulation **inherent in calculative thinking and realize a patient equanimity toward Life**. It is only in the context of this reawakened sense of the unity of life that revolutionary action gains an authentic basis. It is the engagement with “the Other” that shows the ELF actions are truly about defense of plant and animal life, and they demonstrate genuine liberation concerns that typically are trapped within Enframing. That is to say, ELF (and similar) actions, show themselves as part of a dynamic and necessary historical evolution and transformation process, not merely a gesture of opposition and negation, because of their profound solidarity with animals and the Earth. Such guidance solidarity thus serves as a general basis for a post-Enframing, post-capitalist order, an ecological, not a capitalist society. What will change is, first, the preeminence of Enframing as that which animates the epoch and, correspondingly, our relationship to technology. No longer will technical solutions be sought after in realms of activity where technique is not applicable. No longer will everyday activities be pervaded by the standardization and frenzied pace of technology. **No longer will nature be looked upon as a homogenous field of resources to be extracted and exploited**. No longer will resource-intensive and polluting technologies be utilized simply because they serve the blind interests of corporations over the needs of the Earth. No longer will human beings take from the Earth without thought of the far-reaching consequences of such actions on all present and future forms of life. Critics would wrongly denounce this position as atavistic, primitivist, or anti-science/technology. But as the turning toward the re-emergence of Being unfolds, both through revolutionary action rooted in solidarity with nature and through new, non-exploitative modes of acting in the world, technics will not disappear; instead, the limits of technology as a mode of revealing will begin to be discerned so that new forms and uses of technology can emerge. Questions about technology will center on whether a given technology can be developed and used so that plant and animal life can appear as it is and not be reduced to standing reserve. The question, for Heidegger, is not whether technology, in the sense of a set of tools, is done away with, but whether Enframing is surmounted. It is in this sense of releasement Heidegger writes, “Mortals dwell in that they save the earth….Saving does not only snatch something from a danger. To save really means to set something free intro its own presencing. I take this as the literal equivalent of the masked ALF activist reclaiming a puppy from a research lab so that it can become a dog rather than a unit of research, or an ELF activist who stops the destruction of an aquifer or forest so that it can remain an aquifer or forest rather than become a water or wood resource. It is just this new ethos which must guide a revolutionary reconstruction of society on grounds that preserve the openness to Being and the ability of each kind of being to become what it is in its essence. For those who charge Heidegger with merely recycling, and not transcending, Western anthropocentrism, it is important to note that there are possibilities here for an emerging post-humanism – a new orientation to nature beyond egocentric forms of human agency and **towards interrelation with other beings and Being itself**. Heidegger’s philosophy allows for multiple modes of engagement with others and nature as equals, all of them rooted in a relationship of solidarity, respect, and concern. I call this kind of pluralistic, egalitarian, and ecological outlook ontological anarchism. It begins with the rejection of illegitimate “rule” of metaphysical constructs that have served to justify unlimited technological appropriation of the world. In place of Enframing with its subjectivist metaphysical underpinnings, ontological anarchism proclaims a multiplicity of forms of experience in which a sense of revealing comes to the fore – such as in art, music, religion, and philosophy. One such experience, a pre-dominant theme of spiritual re-awakening in the ELF communiques, is found in Native American philosophy and practice.

### 3

#### Obama will win --- a consensus of polls and forecasts prove.

**Silver**, **9/20**/2012 (Nate, Sept. 19: A Wild Day in the Polls, but Obama Ends Up Ahead, Five Thirty Eight, New York Times, p. <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/20/sept-19-a-wild-day-in-the-polls-but-obama-ends-up-ahead/#h>[])

There are also going to be some outliers — sometimes because of unavoidable statistical variance, sometimes because the polling company has a partisan bias, sometimes because it just doesn’t know what it’s doing. (And sometimes: because of all of the above.) By the end of Wednesday, however, it was clear that the preponderance of the evidence favored Mr. Obama. He got strong polls in Ohio, Florida, Michigan, Wisconsin and Virginia, all from credible pollsters. Mr. Obama, who had been slipping in our forecast recently, rebounded to a 75.2 percent chance of winning the Electoral College, up from 72.9 percent on Tuesday. The most unambiguously bearish sign for Mr. Romney are the poor polls he has been getting in swing states from pollsters that use a thorough methodology and include cellphones in their samples. There have been 16 such polls published in the top 10 tipping point states since the Democratic convention ended, all conducted among likely voters. Mr. Obama has held the lead in all 16 of these polls. With the exception of two polls in Colorado — where Mr. Obama’s polling has been quite middling recently — all put him ahead by at least four points. On average, he led by 5.8 percentage points between these 16 surveys. If this is what the post-convention landscape looks like, then Mr. Romney is in a great deal of trouble. Perhaps these polls imply that Mr. Obama’s lead is somewhere in the range of five percentage points in the popular vote — national polls suggest that it’s a bit less than that, but state polls provide useful information about the national landscape. Or perhaps they imply that Mr. Obama is overperforming slightly in the swing states. Either way, that’s a pretty big deficit for Mr. Romney to overcome. What’s more, Mr. Obama was at 49.4 percent of the vote on average between these 16 surveys, meaning that he’d need to capture only a tiny sliver of the undecided vote to get to an outright majority. (If we’re being technical, 49.4 percent might be sufficient for him to win these states on its own, since perhaps 1 or 2 percent of the vote will go to third-party candidates.) To be clear: I do not recommend that this is the only data you look at. The forecast model also evaluates polls that exclude cellphones, although it gives them slightly less weight. Those have not necessarily shown a great deal of strength for Mr. Obama. And just as the model looks at state polls to infer the national trend, it also does the reverse, using the national polls (and essentially the assumption of ”uniform swing”) to infer where the states stand. The national polls show a spread right now from an effective tie to an eight-point lead for Mr. Obama. Taken as a whole, they seem to imply more like a three or four point lead for Mr. Obama rather than something in the range of five points. (These distinctions really do make a difference, especially with so few undecided voters left.) The other questions, of course, are whether Mr. Obama’s bounce is fading, and if it might fade further. His FiveThirtyEight forecast remains off its high of about an 80 percent chance of victory, that he achieved late last week.

#### Solar is massively unpopular

* Concerns about deficit
* Solyndra has tarnished image

Cardwell, 12 (Diane, “Energy Tax Breaks Proposed, Despite Waning Support for Subsidies”, New York Times, January 26, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/27/business/energy-environment/clean-energy-projects-face-waning-subsidies.html?pagewanted=all)

But the lobbying by the wind and solar industries comes at a time when there is little enthusiasm for alternative-energy subsidies in Washington. **Overall concerns about the deficit** are making lawmakers more skeptical about any new tax breaks for business in general. And taxpayer losses of more than half a billion dollars on Solyndra, a bankrupt maker of solar modules that defaulted on a federal loan, has tarnished the image of renewable power in particular. “Most of the folks I think recognize that this is not a Solyndra effort here,” said Representative David G. Reichert, Republican of Washington, who introduced a bill to extend a renewable tax credit last year. Solyndra was financed under a now-expired program, part of the 2009 stimulus package, that provided government loan guarantees for clean-energy projects, some of which administration officials expected to be risky. The wind and solar companies argue that the tax breaks they are seeking are different. The tax credits can be taken only by businesses that are already up and running, so taxpayers are less likely to be stuck subsidizing a failing company, proponents say. “This is a program that doesn’t pick winners or losers,” said Rhone Resch, president and chief executive of the Solar Energy Industries Association. “It’s hard to argue against a program like this that is creating jobs.” Without the new breaks, industry executives warn, they will be forced to scale back production and eliminate jobs in a still-weak economy. The American division of Iberdrola, a big Spanish producer of wind turbines, is already feeling the impending loss of one tax break that expires this year. “We’ve seen the prospects for new wind farms really fall off,” said Donald Furman, a senior vice president at Iberdrola Renewables, which announced this week that it was laying off 50 employees. “We’re not getting out of the business and we’re not in any financial trouble, but we are doing the prudent thing so that we don’t have issues.” The tax break that Iberdrola and other wind companies rely on, called the production tax credit, has been in place since 1992 but after repeated extensions is now scheduled to expire at the end of 2012. It allows for a credit of 2.2 cents per kilowatt-hour of electricity generated for the first 10 years of a project’s operation, which the industry says is sometimes enough to eliminate the price difference between wind power and fossil fuels. The Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation recently estimated that the production tax credit would cost the government $6.8 billion from 2011 to 2015 for projects in place before the end of this year. The other tax break, which expired at the end of last year and was especially popular with solar companies, allows renewable energy companies to get 30 percent of the cost of a new project back as a cash grant once construction is complete. Without the cash grant program, a company can still take the 30 percent credit, but must spread the benefit over a period of years. The industry says the grant program is more effective because it encourages a broader range of private investors to help finance its projects. As of early this year, the cash-grant program, known as the 1603 program, had awarded $1.76 billion for more than 22,000 solar projects, according to the Treasury Department. Mr. Obama, who has been a steadfast supporter of clean-energy programs, has already begun making a case for new government investment in clean energy projects as a way to foster both energy independence and employment at a time when Capitol Hill evaluates new laws in terms of job creation as well as budget cost or savings. “Because of federal investments, renewable energy use — sources like wind and solar — has nearly doubled,” Mr. Obama said at a stop at Buckley Air Force Base in Aurora, Colo., where he promoted the increasing use of renewable power by the military and repeated a call for Congress to approve the tax credits. “Thousands of Americans have jobs because of those efforts.” Mr. Obama used his trip to press for increased use of liquid natural gas in transportation, appearing at a United Parcel Service center in Las Vegas that received a stimulus grant to support natural gas-fueled trucks. He also said that the Interior Department would open up about 38 million acres in the Gulf of Mexico to gas and oil exploration and development, selling leases in June. The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management estimates drilling there could yield one billion barrels of oil and four trillion cubic feet of natural gas. According to the American Wind Energy Association, wind projects account for more than a third of all the new electric generation installed in recent years, while over the last six years, domestic wind turbine production has grown twelvefold, to more than 400 facilities in 43 states. A recent study by Navigant Consulting found that this year the industry would support 78,000 jobs, but that the number would fall to 41,000 in 2013 without an extension of the production tax credit. Solar, too, is growing quickly in the United States. According to the Solar Energy Industries Association, more solar was installed in the third quarter of 2011 than in all of 2009 combined. A one-year extension of the 1603 tax-grant program would create an additional 37,000 solar industry jobs in 2012, according to a report by EuPD Research. Lobbyists for both industries say the new tax breaks need to be passed quickly and are trying to get Congress to include them in a bill to extend the payroll tax cut. That bill, like all tax cuts these days, has **Congress at loggerheads**. “But true performance-based incentives, where incentives are only provided when actual production occurs, seem to be maintaining their support,” said Robert Gramlich, senior vice president for public policy for the American Wind Energy Association. How this will play out in Congress is anybody’s guess, lawmakers say. Mr. Reichert said the credits were not yet part of the negotiations over the payroll tax cut, which is due to expire at the end of February. Republican leaders may look to revive the Keystone XL oil pipeline — as proposed, the pipeline would run 1,700 miles from oil sands in Canada to refineries on the Gulf Coast — as part of a compromise to approve the renewable energy credits, according to lobbyists and lawmakers involved in the discussions. But there is a lot of ideological opposition to more tax credits, said Senator Jeff Bingaman, Democrat of New Mexico and the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, who supports the extension.

#### Clean energy attacks will swing the election for Romney ---it outweighs other issues.

**LeVine**, 6/13/**2012** (Steve – author of *The Oil and Glory*, How Dirty is Romney Prepared to get to win election, Foreign Policy, p. <http://oilandglory.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/12/how_dirty_is_romney_prepared_to_get_to_win_election>)

Is Barack Obama sufficiently dirty to win re-election? Not according to presumptive Republican nominee Mitt Romney, who says the president is too spic and span. Calculating that clean energy is passé among Americans more concerned about jobs and their own pocketbooks, Romney is gambling that he can tip swing voters his way by embracing dirtier air and water if the tradeoff is more employment and economic growth. Romney's gamble is essentially a bet on the demonstrated disruptive potency of shale gas and shale oil, which over the last year or so have shaken up geopolitics from Russia to the Middle East and China. Now, Romney and the GOP leadership hope they will have the same impact on U.S. domestic politics, and sweep the former Massachusetts governor into the White House with a strong Republican majority in Congress. A flood of new oil and natural gas production in states such as North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas is changing the national and global economies. U.S. oil production is projected to reach 6.3 million barrels a day this year, the highest volume since 1997, the Energy Information Agency reported Tuesday. In a decade or so, U.S. oil supplies could help to shrink OPEC's influence as a global economic force. Meanwhile, a glut of cheap U.S. shale gas has challenged Russia's economic power in Europe and is contributing to a revolution in how the world powers itself. But Romney and the GOP assert that Obama is slowing the larger potential of the deluge, and is not up to the task of turning it into what they say ought to be a gigantic jobs machine. The president's critics say an unfettered fossil fuels industry could produce 1.4 million new jobs by 2030. They believe that American voters won't be too impressed with Obama's argument that he is leading a balanced energy-and-jobs approach that includes renewable fuels and electric cars. The GOP's oil-and-jobs campaign -- in April alone, 81 percent of U.S. political ads attacking Obama were on the subject of energy, according to Kantar Media, a firm that tracks political advertising -- is a risk that could backfire. Americans could decide that they prefer clean energy after all. Or, as half a dozen election analysts and political science professors told me, energy -- even if it seems crucial at this moment in time -- may not be a central election issue by November. Yet if the election is as close as the polls suggest, the energy ads could prove a pivotal factor. "Advertising is generally not decisive. Advertising matters at the margins. ... But ask Al Gore if the margin matters," said Ken Goldstein, president of the Campaign Media Analysis Group at Kantar Media. "This is looking like an election where the margin may matter." Romney is hardly the first major U.S. presidential candidate to embrace Big Oil. The politics of clean go back to Lady Bird Johnson's war on litter and Richard Nixon's embrace of environmentalism. But both presidents Bush came from the oil industry, and former Alaska Gov. Sarah Palin, the last GOP vice presidential nominee, gleefully led chants of "Drill, baby, drill" in 2008. Yet President George W. Bush also famously declared that "America is addicted to oil" in his 2006 State of the Union address, and initiated most of the energy programs for which Obama is currently under fire. And Palin's drumbeat in the end seemed to fall flat. The Republican efforts appear to go beyond any modern campaign in their brash embrace of what is dirty, and their scorn of what is not. And the times seem to favor them. In 2009, the GOP, backed by heavy industry lobbying, knocked back environmentalists on their heels by crushing global warming legislation. Other previously central issues -- Afghanistan, Iraq, health care -- are still debated in the campaign, but not as centrally nor as viscerally as energy, said Frank Maisano, an energy and political analyst at Bracewell & Giuliani, a Houston-based law firm. Obama advisors have said rightly that energy is only one component of a much broader American and global economy, but the GOP appears to have at least partially successfully injected the oil and gas boom as a defining feature of the economic discourse. In a Sunday op-ed in the New York Times entitled "America's New Energy Reality," industry consultant Daniel Yergin remarked that while Obama's 2010 State of the Union address focused on clean-energy jobs, the president pivoted this year to talk as much about oil and natural gas. "His announcement that ‘American oil production is the highest it has been in eight years' turned out to be an applause line," Yergin noted.

#### Obama reelection maintains the US/Russian reset --- Romney will collapse relations

**Weir**, 3/27/**2012** (Fred, Obama asks Russia to cut him slack until reelection, Minnesota Post, p. <http://www.minnpost.com/christian-science-monitor/2012/03/obama-asks-russia-cut-him-slack-until-reelection>)

Russian experts say there's little doubt the Kremlin would like to see Obama re-elected. Official Moscow has been pleased by Obama's policy of "resetting" relations between Russia and the US, which resulted in the new START treaty and other cooperation breakthroughs after years of diplomatic chill while George W. Bush was president. The Russian media often covers Obama's lineup of Republican presidential challengers in tones of horror, and there seems to be a consensus among Russian pundits that a Republican president would put a quick end to the Obama-era thaw in relations. "The Republicans are active critics of Russia, and they are extremely negative toward Putin and his return to the presidency," says Dmitry Babich, a political columnist with the official RIA-Novosti news agency. "Democrats are perceived as more easygoing, more positive toward Russia and Putin." Speaking on the record in Seoul, Mr. Medvedev said the years since Obama came to power "were the best three years in the past decade of Russia-US relations.… I hope this mode of relations will maintain between the Russian Federation and the United States and between the leaders." During Putin's own election campaign, which produced a troubled victory earlier this month, he played heavily on anti-Western themes, including what he described as the US drive to attain "absolute invulnerability" at the expense of everyone else. But many Russian experts say that was mostly election rhetoric, and that in office Putin will seek greater cooperation and normal relations with the West. "Russian society is more anti-American than its leaders are," says Pavel Zolotaryov, deputy director of the official Institute of USA-Canada Studies in Moscow. "Leaders have to take popular moods into account. But it's an objective fact that the US and Russia have more points in common than they have serious differences. If Obama wins the election, it seems likely the reset will continue."

#### US/Russian relations prevent nuclear war

**Elliott**, 5/15/**1995** (Michael, Why Russia Still Matters to America, Newsweek, p. lexis)

"Russia," says Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, "is a big country." That it is; lop off the newly independent states born within the old Soviet husk and you've still got a lot left -- a highly educated work force sitting on top of some of the globe's most valuable resources. True, much of that vast territory has an awful climate (climate matters-for different reasons than Russia's, it explains why Australia will never be a great power). But unlike India and China, two other "giant" states, Russia will be able to husband its vast resources without the additional strain of feeding -- and employing-more than a billion souls. It also, of course, is the only country that can launch a **devastating nuclear attack** on the United States. That kind of power demands respect. And sensitive handling. Stephen Sestanovich, head Russia watcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, argues that present U.S. policy is geared too much to "dismantling Russian military might" -- a policy that, since it breeds Russian resentment of Western meddling, is self-defeating. "We have to reorient Russian power," says Sestanovich, "not eliminate it. Because we can't eliminate it." Indeed, Washington should prefer a strong Russia. A Russia so weak, for example, that it could not resist a Chinese land grab of its Far East **without resorting to nuclear weapons** is a 21st-century nightmare. **All this implies a close U.S. -- Russian relationship** stretching into the future. American officials say it will be a "pragmatic" one, recognizing that Russian and U.S. national interests will sometimes collide. The danger, for the United States, is that a pragmatic relationship could be dominated by security issues. In Western Europe, some futurists say that in the coming decades Russia will talk to the United States about nuclear weapons but to the European Union about everything else-trade, economic development and the rest.

### 4

#### TEXT

#### The 50 states should establish the right to, and devote all necessary resources to make available, public housing that is both cost competitive and of higher livable quality than federally provided housing, including allowing occupants of public housing to install passive solar on state assisted housing.

**States can open state affordable housing**

**Progressive State Network 07**, (public housing lobby, Serves as a leading national voice for state legislators.

Promotes an active democracy and shared economic prosperity.

Embraces our nation’s rich diversity and increased access to opportunity for all.

Protects and enhances transparency, accountability, and stewardship of our public and private institutions.

Supports strategic initiatives, processes, and systems that provide immediate results and long term impact, <http://www.progressivestates.org/files/Housing/PSNHousingStatePolicyOptions.pdf>

Create enforceable “rights” to support the development of affordable homes in areas

where they are needed. States can facilitate the construction of new affordable homes by

creating “rights” to develop these homes in areas where they are needed. Typically, these rights

are given “teeth” by the identification of an enforcement agency or state court that hears

expedited appeals from developers whose proposals to build affordable homes have been denied.

The enforcement agency has the authority to override local regulations in municipalities that fail

to comply with state requirements. When the enforcement process is initiated by developers

seeking to build affordable homes, it is sometimes referred to as the “builder’s remedy.”

Individuals in need of affordable housing or advocacy groups that represent such individuals also

could be granted standing to enforce these rights, but this is less common. In general, the burden

of proof in these appeals is shifted to the municipality, which must justify the decision to deny

approval.

### Solvency

#### -- Evaluate consequences – allowing violence for the sake of moral purity is evil

Isaac 2 (Jeffrey C., Professor of Political Science – Indiana-Bloomington, Director – Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life, Ph.D. – Yale, Dissent Magazine, 49(2), “Ends, Means, and Politics”, Spring, Proquest)

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

#### -- Governments must weigh consequences

Harries 94 (Owen, Editor and Founder – National Interest and Senior Fellow – Centre for Independent Studies, “Power and Civilization”, The National Interest, Spring, Lexis)

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

#### -- Extinction mandates consequentialism

Bok 88 (Sissela, Professor of Philosophy – Brandeis College, Applied Ethics and Ethical Theory, Ed. Rosenthal and Shehadi, p. 202-203)

The same argument can be made for Kant’s other formulations of the Categorical Imperative: “So act as to use humanity, both in your own person and in the person of every other, always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means”; and “So act as if you were always through actions a law-making member in a universal Kingdom of Ends.” No one with a concern for humanity could consistently will to risk eliminating humanity in the person of himself and every other or to risk the death of all members in a universal Kingdom of Ends for the sake of justice. To risk their collective death for the sake of following one’s conscience would be, as Rawls said, “irrational, crazy.” And to say that one did not intend such a catastrophe, but that one merely failed to stop other persons from bringing it about would be beside the point when the end of the world was at stake.For although it is true that we cannot be held responsible for most of the wrongs that others commit, the Latin maxim presents a case where we would have to take such a responsibility seriously—perhaps to the point of deceiving, bribing, even killing an innocent person, in order that the world not perish.

#### Problem isn't investment – resource production for solar is impossible

EC 12 -- European Commission, DG Environment News Alert Service, edited by SCU, The University of the West of England, Bristol (1/26/12, "Photovoltaic supply falls short of solar power targets," http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/research/newsalert/pdf/271na7.pdf)

Europe could struggle to meet the target set by the renewable energy sector of 25 per cent of electricity produced by solar energy by 2040 because the supply of materials, including rare metals, needed to produce photovoltaics (PV) is unlikely to meet demand. Production rates need to be drastically improved, according to a new study. Calculations based on available appropriate land, global irradiance and conversions of solar energy to electricity demonstrate that technically, solar energy could provide 7.5 to 9 times the expected electricity demand in 2050. However, several PV technologies employ rare metals, which could limit the capacity for electricity generation. The new study looked at whether current global production of rare metals could support the huge increase in solar panels generation required to meet ambitious energy targets for 2040 laid out by the European Renewable Energy Council (EREC). The scientists looked at the four main PV technologies: crystalline silicon (c-Si), amorphous silicon (a-Si), cadmium tellurium (CdTe) and copper indium gallium diselenide (CIGS). The scientists assumed that by 2040, each technology would have an equal market share of 25 per cent. This reflects the fact that although c-Si currently has the largest share (81 per cent), a shift is already taking place towards the other technologies, which require a thinner layer of PV material. They simulated a 'neutral' future scenario, where moderate technological developments gradually improve the efficiency of electricity generation, in line with current policy expectations. The results showed that the maximum demand for gallium and indium in tonnes per year for use in CIGS technology surpasses current production (2008) by a factor of 7.3 and 2.8, respectively. Even under an 'optimistic' future scenario, in which more ambitious technological advances in cell efficiency require less PV material, demand still outstrips current supply by a factor of 3.9 and 1.5, respectively. Neither cadmium nor copper were found to be seriously limiting, even when the scientists simulated a 'pessimistic' scenario in which technological advances do not meet current expectations. However, the predicted demand for tellurium was found to be 30-180 times higher than today's production rate, depending on the scenario used. Although silicon is the second most abundant element in the earth.s crust, only very high purity silicon is used in the solar industry and production will need to increase by 15 times to meet demand in the neutral scenario and by 10 times in the optimistic scenario. Even bigger shortages may result from competition with the electronics industry, which also uses high-purity silicon. On the other hand, amorphous silicon technology represents the only realistic option for large-scale electricity production since the cumulative demand by 2040 would equal just 20 per cent of production. The research shows that reaching solar power targets for 2040 will not necessarily be limited by known global reserves of silicon and rare metals, but that current production rates will be the limiting factor. Better refining techniques, increased exploitation of deposits and strategic planning of technological shifts are needed to satisfy the demand for PV materials. This poses a challenge as tellurium, indium, gallium, selenium and cadmium are by-products of other processes and are not currently mined separately. New production methods are also likely to take up to 10 years to develop and so research should be initiated soon to meet the anticipated demand.

#### Increased solar adoption causes utilities to reject net metering – makes solar development impossible

Martin 9/12 -- reporter for Bloomberg News (Christopher, 2012, "U.S. Solar Industry Bracing for Utility Backlash Over Metering,"

Utilities are required to purchase electricity generated by solar panels installed on consumers’ homes under so-called net- metering policies, an arrangement that may become less viable as solar systems become more common, said Rhone Resch, chief executive officer of the Washington-based trade group. California, the largest solar market, capped the amount of panels utilities are required to connect to their grids and other states are considering similar policies. Some utilities see the requirement to buy solar power from every rooftop system as a threat to their profitability, Resch said. “Net metering works for us now, but we’re going to see a backlash from utilities as solar penetration increases over the next few years,” Resch said today in an interview at the Solar Power International conference in Orlando, Florida. California regulators capped the amount of rooftop solar that may be connected to the grid at 5 percent of a utility’s power needs, and is studying the long-term impact upon their profits. Other states may consider similar actions, said Tony Clifford, chief executive officer of Standard Solar Inc., a closely held developer based in Rockville, Maryland. “I’m really concerned about a utility pushback on net- metering,” Clifford said in an interview. “What we need is an honest assessment of the true costs and benefits of managing distributed generation and I don’t think we’ve seen that yet.” Utilities are considering ways to offset the cost of buying solar, including Sempra Energy (SRE)’s San Diego Gas & Electric, which proposed a fee for residential solar customers, said Aaron Hall, president of the San Diego-based developer Borrego Solar Systems Inc. Regulars blocked the proposal in January. “That would have made almost every installation lose money and prevent new projects from getting financing,” Hall said.

#### -- Utility maximizes value to life and precludes zeroing anyone out

Dworkin 77 (Ronald, Professor of Law and Philosophy – New York University, Taking Rights Seriously, p. 274-275)

Utilitarian arguments of policy, however, would seem secure from that objection. They do not suppose that any form of life is inherently more valuable than any other, but instead base their claim, that constraints on liberty are necessary to advance some collective goal of the community, just on the fact that that goal happens to be desired more widely or more deeply than any other. Utilitarian arguments of policy, therefore, seem not to oppose but on the contrary to embody the **fundamental right** of equal concern and respect, because they treat the wishes of each member of the community on a par with the wishes of any other, with no bonus or discount reflecting the view that the member is more or less worthy of concern, or his views more or less worthy of respect, than any other.

#### Life always has value

1. For Aaron Swanlek it’s good grades, cats doing dumb things, and beer
2. For me it’s horses, material comforts, and swon dancing gangam style

#### -- Calculations stop the zero-point by increasing diversity and social limitation. Rejecting it increases violence and exclusion

Williams 5 (Michael, Professor of International Politics – University of Wales-Aberystwyth, The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations, p. 165-166)

Yet it is my claim that the willful Realist tradition does not lack an understanding of the contingency of practice or a vision of responsibility to otherness. On the contrary, its strategy of objectification is precisely an attempt to bring together a responsibility to otherness and a responsibility to act within a willfully liberal vision. The construction of a realm of objectivity and calculation is not just a consequence of a need to act — the framing of an epistemic context for successful calculation. It is a form of responsibility to otherness, an attempt to allow for diversity and irreconcilability precisely by — at least initially — reducing the self and the other to a structure of material calculation in order to allow a structure of mutual intelligibility, mediation, and stability. It is, in short, a strategy of limitation: a willful attempt to construct a subject and a social world limited — both epistemically and politically — in the name of a politics of toleration: a liberal strategy that John Gray has recently characterised as one of modus vivendi. If this is the case, then the deconstructive move that gains some of its weight by contrasting itself to a non- or apolitical objectivism must engage with the more complex contrast to a sceptical Realist tradition that is itself a constructed, ethical practice. This issue becomes even more acute if one considers Iver Neumann’s incisive questions concerning postmodern constructions of identity. action, and responsibility. As Neumann points out, the insight that identities are inescapably contingent and relationally constructed, and even the claim that identities are inescapably indebted to otherness, do not in themselves provide a foundation for practice, particularly in situations where identities are ‘sedimented’ and conflictually defined. In these cases, deconstruction alone will not suffice unless it can demonstrate a capacity to counter in practice (and not just in philosophic practice) the essentialist dynamics it confronts. Here, a responsibility to act must go beyond deconstruction to consider viable alternatives and counter-practices. To take this critique seriously is not necessarily to be subject yet again to the straightforward ‘blackmail of the Enlightenment’ and a narrow ‘modernist’ vision of responsibility.85 While an unwillingness to move beyond a deconstructive ethic of responsibility to otherness for fear that an essentialist stance is the only (or most likely) alternative expresses a legitimate concern, it should not license a retreat from such questions or their practical demands. Rather, such situations demand also an evaluation of the structures (of identity and institutions) that might viably be mobilised in order to offset the worst implications of violently exclusionary identities. It requires, as Neumann nicely puts it, the generation of compelling ‘as if’ stories around which counter-subjectivities and political practices can coalesce. Wilful Realism, I submit, arises out of an appreciation of these issues, and comprises an attempt to craft precisely such ‘stories’ within a broader intellectual and sociological analysis of their conditions of production, possibilities of success, and likely consequences. The question is, to what extent are these limits capable of success, and to what extent might they be limits upon their own aspirations toward responsibility? These are crucial questions, but they will not be addressed by retreating yet again into further reversals of the same old dichotomies.

#### This maximizes value to life

Winslow 82 (Gerald**,** Professor of Christian Ethics – Loma Linda University, Triage and Justice, p. 83)

If this method seems cold and impersonal, Fletcher reminds us that ethics is for the ‘tough-minded.’ Besides, he contends, it is a mistake to think of such utilitarian decisions as diminishing a high regard for the life of each individual. ‘It is not discounting the life of the individual, but balancing the interest of one individual against the interest of other INDIVIDUALS.’

#### Electricity prices are low and will likely decline now – gas boom, energy efficiency, reduced demand

**Burtraw 8/21/12** (one of the nation’s foremost experts on environmental regulation in the electricity sector. “Falling Emissions and Falling Prices: Expectations for the Domestic Natural Gas Boom” http://common-resources.org/2012/falling-emissions-and-falling-prices-expectations-for-the-domestic-natural-gas-boom/)

Moreover, the boom in domestic natural gas production could have even more immediate affects for U.S. electricity consumers. The increased supply of gas is expected to lower natural gas prices and retail electricity prices over the next 20 years, according to a [new RFF Issue Brief](http://www.rff.org/Publications/Pages/PublicationDetails.aspx?PublicationID=22019). These price decreases are expected to be even larger if demand for electricity continues on a slow-growth trajectory brought on by the economic downturn and the increased use of energy efficiency.For example, RFF analysis found that delivered natural gas prices would have been almost 35% higher in 2020 if natural gas supply projections had matched the lower estimates released by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) in 2009. Instead, with an increased gas supply, consumers can expect to pay $4.9 per MMBtu for delivered natural gas in 2020 instead of $6.6 per MMBtu. These trends are even more exaggerated if demand for electricity were to increase to levels projected by the EIA just three years ago, in 2009.This decrease in natural gas prices is expected to translate into a decrease in retail electricity prices for most electricity customers in most years out to 2020. Compared to the world with the lower gas supply projections, average national electricity prices are expected to be almost 6% lower, falling from 9.25 cents to 8.75 cents per kilowatt-hour in 2020. Residential, commercial, and industrial customers are all expected to see a price decrease, with the largest price changes occurring in parts of the country that have competitive electricity markets. All of these prices decreases translate into real savings for most electricity customers. The savings are largest for commercial customers, who stand to save $33.9 Billion (real $2009) under the new gas supply projections in 2020. Residential customers also stand to save big, with estimates of $25.8 Billion (real $2009) in savings projected for 2020.

### Justice Adv

#### Renewable energy increases electricity prices – solar is FIVE TIMES more expensive than conventionally produced energy

Zycher 1/17/12 (Benjamin, Visiting Scholar specializing in energy policy @ AEI, "Wind and solar power, part I: uncooperative reality," http://www.aei.org/outlook/energy-and-the-environment/alternative-energy/wind-and-solar-power-part-i-uncooperative-reality/)

The EIA estimates wind (onshore) and solar costs in 2016 at about $149 and $257–396 per mWh, respectively; if we add the rough estimate for backup costs, the total is about $517 for wind and $625–764 for solar generation.13 The EIA estimates for gas- or coal-fired generation are about $80–110 per mWh. Accordingly, the projected cost of renewable power in 2016, including the cost of backup capacity, is at least five times higher than that for conventional electricity. At the same time, outages of wind capacity because of weak wind conditions are much more likely to be correlated geographically than outages of conventional plants, and the same is true for solar electric generation because of the geographic concentrations of thermal solar sites and photovoltaic systems.

The higher cost of electricity generated with renewable energy sources is only one side of the competitiveness question; the other is the value of that generation, as not all electricity is created equal. In particular, power produced at periods of peak demand is more valuable than off-peak generation. In this context, wind generation, in particular, is problematic because, in general, winds tend to blow at night and in the winter, which corresponds inversely to peak energy demand during daylight hours and in the summer.

#### Low electricity prices spurs manufacturing "reshoring" and sparks US economic growth via consumer spending and investment

Perry 7/31/12 (Mark, Prof of Economics @ Univ. of Michigan, "America's Energy Jackpot: Industrial Natural Gas Prices Fall to the Lowest Level in Recent History," http://mjperry.blogspot.com/2012/07/americas-energy-jackpot-industrial.html)

Building petrochemical plants could suddenly become attractive in the United States. Manufacturers will "reshore" production to take advantage of low natural gas and electricity prices. Energy costs will be lower for a long time, giving a competitive advantage to companies that invest in America, and also helping American consumers who get hit hard when energy prices spike.¶ After years of bad economic news, the natural gas windfall is very good news. Let's make the most of it." ¶ The falling natural gas prices also make the predictions in this December 2011 study by PriceWaterhouseCoopers, "Shale gas: A renaissance in US manufacturing?"all the more likely: ¶ U.S. manufacturing companies (chemicals, metals and industrial) could employ approximately one million more workers by 2025 because of abundant, low-priced natural gas.¶ Lower feedstock and energy cost could help U.S. manufacturers reduce natural gas expenses by as much as $11.6 billion annually through 2025.¶ MP: As I have emphasized lately, America's ongoing shale-based energy revolution is one of the real bright spots in an otherwise somewhat gloomy economy, and provides one of the best reasons to be bullish about America's future. The shale revolution is creating thousands of well-paying, shovel-ready jobs in Texas, North Dakota and Ohio, and thousands of indirect jobs in industries that support the shale boom (sand, drilling equipment, transportation, infrastructure, steel pipe, restaurants, etc.). In addition, the abundant shale gas is driving down energy prices for industrial, commercial, residential and electricity-generating users, which frees up billions of dollars that can be spent on other goods and services throughout the economy, providing an energy-based stimulus to the economy. ¶ Cheap natural gas is also translating into cheaper electricity rates, as low-cost natural gas displaces coal. Further, cheap and abundant natural gas is sparking a manufacturing renaissance in energy-intensive industries like chemicals, fertilizers, and steel. And unlike renewable energies like solar and wind, the natural gas boom is happening without any taxpayer-funded grants, subsidies, credits and loans. Finally, we get an environmental bonus of lower CO2 emissions as natural gas replaces coal for electricity generation. Sure seems like a win, win, win, win situation to me.

#### Turns case - Hits poor the worst - Higher electricity prices exacerbates poverty – low-income households have less capacity to reduce energy demand

Chester and Morris 8/20/12 (Lynne and Alan, Professors of Political Economy and Social Sciences @ University of Sydney and University of New South Wales, "'Energy poverty' a growing problem," http://phys.org/news/2012-08-energy-poverty-problem.html)

"Low-income households are the most vulnerable to this kind of poverty because their energy bills take a larger proportion of their disposable income," Dr Chester said. In the five-year period from 2007 to 2012 the average increase in household electricity prices was 80 percent in NSW, more than 60 percent in Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania; and 38 to 45 percent in Northern Territory and the ACT. Further increases recently occurred in NSW, Victoria and Queensland. Across the globe, the liberalisation of electricity sectors has resulted in increased consumer electricity prices that are far in excess of inflation and wage increases. Many disadvantaged households are experiencing discomfort and ill health as well as other forms of material and social deprivation because of the need to choose between essential household items and using electricity to maintain a decent standard of living. Electricity and gas bills have been found, for example, to be the greatest cause of rental arrears in Victorian low-income households. Yet the authors warn there is no large-scale Australian research to provide a substantial evidence base of the consequences for low-income households and that policymakers rely on measures that significantly underestimate electricity price changes. There is consequently little understanding of the pressures and circumstances confronting the poorest Australian households. The paper calls for this to be addressed from a policy perspective in order to prevent the problem becoming more widespread. "Energy poverty needs to be explicitly recognised as a distinct and growing social problem for Australia's 3.5 million households, who fall in the two lowest-income quintiles as defined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics." "Steep increases in electricity prices will cause hardship for low-income households because they have far less capacity to reduce their energy demand."

#### Manufacturing strength is key to both the economy and military power

Ettlinger and Gordon 11 (Michael and Kate, the Vice President for Economic Policy at the Center for American Progress, former director of the Economic Analysis and Research Network of the Economic Policy Institute and Vice President for Energy Policy at the Center for American Progress. Most recently, Kate was the co-director of the national Apollo Alliance, where she still serves as senior policy advisor. Former senior associate at the Center on Wisconsin Strategy, "The Importance and Promise of American Manufacturing" [http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf-)](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf-%29)

Manufacturing is critically important to the American economy. For generations, the strength of our country rested on the power of our factory floors—both the machines and the men and women who worked them. We need manufacturing to continue to be a bedrock of strength for generations to come. Manufacturing is woven into the structure of our economy: Its importance goes far beyond what happens behind the factory gates. The strength or weakness of American manufacturing carries implications for the entire economy, our national security, and the well-being of all Americans. Manufacturing today accounts for 12 percent of the U.S. economy and about 11 percent of the private-sector workforce. But its significance is even greater than these numbers would suggest. The direct impact of manufacturing is only a part of the picture. First, jobs in the manufacturing sector are good middle-class jobs for millions of Americans. Those jobs serve an important role, offering economic opportunity to hard-working, middle-skill workers. This creates upward mobility and broadens and strengthens the middle class to the benefit of the entire economy. What’s more, U.S.-based manufacturing underpins a broad range of jobs that are quite different from the usual image of manufacturing. These are higher-skill service jobs that include the accountants, bankers, and lawyers that are associated with any industry, as well as a broad range of other jobs including basic research and technology development, product and process engineering and design, operations and maintenance, transportation, testing, and lab work. Many of these jobs are critical to American technology and innovation leadership. The problem today is this: Many multinational corporations may for a period keep these higher-skill jobs here at home while they move basic manufacturing elsewhere in response to other countries’ subsidies, the search for cheaper labor costs, and the desire for more direct access to overseas markets, but eventually many of these service jobs will follow. When the basic manufacturing leaves, the feedback loop from the manufacturing floor to the rest of a manufacturing operation—a critical element in the innovative process—is eventually broken. To maintain that feedback loop, companies need to move higher-skill jobs to where they do their manufacturing. And with those jobs goes American leadership in technology and innovation. This is why having a critical mass of both manufacturing and associated service jobs in the United States matters. The "industrial commons" that comes from the crossfertilization and engagement of a community of experts in industry, academia, and government is vital to our nation’s economic competitiveness. Manufacturing also is important for the nation’s economic stability. The experience of the Great Recession exemplifies this point. Although manufacturing plunged in 2008 and early 2009 along with the rest of the economy, it is on the rebound today while other key economic sectors, such as construction, still languish. § Marked 18:55 § Diversity in the economy is important—and manufacturing is a particularly important part of the mix. Although manufacturing is certainly affected by broader economic events, the sector’s internal diversity—supplying consumer goods as well as industrial goods, serving both domestic and external markets— gives it great potential resiliency. Finally, supplying our own needs through a strong domestic manufacturing sector protects us from international economic and political disruptions. This is most obviously important in the realm of national security, even narrowly defined as matters related to military strength, where the risk of a weak manufacturing capability is obvious. But overreliance on imports and substantial manufacturing trade deficits weaken us in many ways, making us vulnerable to everything from exchange rate fluctuations to trade embargoes to natural disasters.

#### Econ decline risks extinction

Auslin 9 (Michael, Resident Scholar – American Enterprise Institute, and Desmond Lachman – Resident Fellow – American Enterprise Institute, “The Global Economy Unravels”, Forbes, 3-6, http://www.aei.org/article/100187)

What do these trends mean in the short and medium term? The Great Depression showed how social and global chaos followed hard on economic collapse. The mere fact that parliaments across the globe, from America to Japan, are unable to make responsible, economically sound recovery plans suggests that they do not know what to do and are simply hoping for the least disruption. Equally worrisome is the adoption of more statist economic programs around the globe, and the concurrent decline of trust in free-market systems. The threat of instability is a pressing concern. China, until last year the world's fastest growing economy, just reported that 20 million migrant laborers lost their jobs. Even in the flush times of recent years, China faced upward of 70,000 labor uprisings a year. A sustained downturn poses grave and possibly immediate threats to Chinese internal stability. The regime in Beijing may be faced with a choice of repressing its own people or diverting their energies outward, leading to conflict with China's neighbors. Russia, an oil state completely dependent on energy sales, has had to put down riots in its Far East as well as in downtown Moscow. Vladimir Putin's rule has been predicated on squeezing civil liberties while providing economic largesse. If that devil's bargain falls apart, then wide-scale repression inside Russia, along with a continuing threatening posture toward Russia's neighbors, is likely. Even apparently stable societies face increasing risk and the threat of internal or possibly external conflict. As Japan's exports have plummeted by nearly 50%, one-third of the country's prefectures have passed emergency economic stabilization plans. Hundreds of thousands of temporary employees hired during the first part of this decade are being laid off. Spain's unemployment rate is expected to climb to nearly 20% by the end of 2010; Spanish unions are already protesting the lack of jobs, and the specter of violence, as occurred in the 1980s, is haunting the country. Meanwhile, in Greece, workers have already taken to the streets. Europe as a whole will face dangerously increasing tensions between native citizens and immigrants, largely from poorer Muslim nations, who have increased the labor pool in the past several decades. Spain has absorbed five million immigrants since 1999, while nearly 9% of Germany's residents have foreign citizenship, including almost 2 million Turks. The xenophobic labor strikes in the U.K. do not bode well for the rest of Europe. A prolonged global downturn, let alone a collapse, would dramatically raise tensions inside these countries. Couple that with possible protectionist legislation in the United States, unresolved ethnic and territorial disputes in all regions of the globe and a loss of confidence that world leaders actually know what they are doing. The result may be a series of small explosions that coalesce into a big bang.

#### -- “Value to life” impact is trash –

A) Always exists – many things make living valuable – people can enjoy life even if slaves

B) “Denying” value isn’t the same as no value – incremental reduction isn’t total

C) Existence is a pre-requisite – have to be alive to value it – so the case impact of extinction turns this

#### Rare earth shortages threaten renewables – Europe proves

Spence 11 -- independent journalist (Timothy, 11/16/11, "Rare-earth shortage to hamper clean energy: EU study," http://www.euractiv.com/sustainability/rare-earth-shortage-hamper-clean-news-508967)

Looming shortages of metals that are in high demand and dominated by a single supplier – China – threaten Europe’s goals for cleaner transport and sustainable energy, says a new study prepared for the European Commission. The study by the Joint Research Centre says supply shortfalls of component metals in the next two decades risk the production of solar, wind and nuclear technologies as well as electric vehicles and carbon-capture systems. “This adds more evidence to the fact that Europe has to look within itself … and more toward waste management, to re-use existing metals,” said Dr. Raymond Moss, lead author of the report. The findings could have serious implications for the EU’s “Roadmap for moving to a low-carbon economy in 2050” that hinges on development of renewable energy, cleaner transport as well as modernising and integrating Europe’s electricity grids. Such ambitions depend heavily on the availability of neodymium, dysprosium, indium, tellurium and gallium, metals that are in demand globally. EU’s vital raw materials The Commission has already identified many so-called rare-earth minerals as well as metals like cobalt in its lists of 14 economically vital raw materials that are prone to supply disruption. The JRC study is part of the Commission’s examination of raw material needs. Europe depends on imports for nearly all of its rare-earth metals. Though many are in abundant supply on the planet, the metals are dispersed or difficult to access, and despite their importance to green energy, require intensive mining and processing. China controls more than 90% of the market. In July, the World Trade Organisation called on China to ease its export restrictions on 17 rare-earth metals important to energy, transport and electronics manufacturing. Shortages or limitations on supply would have serious impact on many industries. But with solar and wind power expected to account for the biggest energy growth markets over the next 20 years, the impact on alternative energy could be profound. The JRC report says five metals - dysprosium, neodymium, tellurium, gallium, and indium - are at the highest risk of supply “bottlenecks” from high demand, concentration of supply and “high political risks due to an extreme concentration of supply in China.” The study examines 14 rare-earth metals. Solar energy technologies, for example, will require half the current world supply of tellurium and 25% of the supply of indium, the report says. Europe’s wind energy technology will require about 4% of the supply of both neodymium and dysprosium. “While the percent might be small, it could have a significant effect on wind technology,” Moss told EurActiv. The concern, he said is that “90 percent of the source is in China at the moment, and they themselves have a rapidly growing demand for the same metals whilst they have also limited restrictions on export.”

#### Utilitarianism produces equality – extreme examples don’t apply

Harsanyi 82 (John, Professor of Economics – University of California, Berkeley, Utilitarianism and Beyond, Ed. Sen and Williams, p. 26-27)

Some further notes on this suggestion will be in place here. First, it is sometimes alleged that justice has to be at odds with utility. But if we ask how we are to be just between the competing interests of different people, it seems hard to give any other answer than it is by giving equal weight, impartially to the interests of everybody. And this is precisely what yields the utility principle. It does not necessarily yield equality in the resulting distribution. There are certainly very good utilitarian reasons for seeking equality in distribution too; but justice is something distinct. The utilitarian is sometimes said to be indifferent between equal and unequal distributions provided that total utility is equal. This is so; but it conceals two important utilitarian grounds for a fairly high degree of actual goods (tempered, of course, as in most systems including Rawls’s by various advantages that are secured by moderate inequalities). The second is that inequalities tend to produce, at any rate in educated societies, envy hatred and malice whose disutility needs no emphasizing. I am convinced that when these two factors are taken into account, utilitarians have no need to fear the accusation that they could favor extreme inequalities of distribution in actual modern societies. Fantastic hypothetical cases can no doubt be invented in which they would have to favor them; but as, as we shall see, this is an illegitimate form of argument.

## 2NC vs George Washington BS

### 2NC - Solvency

#### CP solves 100% of the case and the external net benefit –

#### Extend the Zaidi evidence which indicates the states have authority within

#### Only the CP solves – it encourages energy innovation that moves past federal gridlock and solves sustainable development

Bryner 2 (Gary C. - Professor, Department of Political Science, Brigham Young University, and Research Associate, Natural Resources Law Center. University of Colorado School of Law., “ARTICLE: Policy Devolution and Environmental Law: Exploring the Transition to Sustainable Development”, Fall, 26 Environs Envtl. L. & Pol'y J. 1, lexis)

The United States, and Congress in particular, has not embraced the idea of sustainable development more aggressively because policy makers are still mired in the debates started three decades ago about how to improve the existing scheme of environmental law and regulation, and the enduring American conflict over the size and scope of the Federal government. Criticism of the EPA has been widespread among the Republican leaders of Congress. House Republican leaders such as former Speaker Newt Gingrich (Ga) and Majority Whip Tom DeLay (Tx) regularly railed against the EPA and environmental regulation as they took control of the Congress in 1995 and sought to roll back the provisions of many environmental laws. n68 The debate since then has progressed little. **Congress continues to debate energy**, transportation, and other environmental issues **with little commitment** to the idea of sustainable development, stewardship over natural resources, and U.S. responsibility for solving the environmental problems to which it is a major contributor. Energy bills passed by the House in 2001 and the Senate in 2002, for example, were largely efforts to subsidize and encourage the development of new energy sources, with **only relatively little attention aimed at** moving energy production and consumption **to more sustainable patterns.** n69 The political conflict over environmental law and regulation has been so divisive and time consuming that it has precluded the nation from moving toward the next generation of environmental laws that would incorporate the idea of sustainable development. n70 Rather than make regulatory programs more effective, the Bush administration and Republicans in Congress continue the decades-old debate over how to reduce the costs of complying with them by changing the process by which agencies issue regulations, the criteria by which they assess risks and balance costs and benefits, and the role of private property rights. It [\*29] is difficult to move to a more ambitious agenda of sustainable development when regulatory relief is the primary environmental policy goal. Sustainable development, like any other major policy commitment, ultimately requires the support of Congress and strong, effective legislation, and the greatest failure to engage in the idea of sustainable development has been here. Leaders of both parties in Congress have virtually ignored the idea of sustainable development and the United States' commitments made at the Rio Earth Summit. For them, sustainable development is simply a problem for other countries to worry about. n71 The hostility of the Bush administration and many congressional leaders have to international commitments, along with their opposition to environmental regulation, combine to create a major barrier to pursuing the idea of sustainable development in the United States. Congress continues to debate the question of whether there should be more or less environmental regulation. Rather than asking more fundamental questions about how to balance and integrate economic growth and ecological sustainability, policy makers are mired in efforts to defend or attack the regulatory system that has been in place since the 1970s. As a result, there is no strong commitment to sustainable development, and the nation is far from having in place a strategy that integrates sustainability into environmental, social, and economic activities. n72 State and local governments play a critical role in that strategy in engaging citizens and industry in transforming economic activity. There is strong support for policy devolution from political theories that emphasize participation and civic engagement. Communitarians, for example, have criticized the political expectations underlying the dominant model of regulation and the broader contemporary liberalism of which it is a part because it does not take into account the "moral and political obligations that we commonly recognize, even prize." n73 Liberal individualism fails to recognize and encourage the political obligations people have to each other, fails to see people as "mutually indebted and morally engaged" because "strong notions of community or membership" are a threat to the priority given to individual rights. Liberalism, communitarian critics argue, cannot "secure the liberty it promises, because it cannot sustain the kind of political community and civic engagement that liberty requires." n74 Liberalism provides a weak basis for environmental law because of its impoverished sense of responsibility: [\*30] Our "legal and political vocabularies deal handily with rights-bearing individuals" but seem unable to deal effectively with environmental degradation. n75 Liberalism "impedes creative long-range thinking about our most pressing public problems." n76 Its intertwining with capitalism and the constant drive for expansion, growth, and consumption, critics argue, doom it when it must deal with scarcity, limits, and pollution. n77 Liberalism has been an attractive alternative to socialism and conservatism because it promises unlimited growth, individual freedom, and unconstrained consumption. But those assumptions and values are no longer tenable in light of pollution, environmental damage, and loss of biodiversity and natural resources, and must be replaced, critics argue, with alternative forms of governance that liberate human potential and preserve the biosphere, rather than simply pursue economic growth. n78Central to communitarianism is a fundamental revolution in the idea of public participation. Public involvement in the New Deal model of policy making is limited and constrained. Public hearing and comment periods are provided so citizens can voice their support for or opposition to policy options government agencies are considering or specific proposals they have decided on. But agencies are not required to take these comments into account in making decisions, and the decisions about what alternatives to put on the policy agenda, the selection of the alternative to be pursued, and how policies will be implemented are not negotiated with citizens but decided for them. In contrast, communitarianism engages the public directly in policy formulation, and those policies are a result of an open political process rather than one tightly managed by technocrats or political elites. Real public participation empowers people to make tradeoffs, set priorities, and determine the public interest as they govern themselves. Other proponents of strong democracy emphasize the interaction of environmental and other public problems and the role of citizen participation in remedying them. Insensitivity to ecological constraints and efforts to dominate and exploit nature are intertwined with efforts by humans to dominate and exploit each other. Social domination and hierarchies are barriers to ecological health and preservation. The state itself is a barrier to an ecological society because of its hierarchical, anti-participatory nature, and must be abolished and replaced with human-scaled communities which free them to find technological and behavioral solutions to environmental problems. When individuals are liberated from [\*31] the artificial structures that constrain them, they will be free to learn how to live in harmony with nature. n79 The solution to environmental problems often requires changes in behavior by all members of a community. People are more likely to comply with decisions and agreements they have played a role in formulating. Those who have information and the power to affect decisions will participate in policy making and their participation gives them ownership in the commitments made. People affected by decisions that balance expenditures on pollution control or limits on economic development with other values become responsible themselves for weighing those competing concerns and making the trade-offs, rather than having them imposed by others. n80 Solving environmental problems and building democratic capacity are intertwined. Promoting democratic participation and decision making are just as important as resolving the environmental challenges. Because the environmental and public health stakes are often so high, there is a great incentive to participate and to build democratic decision making capacity. The agenda is much broader than reducing pollution, but reaches into other areas of public concern in empowering people to solve problems and pursue values such as of justice, fairness, and equity, while also enhancing their freedom and ability to govern themselves. n81 Proponents of "strong democracy" argue that citizens and political officials must engage in a public dialogue. Rather than discussions with the public over a few, highly contentious issues such as the citing of hazardous waste facilities, the public plays a central role in the broad range of public issues and determine for themselves where the public interest lies. The role of the political community is to transform self-interested individuals into citizens who also seek public goods. Democratic discourse is essential, where conflicts are resolved through public discussions and decision-making. Forums must be created to provide information and to provide access to scientific and technical information so that citizens can challenge claims made by different participants, to ensure that citizens determine policy outcomes and are not limited to just expressing their views, and to provide continual, enduring opportunities to revise decisions as new information is developed and circumstances change. Public participation not only produces remedies to public problems but also builds democratic capacity and self-governance. n82 [\*32] V. CONCLUSION The idea of sustainable development makes a persuasive case, rooted in empirical observations as well as theoretical arguments, that environmental regulatory process needs to engage more effectively the public and industry in pursuing environmental goals. Giving states increased authority and responsibility to fashion regulatory programs and encourage innovation and experimentation **is an essential element of the rethinking of regulation that is taking place that** **is central in the transition to policies that are firmly embedded in the idea of sustainability.** One of the central questions in environmental policy making is whether the changes that will be required in order to preserve the biosphere and use natural resources sustainably can occur through traditional legal approaches, policy-making models, and ways of thinking, or whether these changes require new paradigms, approaches, and political structures. Some argue that current legal and political conceptual frameworks are sufficient and incremental changes can produce the kinds of adjustments necessary. But incrementalism assumes that ecological change and the evolution of ecological risks are linear and that change is sufficiently slow and that gradual policy adjustment and accommodation are sufficient. A major challenge to begin now to pursue incremental changes, learn from our experience and make mid-course adjustments, keep moving in the direction of sustainability, and build our capacity to make more effective policies, so that as political demands create the will to pursue changes, we are in position to embrace more ambitious policies that will ensure ecologically sustainable economic activity.

#### States empirically give wind tax credits

Carleyolsen 6 (Sanya Carleyolsen, PhD candidate Public Policy @ UNC, Summer 2006, “Tangled in the Wires,” 46 Nat. Resources J. 759, ln)

State legislatures also have a variety of tax incentives at their disposal to help bring down the costs of RE projects and make them more cost-competitive with other fuel methods. Many states have adopted tax incentive systems that can be applied to corporate, income, property or sales taxes. n90 Such corporate and income tax incentives provide deductions or credits for purchased RE equipment. For instance, some states provide Investment Tax Credits (ITC) for either centralized or decentralized wind energy systems. n91 Property and business owners who invest in wind energy systems are granted ITCs equal to a [\*778] percentage, as established by the state legislature, of the amount invested in the project. n92 Some states have adopted sales tax incentives that either exempt or reduce the sales tax on RE equipment. n93 Sales tax reductions may be placed on land assets, materials or equipment, and energy transfer. Yet another, comparatively popular, option is a property tax reduction, granted to RE facility owners. n94 Property tax incentives include property tax and special assessment exemptions based on value-added RE additions, calculated as a percentage of the total assessed value of the facility. n95

####  AND – Counterplan is more efficient - Federal bureaucracy dooms the plan – institutional failures mean zero solvency

Bryner 2 (Gary C. - Professor, Department of Political Science, Brigham Young University, and Research Associate, Natural Resources Law Center. University of Colorado School of Law., “ARTICLE: Policy Devolution and Environmental Law: Exploring the Transition to Sustainable Development”, Fall, 26 Environs Envtl. L. & Pol'y J. 1, lexis)

Devolution theory calls for increased policy authority and discretion to be delegated to state governments in order to improve the efficiency of public policies, ensure they effectively resolve specific problems, and foster political accountability. Devolution also gives different communities the opportunity to strike their own balance among the competing policy objectives of economic growth and reducing environmental risks. n10 Devolution to regulated industries promises to reduce the cost of regulation, create incentives for sources of pollution to find the most efficient and effective means of reducing emissions, encourage reductions that go beyond minimum mandates, and allow for flexibility in business decision making. Devolution to citizens is championed as a way to get the public involved in regulatory initiatives that will change the behavior of citizens. Reducing emissions through energy conservation and increased use of [\*5] mass transit, for example, require major commitments on the part of citizens to change their behavior, and that commitment cannot simply be mandated from the top down. Other forms of participatory policy making have been proposed to respond to the demands of citizens for a role in decisions that affect their health and quality of life. Advocates of devolution argue that the current federal regulatory structure is **plagued by burdensome procedures and a cumbersome chain of command**. The combination of environmental statutes, EPA regulations, and guidance documents result in **an impenetrable pyramid of paperwork, planning, and reports**. A tremendous amount of effort at all levels of governments is required to manage this process. Compliance with these requirements often replaces energy and resources that could be used to actually reduce pollution and improve environmental quality. Accountability is difficult to identify since **so many policy makers compete and jostle for influence**, that citizens do not know who to hold accountable when environmental goals are not achieved. Federal officials lay claim to credit for issuing ambitious environmental goals, while state and local officials bear the brunt of criticism for imposing regulatory burdens. The EPA seeks vainly to develop and impose national requirements on conditions that vary widely throughout the nation. n11 Critics have identified a **host of problems with centralized, command and control regulation**: it has not only failed to remedy many environmental problems and threats, but it has engendered significant opposition because of the restraints on freedom it imposes, the costs and burdens of compliance, and **the apparent ease by which some businesses are able to escape** liability and responsibility for their actions. n12 There are real limits to the power of government to promote and ensure the preservation of air, water, land, and other resources. Government agencies alone cannot accomplish these environmental goals, but must be combined with clear and effective economic incentives and with a widely held ethic of care for the land and resources on which all life is so dependent. But the dominant role the federal government plays in environmental policy making focuses too much attention on Washington, and **fails to encourage more local efforts**. n13 Other critics of the current structure of regulatory federalism argue that some state and local governments had a long tradition of ambitious environmental regulation and enacted ambitious pollution control legislation well before Congress or the executive branch acted. The first clean air laws in the United States were enacted by cities in the 1880s, [\*6] some 75 years before the first federal program aimed at air pollution. n14 Many states passed water pollution laws in the 1920 and 30s, and by 1948, every state had an environmental protection agency. n15 While it is true that many federal initiatives for air and water pollution predated the 1970 Earth Day, when the modern era of environmental regulation began, states are not newcomers to environmental regulation. Nor is federal regulation a clear success story. Federal environmental policy has been, **in many areas, problematic**, and has threatened environmental quality. Federal subsidies for road building in national forests, grazing on public lands, the development of fossil fuels, and the emptying of rivers and streams into reservoirs for irrigation, for example, have taken a tremendous toll on natural systems and resources and have encouraged waste, unsustainable consumption, and pollution. n16 One of the consequences of environmental federalism has been to place limitations on more aggressive state regulations. A major impetus for federal air pollution regulation, for example, was a concern by the auto industry that states would impose different emission standards on new vehicles; this fear of having to meet a maze of state regulatory requirements prompted Detroit to lobby for federal regulation of new vehicle emissions. n17 Another example, from the mid-1990s, is the development of federal emission standards for hazardous emissions from coke ovens that were less stringent than those devised in some states, such as Pennsylvania, where environmental advocates had pushed for and won more ambitious limits. n18

### A2: Perm do both

#### -- Links to politics – includes immediate federal action. Perm doesn’t shield: state support is slow. Delay means it won’t take effect until after the vote.

#### -- Impossible – CP transfers authority to the states. The federal government can’t do it while transferring authority to the states – if they can – it’s intrinsic because it adds a new time element that is neither in the plan or counterplan – that’s a voting issue

#### Federal policies crowd out the states—reduces demand for state action

Adler 7 (Jonathan H – Professor of Law and Co-Director, Center for Business Law and Regulation, Case Western Reserve University School of Law, ., “WHEN IS TWO A CROWD? THE IMPACT OF

FEDERAL ACTION ON STATE ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION”, 31 Harv. Envtl. L. Rev. 67, Lexis)

A second potential negative indirect effect of federal regulation on state regulatory choices is crowding out. This occurs because federal regulation **may serve as a substitute for state-level regulation, thereby reducing the benefits of adopting or maintaining state-level protections**. Insofar as voters in a given state demand a certain level of environmental protection, there is no reason to expect states to duplicate federal efforts when a federal program satisfies that demand, particularly if a state has not already created such a program. If the federal floor is greater than or equal to the level of environmental protection demanded by a state's residents, **that state has no reason to adopt environmental regulations of its own** once the federal government has acted. To the extent that this effect occurs, it is separate from--perhaps even in addition to--the signaling effect described above. The claim here is not simply that states regulate less than they would absent federal regulation--although this claim is almost certainly true. Rather, the claim is that some states that would adopt regulations more protective than the federal floor, absent the imposition of federal regulation, have not done so due to federal regulation and may not do so in the future. If this hypothesis is correct, the net effect of federal environmental regulation in at least some states could be less environmental protection than would have been adopted had the federal government not intervened. To see how this could occur, recall that the demand for environmental regulation in any given jurisdiction tends to increase over time as wealth, [\*99] technical capability, scientific knowledge, and environmental impacts increase. n131 In any given state (as in the nation as a whole), there is an initial period ("Period A") during which the demand for a given type of environmental protection is relatively low. The costs of adopting environmental regulations in this period are greater than the benefits of adopting any such protections. These costs include the costs of developing, drafting, and passing legislation; the costs of creating a new policy program, drafting and implementing regulations, defending the regulations from any potential legal or administrative challenges, creating a means to monitor and enforce regulatory compliance; and so on. In addition, there are opportunity costs of devoting state resources and political capital to the cause of environmental protection as opposed to some other policy goal. As discussed earlier, the demand for environmental protection has tended to increase over time along with increases in living standards. n132 At the same time, increases in technical knowledge and administrative efficiency may lower the costs of a given regulatory program. Eventually, a state will enter a second period ("Period B") in which the benefits of a given environmental regulatory program are greater than the costs of initiating, implementing, and operating such a program. Absent any federal interference, the hypothetical state will not adopt environmental regulations in Period A, but will adopt such regulations in Period B. See Figure 3. This is the environmental transition discussed in Part I. In Period A, the demand for environmental protection is insufficient to justify the costs of implementing environmental protection measures. By Period B, however, the demand for environmental protection has risen due to increases in wealth and knowledge, among other factors. At the same time, increases in technical capacity and scientific understanding have reduced the cost of adopting environmental protections. As a result, in Period B a state will adopt Q[B] amount of environmental protection. n133 [\*100] The timing of Period A and Period B will vary from state to state. This is clearly the case as different states have enacted different environmental regulatory measures at different times--some before the adoption of federal environmental regulation, some after, and some not at all. Looking at the history of various environmental concerns, such as air quality, water quality, or wetlands, it is clear that many states moved from Period A to Period B for these environmental concerns at various times prior to the onset of federal regulations in the 1970s. In many other states, however, a federal regulatory floor was adopted before the onset of Period B. [\*101] For states that went through their environmental transition and entered Period B prior to the enactment of federal environmental protection, whether the adoption of a federal regulatory floor increased the aggregate level of environmental protection in that state depended upon whether preexisting state policies offered greater or lesser levels of protection than the relevant federal policies. For states in which the onset of Period B begins after the adoption of federal regulations, the enactment of a federal regulatory floor will, at the time of enactment, increase the aggregate level of environmental protection in that state. However, this may not be the case over time. In states that desire a greater level of protection than that provided by the relevant federal regulations, it is not clear that the existence of the federal regulatory floor will result in an equal or greater level of protection than would be adopted were it not for the federal regulations. This is because federal regulation will, **to some extent, act as a substitute for state regulation**. As a result, the adoption of federal regulation has the potential to reduce the demand for state regulation and, in some instances, even result in less aggregate regulation in a given state than would have been adopted absent federal intervention. In short, federal regulation can crowd out state regulation. **The potential for such a crowding-out effect is illustrated** in Figure 4. The existence of federal regulation will reduce the demand for state regulation by an amount equal to the extent to which federal regulation is a substitute for state regulation of the same environmental concern (Q[FReg]). This substitution effect will reduce the net benefit of adopting state-level environmental regulations from OCQ[B] to OC'Q'[B]. By reducing the net benefits of state-level environmental regulation in this manner, federal regulation has the potential to crowd out state-level environmental protections, even if the quantity of environmental protection demanded in the state is greater than that provided by the federal government. In such cases, the aggregate level of environmental protection will be lower with federal regulation than it would be without it. [\*102]

#### Perm fails – preemption means it’s net worse

Leshy 4 (John D., Distinguished Professor of Law – University of California Hastings College of the Law, “Natural Resources Policy in the Bush Administration: an Outsider's Somewhat Jaundiced Assessment,” Duke Environmental Law & Policy Forum, Spring, 14 Duke Envtl. L. & Pol'y F. 347, Lexis)

VI. Traditional conservative principles, like promoting free markets and **devolving governmental responsibilities to state and local governments**, have taken a back seat where they conflict with industry desires Perhaps the strongest indication of the administration's capture by industry is the manner in which it has kept the free-market ideologies of some of its key natural resource appointees firmly in check, readily sacrificing them where they conflict with industry demands. For example, in recent years, ideological conservatives, among others, have touted the resolution of longstanding conflicts over the environmental impacts of livestock grazing on arid federal lands by buying the ranches in consensual, market-based transactions, and retiring the federal lands their cattle has been grazing from livestock grazing in the future. n34 This has provided the administration with a great opportunity to put in place the principles of so-called "free-market environmentalism" favored by many of the Bush Administration's right-wing supporters. [\*356] But when the Grand Canyon Trust, a conservation group, went into the marketplace to purchase grazing permits on nearly a million acres of public lands in the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument in southern Utah, and sought to retire those lands from grazing, the Bush Administration balked. n35 The Interior Solicitor (a former official of the National Public Lands Council, a rancher trade association) issued legal opinions throwing up roadblocks to retirement, and the retirement proposal continues to languish inside the Department. n36 Even though Interior has acknowledged that retirement will improve the health of the land, n37 the administration is more concerned about placating the cattlemen's association and hard-bitten local opponents of the national monument who do not want to see even market-based land conservation. The unhappy result is that philanthropic money to invest in grazing retirements is harder to come by, much to the chagrin of free-market environmental groups, one of who recently gave the administration a "C-" in its report card on this point. n38 Another example is the administration's unwillingness to defer to state and local governments when their interests diverge from those of industry. Thus, the administration told a federal court in Nevada that federal mining law preempted efforts by a local county to regulate a proposed processing plant for federal minerals that would be located on private land. n39 The overriding federal interest here is somewhat mysterious, considering that the only use of the material being mined is to make kitty litter. n40 The administration has made a similar argument in opposing Los Angeles County's efforts to regulate a quarry on private land extracting sand and gravel owned by the federal government. n41 And it has aggressively (but so far unsuccessfully) [\*357] pushed the Congress to give it authority to preempt state regulation of rights-of-way for energy facilities. n42

#### Doesn’t solve

Zimmerman 1 (Joseph F., Professor of Political Science – State University of New York at Albany, Publius, Spring, p 16)

Examining this list, it becomes apparent that different institutional features of the federal structure are more or less important for securing these different values. Some of the values ‑ diversity, competition, and experimentalism ‑ appear to depend significantly on the existence of many states pursuing unique regulatory agendas. If all of the states pursued identical regulatory strategies, or were prevented from instituting meaningful agendas altogether, these values, as a logical matter, could not be promoted. Obviously there would be no regulatory diversity, because all of the states would structure the lives of their citizens in the same way. Moreover, this uniformity would prevent state competition and experimentation: people would have no incentive to "vote with their feet" if each state provided the same package of public goods, and experimentation by definition requires that different states attempt different solutions to the same social problems.

### A2: Perm do the CP

#### Clearly severs– the states reduce restrictions- federal action is bad

#### They have to defend only federal action

Webster’s 76 (New International Dictionary Unabridged, p. 883)

Federal government. Of or relating to the central government of a nation, having the character of a federation as distinguished from the governments of the constituent unites (as states or provinces).

#### Perm severs immediacy -

#### 'Substantial' must be at the present time

Words and Phrases 64 (40W&P 759)

The words" outward, open, actual, visible, substantial, and exclusive," in connection with a change of possession, mean substantially the same thing. They mean not concealed; not hidden; exposed to view; free from concealment, dissimulation, reserve, or disguise; in full existence; denoting that which not merely can be, but is opposed to potential, apparent, constructive, and imaginary; veritable; genuine; certain: absolute: real at present time, as a matter of fact, not merely nominal; opposed to fonn; actually existing; true; not including, admitting, or pertaining to any others; undivided; sole; opposed to inclusive.

#### “Should” means immediate

Summer 94 (Justice, Oklahoma Supreme Court, “Kelsey v. Dollarsaver Food Warehouse of Durant”, http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14)

4 The legal question to be resolved by the court is whether the word "should"[13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13) in the May 18 order connotes futurity or may be deemed a ruling in praesenti.[14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14) The answer to this query is not to be divined from rules of grammar;[15](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn15) it must be governed by the age-old practice culture of legal professionals and its immemorial language usage. To determine if the omission (from the critical May 18 entry) of the turgid phrase, "and the same hereby is", (1) makes it an in futuro ruling - i.e., an expression of what the judge will or would do at a later stage - or (2) constitutes an in in praesenti resolution of a disputed law issue, the trial judge's intent must be garnered from the four corners of the entire record.[16](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn16)  ¶5 Nisi prius orders should be so construed as to give effect to every words and every part of the text, with a view to carrying out the evident intent of the judge's direction.[17](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn17) The order's language ought not to be considered abstractly. The actual meaning intended by the document's signatory should be derived from the context in which the phrase to be interpreted is used.[18](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn18) When applied to the May 18 memorial, these told canons impel my conclusion that the judge doubtless intended his ruling as an in praesenti resolution of Dollarsaver's quest for judgment n.o.v. Approval of all counsel plainly appears on the face of the critical May 18 entry which is [885 P.2d 1358] signed by the judge.[19](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn19) True minutes[20](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn20) of a court neither call for nor bear the approval of the parties' counsel nor the judge's signature. To reject out of hand the view that in this context "should" is impliedly followed by the customary, "and the same hereby is", makes the court once again revert to medieval notions of ritualistic formalism now so thoroughly condemned in national jurisprudence and long abandoned by the statutory policy of this State. **[Continues – To Footnote]** [14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn14) In praesenti means literally "at the present time." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 792 (6th Ed. 1990). In legal parlance the phrase denotes that which in law is presently or immediately effective, as opposed to something that will or would become effective in the future [in futurol]. See Van Wyck v. Knevals, [106 U.S. 360](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=106&box2=U.S.&box3=360), 365, 1 S.Ct. 336, 337, 27 L.Ed. 201 (1882).

#### Voting issue – stable agent is the locus of all ground

#### This is preposterous. Confusing signals on energy production have no chance of undermining overall hegemony. The basic idea is clear, the fed will control other areas, and energy is a tiny subset of all policies. Plus, structural factors like a sweet military and economic strength overwhelm

#### “One voice” theory is outdated – federal exclusivity has no impact on U.S. leadership

Spiro 99 (Peter J., Associate Professor – Hofstra University Law School, “Role of the States in Foreign Affairs: Foreign Relations Federalism”, University of Colorado Law Review, Fall, 70 U. Colo. L. Rev. 1223, Lexis)

Foreign relations law has long been different. [**1**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n1) But difference is not the same as illegitimacy. To take a standard refrain from the law of equal protection, different things need not be treated as if they are the same. Context justifies difference; and the context of foreign relations has been different indeed. In the domestic realm, mistakes can be corrected and outliers brought to heel. By contrast, foreign relations law definitionally involves the presence of third parties - other nation-states - not within our direct control. Some of these third parties have been hostile, some so powerful that they might threaten our very existence as a nation. This context has weighed heavily against standard vindication of the constitutional values that undergird domestic authorities. Against survival, the virtues of separated powers and of individual rights are less compelling. Foreign relations law may be exceptional to the twentieth-century constitutional canon, [**2**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n2) but that difference has been largely justified. But the context that once rationalized the foreign relations differential is itself now changing in a way that demands reassessment. The world is no longer so neatly divided into sovereign boxes, locked in a zero-sum conflict that was buffered by few institutional restraints. The Cold War is over, and a democratic peace now prevails; [3](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n3) survival is no longer so clearly at  [\*1224]  stake in foreign relations decision making. That alone would undermine more extreme departures from domestic constitutional norms, especially in the realm of individual rights. But not only have the stakes diminished, the very nature of international society may have changed in such a way as to more completely undermine the foreign affairs differential. The nation has been disaggregated, [**4**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n4) so that the channels of contact across national boundaries are now myriad where they used to be singular. With such contacts comes an understanding of the internal allocation of authorities in other nations. In this new dynamic, other nations will be less likely to misascribe the position of one institution to that of another or of the nation as a whole. The conduct of one component is much less likely to destabilize international relationships than in an old world in which nations were presumed unitary. [**5**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n5) This disaggregation may undermine the centralizing institutional anomalies of the foreign affairs regime. Perhaps in no area has the foreign relations differential been as great as it has on issues of federalism. In recent decades, few have challenged the proposition that the states have little role to play on the international stage. The courts have slapped down state activity that poses even the potential to complicate the nation's foreign relations, and the commentators have been nearly unanimous in accepting this core presumption. [**6**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n6) The result has been what I will call the exclusivity principle, under which the federal government alone enjoys the capacity to conduct the nation's foreign relations. The principle's mantra: the need to "speak with one voice" in foreign rela [\*1225]  tions. [**7**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n7) The rule has been functionally justified as eliminating the serious externalities that will be inherent in state foreign policymaking activity. Without constraints on state power, the argument has gone, one state will take action for which other states or the whole nation will suffer the adverse consequences. [**8**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n8) The exclusivity principle has taken some recent knocks in both the cases [**9**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n9) and commentary. [**10**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n10) The purpose of this essay is to present a coherent explanation of why the doctrine was once appropriate, even imperative, but is fast becoming obsolete. In other words, I assert the historical contingency of federal exclusivity over foreign relations. The argument turns on the post-Cold War reconstruction of international society to include not only nation-states but also subnational governments. [**11**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n11) Insofar as the states are recognized as autonomous players in global politics within their independent spheres of authority, and are subject to the discipline of a globalized international economy, there should no longer be a need to suppress their discrete preferences on international issues.

#### Heg doesn’t prevent conflict

Crawford 3 (Timothy W., Professor of Political Science – Boston College, Pivotal Deterrence: Third-Party Statecraft and the Pursuit of Peace, p. 209-210)

*Forward Engagement, Global Leadership, and U.S. Pivotal Deterrence*

As the preponderant power in a globalized and interdependent world, the United States—so we are told—must embrace "forward engagement" and "global leadership." Depending on one's preferred partisan formula, it must either "address problems early before they become crises," or "shape circumstances before crises emerge."9 In these slogans there is a strong whiff of an enduring nostrum. As an early twentieth century writer put it, "the secret of foreign policy" is that "a nation cannot be merely pas­sive ... a nation should in every line take the most vigorous initiative."10 Or, as President George W. Bush put it in September 2002, "In the world that we have entered, the only path to peace and security is the path of ac­tion."11 Those who trumpet such an activist posture tend only to see peaceful consequences resulting from forward engagement. For them "American power is now the linchpin of stability in every region, from Europe to Asia to the Persian Gulf to Latin America."12 They rarely concede that the strong prospect of U.S. involvement in regional conflicts may not always cause sta­bility but instead cause instability. But the incentives (if not the underlying motives) that lead some to aggress will often be shaped by optimism about outside involvement.13 We should not assume that the forces of globaliza­tion that justify U.S. activism and incline the international community toward intervention do not also play into the strategies of regional adver­saries. It is naive to think that they, with survival at stake, do not gird for war keenly aware of the opportunities as well as dangers posed by inter­vention by the United States or other outside actors. There is thus no reason to assume that forward U.S. engagement will re­inforce regional stability and promote peaceful change. Because the United States may significantly influence the outcome of many conflicts, that po­tential must be seen for what it is; something that, by looming so large, may encourage as well discourage revisionism. If the massive risks of running afoul of U.S. power are a deterrent "shaping" the intentions of some re­gional antagonists, the potential windfall of securing U.S. support will shape the intentions of others. Because the benefits of enlisting U.S. support in a war may be enormous, even the slim chance of doing so may goad a party to act provocatively, become inflexible in negotiations, or otherwise do things that make war likely. In sum, forward U.S. engagement may fuel disintegrative as well as integrative tendencies in world politics and "jiggle loose" as many deadly conflicts as it knits back together.

#### Heg is resilient

Wohlforth 7 (William, Professor of Government – Dartmouth College, “Unipolar Stability”, Harvard International Review, Spring, http://hir.harvard.edu/articles/1611/3/)

US military forces are stretched thin, its budget and trade deficits are high, and the country continues to finance its profligate ways by borrowing from abroad—notably from the Chinese government. These developments have prompted many analysts to warn that the United States suffers from “imperial overstretch.” And if US power is overstretched now, the argument goes, unipolarity can hardly be sustainable for long. The problem with this argument is that it fails to distinguish between actual and latent power. One must be careful to take into account both the level of resources that can be mobilized and the degree to which a government actually tries to mobilize them. And how much a government asks of its public is partly a function of the severity of the challenges that it faces. Indeed, one can never know for sure what a state is capable of until it has been seriously challenged. Yale historian Paul Kennedy coined the term “imperial overstretch” to describe the situation in which a state’s actual and latent capabilities cannot possibly match its foreign policy commitments. This situation should be contrasted with what might be termed “self-inflicted overstretch”—a situation in which a state lacks the sufficient resources to meet its current foreign policy commitments in the short term, but has untapped latent power and readily available policy choices that it can use to draw on this power. This is arguably the situation that the United States is in today. But the US government has not attempted to extract more resources from its population to meet its foreign policy commitments. Instead, it has moved strongly in the opposite direction by slashing personal and corporate tax rates. Although it is fighting wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and claims to be fighting a global “war” on terrorism, the United States is not acting like a country under intense international pressure. Aside from the volunteer servicemen and women and their families, US citizens have not been asked to make sacrifices for the sake of national prosperity and security. The country could clearly devote a greater proportion of its economy to military spending: today it spends only about 4 percent of its GDP on the military, as compared to 7 to 14 percent during the peak years of the Cold War. It could also spend its military budget more efficiently, shifting resources from expensive weapons systems to boots on the ground. Even more radically, it could reinstitute military conscription, shifting resources from pay and benefits to training and equipping more soldiers. On the economic front, it could raise taxes in a number of ways, notably on fossil fuels, to put its fiscal house back in order. No one knows for sure what would happen if a US president undertook such drastic measures, but there is nothing in economics, political science, or history to suggest that such policies would be any less likely to succeed than China is to continue to grow rapidly for decades. Most of those who study US politics would argue that the likelihood and potential success of such power-generating policies depends on public support, which is a function of the public’s perception of a threat. And as unnerving as terrorism is, there is nothing like the threat of another hostile power rising up in opposition to the United States for mobilizing public support. With latent power in the picture, it becomes clear that unipolarity might have more built-in self-reinforcing mechanisms than many analysts realize. It is often noted that the rise of a peer competitor to the United States might be thwarted by the counterbalancing actions of neighboring powers. For example, China’s rise might push India and Japan closer to the United States—indeed, this has already happened to some extent. There is also the strong possibility that a peer rival that comes to be seen as a threat would create strong incentives for the United States to end its self-inflicted overstretch and tap potentially large wellsprings of latent power.

### Ext – Modeling (Solar/Wind)

#### Federal government models state innovation on solar and wind projects

Klass 11 (Alexandra – Professor of Law, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and Solly Robins Distinguished Research Fellow, University of Minnesota Law School, “Property Rights on the New Frontier: Climate Change, Natural Resource Development, and Renewable Energy”, 2011, lexis)

This subpart explores the extent to which state and local governments have created, defined, and protected property rights in access to solar and wind as well as the extent to which they have removed local impediments to solar and wind development and created permitting, siting, and land use frameworks for such development. Regulatory activity in regards to solar and wind projects on private land has thus far occurred almost exclusively at the state and local levels, with the federal government limiting its involvement to financial assistance and permitting of solar and wind development on federal public lands. n153 Many states have created similar property structures and regulatory frameworks for solar and wind. There is also significant diversity among the states, however, revealing that productive state experimentation is taking place, and that these initiatives **can serve not only as potential models for other states but,** ultimately, for the federal government. 1. Solar Although the amount of solar energy generated in the United States currently represents less than one percent of annual U.S. electricity sales, n154 many state and local governments are attempting to facilitate the development of solar energy. Thus far, both the federal government and [\*96] state governments have created incentive programs, grants, and loans to promote its use. n155 Many state and local governments, however, drawing on historical natural resources law, have also created property rights in solar access.

### Federal Bureaucracy – 2NC

#### Federal bureaucracy dooms the plan – institutional failures mean zero solvency

Bryner 2 (Gary C. - Professor, Department of Political Science, Brigham Young University, and Research Associate, Natural Resources Law Center. University of Colorado School of Law., “ARTICLE: Policy Devolution and Environmental Law: Exploring the Transition to Sustainable Development”, Fall, 26 Environs Envtl. L. & Pol'y J. 1, lexis)

Devolution theory calls for increased policy authority and discretion to be delegated to state governments in order to improve the efficiency of public policies, ensure they effectively resolve specific problems, and foster political accountability. Devolution also gives different communities the opportunity to strike their own balance among the competing policy objectives of economic growth and reducing environmental risks. n10 Devolution to regulated industries promises to reduce the cost of regulation, create incentives for sources of pollution to find the most efficient and effective means of reducing emissions, encourage reductions that go beyond minimum mandates, and allow for flexibility in business decision making. Devolution to citizens is championed as a way to get the public involved in regulatory initiatives that will change the behavior of citizens. Reducing emissions through energy conservation and increased use of [\*5] mass transit, for example, require major commitments on the part of citizens to change their behavior, and that commitment cannot simply be mandated from the top down. Other forms of participatory policy making have been proposed to respond to the demands of citizens for a role in decisions that affect their health and quality of life. Advocates of devolution argue that the current federal regulatory structure is **plagued by burdensome procedures and a cumbersome chain of command**. The combination of environmental statutes, EPA regulations, and guidance documents result in **an impenetrable pyramid of paperwork, planning, and reports**. A tremendous amount of effort at all levels of governments is required to manage this process. Compliance with these requirements often replaces energy and resources that could be used to actually reduce pollution and improve environmental quality. Accountability is difficult to identify since **so many policy makers compete and jostle for influence**, that citizens do not know who to hold accountable when environmental goals are not achieved. Federal officials lay claim to credit for issuing ambitious environmental goals, while state and local officials bear the brunt of criticism for imposing regulatory burdens. The EPA seeks vainly to develop and impose national requirements on conditions that vary widely throughout the nation. n11 Critics have identified a **host of problems with centralized, command and control regulation**: it has not only failed to remedy many environmental problems and threats, but it has engendered significant opposition because of the restraints on freedom it imposes, the costs and burdens of compliance, and **the apparent ease by which some businesses are able to escape** liability and responsibility for their actions. n12 There are real limits to the power of government to promote and ensure the preservation of air, water, land, and other resources. Government agencies alone cannot accomplish these environmental goals, but must be combined with clear and effective economic incentives and with a widely held ethic of care for the land and resources on which all life is so dependent. But the dominant role the federal government plays in environmental policy making focuses too much attention on Washington, and **fails to encourage more local efforts**. n13 Other critics of the current structure of regulatory federalism argue that some state and local governments had a long tradition of ambitious environmental regulation and enacted ambitious pollution control legislation well before Congress or the executive branch acted. The first clean air laws in the United States were enacted by cities in the 1880s, [\*6] some 75 years before the first federal program aimed at air pollution. n14 Many states passed water pollution laws in the 1920 and 30s, and by 1948, every state had an environmental protection agency. n15 While it is true that many federal initiatives for air and water pollution predated the 1970 Earth Day, when the modern era of environmental regulation began, states are not newcomers to environmental regulation. Nor is federal regulation a clear success story. Federal environmental policy has been, **in many areas, problematic**, and has threatened environmental quality. Federal subsidies for road building in national forests, grazing on public lands, the development of fossil fuels, and the emptying of rivers and streams into reservoirs for irrigation, for example, have taken a tremendous toll on natural systems and resources and have encouraged waste, unsustainable consumption, and pollution. n16 One of the consequences of environmental federalism has been to place limitations on more aggressive state regulations. A major impetus for federal air pollution regulation, for example, was a concern by the auto industry that states would impose different emission standards on new vehicles; this fear of having to meet a maze of state regulatory requirements prompted Detroit to lobby for federal regulation of new vehicle emissions. n17 Another example, from the mid-1990s, is the development of federal emission standards for hazardous emissions from coke ovens that were less stringent than those devised in some states, such as Pennsylvania, where environmental advocates had pushed for and won more ambitious limits. n18

## 1NR vs George Washington BS

### Impact Outweighs and Turns the Case

#### Disad outweights – it outweighs case because it’s the only extinction impact in the round and existential risk o/w

War and extinction prevent a focus on the value to life of the poor

#### US/Russian nuclear war causes extinction – its categorically different than other impacts

Bostrom 2 (Nick, PhD Philosophy – Oxford University, “Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios”, Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, March, http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)

The unique challenge of existential risks Risks in this sixth category are a recent phenomenon. This is part of the reason why it is useful to distinguish them from other risks. We have not evolved mechanisms, either biologically or culturally, for managing such risks. Our intuitions and coping strategies have been shaped by our long experience with risks such as dangerous animals, hostile individuals or tribes, poisonous foods, automobile accidents, Chernobyl, Bhopal, volcano eruptions, earthquakes, draughts, World War I, World War II, epidemics of influenza, smallpox, black plague, and AIDS. These types of disasters have occurred many times and our cultural attitudes towards risk have been shaped by trial-and-error in managing such hazards. But tragic as such events are to the people immediately affected, in the big picture of things – from the perspective of humankind as a whole – even the worst of these catastrophes are **mere ripples** on the surface of the great sea of life. They haven’t significantly affected the total amount of human suffering or happiness or determined the long-term fate of our species. With the exception of a species-destroying comet or asteroid impact (an extremely rare occurrence), there were probably no significant existential risks in human history until the mid-twentieth century, and certainly none that it was within our power to do something about. The first manmade existential risk was the inaugural detonation of an atomic bomb. At the time, there was some concern that the explosion might start a runaway chain-reaction by “igniting” the atmosphere. Although we now know that such an outcome was physically impossible, it qualifies as an existential risk that was present at the time. For there to be a risk, given the knowledge and understanding available, it suffices that there is some subjective probability of an adverse outcome, even if it later turns out that objectively there was no chance of something bad happening. If we don’t know whether something is objectively risky or not, then it is risky in the subjective sense. The subjective sense is of course what we must base our decisions on.[[2]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html#_ftn2) At any given time we must use our best current subjective estimate of what the objective risk factors are.[[3]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html#_ftn3) A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as **global** and **terminal**. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[[4]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html#_ftn4)  Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

#### Romney will aggressively push human rights legislation on Russia.

Business Insider, 9/1/**2012** (Romney Could Screw Up US Relations With Russia, p. <http://www.businessinsider.com/mitt-romneys-foreign-policy-chops-come-into-light-2012-9>)

Russia has joined the World Trade Organisation (WTO), but the US is yet to grant Russia permanent normal trade relations. Moves to do so by repealing the Jackson-Vanik amendment have been stymied by the US election and efforts in Congress to tie such relations to legislation that would punish Russian officials deemed guilty of human rights abuses, including the arrest and death in custody of Sergei Magnitsky, a whistleblower. The Obama administration has taken action against those suspected of complicity in Mr Magnitsky's death, but in a limited and low-profile manner. It is not clear whether Mr Romney would be more forceful, because there are Democrats and Republicans on both sides of the argument. It seems likely that Mr Romney will back granting permanent normal trade relations soon after the election, but he might be more amenable to framing human rights legislation in ways that the Russian political class would regard as unwarranted interference in Russian domestic affairs.

#### That undermines START and U.S./Russian relations.

**Rogin**, **4/24**/2012 (Josh, Kerry delays action on Magnitsky bill, Foreign Policy, p. http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/04/24/kerry\_delays\_action\_on\_magnitsky\_bill)

The Obama administration is on the record opposing the Magnitsky bill and believes that its passage could imperil U.S.-Russian cooperation on a range of issues. The Russian government has even threatened to scuttle the New START nuclear reductions treaty if the Magnitsky bill is passed, which would erase the signature accomplishment of the administration's U.S.-Russia reset policy. "Senior Russian government officials have warned us that they will respond asymmetrically if legislation passes," the administration said in its official comments on the bill last July. "Their argument is that we cannot expect them to be our partner in supporting sanctions against countries like Iran, North Korea, and Libya, and sanction them at the same time. Russian officials have said that other areas of bilateral cooperation, including on transit Afghanistan, could be jeopardized if this legislation passes." Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak said Monday at a lunch with reporters in Washington that passage of the Magnitsky bill would have a "significant negative impact" on the U.S.-Russia relationship and said it was unacceptable for the United States to interfere in the Magnitsky case, which he said was an internal Russian issue.

#### START collapse causes extinction

**Collins and Rojansky**, 8/18/**2010** (James – director of the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, ex-US ambassador to the Russian Federation, and Matthew – deputy director of the Russia and Eurasia Program, Why Russia Matters, Foreign Policy, p. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/08/18/why\_Russia\_matters)

Russia's nukes are still an existential threat. Twenty years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, Russia has thousands of nuclear weapons in stockpile and hundreds still on hair-trigger alert aimed at U.S. cities. This threat will not go away on its own; cutting down the arsenal will require direct, bilateral arms control talks between Russia and the United States. New START, the strategic nuclear weapons treaty now up for debate in the Senate, is the latest in a long line of bilateral arms control agreements between the countries dating back to the height of the Cold War. To this day, it remains the only mechanism granting U.S. inspectors access to secret Russian nuclear sites. The original START agreement was essential for reining in the runaway Cold War nuclear buildup, and New START promises to cut deployed strategic arsenals by a further 30 percent from a current limit of 2,200 to 1,550 on each side. Even more, President Obama and his Russian counterpart, Dmitry Medvedev, have agreed to a long-term goal of eliminating nuclear weapons entirely. But they can only do that by working together.

### Uniqueness

#### Obama will win the election --- Abramowitz prediction model proves. But dramatic events can still change the outcome.

**Ravi**, **9/13**/2012 (Anusha, Abramowitz Predicts 2012 Election Results, The Emory Wheel, p. http://www.emorywheel.com/abramowitz-predicts-2012-election-results/)

Alan Abramowitz, the Alben W. Barkley Professor of Political Science, has released his forecast for the outcome of the presidential election this November. Abramowitz, who has accurately predicted the popular vote winner of every presidential election since 1988, says incumbent President Barack Obama will win the election by a close margin of about 1.2 percent. Abramowitz based his forecast on statistical analysis composed of the candidate’s approval rating at the end of June, the growth of the economy and the value of the “incumbency factor,” which refers to the advantage a candidate will have simply for being the candidate that voters are familiar with. “The Democratic constituency is just larger than the Republicans’ and encompasses far more different types of people,” Abramowitz said. “Even if Romney receives the maximum turnout from white Republican voters, he won’t win.” In the past, the incumbency factor has meant more, according to Abramowitz. But more recently, the value of merely being the incumbent candidate has decreased because of the stark polarization — the division of voters into political extremes — of the American voting public. While Abramowitz has made his prediction about two months before the election takes place, he said that a very dramatic event would have to occur to change what he believes will be the outcome of the election.

#### Challenger won’t get the undecided voters.

**Cohn**, **8/8**/2012 (Nate – former Whitman debater and author of the Electionate, 90 Days Until the Election – And Obama Has the Advantage, The New Republic, p. <http://www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/105912/obama-has-the-advantage-90-days-go>)

Contrary to conventional wisdom, history suggests that undecided voters are unlikely to uniformly flock toward the challenger: Candidates almost always finish above their share of the vote in summer polling. While there are examples of challengers sweeping undecided voters, as Reagan did in 1980, the “1980 or bust” position is hardly enviable. The economy is bad enough that the 1980 scenario can’t be discounted, but the differences between 1980 and 2012 are too great to count on it—especially given Romney’s astonishingly bad numbers among undecided voters.

#### Obama will win – Romney is not exploiting white voters.

**Cohn**, **8/8**/2012 (Nate – former Whitman debater and author of the Electionate, 90 Days Until the Election – And Obama Has the Advantage, The New Republic, p. <http://www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/105912/obama-has-the-advantage-90-days-go>)

Barack Obama has the advantage with 90 days to go until November 6, and the Romney campaign mostly has itself to blame. Four years after Obama’s decisive victory in 2008, a poor economy, dissatisfaction with the direction of the country, and mediocre approval ratings have conspired to endanger the president’s reelection chances. But a close race, which is what the polls show, is not the same as a dead heat. Romney is an imperfect candidate who has been poorly served by a strategy that has failed to contest Obama’s predictable attacks, leaving him poorly positioned heading into the conventions. Over the last four years, Obama’s coalition suffered deep enough losses to give his challenger a legitimate path to victory. But those losses were narrow and concentrated among white voters without a college degree, as Obama retains near-2008 levels of support among minorities and college-educated whites. As a wealthy former CEO of a private equity firm with an awkward cadence who could never call himself a great politican, Romney has never naturally appealed to white working class voters, and, as a result, Romney’s ability to capitalize on Obama’s biggest weakness requires him to overcome his own. With three months to go, these weaknesses are as pronounced as ever. The Obama campaign adopted a strategy to remedy their weakness among white working class voters by defining Romney as an out-of-touch, outsourcing plutocrat willing to close factories, fire workers, and avoid taxes to advance his self-interest. If the Romney campaign possessed effective tools to blunt Obama’s offensive, they weren’t properly employed. Instead, the Romney campaign inexplicably focused on attacking a well-defined incumbent president, while permitting Obama and his allies to broadcast unflattering and uncontested tales about an undefined challenger. Boston’s ill-advised strategy has endangered Romney’s chances. Romney’s unfavorable ratings remain high and he hasn’t yet consolidated the disaffected white working class voters with reservations about Obama’s performance. In Ohio—ground zero for the Obama campaign’s efforts—Romney’s numbers have plummeted to the low forties, an extremely weak showing in a must win state. Undecided voters harbor particularly unfavorable impressions of the Republican nominee. According to recent surveys, Romney’s favorables are in the teens among undecided voters, while a majority has already formulated a negative impression.

#### Obama is ahead in the approval and favorability poll.

**Cohn**, **8/8**/2012 (Nate – former Whitman debater and author of the Electionate, 90 Days Until the Election – And Obama Has the Advantage, The New Republic, p. <http://www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/105912/obama-has-the-advantage-90-days-go>)

If Romney was closer to fifty percent, he could more easily overcome these problems with undecided voters. But Obama has a consistent three-point edge in national surveys, with 47 or 48 percent of registered voters; this means that to fight to a tie, let alone to win, Romney will need to persuade the preponderance of undecided voters. And while many hold that Obama’s 47 or 48 percent approval rating suggests that a majority of voters are lined up to unconditionally select the challenger, reality is somewhat more complicated. Obama’s net approval is roughly even and a majority of voters usually say they have a favorable opinion of Obama, unlike Romney. While approval ratings are a great indicator of an incumbent’s chances, net-approval or favorability ratings also perform quite well. Once all the metrics are taken into account, it is not clear that a majority of voters are committed to voting against Obama.

### Intrinsicness

-- Our disad is intrinsic – the link proves that the plan results in \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

-- Destroys all ground –

A) No disad is intrinsic – “make-up calls” can be crafted to solve any link or impact – even purely reaction-based DAs like Relations can be avoided by having the government cut the offended nation a big check

B) Fairness outweighs – logical debate is worthless if the Neg always loses. Fairness protects the forum that makes debate educational

-- Moving target – intrinsicness makes the plan conditional – destroys fairness because it's the locus of debate

-- Not logical: no single actor can do the plan and other actions. Even Congress is made up of many individual legislators.

-- Empirical intrinsicness checks – the Aff can read evidence that Congress will react to the plan by taking action – but not fiat that it occurs

### Links Debate

#### Link alone turns case - GOP win rolls back solar tax incentives

**Carus**, 7/16/**2012** (Felicity – UK journalist based in California, former for the Guardian, Suntech President Warns of Election Threat to Solar Incentives, Aol Energy, p. <http://energy.aol.com/2012/07/16/suntech-president-warns-of-election-threat-to-solar-incentives/>)

The US president of the world's largest PV manufacturer said this week that he was more concerned about a change of administration in the White House that could revoke incentives for solar than he was about controversial trade tariffs on Chinese suppliers. John Lefebvre, the president of Suntech America, said that he was especially concerned about potential Republican attempts to revoke the Investment Tax Credit, which returns 30% of the cost of a solar project, and state-level renewable goals. "There are currently threats against the ITC, the ITC being extended or perhaps being revoked. State Renewable Portfolio Standards are under attack in a lot of different markets that will certainly impact the utility business potentially in a large way."

They’ll say no link but plan will be perceived as an incentive

#### Clean energy loses Obama the election --- GOP attacks will swing key voters in favor of Romney and the support from clean energy is weaker than the opposition. That’s the 1NC LeVine evidence.

#### Plan kills blue collar support --- causes Obama to lose.

**Mead**, 6/6/**2012** (Walter Russell – avid fan of the television show the Price is Right and the movie Saving Private Ryan, Green Politics Hurting Obama in Swing States, The American Interest, p. http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2012/06/06/green-politics-hurting-obama-in-swing-states/)

Since the beginning of the recession, America’s “brown jobs” revolution has been one of the few bright spots in an otherwise shaky recovery. States like North Dakota and Texas have led the country in growth due to their strong energy sectors, and the discovery of vast quantities of shale gas in states like Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Colorado are now providing new jobs. These states have more than shale gas in common: all of them are also on the short list of swing states that decide this year’s presidential election. Republicans are seizing the opportunity to make energy politics a centerpiece of their campaign. As the FT reports: “Blue-collar voters were never that sold on environmental issues, and if some Democrats come across as not keen on economic development, it could lose them support here in Ohio,” he said. Republicans, from Mitt Romney, the party’s presidential candidate, to the congressional leadership, have made Barack Obama’s alleged stifling of the energy industry a centrepiece of their campaigns this year. . . . Mr Romney has said he will approve the Keystone XL pipeline as soon as he wins office and curb the powers of the Environmental Protection Agency. Only time will tell whether this is a winning strategy, but there is reason to think it could work. As we’ve mentioned before, energy politics is an area where Obama is particularly vulnerable. His decision to nix the popular Keystone pipeline earlier this year signaled antipathy toward one of America’s strongest industries while doing nothing to help the environment; it was lambasted as a pointless blunder by observers on both sides of the aisle. Meanwhile, his pet projects in alternative energy have fallen flat, as debacles like Solyndra have received far more attention than the program’s few successes. This should be seriously worrying to the Obama campaign. Brown jobs may be unpopular in Obama’s white-collar, urban, coastal base, but it is blue collar voters in swing states that are likely to decide the election, and many of these voters stand to reap significant benefits from an expansion of America’s energy sector. From a political perspective, Obama has placed himself on the wrong side of this issue. It may come back to bite him come November.

#### True even of ps- if they get people off the grid this pisses off people who lose their jobs as a result – perception of the attempt to do this causes the link

#### Link alone turns case – Romney is worse for the impoverished

#### Energy is Obama’s vulnerability --- the plan is a lightning rod for criticism.

**Belogolova**, 5/17/**2012** (Olga – staff reporter for the National Journal, Insiders: Outreach to Oil Industry Won’t Help Obama, p. http://www.nationaljournal.com/energy/insiders-outreach-to-oil-industry-won-t-help-obama-20120517)

“The president has been navigating towards the economic center since November 2010 and a pro-production veneer will certainly help make that case (even if it doesn’t last),” said one Insider. That doesn’t mean Republicans will back off from attacking Obama on his energy policies. While improved relations between the White House and big oil have thrown a wrench into some of their plans, 93 percent of Insiders say Republicans have plenty of material left. Whether it’s the administration refusing to “drill, baby, drill,” delayng the Keystone XL pipeline, imposing tough environmental regulations, or backing a big loan to struggling solar company Solyndra, Republicans are not short on ammunition to fire at Obama on energy issues. “It may be harder now for Republicans to land punches related to oil and gas, because the administration has called off the dogs, but many voters still think the president would like to thwart production and consumption of fossil fuels,” said one Insider. “Every time the president singles out the oil and gas industry for unfavorable tax treatment, voters are reminded of the White House's true goals." Insiders said that energy issues will continue to be a sticking point in this election — to the very end. “Energy is one of the president's biggest vulnerabilities. From Solyndra to 'cap and tax,' the administration has pursued one energy flop after another. The president's campaign team must agree, since their first ad was a defensive spot on their energy record, and the follow-up was a campaign swing through the country's energy heartland,” said another Insider. “Republicans are going to continue to pound away on the president's energy record to make sure he doesn't get away with trying to mask it.”

### Justice

#### -- Extend governments must weigh consequences – even if morality generally matters, it shouldn’t be considered in the context of public policy-making because governments have unique obligations to other considerations (like national security and growth) – that’s Harries

#### The distinction is critical – deontology only makes sense in private contexts

**Goodin 98** (Robert, Distinguished Professor of Philosophy at the Research School of the Social Sciences – Australian National University, Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy, p. 38)

The great advantage of utilitarianism as a guide to public conduct is that it avoids gratuitous sacrifices, it ensures as best we are able to ensure in the uncertain world of public policy-making that policies are sensitive to people's interests or desires or preferences. The great failing of more deontological theories applied to those realms, is that they fixate upon duties done for the sake of duty rather than for the sake of any good that is done by doing one's duty. Perhaps it is permissible (perhaps it is even proper) for private individuals in the course of their personal affairs to fetishize duties done their own sake. It would be a mistake for public officials to do likewise, not least because it is impossible.

#### Uncertainty of public policy mandates utility

**Goodin 98** (Robert, Distinguished Professor of Philosophy at the Research School of the Social Sciences – Australian National University, Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy, p. 43)

Consider, first, the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices - public and private alike - are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices. But that is all. That is enough to allow public policy-makers to use the utilitarian calculus - if they want to use it at all - to choose general rules of conduct. Knowing aggregates and averages, they can proceed to calculate the utility payoffs from adopting each alternative possible general rule.

#### Utilitarianism produces equality – extreme examples don’t apply

Harsanyi 82 (John, Professor of Economics – University of California, Berkeley, Utilitarianism and Beyond, Ed. Sen and Williams, p. 26-27)

Some further notes on this suggestion will be in place here. First, it is sometimes alleged that justice has to be at odds with utility. But if we ask how we are to be just between the competing interests of different people, it seems hard to give any other answer than it is by giving equal weight, impartially to the interests of everybody. And this is precisely what yields the utility principle. It does not necessarily yield equality in the resulting distribution. There are certainly very good utilitarian reasons for seeking equality in distribution too; but justice is something distinct. The utilitarian is sometimes said to be indifferent between equal and unequal distributions provided that total utility is equal. This is so; but it conceals two important utilitarian grounds for a fairly high degree of actual goods (tempered, of course, as in most systems including Rawls’s by various advantages that are secured by moderate inequalities). The second is that inequalities tend to produce, at any rate in educated societies, envy hatred and malice whose disutility needs no emphasizing. I am convinced that when these two factors are taken into account, utilitarians have no need to fear the accusation that they could favor extreme inequalities of distribution in actual modern societies. Fantastic hypothetical cases can no doubt be invented in which they would have to favor them; but as, as we shall see, this is an illegitimate form of argument.

## 1NC vs Liberty LW

### 1

#### Interpretation – “financial incentive” is a distinct category that requires a cash transfer – tax incentives are not included.

Christiansen & Böhmer 5 (Hans, Senior Economist in the OECD Directorate for Financial, Fiscal and Enterprise Affairs, & Alexander, co-ordinator of the MENA-OECD Investment Programme in the OECD’s Directorate for Financial and Enterprise Affairs, Investment Division, “Incentives and Free Zones In The MENA Region: A Preliminary Stocktaking,” MENA-OECD Investment Programme, OECD, Working Group 2, p. 4-5, www.oecd.org/dataoecd/56/22/36086747.pdf)

I. Toward a common definition of incentives and FEZs¶ a) Investment incentives¶ 3. There is a grey area between, on the one hand, investment promotion and facilitation, and investment incentives on the other. Investment promoters may make information about their host location, relevant laws and administrative procedures available as a public good, but as soon as they offer facilitation and matchmaking tailored to the needs of individual investors then they are effectively subsidising these investors. The monetary value to investors of such assistance may in some cases exceed the value of outright investment incentives. Conversely, actual investment incentives are normally considered as falling into three categories, namely “regulatory”, “fiscal” and “financial” incentives1:¶ • Regulatory incentives are policies of attracting investment projects by offering derogations from national or sub-national rules and regulation. Where such derogations are offered on an economy-wide basis they tend to focus on the environmental, social and labour-market related requirements placed on investors. In the context of FEZs, they often consist in the relaxation of direct investment regulations (e.g. nationality requirements; screening and authorisation procedures) in place elsewhere in the host economy.¶ • Fiscal incentives consist of an easing of the tax burden on the investing companies or their employees. Unlike many other incentives they are most commonly rules-based as changes in taxation in most cases require legislative action. General fiscal incentives normally take the form of reduced corporate tax rates or tax holidays; encouragement of capital formation (e.g. investment tax credits and accelerated depreciation allowances); and preferential treatment of foreign operators (e.g. lower tax on remittances; reduced personal income tax rates on expatriates). In FEZs fiscal incentives, virtually by definition, also include lower import and export taxes and tariffs.¶ • Financial incentives consist of out of hand public spending to attract companies or induce them to invest. They are often formally justified by a need to compensate investors for the perceived disadvantages of a particular location (“site equalisation outlays”), or may take the form of tailoring the infrastructure of a prospective location to the needs of investors. Other financial incentives include subsidising the actual costs of relocating corporate units (e.g. job training cost; expatriation support; and temporary wage subsidies).

#### Violation – that excludes tax credits

Chi and Hoffman 2k (Keon S., Senior Fellow – CSG, and Daniel J., Research Associate, “State Business Incentives: Trends and Options for the Future,” The Council of State Governments, http://www.csg.org/knowledgecenter/docs/Misc00BusinessIncentives.pdf)

In this report, the term “business incentives” is broadly defined as public subsidies, including, but not limited to, tax abatement and financial assistance programs, designed to create, retain or lure businesses for job creation. The term is used interchangeably as “industrial” or “development incentives.” The term “tax incentives” broadly refers to any credits or abatements of corporate income, personal income, sales-and-use, property or other taxes to create, retain or lure business. **The term “financial incentives” broadly refers to any type of direct loan, loan guarantee grant, infrastructure development, or job training assistance** offered to help create, retain or lure businesses.

#### Voting issue –

#### A. Limits – each category is massive, they explode the topic by allowing hundreds of new, conceptually distinct incentives – makes neg research impossible.

#### B. Ground – different generics apply by category – forcing the aff to spend government money is the only stable mechanism for disad links and counterplan competition.

### 2

#### Energy policy justified through security perpetuates inequalities, environmental degradation, and inhibits their long-term development – must be examined prior to their enactment

Simpson 7 – Founding Convenor of the APSA Environmental Politics and Policy Group, Lecturer in the International Relations program at the University of South Australia where he coordinates courses on IR and Environmental Politics, Researcher (Full Member) in the Hawke Research Institute and a member of the UniSA Human Rights and Security Cluster Leadership Committee, Associate at the Indo-Pacific Governance Research Centre (IPGRC) at the University of Adelaide (Adam, 2007, "The Environment: Energy Security Nexus: Critical Analysis of an Energy 'Love Triangle' in Southeast Asia," Third World Quarterly, 28(3), JSTOR)

The pursuit of energy security has been a dominant policy objective and political tool for governments of various hues throughout the world. While there is no doubt that individuals have certain minimum energy require ments, the rhetoric of energy security has often been used as an excuse for governing elites to pursue centralised industrialisation and grandiose energy projects at the expense of marginalised populations. Mega-dams, gas pipelines and similar projects undertaken in majority, or less affluent, countries in the name of energy security and development are rarely vetted through a process of environmental or social impact assessment.' On the rare occasions when this does occur, the process is often a rubber-stamping exercise with little input from local communities. The situation is exacerbated when the political regime promoting or administering the project is particularly repressive or authoritarian in nature, such as in Burma.2 It is usually the case that the communities surrounding these projects are indigenous, dispossessed or otherwise marginalised and have little chance of mitigating the adverse effects that flow from the development, while most of the benefits are reaped in elite circles of the urban centres, where the development decisions are usually made. The interests of these elites, despite populist overtures, are largely antagonistic to the general populations, and this is reflected in development decision-making processes. Attempts by governments and developers either to enrich themselves or, at best, provide electricity for the urban middle classes invariably result in local ethnic minorities or indigenous peoples bearing the brunt of the environmental and social costs associated with the projects while having little input into the development process itself. While the discourse of national energy security is employed by dominant interests, the environmental security of the local communities can be severely undermined by a project but is rarely considered. Environmental security can be defined quite narrowly or understood more broadly to include the energy security deficit felt by many communities in majority countries, who often see no relief from the deficit when an energy project is completed. While the discourse of energy security is used to justify the project, communities living in its vicinity may remain without electricity following its completion and have other elements of their security, such as food, water or livelihood, undermined.4 In this situation it becomes pertinent to ask whose security whether it be 'energy', 'environmental' or 'financial' is being addressed by the project. Unfortunately, it is often the financial security of governing and business elites that determines project decision making at the expense of the environmental security of local communities.5 The transnational projects to be discussed here include a gas pipeline and various mega-dam projects in Southeast Asia. These projects are at various stages of their development but all relate to the purported pursuit of energy security by the dominant classes in Thailand and the supply thereof by their colleagues in Burma (or Myanmar) and Laos. In Thailand, former prime minister Thaksin Shinawatra and his Thai Rak Thai party used the rhetoric of economic nationalism to obtain acquiescence to major projects but, in reality, Thaksin and other plutocratic government elements ran much of the economy for their own profit, privatising benefits but socialising costs and risks.6 In Burma the corrupt military regime of the State Peace and Development Council (SPDc) has ensured energy exporting projects bring little but suffering to local communities, with transnational corporations and successive Thai governments also being complicit.7 The SPDC and the military dominate Burma's economy, through both state and individual interests, and following dubious privatisations since 1988 the 'iron glove of the military envelops the invisible hand of the private sector'.8 In Laos corruption is also rampant and the economy is tightly controlled by the state. The state, in turn, is a tool of the sole legal political entity, the Lao People's Revolutionary Party, membership of which offers the best guarantee of wealth.9 In all three countries major political and economic interests are virtually indistinguish able, often co-operating with foreign transnational corporations and bodies such as the World Bank to promote large-scale energy projects. By the mid-1990s, however, the success of the environment and anti-dam movements in Thailand made it politically expedient for Thai businesses and governments-including the Electricity Generating Authority of Thailand (EGAT) to export the environmental and social problems associated with large dams and other energy pro ects to its more authoritarian neighbours while importing the electricity. 1 In Burma the completed Yadana gas pipeline to Thailand has resulted in significant human and environmental depredations against local ethnic minorities. The preparations being under taken for the Nam Theun 2 Dam in Laos and a series of dams on Burma's Salween River to export electricity to Thailand are already having similar impacts, for which recent studies of the Narmada Dams in India would provide a salutary lesson.11 These projects, at various stages of development, illustrate the vast chasm between the security interests of governing elites and those of the local indigenous or ethnic minority communities in these countries. These situations, juxtaposing energy projects with environmental destruc tion and human rights violations, have led to the new concept of 'earth rights', the nexus between human rights and environmental protection.12 Before examining these projects, a brief exposition on the nature of earth rights and environmental and energy security will assist in clarifying the location of this research within the field of critical security studies. The environment-energy security nexus Security is a contested concept, but the field of critical security studies has, since the late 1980s, challenged the state-centric focus of traditional cold war studies.13 Within this field environmental security has now been established as a significant area of interest.14 Barnett's definition of environmental insecurity considers the way in which 'environmental degradation threatens the security of people'.15 His added focus on the inequitable distribution of degradation resonates strongly with environmental justice theory. From this perspective, environmental security focuses more on human security than on threats to national security from environmental degradation or a securing 'of the environment itself.'6 Recent writings linking the concept of human security to that of environmental security have been concerned with 'social disruptions' as the principal source of insecurity.17 In this sense dislocation caused by major development projects such as dams may cause insecurity, but when this is linked to civil conflict the impacts are compounded. There is now a well established link between the exploitation of abundant resources and the propensity for civil strife, indicating that resource exploitation can be linked to both environmental degradation and human insecurity.'8 As my interest here relates to the majority world, one of the most useful concepts to emerge is that of 'earth rights'.' In addition to the benefit of its holistic inferences and simple terminology, most work on the concept is related to the majority world, where the interrelationships between environmental protection and human rights are most acute.20 Implicit in the notion of earth rights is that a degradation of environmental security reflects an erosion of human rights, and often vice versa. In their analysis of this concept Greer and Giannini have produced the most useful description thus far, arguing that: earth rights are those rights that demonstrate the connection between human well-being and a sound environment, and include the right to a healthy environment, the right to speak out and act topirotect the environment, and the right to participate in development decisions. In the projects that this paper investigates, it is these acknowledged rights to act in defence of the environment and the right to a healthy environment that are, for ethnic minority and indigenous communities living in the vicinity of the projects, most at risk. While a rights-based approach has been, to some extent, co-opted by institutions such as the World Bank, it can still provide a useful method of analysing development activities when employed from a critical perspective.22 In addition to theoretical developments in earth rights and environmental security, increased attention has also been given to energy security. It comes as no surprise, however, that discourses of energy security focus particularly on fossil fuels and large-scale electricity projects, given their centrality to military and industrial development. While this article examines this dominant energy discourse, it is only for the purposes of critical analysis. Although I examine cross-border energy projects in three countries, and therefore national issues do arise, it is the security impacts on local communities surrounding these projects that are of particular interest here. An important question to consider before discussing the impacts of these projects is, however, the reasons for the institutional and political momentum behind such large-scale undertakings in the first place. The industrial-scale development paradigm There are numerous reasons for the fixation, both academic and develop mental, on large-scale energy projects. Some relate to academic or government research funding opportunities, but this approach also fits neatly within the predominant large-scale and hierarchical, top-down development paradigm prescribed by financial institutions such as the IMF and World Bank. Much of the national development programmes throughout the 1980s and well into the 1 990s were undertaken within the 'Washington Consensus' model of neoliberal reform and structural adjustments. These policies exacerbated existing exploitative relationships between the North and South, with economic growth considered by these Bretton Woods institutions to be the only possible 'sustainable development', an approach considered to be 'Northern imperial ism, using the language of ecology'.24 The 'Post-Washington Consensus', which emerged within the World Bank and the IMF in response to an avalanche of criticism, revised the emphasis on pure neoliberalism, admitting a limited role for the state in development processes. Poverty and governance became key issues, but this approach continues to show an 'inability or unwillingness to address major issues pertaining to [political] power and its distribution both at the domestic and international levels'.25 In addition, the development modus operandi of the Bretton Woods institutions that produced poverty and inequality in the past is very much a part of the present.26 The World Bank has adopted a rights-based approach, but its interpretation of rights relates more to the rights of private enterprise than to those enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.27 Undoubtedly rhetoric at organisations such as the World Bank has changed; in terms of energy security there is now a focus on poverty reduction to be achieved through access to 'clean energy' sources. There is, however, a disconnect between World Bank rhetoric and its funding of major projects such as mega-dams that have proven to be environmentally and culturally destructive, while providing little in terms of energy security for local people. Despite some rhetorical revisionism, the discourse of energy security is still employed by government and business elites to justify top-down investments in large-scale energy projects, which require significant initial capital injections and subsequent industrial-scale capital returns. According to the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, this top-down approach to development has caused ecological destruction on a vast scale and tends to perpetuate, rather than ameliorate, inequalities.29 After decades of promoting capitalist industrialisation in the majority world, even the World Bank now recognises that inequality both within and between is increasing and can inhibit development. Nonetheless, the bank still cites 'ine uality of outcomes' as playing an important role in facilitating development.

#### Enframing of national security is a pre-requisite to macropolitical violence

Burke 7 (Anthony, Senior Lecturer in Politics and International Relations at UNSW, Sydney, “Ontologies of War: Violence, Existence and Reason”, Theory and Event, 10.2, Muse)

My argument here, whilst normatively sympathetic to Kant's moral demand for the eventual abolition of war, militates against excessive optimism.86 Even as I am arguing that war is not an enduring historical or anthropological feature, or a neutral and rational instrument of policy -- that it is rather the product of hegemonic forms of knowledge about political action and community -- my analysis does suggest some sobering conclusions about its power as an idea and formation. Neither the progressive flow of history nor the pacific tendencies of an international society of republican states will save us. The violent ontologies I have described here in fact dominate the conceptual and policy frameworks of modern republican states and have come, against everything Kant hoped for, to stand in for progress, modernity and reason. Indeed what Heidegger argues, I think with some credibility, is that the enframing world view has come to stand in for being itself. Enframing, argues Heidegger, 'does not simply endanger man in his relationship to himself and to everything that is...it drives out every other possibility of revealing...the rule of Enframing threatens man with the possibility that it could be denied to him to enter into a more original revealing and hence to experience the call of a more primal truth.'87 What I take from Heidegger's argument -- one that I have sought to extend by analysing the militaristic power of modern ontologies of political existence and security -- is a view that the challenge is posed not merely by a few varieties of weapon, government, technology or policy, but by an overarching system of thinking and understanding that lays claim to our entire space of truth and existence. Many of the most destructive features of contemporary modernity -- militarism, repression, coercive diplomacy, covert intervention, geopolitics, economic exploitation and ecological destruction -- derive not merely from particular choices by policymakers based on their particular interests, but from calculative, 'empirical' discourses of scientific and political truth rooted in powerful enlightenment images of being. Confined within such an epistemological and cultural universe, pol icymakers' choices become necessities, their actions become inevitabilities, and humans suffer and die. Viewed in this light, 'rationality' is the name we give the chain of reasoning which builds one structure of truth on another until a course of action, however violent or dangerous, becomes preordained through that reasoning's very operation and existence. It creates both discursive constraints -- available choices may simply not be seen as credible or legitimate -- and material constraints that derive from the mutually reinforcing cascade of discourses and events which then preordain militarism and violence as necessary policy responses, however ineffective, dysfunctional or chaotic. The force of my own and Heidegger's analysis does, admittedly, tend towards a deterministic fatalism. On my part this is quite deliberate; it is important to allow this possible conclusion to weigh on us. Large sections of modern societies -- especially parts of the media, political leaderships and national security institutions -- are utterly trapped within the Clausewitzian paradigm, within the instrumental utilitarianism of 'enframing' and the stark ontology of the friend and enemy. They are certainly tremendously aggressive and energetic in continually stating and reinstating its force. But is there a way out? Is there no possibility of agency and choice? Is this not the key normative problem I raised at the outset, of how the modern ontologies of war efface agency, causality and responsibility from decision making; the responsibility that comes with having choices and making decisions, with exercising power? (In this I am much closer to Connolly than Foucault, in Connolly's insistence that, even in the face of the anonymous power of discourse to produce and limit subjects, selves remain capable of agency and thus incur responsibilities.88) There seems no point in following Heidegger in seeking a more 'primal truth' of being -- that is to reinstate ontology and obscure its worldly manifestations and consequences from critique. However we can, while refusing Heidegger's unworldly89 nostalgia, appreciate that he was searching for a way out of the modern system of calculation; that he was searching for a 'questioning', 'free relationship' to technology that would not be immediately recaptured by the strategic, calculating vision of enframing. Yet his path out is somewhat chimerical -- his faith in 'art' and the older Greek attitudes of 'responsibility and indebtedness' offer us valuable clues to the kind of sensibility needed, but little more. When we consider the problem of policy, the force of this analysis suggests that choice and agency can be all too often limited; they can remain confined (sometimes quite wilfully) within the overarching strategic and security paradigms. Or, more hopefully, policy choices could aim to bring into being a more enduringly inclusive, cosmopolitan and peaceful logic of the political. But this cannot be done without seizing alternatives from outside the space of enframing and utilitarian strategic thought, by being aware of its presence and weight and activating a very different concept of existence, security and action.90 This would seem to hinge upon 'questioning' as such -- on the questions we put to the real and our efforts to create and act into it. Do security and strategic policies seek to exploit and direct humans as material, as energy, or do they seek to protect and enlarge human dignity and autonomy? Do they seek to impose by force an unjust status quo (as in Palestine), or to remove one injustice only to replace it with others (the U.S. in Iraq or Afghanistan), or do so at an unacceptable human, economic, and environmental price? Do we see our actions within an instrumental, amoral framework (of 'interests') and a linear chain of causes and effects (the idea of force), or do we see them as folding into a complex interplay of languages, norms, events and consequences which are less predictable and controllable?91 And most fundamentally: Are we seeking to coerce or persuade? Are less violent and more sustainable choices available? Will our actions perpetuate or help to end the global rule of insecurity and violence? Will our thought?

#### Altenative – reject the affirmative’s security discourse – only resistance can generate genuine political thought

Neoclous 8 – Mark Neocleous, Prof. of Government @ Brunel, 2008 [Critique of Security, 185-6]

The only way out of such a dilemma, to escape the fetish, is perhaps to eschew the logic of security altogether - to reject it as so ideologically loaded in favour of the state that any real political thought other than the authoritarian and reactionary should be pressed to give it up. That is clearly something that can not be achieved within the limits of bourgeois thought and thus could never even begin to be imagined by the security intellectual. It is also something that the constant iteration of the refrain 'this is an insecure world' and reiteration of one fear, anxiety and insecurity after another will also make it hard to do. But it is something that the critique of security suggests we may have to consider if we want a political way out of the impasse of security. This impasse exists because security has now become so all-encompassing that it marginalises all else, most notably the constructive conflicts, debates and discussions that animate political life. The constant prioritising of a mythical security as a political end - as the political end constitutes a rejection of politics in any meaningful sense of the term. That is, as a mode of action in which differences can be articulated, in which the conflicts and struggles that arise from such differences can be fought for and negotiated, in which people might come to believe that another world is possible - that they might transform the world and in turn be transformed. Security politics simply removes this; worse, it remoeves it while purportedly addressing it. In so doing it suppresses all issues of power and turns political questions into debates about the most efficient way to achieve 'security', despite the fact that we are never quite told - never could be told - what might count as having achieved it. Security politics is, in this sense, an anti-politics,"' dominating political discourse in much the same manner as the security state tries to dominate human beings, reinforcing security fetishism and the monopolistic character of security on the political imagination. We therefore need to get beyond security politics, not add yet more 'sectors' to it in a way that simply expands the scope of the state and legitimises state intervention in yet more and more areas of our lives. Simon Dalby reports a personal communication with Michael Williams, co-editor of the important text Critical Security Studies, in which the latter asks: if you take away security, what do you put in the hole that's left behind? But I'm inclined to agree with Dalby: maybe there is no hole."' The mistake has been to think that there is a hole and that this hole needs to be filled with a new vision or revision of security in which it is re-mapped or civilised or gendered or humanised or expanded or whatever. All of these ultimately remain within the statist political imaginary, and consequently end up reaffirming the state as the terrain of modern politics, the grounds of security. The real task is not to fill the supposed hole with yet another vision of security, but to fight for an alternative political language which takes us beyond the narrow horizon of bourgeois security and which therefore does not constantly throw us into the arms of the state. That's the point of critical politics: to develop a new political language more adequate to the kind of society we want. Thus while much of what I have said here has been of a negative order, part of the tradition of critical theory is that the negative may be as significant as the positive in setting thought on new paths. For if security really is the supreme concept of bourgeois society and the fundamental thematic of liberalism, then to keep harping on about insecurity and to keep demanding 'more security' (while meekly hoping that this increased security doesn't damage our liberty) is to blind ourselves to the possibility of building real alternatives to the authoritarian tendencies in contemporary politics. To situate ourselves against security politics would allow us to circumvent the debilitating effect achieved through the constant securitising of social and political issues, debilitating in the sense that 'security' helps consolidate the power of the existing forms of social domination and justifies the short-circuiting of even the most democratic forms. It would also allow us to forge another kind of politics centred on a different conception of the good. We need a new way of thinking and talking about social being and politics that moves us beyond security. This would perhaps be emancipatory in the true sense of the word. What this might mean, precisely, must be open to debate. But it certainly requires recognising that security is an illusion that has forgotten it is an illusion; it requires recognising that security is not the same as solidarity; it requires accepting that insecurity is part of the human condition, and thus giving up the search for the certainty of security and instead learning to tolerate the uncertainties, ambiguities and 'insecurities' that come with being human; it requires accepting that 'securitizing' an issue does not mean dealing with it politically, but bracketing it out and handing it to the state; it requires us to be brave enough to return the gift."'

### 3

#### Text: The fifty state governments of the United States and relevant subnational actors should implement permanent production tax credits for onshore and offshore wind turbine components and turbine installation vessels. State-level production tax credits should parallel the size and scope of the federal production tax credit.

#### 50 State action solves better

Milford 10 (Lewis – The founder and president of Clean Energy Group (CEG), “Federal Climate and Energy Legislation and the States: Legislative Principles and Recommendations for a New Clean Energy Federalism”, April, http://www.cleanenergystates.org/assets/Uploads/CEGCleanEnergyFederalismv3April2010.pdf)

States should and will remain the laboratories of experimentation and innovation on technology and economic development because most energy investment decisions are made at the state and/or local utility and customer level. 2. State and local clean energy development decisions are made closer to the markets, are often more politically durable and stable over time, and should be encouraged. 3. There is no simple, standard or optimal clean energy program design and practice that will achieve carbon stabilization; instead, all states and local jurisdictions should be given adequate federal resources and assistance to create and implement a diverse portfolio of finance, technology, and policy tools to create the necessary fifty state programs to advance a clean energy future. 4. There are many existing, experienced and “best practice” state-based, clean energy institutions that deserve continued and expanded support for their decade-long successes in these areas. 5. States can develop more nuanced and effective finance mechanisms that can leverage private sector development because they know their markets, their market players and their barriers to success. 6. Bottom-up, distributed solutions that the states can provide have always proved the most responsive and nimble solutions **that best respect the ever changing demands of locally regulated state energy investment decisions**, which are the hallmark of the US energy sector. 7. States should be given express authority to enact climate and clean energy policy and laws that are more stringent and aggressive than the federal programs.

#### State wind incentives solve

Zaidi 7 (Kamaal, “WIND ENERGY AND ITS IMPACT ON FUTURE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY PLANNING: POWERING RENEWABLE ENERGY IN CANADA AND ABROAD”, 2007, 11 Alb. L. Envtl. Outlook 198, lexis)

The growing emergence of renewable energy highlights the importance of searching for cheaper, cleaner, and more reliable methods of using the world's natural resources. This response is reasonable given the volatility of electricity prices in the market [\*273] from the use of conventional fossil fuels, such as oil and natural gas. n515 Whether or not wind energy can replace these conventional sources remains to be seen. However, more nations are discovering its untapped potential, and are targeting energy capacity goals by using wind energy technology's natural availability. n516 Thus, harnessing this potential depends upon the level of commitment by government, industry, and citizens to establish a meaningful partnership in advancing sensible environmental policy frameworks. n517 As described earlier, federal and state/provincial governments **play an active role in promoting the use** of renewable energy by providing financial incentives to companies by way of tax incentives, favorable loan treatment, and funding for research and development of new wind technology. n518 Furthermore, companies are given financial incentives through funding mechanisms by purchasing electricity directly from renewable energy sources. n519 Wind-generated electricity is certainly becoming prosperous given the high urbanization rates and an increasing pressure on local authorities to provide affordable electricity to consumers. n520 Numerous authorities are attempting to cushion against fluctuating energy market prices that stem from conventional fossil fuel sources. n521 It is no wonder why renewable energy is being sought to guide future environmental policy planning. n522 Aside from economic considerations, several nations have committed to promote wind energy that minimizes [\*274] the impact on local environments. n523

### 4

#### A. Electricity prices are low and will likely decline now – gas boom, energy efficiency, reduced demand

**Burtraw 8/21/12** (one of the nation’s foremost experts on environmental regulation in the electricity sector. “Falling Emissions and Falling Prices: Expectations for the Domestic Natural Gas Boom” http://common-resources.org/2012/falling-emissions-and-falling-prices-expectations-for-the-domestic-natural-gas-boom/)

Moreover, the boom in domestic natural gas production could have even more immediate affects for U.S. electricity consumers. The increased supply of gas is expected to lower natural gas prices and retail electricity prices over the next 20 years, according to a [new RFF Issue Brief](http://www.rff.org/Publications/Pages/PublicationDetails.aspx?PublicationID=22019). These price decreases are expected to be even larger if demand for electricity continues on a slow-growth trajectory brought on by the economic downturn and the increased use of energy efficiency.For example, RFF analysis found that delivered natural gas prices would have been almost 35% higher in 2020 if natural gas supply projections had matched the lower estimates released by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) in 2009. Instead, with an increased gas supply, consumers can expect to pay $4.9 per MMBtu for delivered natural gas in 2020 instead of $6.6 per MMBtu. These trends are even more exaggerated if demand for electricity were to increase to levels projected by the EIA just three years ago, in 2009.This decrease in natural gas prices is expected to translate into a decrease in retail electricity prices for most electricity customers in most years out to 2020. Compared to the world with the lower gas supply projections, average national electricity prices are expected to be almost 6% lower, falling from 9.25 cents to 8.75 cents per kilowatt-hour in 2020. Residential, commercial, and industrial customers are all expected to see a price decrease, with the largest price changes occurring in parts of the country that have competitive electricity markets. All of these prices decreases translate into real savings for most electricity customers. The savings are largest for commercial customers, who stand to save $33.9 Billion (real $2009) under the new gas supply projections in 2020. Residential customers also stand to save big, with estimates of $25.8 Billion (real $2009) in savings projected for 2020.

#### Expanding wind power skyrockets electricity prices – costs of expansion would be enormous

Bryce 11 (Robert, Senior Fellow @ Manhattan Institute, "The High Cost of Wind Energy as a Carbon-Dioxide Reduction Method," http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/ib\_11.htm)

The Global Wind Energy Council (GWEC), an industry group, maintains that reducing the amount of carbon dioxide going into the atmosphere “is the most important environmental benefit from wind power generation.”[27] For its part, the American Wind Energy Association (AWEA), a national trade association, says “there is no need to wait for a new climate solution. Wind power is one of only a few near-term options to reduce emissions.”[28] In its 2008 report, the NREL claimed that if the United States were to derive 20 percent of its electricity from wind, it “could avoid approximately 825 million metric tons of carbon dioxide in the electric sector in 2030.”[29]¶ How does that 825 million tons of carbon dioxide compare with global emissions? In 2010, global carbon-dioxide emissions totaled 33.1 billion tons.[30] Thus, if the United States were somehow able to instantly increase its wind-generated electricity to 20 percent of total consumption, doing so might reduce global emissions by about 2.5 percent. But it is unlikely that global emissions will be the same in 2030 as they were in 2010. By 2030, the International Energy Agency (IEA) expects global emissions will total about 40.2 billion tons.[31] Thus, the 825 million tons that NREL claims might be reduced by achieving the “20 by ‘30” goal will result in a global reduction of just 2 percent.[32]¶ Therefore, to justify a total investment of $850 billion in wind, U.S. policymakers would have to agree that reducing carbon dioxide in the year 2030 is worth spending $1,030 per ton. Of course, that amount would not be spent all at once. Instead it would be allocated over the coming 19 years and would be, in effect, a carbon tax set at $54 per ton.¶ However, the actual cost may be somewhat lower. In its 2008 report, NREL claimed that only 305,000 megawatts of wind capacity would be needed to meet the “20 by ‘30” goal. Recall that the United States has built about 40,000 megawatts of wind capacity at a cost of about $68 billion. Thus, building an additional 265,000 megawatts of wind capacity (again, at $2.43 million per megawatt) at a cost of $644 billion, would lead to a total cost of $712 billion, thereby implying that cutting one ton of carbon dioxide by 2030 would cost about $863. Spread over the next 19 years, the cost would be the equivalent of a carbon levy set at $45 per ton.¶ Achieving the “20 by ‘30” goal will have a significant impact on electricity rates. In 2007, Steven Hayward and Kenneth Green of the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) estimated that a $15 carbon tax would likely increase the cost of coal-fired generation by about $0.0163 per kilowatt-hour. Therefore, we can assume that a carbon levy of $54-per-ton could increase electricity rates in coal-reliant regions by about $0.058 per kilowatt-hour. That’s a major increase given that the average price of electricity for residential consumers in the United States is currently $0.12 per kilowatt-hour.[33]¶ Put another way, if the United States were to achieve the “20 by ‘30” goal, U.S. residential electricity prices in coal-dependent regions could increase by about 48 percent over current levels. If we use the lower range of wind costs outlined by NREL in its 2008 report, and assume that reducing a ton of carbon by 2030 will cost $45 per year, the increase in electricity costs in coal-dependent areas will amount to about $0.049 per kilowatt-hour. That would result in an increase of 40 percent over current levels for residential customers in those regions.¶ These higher electricity costs will likely accelerate the pace of electric rate increases now underway around the country. Since 2004, the average cost of residential electricity has gone from $0.0895 per kilowatt-hour to $0.1218 per kilowatt-hour, an increase of 36 percent.[34]¶ Wind energy is not a cost-effective method of reducing carbon-dioxide emissions. Any effort—whether at the state level or the federal level—to dramatically increase the use of wind energy will result in a new tax on electricity consumers. If the United States were to achieve the “20 by ‘30” goal, the effective carbon tax of $45 to $54 per ton would far exceed any such tax regime currently in place. Further, if the stated goal were met by 2030, the likely reduction in carbon dioxide emissions would amount to just 2 percent of the expected global total.

#### C. Low electricity prices spurs manufacturing "reshoring" and sparks US economic growth via consumer spending and investment

Perry 7/31/12 (Mark, Prof of Economics @ Univ. of Michigan, "America's Energy Jackpot: Industrial Natural Gas Prices Fall to the Lowest Level in Recent History," http://mjperry.blogspot.com/2012/07/americas-energy-jackpot-industrial.html)

Building petrochemical plants could suddenly become attractive in the United States. Manufacturers will "reshore" production to take advantage of low natural gas and electricity prices. Energy costs will be lower for a long time, giving a competitive advantage to companies that invest in America, and also helping American consumers who get hit hard when energy prices spike.¶ After years of bad economic news, the natural gas windfall is very good news. Let's make the most of it." ¶ The falling natural gas prices also make the predictions in this December 2011 study by PriceWaterhouseCoopers, "Shale gas: A renaissance in US manufacturing?"all the more likely: ¶ U.S. manufacturing companies (chemicals, metals and industrial) could employ approximately one million more workers by 2025 because of abundant, low-priced natural gas.¶ Lower feedstock and energy cost could help U.S. manufacturers reduce natural gas expenses by as much as $11.6 billion annually through 2025.¶ MP: As I have emphasized lately, America's ongoing shale-based energy revolution is one of the real bright spots in an otherwise somewhat gloomy economy, and provides one of the best reasons to be bullish about America's future. The shale revolution is creating thousands of well-paying, shovel-ready jobs in Texas, North Dakota and Ohio, and thousands of indirect jobs in industries that support the shale boom (sand, drilling equipment, transportation, infrastructure, steel pipe, restaurants, etc.). In addition, the abundant shale gas is driving down energy prices for industrial, commercial, residential and electricity-generating users, which frees up billions of dollars that can be spent on other goods and services throughout the economy, providing an energy-based stimulus to the economy. ¶ Cheap natural gas is also translating into cheaper electricity rates, as low-cost natural gas displaces coal. Further, cheap and abundant natural gas is sparking a manufacturing renaissance in energy-intensive industries like chemicals, fertilizers, and steel. And unlike renewable energies like solar and wind, the natural gas boom is happening without any taxpayer-funded grants, subsidies, credits and loans. Finally, we get an environmental bonus of lower CO2 emissions as natural gas replaces coal for electricity generation. Sure seems like a win, win, win, win situation to me.

#### D. Manufacturing strength is key to both the economy and military power

Ettlinger and Gordon 11 (Michael and Kate, the Vice President for Economic Policy at the Center for American Progress, former director of the Economic Analysis and Research Network of the Economic Policy Institute and Vice President for Energy Policy at the Center for American Progress. Most recently, Kate was the co-director of the national Apollo Alliance, where she still serves as senior policy advisor. Former senior associate at the Center on Wisconsin Strategy, "The Importance and Promise of American Manufacturing" [http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf-)](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf-%29)

Manufacturing is critically important to the American economy. For generations, the strength of our country rested on the power of our factory floors—both the machines and the men and women who worked them. We need manufacturing to continue to be a bedrock of strength for generations to come. Manufacturing is woven into the structure of our economy: Its importance goes far beyond what happens behind the factory gates. The strength or weakness of American manufacturing carries implications for the entire economy, our national security, and the well-being of all Americans. Manufacturing today accounts for 12 percent of the U.S. economy and about 11 percent of the private-sector workforce. But its significance is even greater than these numbers would suggest. The direct impact of manufacturing is only a part of the picture. First, jobs in the manufacturing sector are good middle-class jobs for millions of Americans. Those jobs serve an important role, offering economic opportunity to hard-working, middle-skill workers. This creates upward mobility and broadens and strengthens the middle class to the benefit of the entire economy. What’s more, U.S.-based manufacturing underpins a broad range of jobs that are quite different from the usual image of manufacturing. These are higher-skill service jobs that include the accountants, bankers, and lawyers that are associated with any industry, as well as a broad range of other jobs including basic research and technology development, product and process engineering and design, operations and maintenance, transportation, testing, and lab work. Many of these jobs are critical to American technology and innovation leadership. The problem today is this: Many multinational corporations may for a period keep these higher-skill jobs here at home while they move basic manufacturing elsewhere in response to other countries’ subsidies, the search for cheaper labor costs, and the desire for more direct access to overseas markets, but eventually many of these service jobs will follow. When the basic manufacturing leaves, the feedback loop from the manufacturing floor to the rest of a manufacturing operation—a critical element in the innovative process—is eventually broken. To maintain that feedback loop, companies need to move higher-skill jobs to where they do their manufacturing. And with those jobs goes American leadership in technology and innovation. This is why having a critical mass of both manufacturing and associated service jobs in the United States matters. The "industrial commons" that comes from the crossfertilization and engagement of a community of experts in industry, academia, and government is vital to our nation’s economic competitiveness. Manufacturing also is important for the nation’s economic stability. The experience of the Great Recession exemplifies this point. Although manufacturing plunged in 2008 and early 2009 along with the rest of the economy, it is on the rebound today while other key economic sectors, such as construction, still languish. Diversity in the economy is important—and manufacturing is a particularly important part of the mix. Although manufacturing is certainly affected by broader economic events, the sector’s internal diversity—supplying consumer goods as well as industrial goods, serving both domestic and external markets— gives it great potential resiliency. Finally, supplying our own needs through a strong domestic manufacturing sector protects us from international economic and political disruptions. This is most obviously important in the realm of national security, even narrowly defined as matters related to military strength, where the risk of a weak manufacturing capability is obvious. But overreliance on imports and substantial manufacturing trade deficits weaken us in many ways, making us vulnerable to everything from exchange rate fluctuations to trade embargoes to natural disasters.

#### E. Heg solves multiple scenarios for nuke war

Kagan 7 (Robert, Senior Associate – Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “End of Dreams, Return of History: International Rivalry and American Leadership”, Policy Review, August/September, http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/8552512.html#n10)

The jostling for status and influence among these ambitious nations and would-be nations is a second defining feature of the new post-Cold War international system. Nationalism in all its forms is back, if it ever went away, and so is international competition for power, influence, honor, and status. American predominance prevents these rivalries from intensifying —  its regional as well as its global predominance. Were the United States to diminish its influence in the regions where it is currently the strongest power, the other nations would settle disputes as great and lesser powers have done in the past: sometimes through diplomacy and accommodation but often through confrontation and wars of varying scope, intensity, and destructiveness. One novel aspect of such a multipolar world is that most of these powers would possess **nuclear weapons**. That could make wars between them less likely, or it could simply make them more **catastrophic**. It is easy but also dangerous to underestimate the role the United States plays in providing a measure of stability in the world even as it also disrupts stability. For instance, the United States is the dominant naval power everywhere, such that other nations cannot compete with it even in their home waters. They either happily or grudgingly allow the United States Navy to be the guarantor of international waterways and trade routes, of international access to markets and raw materials such as oil. Even when the United States engages in a war, it is able to play its role as guardian of the waterways. In a more genuinely multipolar world, however, it would not. Nations would compete for naval dominance at least in their own regions and possibly beyond. Conflict between nations would involve struggles on the oceans as well as on land. Armed embargos, of the kind used in World War i and other major conflicts, would disrupt trade flows in a way that is now impossible. Such order as exists in the world rests not only on the goodwill of peoples but also on American power. Such order as exists in the world rests not merely on the goodwill of peoples but on a foundation provided by American power. Even the European Union, that great geopolitical miracle, owes its founding to American power, for without it the European nations after World War II would never have felt secure enough to reintegrate Germany. Most Europeans recoil at the thought, but even today Europe ’s stability depends on the guarantee, however distant and one hopes unnecessary, that the United States could step in to check any dangerous development on the continent. In a genuinely multipolar world, that would not be possible without renewing the danger of world war. People who believe greater equality among nations would be preferable to the present American predominance often succumb to a basic logical fallacy. They believe the order the world enjoys today exists independently of American power. They imagine that in a world where American power was diminished, the aspects of international order that they like would remain in place. But that ’s not the way it works. International order does not rest on ideas and institutions. It is shaped by configurations of power. The international order we know today reflects the distribution of power in the world since World War ii, and especially since the end of the Cold War. A different configuration of power, a multipolar world in which the poles were Russia, China, the United States, India, and Europe, would produce its own kind of order, with different rules and norms reflecting the interests of the powerful states that would have a hand in shaping it. Would that international order be an improvement? Perhaps for Beijing and Moscow it would. But it is doubtful that it would suit the tastes of enlightenment liberals in the United States and Europe. The current order, of course, is not only far from perfect but also offers no guarantee against major conflict among the world ’s great powers. Even under the umbrella of unipolarity, regional conflicts involving the large powers may erupt. **War could erupt between** **China and Taiwan** and draw in both the United States and Japan. War could erupt between **Russia and Georgia**, forcing the United States and its European allies to decide whether to intervene or suffer the consequences of a Russian victory. Conflict between **India and Pakistan** remains possible, as does conflict between Iran and Israel **or** other **Middle** **Eastern states**. **These**, too, could **draw in** other **great powers**, including the United States. Such conflicts may be unavoidable no matter what policies the United States pursues. But they are more likely to erupt if the United States weakens or withdraws from its positions of regional dominance. This is especially true in East Asia, where most nations agree that a reliable American power has a stabilizing and pacific effect on the region. That is certainly the view of most of China ’s neighbors. But even China, which seeks gradually to supplant the United States as the dominant power in the region, faces the dilemma that an American withdrawal could unleash an ambitious, independent, nationalist Japan. Conflicts are more likely to erupt if the United States withdraws from its positions of regional dominance. In Europe, too, the departure of the United States from the scene — even if it remained the world’s most powerful nation — could be destabilizing. It could tempt Russia to an even more overbearing and potentially forceful approach to unruly nations on its periphery. Although some realist theorists seem to imagine that the disappearance of the Soviet Union put an end to the possibility of confrontation between Russia and the West, and therefore  to the need for a permanent American role in Europe, history suggests that conflicts in Europe involving Russia are possible even without Soviet communism. If the United States withdrew from Europe — if it adopted what some call a strategy of “offshore balancing” — this could in time increase the likelihood of conflict involving Russia and its near neighbors, which could in turn **draw the** **U**nited **S**tates **back in** under unfavorable circumstances.

### 5

#### Obama will win --- a consensus of polls and forecasts prove.

**Silver**, **9/20**/2012 (Nate, Sept. 19: A Wild Day in the Polls, but Obama Ends Up Ahead, Five Thirty Eight, New York Times, p. <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/20/sept-19-a-wild-day-in-the-polls-but-obama-ends-up-ahead/#h>[])

There are also going to be some outliers — sometimes because of unavoidable statistical variance, sometimes because the polling company has a partisan bias, sometimes because it just doesn’t know what it’s doing. (And sometimes: because of all of the above.) By the end of Wednesday, however, it was clear that the preponderance of the evidence favored Mr. Obama. He got strong polls in Ohio, Florida, Michigan, Wisconsin and Virginia, all from credible pollsters. Mr. Obama, who had been slipping in our forecast recently, rebounded to a 75.2 percent chance of winning the Electoral College, up from 72.9 percent on Tuesday. The most unambiguously bearish sign for Mr. Romney are the poor polls he has been getting in swing states from pollsters that use a thorough methodology and include cellphones in their samples. There have been 16 such polls published in the top 10 tipping point states since the Democratic convention ended, all conducted among likely voters. Mr. Obama has held the lead in all 16 of these polls. With the exception of two polls in Colorado — where Mr. Obama’s polling has been quite middling recently — all put him ahead by at least four points. On average, he led by 5.8 percentage points between these 16 surveys. If this is what the post-convention landscape looks like, then Mr. Romney is in a great deal of trouble. Perhaps these polls imply that Mr. Obama’s lead is somewhere in the range of five percentage points in the popular vote — national polls suggest that it’s a bit less than that, but state polls provide useful information about the national landscape. Or perhaps they imply that Mr. Obama is overperforming slightly in the swing states. Either way, that’s a pretty big deficit for Mr. Romney to overcome. What’s more, Mr. Obama was at 49.4 percent of the vote on average between these 16 surveys, meaning that he’d need to capture only a tiny sliver of the undecided vote to get to an outright majority. (If we’re being technical, 49.4 percent might be sufficient for him to win these states on its own, since perhaps 1 or 2 percent of the vote will go to third-party candidates.) To be clear: I do not recommend that this is the only data you look at. The forecast model also evaluates polls that exclude cellphones, although it gives them slightly less weight. Those have not necessarily shown a great deal of strength for Mr. Obama. And just as the model looks at state polls to infer the national trend, it also does the reverse, using the national polls (and essentially the assumption of ”uniform swing”) to infer where the states stand. The national polls show a spread right now from an effective tie to an eight-point lead for Mr. Obama. Taken as a whole, they seem to imply more like a three or four point lead for Mr. Obama rather than something in the range of five points. (These distinctions really do make a difference, especially with so few undecided voters left.) The other questions, of course, are whether Mr. Obama’s bounce is fading, and if it might fade further. His FiveThirtyEight forecast remains off its high of about an 80 percent chance of victory, that he achieved late last week.

**Massive opposition to wind power – local NIMBY groups working with oil and gas industry**

**Goldenberg 12** (Suzanne, US environment correspondent, “Conservative thinktanks step up attacks against Obama's clean energy strategy,” 5-8-12, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/may/08/conservative-thinktanks-obama-energy-plans>)

A network of ultra-conservative groups is ramping up an offensive on multiple fronts to turn the American public against wind farms and Barack Obama's energy agenda. A number of rightwing organisations, including Americans for Prosperity, which is funded by the billionaire Koch brothers, are attacking Obama for his support for solar and wind power. The American Legislative Exchange Council (Alec), which also has financial links to the Kochs, has drafted bills to overturn state laws promoting wind energy. Now a confidential strategy memo seen by the Guardian advises using "subversion" to build a **national movement of wind farm protesters**. The strategy proposal was prepared by a fellow of the American Tradition Institute (ATI) – although the thinktank has formally disavowed the project. The proposal was discussed at a meeting of self-styled 'wind warriors' from across the country in Washington DC last February. "These documents show for the first time that local Nimby anti-wind groups are co-ordinating and working with national fossil-fuel funded advocacy groups to wreck the wind industry," said Gabe Elsner, a co-director of the Checks and Balances, the accountability group which unearthed the proposal and other documents. Among its main recommendations, the proposal calls for a **national PR campaign** aimed at causing "subversion in message of industry so that it effectively because so bad that no one wants to admit in public they are for it." It suggests setting up "dummy businesses" to buy anti-wind billboards, and creating a "counter-intelligence branch" to track the wind energy industry. It also calls for spending $750,000 to create an organisation with paid staff and tax-exempt status dedicated to building public opposition to state and federal government policies encouraging the wind energy industry. The proposal was reviewed by John Droz Jr, a senior fellow at ATI, for discussion at the Washington meeting, which he also organised. ATI's executive director, Tom Tanton, said Droz had acted alone on the memo, although he confirmed he remains a fellow at the thinktank. Droz is a longtime opponent of wind farms, arguing that the technology has not yet been proven and that wind technology should not receive government support. He claims 10,000 subscribers to his anti-wind-power email newsletter. In a telephone interview, Droz said the Washington strategy session was his own initiative, and that neither he nor any of the participants had been paid for attending the session. Their main priority was co-ordinating PR strategy. "Our No 1 reason for getting together was to talk about whether there should be agreement to talk about a common message." The strategy session is the latest evidence of a **concerted attack** on the clean energy industry by thinktanks and lobby groups connected to oil and coal interests and free-market ideologues.

#### Romney election results in Iran strikes --- Obama reelection defuses the situation with diplomacy

**Daily Kos**, 4/16/**2012** (President Obama versus Romney on Iran, p. <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/04/16/1083726/-President-Obama-versus-Romney-on-Iran>)

3. Approach to foreign policy: Romney says he will “not apologize” for America and advocates a return to the Bush cowboy “my way or the highway” approach to dealing with other nations. When John Bolton is an endorser, that scares me. To me, however the biggest contrast is their approach to Iran. Binyamin Netanyahu by all accounts is a hawk who is pushing the United States to bomb Iran and has been doing so for a long time. He appears to see no need for negotiation. Granted, he has a right to protect his nation if he believes that its under threat. However, we all know how flawed the “intelligence” was for the Iraq war. And its important to let negotiations play out as far as possible before rushing to war, which would have many unintended consequences for years to come. (See the Iraq war). Here’s the big difference. Here’s Netanyahu’s recent response to the ongoing P5+1 talks: http://news.yahoo.com/... Netanyahu -- whose government has not ruled out a preemptive strike on Iranian nuclear facilities -- earlier said however that Tehran had simply bought itself some extra time to comply. "My initial impression is that Iran has been given a 'freebie'," Netanyahu said during talks with visiting US Senator Joe Lieberman, the premier's office reported. "It has got five weeks to continue enrichment without any limitation, any inhibition. I think Iran should take immediate steps to stop all enrichment, take out all enrichment material and dismantle the nuclear facility in Qom," he said. "I believe that the world's greatest practitioner of terrorism must not have the opportunity to develop atomic bombs," he said. Here’s President Obama’s response yesterday to Netanyahu (in a response to a journalist's question) at the press conference in Cartagena: But Obama refuted that statement, saying "The notion that we've given something away or a freebie would indicate that Iran has gotten something." "In fact, they got the toughest sanctions that they're going to be facing coming up in a few months if they don't take advantage of those talks. I hope they do," Obama said. "The clock is ticking and I've been very clear to Iran and our negotiating partners that we're not going to have these talks just drag out in a stalling process," Obama told reporters after an Americas summit in Colombia."But so far at least we haven't given away anything -- other than the opportunity for us to negotiate," he said. Obama in conjunction with world powers is negotiating with Iran, trying to prevent a needless war. You can be sure that Mitt Romney would bow to his buddy Netanyahu and attack Iran. He has previously said “We will not have an inch of difference between ourselves and Israel”. As he also said in a debate, before making any decision regarding Israel, he will call his friend Bibi. Bottom line, if somehow the American people elect Mitt Romney, expect more of the bombastic, Bush cowboy approach to foreign policy with a more than likely bombardment of Iran. If the American people are not fooled by this charlatan and they reelect Barack Obama, he will continue in his measured way to deal with the threats around the world, quietly, through the use of negotiation, and force if absolutely necessary, but only as a last resort, without bragging, and scaring the American people with needless terrorism alerts.

#### Iran strikes escalates to a nuclear world war.

**Chossudovsky**, 12/26/**2011** (Michel, Preparing to attack Iran with Nuclear Weapons, Global Research, p. http://globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=28355)

An attack on Iran would have devastating consequences, It would unleash an all out regional war from the Eastern Mediterranean to Central Asia, potentially leading humanity into a World War III Scenario. The Obama Administration constitutes a nuclear threat. NATO constitutes a nuclear threat Five European "non-nuclear states" (Germany, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, Turkey) with tactical nuclear weapons deployed under national command, to be used against Iran constitute a nuclear threat. The Israeli government of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu not only constitutes a nuclear threat, but also a threat to the security of people of Israel, who are misled regarding the implications of an US-Israeli attack on Iran. The complacency of Western public opinion --including segments of the US anti-war movement-- is disturbing. No concern has been expressed at the political level as to the likely consequences of a US-NATO-Israel attack on Iran, using nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear state. Such an action would result in "the unthinkable": a nuclear holocaust over a large part of the Middle East.

### Solvency

#### Wind Power is “Inordinately Expensive”

The Blaze 12 (Jan 10, Environmental Writer Liz Klimas, Report: Hidden Expenses Associated with Wind Farming cancels out ‘Green’ Benefits, <http://www.theblaze.com/stories/report-hidden-expenses-associated-with-wind-farming-could-cancel-out-green-benefits/>)

Civitas, an independent think tank, recently published a report by British economist Ruth Lea — director of the manufacturing renewal project at Civitas and an economic adviser to the Arbuthnot Banking Group – that concludes the expense of wind farms and need for backup energy makes harvesting wind “inordinately expensive and ineffective at cutting emissions.” According to the U.K.’s Climate Change Act, signed in 2008, greenhouse gas emission goals set a 20 percent reduction by 2020 compared to 1990 levels and an 80 percent cut by 2050. Such drastic reductions fundamentally change the way many businesses operate and require adoption of renewable energy or carbon-cutting technology. Since generation of electricity alone accounted for nearly a third of the U.K.’s CO2 emissions in 2010, according to the report, this is clearly an area where the government is seeking to make improvements. The Telegraph reports that the U.K. plans to build as many as 32,000 wind turbines in the next two decades. This initiative is part of a goal set by EU’s Renewables Directive to have 15 percent of the energy produced in the U.K. come from renewables by 2020. The Lea report states that while wind power looks like a competitive option for alternative energy, additional costs associated are not being considered and may in fact negate the carbon-saving benefits: The costing of wind-power electricity generation is clearly very complex. But one conclusion can safely be drawn and that is that wind-power is expensive – especially offshore. Under these circumstances it seems unwise to be embarking on a huge programme of investment in wind generated electricity, especially when the country is facing grave economic challenges. This analysis also ignores the perceived environmental costs of wind-power, especially onshore wind turbines.

#### Wind will always require backup fuel sources

Driessen 12 (MAKE THIS CITE MATCH, 8 May 2012, Big Wind Subsidies: Time to Terminate?, <http://www.masterresource.org/2012/05/wind-subsidies-terminate/#more-19930>)

Energy 101. It is impossible to have wind turbines without fossil fuels, especially natural gas. Turbines average only 30% of their “rated capacity” – and less than 5% on the hottest and coldest days, when electricity is needed most. They produce excessive electricity when it is least needed, and electricity cannot be stored for later use. Hydrocarbon-fired backup generators must run constantly, to fill the gap and avoid brownouts, blackouts, and grid destabilization due to constant surges and falloffs in electricity to the grid. Wind turbines frequently draw electricity from the grid, to keep blades turning when the wind is not blowing, reduce strain on turbine gears, and prevent icing during periods of winter calm.¶ Energy 201.Despite tens of billions in subsidies, wind turbines still generate less than 3% of US electricity. Thankfully, conventional sources keep our country running – and America still has centuries of hydrocarbon resources. It’s time our government allowed us to develop and use those resources.

#### Chinese Dysprosium is key to Turbines – and it’s running out

Rhodes 12 (July 30, Chris, chemistry and doctor phil, youngest professor of Physical Chemistry in UK, “The No.1 Source for Oil and Energy News,” “Peak Minerals: Shortage of Rare Earth Metals Threatens Renewable Energy” <http://oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Renewable-Energy/Peak-Minerals-Shortage-of-Rare-Earth-Metals-Threatens-Renewable-Energy.html>)

Of the other REEs, demands for dysprosium and terbium, which are harder elements to extract than their lighter relatives, are such that supply will be outpaced within a decade. The latter have been described as "miracle" ingredients for green energy production since small quantities of dysprosium can result in magnets with only one tenth the weight of conventional permanent magnets of similar strength, while terbium can be used to furnish lights that use as little as 20% of the power consumed by normal illumination. By alloying neodymium with dysprosium and terbium, magnets are created that more readily maintain their magnetism at the high temperatures of hybrid car engines. However, far more dysprosium relative to neodymium is required than occurs naturally in the REE ores, meaning that another source of dysprosium must be found if hybrid cars are to be manufactured at a seriously advancing rate. As noted, almost all REEs come from China whom it appears will run out of dysprosium and terbium within 15 years, or sooner if demand continues to soar, notwithstanding that Chinese hegemony for its own future energy projects may mean that the current amount of REEs being released onto the world markets will be severely curbed. Almost certainly, new sources of REEs will be sought, given their vital importance to providing future renewable energy, and Japanese geologists have reported that there may be 100 billion tonnes of REEs in the mud of the floor of the Pacific Ocean. Since the minerals were found at depths of 3,500 to 6,000 metres (11,500-20,000 ft) below the ocean surface, the undertaking required to recover them will not be trivial, however, and the practicalities of the enterprise remain to be seen.

#### Tightening REE supply causes US-China trade wars

Time 12 (Time Science & Space, “Raring to Fight: The US Tangles with China over Rare-Earth Exports,” Bryan Walsh, March 13, http://science.time.com/2012/03/13/raring-to-fight-the-u-s-tangles-with-china-over-rare-earth-exports/)

Or not. This morning Obama announced that the U.S. — along with the European Union and Japan — had filed a case with the World Trade Organization requesting talks with China over its export controls of the rare-earth minerals used in the high-tech and clean-tech manufacturing industries. The request for consultations is the first step in a process that will lead to a full legal case within two months, unless China agrees to the demands to ease its tightening export quotas on rare-earth minerals. That isn’t likely — and the fact that Obama chose to make his case publicly, from the White House Rose Garden, indicates that both sides could be gearing up for a trade war in a presidential-election year. “Being able to manufacture advanced batteries and cars is too important to sit back and do nothing,” Obama said. “We can’t let the new energy industry take root in other countries because they are allowed to break the rules.”

#### Trade Wars Empirically Go Hot

**Droke 10** (Clif, Editor – Momentum Strategies Report, “America and the Next Major War’, Green Faucet, 3-29, http://www.greenfaucet.com/technical-analysis/america-and-the-next-major-war/79314)

In the current phase of relative peace and stability we now enjoy, many are questioning when the next major war may occur and speculation is rampant as to major participants involved. Our concern here is strictly of a financial nature, however, and a discussion of the geopolitical and military variables involved in the escalation of war is beyond the scope of this commentary. But what we can divine from financial history is that "hot" wars in a military sense often emerge from trade wars. As we shall see, the elements for what could prove to be a trade war of epic proportions are already in place and the key figures are easily identifiable.

#### Conflict with China will escalate to global nuclear war

**Hunkovic 9** (Lee J, American Military University, “The Chinese-Taiwanese Conflict: Possible Futures of a Confrontation between China, Taiwan and the United States of America”, [http://www.lamp-method.org/eCommons/ Hunkovic.pdf](http://www.lamp-method.org/eCommons/Hunkovic.pdf))

A war between China, Taiwan and the United States has the potential **to escalate into a nuclear conflict and a third world war**, therefore, many countries other than the primary actors could be affected by such a conflict, including Japan, both Koreas, Russia, Australia, India and Great Britain, if they were drawn into the war, as well as all other countries in the world that participate in the global economy, in which the United States and China are the two most dominant members. If China were able to successfully annex Taiwan, the possibility exists that they could then plan to attack Japan and begin a policy of aggressive expansionism in East and Southeast Asia, as well as the Pacific and even into India, which could in turn create an international standoff and deployment of military forces to contain the threat. In any case, if China and the United States engage in a full-scale conflict, there are few countries in the world that will not be economically and/or militarily affected by it. However, China, Taiwan and United States are the primary actors in this scenario, whose actions will determine its eventual outcome, therefore, other countries will not be considered in this study.

#### Grid Problems Prevent Solvency

Rosenbloom 6 (Eric, Science Writer, president of National Wind Watch, September 2006, A Problem with Wind Power, <http://www.aweo.org/ProblemWithWind.html>, summary)

The biggest problem with large-scale wind-powered electricity generation is the grid. A home system can work well because the fluctuating output (even in the windiest places it is highly variable) can be regulated by batteries, and another source (the grid or a gas-powered generator) is tied in to kick in when need be. This is the model where larger systems work in isolated villages, too. But industrial-scale wind plants designed to supply the grid do not work well, even where the wind is superb. The grid is meant to respond to demand, constantly modulating the various suppliers to match the demand exactly. Wind plants respond only to the wind, forcing the more controllable "conventional" plants to change their output in response to wind production as well as to grid demand. And the need to respond within seconds to a drop in wind production requires a plant that runs more inefficiently than one that could run if the grid didn't have to cope with the unpredictable fluctuations of significant wind-powered sources. That is to say, wind farms may actually cause more fossil fuel burning. The huge turbines designed for the grid can't work without electricity from the grid, either. They produce on average 25%-35% of what they are capable of, but they are using electricity (apparently free) 100% of the time. And a problem about sites with good steady strong winds is that they are too windy. The turbines can't handle strong gusts and automatically shut down (typically around 55 mph). So "good" sites turn out to be very little more productive than less windy ones.

### Econ

#### Wind subsidies artificially extend a dead industry – there’s no economic benefit

Hawaii Reporter 12 (August 20, “Wind Energy Subsidies Are As Useful As VHS Tape Subsidies,” Quoting and referring to the work of Nicolas Loris, Economist with a research focus in energy and environmental and regulatory issues, Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, <http://www.hawaiireporter.com/?p=53632>)

Heritage's Nicolas Loris has made the case that the wind energy tax credit makes as much sense as a VHS production tax credit. Can you imagine the logic: "We can't afford to lose our VHS tape manufacturing plants. They provide valuable jobs. Americans need a variety of ways to watch recorded entertainment." Loris says this is what proponents of wind energy tax credits sound like. Wasting taxpayer dollars on different but similar programs—claiming that these subsidies really are necessary to create jobs or prevent layoffs—simply creates a "subsidies for me but not for thee" mentality in Washington….Renewable energy production tax credits have received support from Democrats, Republicans, and industry groups, but that doesn't make it good policy. The credit is a huge handout to wind producers, allowing them to sell their electricity for less than market price. They would profit even if they offered it for free—because they would still pocket the subsidy. The subsidy is already equivalent to 50 percent to 70 percent of the wholesale price of electricity. And that isn't the only special-interest treatment wind producers receive, as Heritage's David Kreutzer explains: Though you would not know it from wailing and gnashing of teeth over the expiration of the [production tax credit, or] PTC, many states also have renewable energy standards that force ratepayers to buy wind, solar, and biomass produced electricity regardless of how much it costs. These renewable standards are separate from—and, for wind-power producers, in addition to—the PTC. A business that cannot survive without taxpayers paying 50 percent of the costs does not help the economy. Instead, it eats up more value than it produces. Policies like the production tax credit concentrate benefits on a few recipients and spread the costs among the rest of us through higher taxes and energy costs. They hurt the economy by making production more expensive, which puts U.S.-based products at a competitive disadvantage. This means fewer jobs for American workers. Those production expenses also make necessities more expensive for consumers, who are already hurting from the higher energy costs. Higher prices across the board hit lower-income Americans the hardest.

#### Wind empirically kills jobs – turns case

Driessen 12 (MAKE THIS CITE MATCH, 8 May 2012, Big Wind Subsidies: Time to Terminate?, <http://www.masterresource.org/2012/05/wind-subsidies-terminate/#more-19930>)

Economics 201. As Spain, Germany, Britain and other countries have learned, wind energy mandates and subsidies drive up the price of electricity – for families, factories, hospitals, schools, offices and shops. They squeeze budgets and cost jobs. Indeed, studies have found that two to four traditional jobs are lost for every wind or other “green” job created. That means the supposed 37,000 jobs (perpetuated by $5 billion to $10 billion in combined annual subsidies, or $135,000 to $270,000 per wind job) are likely costing the United States 74,000 to 158,000 traditional jobs, while diverting billions from far more productive uses.

#### Alt cause: Consumer Spending

Reich 12 (Robert, chancellor's professor of public policy at UC Berkeley, and former U.S. secretary of labor,

<http://www.sfgate.com/opinion/reich/article/Consumer-spending-key-to-job-creation-3866757.php#ixzz26ZAhK5H9> “Consumer Spending Key to Job Creation” Sept 14, 2012, San Francisco Chronicle)

If that were all there was to it, the Sept. 7 report from the Bureau of Labor Statistics showing that the economy added only 96,000 jobs in August - below what's needed merely to keep up with the growth in the number of eligible workers - would seem to bolster Romney's claim. But, of course, congressional Republicans have never even given Obama a chance to try his approach. They've blocked everything he's tried to do - including his proposed Jobs Act that would help state and local governments replace many of the teachers, police officers, social workers and firefighters they've had to let go over the past several years. The deeper question is what should be done starting in January to boost a recovery that by anyone's measure is still anemic. In truth, not even the Jobs Act will be enough. At the Republican convention in Tampa, Fla., Romney produced the predictable set of Republican bromides: cut taxes on corporations and the already rich, cut government spending (mainly on the lower middle class and the poor) and gut business regulations. It's the same supply-side nonsense that got the economy into trouble in the first place. Corporations won't hire more workers just because their tax bill is lower and they spend less on regulations. In case you hadn't noticed, corporate profits are up. Most companies don't even know what to do with the profits they're already making. Not incidentally, many of those profits have come from replacing jobs with computer software or outsourcing them abroad. Meanwhile, the wealthy don't create jobs, and giving them additional tax cuts won't bring unemployment down. America's rich are already garnering a bigger share of American income than they have in 80 years. They're using much of it to speculate in the stock market. All this has done is drive stock prices higher. The way to get jobs back is to get American consumers to spend again. Consumer spending is 70 percent of the nation's economic activity. Most of it comes from the middle class and those aspiring to join the middle class. They're the real job creators. But here's the problem: Middle-class consumers won't and can't spend because their savings are depleted, their homes are worth a fraction of what they were five years ago, their wages are dropping, and they're worried about keeping their jobs. And they're no longer able borrow against the rising values of their homes because the housing bubble burst - which means they can no longer pretend they're in better financial shape than they really are.

#### Multiple thumpers to the US and global economies - Eurozone, China hard landing, emerging market recession, anemic US growth and budget fights, Iran

Roubini 9/13/12 (Nouriel, professor at NYU’s Stern School of Business and Chairman of Roubini Global Economics, "Fiddling at the Fire," http://www.project-syndicate.org/print/fiddling-at-the-fire-by-nouriel-roubini)

In the eurozone, euphoria followed the ECB’s decision to provide support with potentially unlimited purchases of distressed countries’ bonds. But the move is not a game changer; it only buys time for policymakers to implement the tough measures needed to resolve the crisis. And the policy challenges are daunting: the eurozone’s recession is deepening as front-loaded fiscal consolidation and severe credit rationing continues. And, as eurozone banks and public-debt markets become increasingly balkanized, establishing a banking union, a fiscal union, and an economic union while pursuing macroeconomic policies that restore growth, external balance, and competitiveness will be extremely difficult.¶ Even the ECB’s support is not obvious. Monetary hawks – the Bundesbank and several other core central banks – who were worried about a new open-ended ECB mandate pushed successfully for strict and effective conditionality for countries benefiting from the bond purchases. As a result, they can pull the plug on the program if its stringent criteria are not met.¶ Moreover, Greece could exit the eurozone in 2013, before Spain and Italy are successfully ring-fenced; Spain – like Greece – is spiraling into depression, and may need a full-scale bailout by the “troika” (the ECB, the European Commission, and the International Monetary Fund). Meanwhile, austerity fatigue in the eurozone periphery is increasingly clashing with bailout fatigue in the core.¶ Small wonder, then, that Germany, politically unable to vote on more bailout resources, has outsourced that job to the ECB, the only institution that can bypass democratically elected parliaments. But, again, liquidity provision alone – without policies to restore growth soon – would merely delay, not prevent, the breakup of the monetary union, ultimately taking down the economic/trade union and leading to the destruction of the single market.¶ In the United States, the latest economic data – including a weak labor market – confirm that growth is anemic, with output in the second half of 2012 unlikely to be significantly stronger than the 1.6% annual gain recorded in January-June. And, given America’s political polarization and policy gridlock, we can expect more fights on the budget and the debt ceiling, another rating downgrade, and no agreement on a path toward medium-term fiscal consolidation and sustainability – regardless of whether President Barack Obama is reelected in November. On the contrary, we should expect agreement only on the path of least political resistance: avoidance of tough fiscal choices until the bond vigilantes eventually wake up, spike long rates, and force fiscal adjustment on the political system.¶ In China, a hard economic landing looks increasingly likely as the investment bubble deflates and net exports shrink. Meanwhile, the reforms necessary to reduce savings and increase private consumption are being delayed. As in Europe and the US, the worst will be avoided in 2012 only by kicking the can down the road with more monetary, fiscal, and credit stimulus.¶ But a hard landing becomes more likely in 2013, as the stimulus fades, non-performing loans rise, the investment bust accelerates, and the problem of rolling over the debts of provincial governments and their special investment vehicles can no longer be papered over. And, given a new leadership’s caution as it establishes its power, reforms will occur at a snail’s pace, making social and political unrest more likely.¶ Meanwhile, Brazil, India, Russia, and other emerging economies are playing the same game. Many have not adjusted as advanced economies’ weakness reduces the room for export-led growth; and many delayed structural reforms needed to boost private-sector development and productivity growth, while embracing a model of state capitalism that will soon reveal its limits. So the recent slowdown of growth in emerging markets is not just cyclical, owing to weak growth or outright recession in advanced economies; it is also structural.¶ Similar dithering is apparent at the geopolitical level as well. The major global powers are still trying negotiations and sanctions to induce Iran to abandon its efforts to develop nuclear weapons. But Iran is playing for time and hoping to reach a zone of immunity. By 2013, an Israel that – rightly or wrongly – perceives Iran’s nuclear program to be an existential threat, and/or the US, which has rejected containment of a nuclear Iran, may decide to strike, leading to a war and a massive spike in oil prices.¶ Ineffective governments with weak leadership are at the root of the problem. In democracies, repeated elections lead to short-term policy choices. In autocracies like China and Russia, leaders resist the radical reforms that would reduce the power of entrenched lobbies and interests, thereby fueling social unrest as resentment against corruption and rent-seeking boils over into protest.¶ But, as everyone kicks the can down the road, the can is getting heavier and, in the major emerging markets and advanced economies alike, is approaching a brick wall. Policymakers can either crash into that wall, or they can show the leadership and vision needed to dismantle it safely.

#### Wind incentives distort the market and increase costs

Schwartz 5 (L.M. Schwartz is the Chairman of the Virginia Land Rights Coalition. “Wind Power Dollars and Sense” http://www.vlrc.org/articles/3.html)

Despite the multi-billion dollar expenditure of taxpayer funds by government and the “renewable energy” industry during the past 35+ years, the results have proven disastrous in economic terms. The Department of Energy (DOE) and other federal and state agencies have spent over $40 billion on “energy research and development” and subsidies, not including private R&D costs, yet virtually nothing has been ‘developed’ that is technologically, economically or environmentally sound.¶ The subsidy of “green” energy, such as solar, geo-thermal, hydro, bio-mass and wind, has distorted the operation of electrical power markets, increased electricity rates to consumers, increased taxes at all levels of government, diverted resources from industry financed (private) research for more efficient and cleaner means of producing and distributing power, politicized energy production, and prevented or delayed bringing more base capacity on line to reliably meet present and projected increases in demand.

#### No solvency - stats skewed by low baseline

Murphy 12 (Robert, Ph.D Economics, senior fellow Pacific Research Institute, Institute for Energy Research, January 4 2012, <http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2012/01/04/wind-power-and-the-free-market/> “Wind Power and the Free Market”)

Lockard’s talking points make it sound as if wind power is poised to take over the energy scene. But like Paul Krugman’s similar remarks about solar power, these too are unsubstantiated. According to the Energy Information Administration, in 2010, wind power accounted for 0.9 percent of the energy used in the United States. Yes, it’s easy to achieve large rates of growth in the wind sector, when starting from such a low baseline. The EIA projects that wind will only produce 3.1 percent of electricity by 2035, up from 2.3 percent in 2010. Because of higher costs and the tremendous problem of intermittency—the wind doesn’t always blow—wind power is nowhere near a position to fuel an economic recovery.

#### Redundancy checks genetic diversity

Marxen 3 (Craig S., Associate Professor of Economics – University of Nebraska, The Independent Review, 7(3), Winter, http://www.independent.org/pdf/tir/tir\_07\_3\_marxsen.pdf)

Carlos Davidson (2000), a biologist with an economics background, takes issue with what he perceives as Sagoff’s agnosticism concerning the existence of significant environmental destruction relevant to humankind’s well-being. He perceives that Sagoff risks overstatement of the environment’s robustness, and he argues that human activities clearly damage the environment, but not in a way that is likely to lead to catastrophe. According to Davidson, environmental damage is not so much like pulling rivets out of an airplane as it is like pulling threads out of a tapestry. The tapestry becomes more and more threadbare and damaged looking, but it never reaches some critical threshold of cataclysmic failure. The ecosystem is **brimming with redundancy**, and problems such as reductions in biodiversity do not threaten the viability of the simpler system that results. Like an old carpet, an increasingly damaged and dirty environment would show no tendency to resolve the deterioration trend catastrophically.

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

Miller 00 (Morris, Economist, Adjunct Professor in the Faculty of Administration – University of Ottawa, Former Executive Director and Senior Economist – World Bank, “Poverty as a Cause of Wars?”, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Winter, p. 273)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that
exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis – as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore **no relationship** to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

#### History proves

Ferguson 6 (Niall, Professor of History – Harvard University, Foreign Affairs, 85(5), September / October, Lexis)

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out. Nazi Germany started the war in Europe only after its economy had recovered. Not all the countries affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression. In fact, no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole. Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

#### Wind farms could harm critical Texas wetlands which are key to aquifer recharge

DallasNews.Com 9 (Reporter Elizabeth Souder, The Dallas Morning News, 3 June 2009, “Do Wind Turbines Hurt the Environment” <http://energyandenvironmentblog.dallasnews.com/archives/2009/06/do-wind-turbines-hurt-the-envi.html>)

Despite the attraction of wind as a nearly pollution-free power source, a Texas Tech University wildlife ecologist cautions that a tsunami of modern wind turbines dotting the South Plains of Texas could have as yet unknown ecological consequences on critical wetlands known as playas. And there are plenty of playas on the Texas High Plains and in Eastern New Mexico - approximately 22,000, in fact. Indeed, it's the largest concentration in the world. Playas act as natural water storage sites, providing irrigation water and seasonally recharging the Ogallala, the nation's largest aquifer. "We don't have any information specific to this region about the effect of wind farm construction on wildlife, and that's a problem because the Panhandle and South Plains of Texas are going to be major players in the wind industry," said David Haukos, an adjunct wildlife ecology professor in Texas Tech's Department of Natural Resources Management.

#### Ogallala decline destroys irrigated crop production, which causes farmers to switch to risky dryland crops, decimating the agricultural sector, lowering employment, and tanking the regional economy

Terrell and Johnson 99 (Bonnie L, assistant director of agricultural investments for Mutual of New York, and Phillip N, Assistant professor in the department of agricultural and applied economics, Texas Tech University, paper presented at American Agricultural Economics Association Aug 8-11 1999, “Economic Impact of the Depletion of the Ogallala Aquifer: A Case Study of the Southern High Plains of Texas, <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/21589/1/sp99te01.pdf>)

The results of this study support the conclusion that as the saturated thickness of the Ogallala aquifer diminishes and pumping lifts of irrigation wells increase, the regional cropping patterns will begin to shift toward more dryland agriculture. As water availability decreases, fanners will reevaluate their traditional cropping patterns. When faced with reduced water availability, the results indicate that the optimal solution for producers will be to shift their focus to those crops that utilize less water during the growing season, and to adopt the most efficient irrigation technologies. Irrigated and dryland cotton were consistently the optimal choices. In comparing the net returns of all possible combinations of crops and technology, irrigated cotton surpasses all other crops. Although irrigated corn displayed high levels of gross returns, irrigation requirements and the associated costs of production caused its acreage to diminish within the region. The low profitability of irrigated and dryland grain sorghum and wheat caused these crops to decrease, although dryland wheat production increased in the latter years of the time horizon. As feed grain production declines in the SHP, the cattle feedlot sector of the regional economy may experience associated impacts. In 1997, the feedlot sector contributed approximately $2.655 billion in output value to the regional economy (Texas Agricultural Statistics Service, 1998). As production from the feed grain sector declines, this may negatively affect the cattle feeding industry in this region due to the symbiotic relationship between the two sectors. The results point to the conclusion that cotton is "king" in the SHP region and should be regarded as the crop of choice for producers. Yet, this analysis does not take into consideration the threat that boll weevil infestations present to an economy dominated by cotton production or possible changes in crop prices in the future. Recognizing these limitations, the results demonstrate important trends for the area's regional economy. Even producing at an optimal level dominated by cotton production, the contribution of agricultural production to the regional economy is reduced given a declining irrigation groundwater resource. This analysis represents a lower bound estimate in terms of the negative economic impacts resulting from the depletion of the Ogallala because of the assumption that all fanners will produce at the optimal level, which entails the willingness to make the transition to dryland farming and more efficient irrigation technology. Additionally, the optimization models are based on the assumption that as long as there is any positive net return a farmer will continue to produce, which is not necessarily the case. Not only will the sectors facing decreasing agricultural production be affected, but the economy as a whole will be affected due to the interdependence between all industries in an economy and the corresponding multiplier effects of any change within an economy. Once regional agricultural production peaks and begins to decline through diminished irrigated acreage, the entire economy would be affected. The direct effects from agricultural production will be reduced as dryland crops with their associated yields replace higher yielding irrigated crops. In turn, this reduction in the final demand within the agricultural sectors will ripple through the economy and effect virtually everyone within § Marked 08:26 § the region to some degree. This occurs through the indirect and induced effects of a change in final demand. Employment, and thus household consumption, will eventually be impacted as the regional economy dominated by agriculture begins to feel the effects of decreasing irrigated crop production.

#### Economy is resilient Behravesh 06 (Nariman, most accurate economist tracked by USA Today and chief global economist and executive vice president for Global Insight, Newsweek, “The Great Shock Absorber; Good macroeconomic policies and improved microeconomic flexibility have strengthened the global economy's 'immune system.'” 10-15-2006, www.newsweek.com/id/47483)

The U.S. and global economies were able to withstand three body blows in 2005--one of the worst tsunamis on record (which struck at the very end of 2004), one of the worst hurricanes on record and the highest energy prices after Hurricane Katrina--without missing a beat. This resilience was especially remarkable in the case of the United States, which since 2000 has been able to shrug off the biggest stock-market drop since the 1930s, a major terrorist attack, corporate scandals and war. Does this mean that recessions are a relic of the past? No, but recent events do suggest that the global economy's "immune system" is now strong enough to absorb shocks that 25 years ago would probably have triggered a downturn. In fact, over the past two decades, recessions have not disappeared, but have become considerably milder in many parts of the world. What explains this enhanced recession resistance? The answer: a combination of good macroeconomic policies and improved microeconomic flexibility. Since the mid-1980s, central banks worldwide have had great success in taming inflation. This has meant that long-term interest rates are at levels not seen in more than 40 years. A low-inflation and low-interest-rate environment is especially conducive to sustained, robust growth. Moreover, central bankers have avoided some of the policy mistakes of the earlier oil shocks (in the mid-1970s and early 1980s), during which they typically did too much too late, and exacerbated the ensuing recessions. Even more important, in recent years the Fed has been particularly adept at crisis management, aggressively cutting interest rates in response to stock-market crashes, terrorist attacks and weakness in the economy. The benign inflationary picture has also benefited from increasing competitive pressures, both worldwide (thanks to globalization and the rise of Asia as a manufacturing juggernaut) and domestically (thanks to technology and deregulation). Since the late 1970s, the United States, the United Kingdom and a handful of other countries have been especially aggressive in deregulating their financial and industrial sectors. This has greatly increased the flexibility of their economies and reduced their vulnerability to inflationary shocks. Looking ahead, what all this means is that a global or U.S. recession will likely be avoided in 2006, and probably in 2007 as well. Whether the current expansion will be able to break the record set in the 1990s for longevity will depend on the ability of central banks to keep the inflation dragon at bay and to avoid policy mistakes. The prospects look good. Inflation is likely to remain a low-level threat for some time, and Ben Bernanke, the incoming chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, spent much of his academic career studying the past mistakes of the Fed and has vowed not to repeat them. At the same time, no single shock will likely be big enough to derail the expansion. What if oil prices rise to $80 or $90 a barrel? Most estimates suggest that growth would be cut by about 1 percent--not good, but no recession. What if U.S. house prices fall by 5 percent in 2006 (an extreme assumption, given that house prices haven't fallen nationally in any given year during the past four decades)? Economic growth would slow by about 0.5 percent to 1 percent. What about another terrorist attack? Here the scenarios can be pretty scary, but an attack on the order of 9/11 or the Madrid or London bombings would probably have an even smaller impact on overall GDP growth.

### Investment

#### -- No famine – the poorest are insulated from global markets

Paarlberg 8 (Robert, Professor of Political Science – Wellesley College, “It's Not the Price that Causes Hunger”, The International Herald Tribune, 4-23, Lexis)

International prices of rice, wheat and corn have risen sharply, setting off violent urban protests in roughly a dozen countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. But is this a ''world food crisis?'' It is certainly a troubling instance of price instability in international commodity markets, leading to social unrest among urban food-buyers. But we must be careful not to equate high crop prices with hunger around the world. Most of the world's hungry people do not use international food markets, and most of those who use these markets are not hungry. International food markets, like international markets for everything else, are used primarily by the prosperous and secure, not the poor and vulnerable. In world corn markets, the biggest importer by far is Japan. Next comes the European Union. Next comes South Korea. Citizens in these countries are not underfed. In the poor countries of Asia, rice is the most important staple , yet most Asian countries import very little rice. As recently as March , India was keeping imported rice out of the country by imposing a 70 percent duty. Data on the actual incidence of malnutrition reveal that the regions of the world where people are most hungry, in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, are those that depend least on imports from the world market. Hunger is caused in these countries not by high international food prices, but by local conditions, especially rural poverty linked to low productivity in farming. When international prices are go up, the disposable income of some import-dependent urban dwellers is squeezed. But most of the actual hunger takes place in the villages and in the countryside , and it persists even when international prices are low. When hunger is measured as a balanced index of calorie deficiency, prevalence of underweight children and mortality rates for children under five, we find that South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa in 2007 had hunger levels two times as high as in the developing countries of East Asia, four times as high as in Latin America, North Africa or the Middle East, and five times as high as in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. The poor in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa are hungry even though their connections to high-priced international food markets are quite weak. In the poorest developing countries of Asia, where nearly 400 million people are hungry, international grain prices are hardly a factor, since imports supply only 4 percent of total consumption - even when world prices are low. Similarly in sub-Saharan Africa, only about 16 percent of grain supplies have recently been imported, going mostly into the more prosperous cities rather than the impoverished countryside, with part arriving in the form of donated food aid rather than commercial purchases at world prices. The region in Africa that depends on world markets most heavily is North Africa, where 50 percent of grain supplies are imported. Yet food consumption in North Africa is so high (average per capita energy consumption there is about 3,000 calories per day, comparable to most rich countries) that increased import prices may cause economic stress for urban consumers (and perhaps even street demonstrations) but little real hunger. Import dependence is also high in Latin America (50 percent for some countries) but again high world prices will not mean large numbers of hungry people, because per capita GDP in this region is five times higher than in sub-Saharan Africa. There is a severe food crisis among the poor in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, but it does not come from high world prices. Even in 2005 in sub-Saharan Africa, a year of low international crop prices, 23 out of 37 countries in the region consumed less than their nutritional requirements. Africa's food crisis grows primarily out of the low productivity, year in and year out, of the 60 percent of all Africans who plant crops and graze animals for a living. The average African smallholder farmer is a woman who has no improved seeds, no nitrogen fertilizers, no irrigation and no veterinary medicine for her animals. Her crop yields are only one third as high as in the developing countries of Asia, and her average income is only $1 a day.

#### new supplies solve

**Pelletier 12**

[ Martin Pelletier, CFA, is a portfolio manager at TriVest Wealth Counsel Ltd, 6/12/12, <http://business.financialpost.com/2012/06/12/sad-news-for-peak-oil-disciples/?__lsa=2f97124e>]

Whenever oil prices surpass US$100 per barrel, a certain group of well-known economists and investment banks re-emerge to tout their dire warnings that oil will soon top US$200 or more because of peaking oil supplies. Several bestselling books have been written warning that the world’s supply of oil has peaked and we had better prepare for the day of reckoning when there will be global shortfall of crude. I must admit the data, especially given the rapid growth in demand from emerging countries, seemed very compelling five or six years ago. So much so that even the contrarian in me capitulated and I was an active participant among those predicting a global shortage of energy. Times certainly have changed and so have I. Very few observers, if any, were able to predict the enormous impact new technologies such as horizontal multi-stage fracking would have on unlocking supplies of oil and gas once thought unrecoverable. There seems to be no shortage of news these days about the vast amounts of unconventional oil and gas being discovered in North America, Russia, China and several other countries.

#### Wind doesn’t reduce oil consumption – because wind affects electricity not transportation

#### -- Lack of infrastructure and distribution networks cause famine – not high prices

Khosla 7 (Vinod, Founder – Sun Microsystems and Khosla Ventures, “Food versus Fuel” or the “Salve for Africa”?, <http://www.khoslaventures.com/presentations/FOODvFUEL.pdf>)

Despite its misplaced pessimism about corn-ethanol, the excerpted section does note that the advent of cellulosic ethanol would mitigate the purported prices rises; as production capacity for cellulosic ethanol ramps up, it will be competitive, even without further improvements in technology. Cellulosic ethanol will act as price-ceiling on corn ethanol, much as corn ethanol can do for oil today. Nonetheless, the pessimism that the world’s poor starve because we don’t produce enough food is absurd. The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) notes that there is more food per-capita today than ever before – the lack of infrastructure, income, and distribution networks are the real causes of hunger, and not corn prices (indeed, the U.S exports just 17% of its corn production, and the majority of even this exported crop is used for livestock feed). Instead of rebelling against corn ethanol, the developing world (and Africa in particular) has been pushing the western world for agricultural subsidy reductions in the West, noting that their farmers cannot compete (and earn income) against such heavily discounted products. Critics conjure up images of starving children as innocent byproducts of corn ethanol; meanwhile, the EU actually pays farmers not to grow food (and thus to reduce supply). The (subsidized) low prices of agricultural products like corn have made foreign farmers in poor countries uneconomic producers. According to the New York Times (Aug 18, 2007), “CARE, the big global charity, had decided to stop selling subsidized American farm products in poor African countries because the program was inefficient and undercut local farmers.” Corn ethanol, by helping make corn more economic to grow and hence reducing corn subsidies, is actually helping the poor.

#### Wind doesn’t solve oil prices – only affects electricity

MasterResource 12 (Letter from Glen Schleede, June 4 “Dear Senator Warner (D-Va.): PTC a Loser All Around” <http://www.masterresource.org/2012/06/dear-senator-warner-d-va-ptc/#more-20272>)

Your letter asserts, incorrectly, that “Domestically generated wind power can … [help] reduce dependence on foreign oil…” This simply isn’t true.¶ Wind turbines are built solely to produce electricity. Virtually none (about 1%) of the electricity produced in the US is produced by oil-fired generating units. Many of the units making up this small percentage are “peaking” units (turbine or internal combustion) that are used primarily on hot days when electricity demand reaches very high levels – a time when wind turbines tend to produce little or no electricity.

#### -- Market reactions solve – production will increase to meet demand

Khosla 7 (Vinod, Founder – Sun Microsystems and Khosla Ventures, “Food versus Fuel” or the “Salve for Africa”?, <http://www.khoslaventures.com/presentations/FOODvFUEL.pdf>)

Markets have already reacted to the higher-corn demand with increases supply, which have already dropped prices to about $3.50 per bushel. The ProExporter Network’s data shows us that while total corn demand in 2007/08 is estimated to be approximately 900 million bushels higher than 2006/07, total supply will increase by a 1.6 billion bushels (sufficient for about 4.8 billion gallo
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### 2NC - Solvency

#### CP solves 100% of the case and the external net benefit –

#### Extend the Zaidi evidence which indicates the states have authority within

#### Only the CP solves – it encourages energy innovation that moves past federal gridlock and solves sustainable development

Bryner 2 (Gary C. - Professor, Department of Political Science, Brigham Young University, and Research Associate, Natural Resources Law Center. University of Colorado School of Law., “ARTICLE: Policy Devolution and Environmental Law: Exploring the Transition to Sustainable Development”, Fall, 26 Environs Envtl. L. & Pol'y J. 1, lexis)

The United States, and Congress in particular, has not embraced the idea of sustainable development more aggressively because policy makers are still mired in the debates started three decades ago about how to improve the existing scheme of environmental law and regulation, and the enduring American conflict over the size and scope of the Federal government. Criticism of the EPA has been widespread among the Republican leaders of Congress. House Republican leaders such as former Speaker Newt Gingrich (Ga) and Majority Whip Tom DeLay (Tx) regularly railed against the EPA and environmental regulation as they took control of the Congress in 1995 and sought to roll back the provisions of many environmental laws. n68 The debate since then has progressed little. **Congress continues to debate energy**, transportation, and other environmental issues **with little commitment** to the idea of sustainable development, stewardship over natural resources, and U.S. responsibility for solving the environmental problems to which it is a major contributor. Energy bills passed by the House in 2001 and the Senate in 2002, for example, were largely efforts to subsidize and encourage the development of new energy sources, with **only relatively little attention aimed at** moving energy production and consumption **to more sustainable patterns.** n69 The political conflict over environmental law and regulation has been so divisive and time consuming that it has precluded the nation from moving toward the next generation of environmental laws that would incorporate the idea of sustainable development. n70 Rather than make regulatory programs more effective, the Bush administration and Republicans in Congress continue the decades-old debate over how to reduce the costs of complying with them by changing the process by which agencies issue regulations, the criteria by which they assess risks and balance costs and benefits, and the role of private property rights. It [\*29] is difficult to move to a more ambitious agenda of sustainable development when regulatory relief is the primary environmental policy goal. Sustainable development, like any other major policy commitment, ultimately requires the support of Congress and strong, effective legislation, and the greatest failure to engage in the idea of sustainable development has been here. Leaders of both parties in Congress have virtually ignored the idea of sustainable development and the United States' commitments made at the Rio Earth Summit. For them, sustainable development is simply a problem for other countries to worry about. n71 The hostility of the Bush administration and many congressional leaders have to international commitments, along with their opposition to environmental regulation, combine to create a major barrier to pursuing the idea of sustainable development in the United States. Congress continues to debate the question of whether there should be more or less environmental regulation. Rather than asking more fundamental questions about how to balance and integrate economic growth and ecological sustainability, policy makers are mired in efforts to defend or attack the regulatory system that has been in place since the 1970s. As a result, there is no strong commitment to sustainable development, and the nation is far from having in place a strategy that integrates sustainability into environmental, social, and economic activities. n72 State and local governments play a critical role in that strategy in engaging citizens and industry in transforming economic activity. There is strong support for policy devolution from political theories that emphasize participation and civic engagement. Communitarians, for example, have criticized the political expectations underlying the dominant model of regulation and the broader contemporary liberalism of which it is a part because it does not take into account the "moral and political obligations that we commonly recognize, even prize." n73 Liberal individualism fails to recognize and encourage the political obligations people have to each other, fails to see people as "mutually indebted and morally engaged" because "strong notions of community or membership" are a threat to the priority given to individual rights. Liberalism, communitarian critics argue, cannot "secure the liberty it promises, because it cannot sustain the kind of political community and civic engagement that liberty requires." n74 Liberalism provides a weak basis for environmental law because of its impoverished sense of responsibility: [\*30] Our "legal and political vocabularies deal handily with rights-bearing individuals" but seem unable to deal effectively with environmental degradation. n75 Liberalism "impedes creative long-range thinking about our most pressing public problems." n76 Its intertwining with capitalism and the constant drive for expansion, growth, and consumption, critics argue, doom it when it must deal with scarcity, limits, and pollution. n77 Liberalism has been an attractive alternative to socialism and conservatism because it promises unlimited growth, individual freedom, and unconstrained consumption. But those assumptions and values are no longer tenable in light of pollution, environmental damage, and loss of biodiversity and natural resources, and must be replaced, critics argue, with alternative forms of governance that liberate human potential and preserve the biosphere, rather than simply pursue economic growth. n78Central to communitarianism is a fundamental revolution in the idea of public participation. Public involvement in the New Deal model of policy making is limited and constrained. Public hearing and comment periods are provided so citizens can voice their support for or opposition to policy options government agencies are considering or specific proposals they have decided on. But agencies are not required to take these comments into account in making decisions, and the decisions about what alternatives to put on the policy agenda, the selection of the alternative to be pursued, and how policies will be implemented are not negotiated with citizens but decided for them. In contrast, communitarianism engages the public directly in policy formulation, and those policies are a result of an open political process rather than one tightly managed by technocrats or political elites. Real public participation empowers people to make tradeoffs, set priorities, and determine the public interest as they govern themselves. Other proponents of strong democracy emphasize the interaction of environmental and other public problems and the role of citizen participation in remedying them. Insensitivity to ecological constraints and efforts to dominate and exploit nature are intertwined with efforts by humans to dominate and exploit each other. Social domination and hierarchies are barriers to ecological health and preservation. The state itself is a barrier to an ecological society because of its hierarchical, anti-participatory nature, and must be abolished and replaced with human-scaled communities which free them to find technological and behavioral solutions to environmental problems. When individuals are liberated from [\*31] the artificial structures that constrain them, they will be free to learn how to live in harmony with nature. n79 The solution to environmental problems often requires changes in behavior by all members of a community. People are more likely to comply with decisions and agreements they have played a role in formulating. Those who have information and the power to affect decisions will participate in policy making and their participation gives them ownership in the commitments made. People affected by decisions that balance expenditures on pollution control or limits on economic development with other values become responsible themselves for weighing those competing concerns and making the trade-offs, rather than having them imposed by others. n80 Solving environmental problems and building democratic capacity are intertwined. Promoting democratic participation and decision making are just as important as resolving the environmental challenges. Because the environmental and public health stakes are often so high, there is a great incentive to participate and to build democratic decision making capacity. The agenda is much broader than reducing pollution, but reaches into other areas of public concern in empowering people to solve problems and pursue values such as of justice, fairness, and equity, while also enhancing their freedom and ability to govern themselves. n81 Proponents of "strong democracy" argue that citizens and political officials must engage in a public dialogue. Rather than discussions with the public over a few, highly contentious issues such as the citing of hazardous waste facilities, the public plays a central role in the broad range of public issues and determine for themselves where the public interest lies. The role of the political community is to transform self-interested individuals into citizens who also seek public goods. Democratic discourse is essential, where conflicts are resolved through public discussions and decision-making. Forums must be created to provide information and to provide access to scientific and technical information so that citizens can challenge claims made by different participants, to ensure that citizens determine policy outcomes and are not limited to just expressing their views, and to provide continual, enduring opportunities to revise decisions as new information is developed and circumstances change. Public participation not only produces remedies to public problems but also builds democratic capacity and self-governance. n82 [\*32] V. CONCLUSION The idea of sustainable development makes a persuasive case, rooted in empirical observations as well as theoretical arguments, that environmental regulatory process needs to engage more effectively the public and industry in pursuing environmental goals. Giving states increased authority and responsibility to fashion regulatory programs and encourage innovation and experimentation **is an essential element of the rethinking of regulation that is taking place that** **is central in the transition to policies that are firmly embedded in the idea of sustainability.** One of the central questions in environmental policy making is whether the changes that will be required in order to preserve the biosphere and use natural resources sustainably can occur through traditional legal approaches, policy-making models, and ways of thinking, or whether these changes require new paradigms, approaches, and political structures. Some argue that current legal and political conceptual frameworks are sufficient and incremental changes can produce the kinds of adjustments necessary. But incrementalism assumes that ecological change and the evolution of ecological risks are linear and that change is sufficiently slow and that gradual policy adjustment and accommodation are sufficient. A major challenge to begin now to pursue incremental changes, learn from our experience and make mid-course adjustments, keep moving in the direction of sustainability, and build our capacity to make more effective policies, so that as political demands create the will to pursue changes, we are in position to embrace more ambitious policies that will ensure ecologically sustainable economic activity.

#### States empirically give wind tax credits

Carleyolsen 6 (Sanya Carleyolsen, PhD candidate Public Policy @ UNC, Summer 2006, “Tangled in the Wires,” 46 Nat. Resources J. 759, ln)

State legislatures also have a variety of tax incentives at their disposal to help bring down the costs of RE projects and make them more cost-competitive with other fuel methods. Many states have adopted tax incentive systems that can be applied to corporate, income, property or sales taxes. n90 Such corporate and income tax incentives provide deductions or credits for purchased RE equipment. For instance, some states provide Investment Tax Credits (ITC) for either centralized or decentralized wind energy systems. n91 Property and business owners who invest in wind energy systems are granted ITCs equal to a [\*778] percentage, as established by the state legislature, of the amount invested in the project. n92 Some states have adopted sales tax incentives that either exempt or reduce the sales tax on RE equipment. n93 Sales tax reductions may be placed on land assets, materials or equipment, and energy transfer. Yet another, comparatively popular, option is a property tax reduction, granted to RE facility owners. n94 Property tax incentives include property tax and special assessment exemptions based on value-added RE additions, calculated as a percentage of the total assessed value of the facility. n95

####  AND – Counterplan is more efficient - Federal bureaucracy dooms the plan – institutional failures mean zero solvency

Bryner 2 (Gary C. - Professor, Department of Political Science, Brigham Young University, and Research Associate, Natural Resources Law Center. University of Colorado School of Law., “ARTICLE: Policy Devolution and Environmental Law: Exploring the Transition to Sustainable Development”, Fall, 26 Environs Envtl. L. & Pol'y J. 1, lexis)

Devolution theory calls for increased policy authority and discretion to be delegated to state governments in order to improve the efficiency of public policies, ensure they effectively resolve specific problems, and foster political accountability. Devolution also gives different communities the opportunity to strike their own balance among the competing policy objectives of economic growth and reducing environmental risks. n10 Devolution to regulated industries promises to reduce the cost of regulation, create incentives for sources of pollution to find the most efficient and effective means of reducing emissions, encourage reductions that go beyond minimum mandates, and allow for flexibility in business decision making. Devolution to citizens is championed as a way to get the public involved in regulatory initiatives that will change the behavior of citizens. Reducing emissions through energy conservation and increased use of [\*5] mass transit, for example, require major commitments on the part of citizens to change their behavior, and that commitment cannot simply be mandated from the top down. Other forms of participatory policy making have been proposed to respond to the demands of citizens for a role in decisions that affect their health and quality of life. Advocates of devolution argue that the current federal regulatory structure is **plagued by burdensome procedures and a cumbersome chain of command**. The combination of environmental statutes, EPA regulations, and guidance documents result in **an impenetrable pyramid of paperwork, planning, and reports**. A tremendous amount of effort at all levels of governments is required to manage this process. Compliance with these requirements often replaces energy and resources that could be used to actually reduce pollution and improve environmental quality. Accountability is difficult to identify since **so many policy makers compete and jostle for influence**, that citizens do not know who to hold accountable when environmental goals are not achieved. Federal officials lay claim to credit for issuing ambitious environmental goals, while state and local officials bear the brunt of criticism for imposing regulatory burdens. The EPA seeks vainly to develop and impose national requirements on conditions that vary widely throughout the nation. n11 Critics have identified a **host of problems with centralized, command and control regulation**: it has not only failed to remedy many environmental problems and threats, but it has engendered significant opposition because of the restraints on freedom it imposes, the costs and burdens of compliance, and **the apparent ease by which some businesses are able to escape** liability and responsibility for their actions. n12 There are real limits to the power of government to promote and ensure the preservation of air, water, land, and other resources. Government agencies alone cannot accomplish these environmental goals, but must be combined with clear and effective economic incentives and with a widely held ethic of care for the land and resources on which all life is so dependent. But the dominant role the federal government plays in environmental policy making focuses too much attention on Washington, and **fails to encourage more local efforts**. n13 Other critics of the current structure of regulatory federalism argue that some state and local governments had a long tradition of ambitious environmental regulation and enacted ambitious pollution control legislation well before Congress or the executive branch acted. The first clean air laws in the United States were enacted by cities in the 1880s, [\*6] some 75 years before the first federal program aimed at air pollution. n14 Many states passed water pollution laws in the 1920 and 30s, and by 1948, every state had an environmental protection agency. n15 While it is true that many federal initiatives for air and water pollution predated the 1970 Earth Day, when the modern era of environmental regulation began, states are not newcomers to environmental regulation. Nor is federal regulation a clear success story. Federal environmental policy has been, **in many areas, problematic**, and has threatened environmental quality. Federal subsidies for road building in national forests, grazing on public lands, the development of fossil fuels, and the emptying of rivers and streams into reservoirs for irrigation, for example, have taken a tremendous toll on natural systems and resources and have encouraged waste, unsustainable consumption, and pollution. n16 One of the consequences of environmental federalism has been to place limitations on more aggressive state regulations. A major impetus for federal air pollution regulation, for example, was a concern by the auto industry that states would impose different emission standards on new vehicles; this fear of having to meet a maze of state regulatory requirements prompted Detroit to lobby for federal regulation of new vehicle emissions. n17 Another example, from the mid-1990s, is the development of federal emission standards for hazardous emissions from coke ovens that were less stringent than those devised in some states, such as Pennsylvania, where environmental advocates had pushed for and won more ambitious limits. n18

### A2: Perm do both

#### -- Links to politics – includes immediate federal action. Perm doesn’t shield: state support is slow. Delay means it won’t take effect until after the vote.

#### -- Impossible – CP transfers authority to the states. The federal government can’t do it while transferring authority to the states – if they can – it’s intrinsic because it adds a new time element that is neither in the plan or counterplan – that’s a voting issue

#### Federal policies crowd out the states—reduces demand for state action

Adler 7 (Jonathan H – Professor of Law and Co-Director, Center for Business Law and Regulation, Case Western Reserve University School of Law, ., “WHEN IS TWO A CROWD? THE IMPACT OF

FEDERAL ACTION ON STATE ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION”, 31 Harv. Envtl. L. Rev. 67, Lexis)

A second potential negative indirect effect of federal regulation on state regulatory choices is crowding out. This occurs because federal regulation **may serve as a substitute for state-level regulation, thereby reducing the benefits of adopting or maintaining state-level protections**. Insofar as voters in a given state demand a certain level of environmental protection, there is no reason to expect states to duplicate federal efforts when a federal program satisfies that demand, particularly if a state has not already created such a program. If the federal floor is greater than or equal to the level of environmental protection demanded by a state's residents, **that state has no reason to adopt environmental regulations of its own** once the federal government has acted. To the extent that this effect occurs, it is separate from--perhaps even in addition to--the signaling effect described above. The claim here is not simply that states regulate less than they would absent federal regulation--although this claim is almost certainly true. Rather, the claim is that some states that would adopt regulations more protective than the federal floor, absent the imposition of federal regulation, have not done so due to federal regulation and may not do so in the future. If this hypothesis is correct, the net effect of federal environmental regulation in at least some states could be less environmental protection than would have been adopted had the federal government not intervened. To see how this could occur, recall that the demand for environmental regulation in any given jurisdiction tends to increase over time as wealth, [\*99] technical capability, scientific knowledge, and environmental impacts increase. n131 In any given state (as in the nation as a whole), there is an initial period ("Period A") during which the demand for a given type of environmental protection is relatively low. The costs of adopting environmental regulations in this period are greater than the benefits of adopting any such protections. These costs include the costs of developing, drafting, and passing legislation; the costs of creating a new policy program, drafting and implementing regulations, defending the regulations from any potential legal or administrative challenges, creating a means to monitor and enforce regulatory compliance; and so on. In addition, there are opportunity costs of devoting state resources and political capital to the cause of environmental protection as opposed to some other policy goal. As discussed earlier, the demand for environmental protection has tended to increase over time along with increases in living standards. n132 At the same time, increases in technical knowledge and administrative efficiency may lower the costs of a given regulatory program. Eventually, a state will enter a second period ("Period B") in which the benefits of a given environmental regulatory program are greater than the costs of initiating, implementing, and operating such a program. Absent any federal interference, the hypothetical state will not adopt environmental regulations in Period A, but will adopt such regulations in Period B. See Figure 3. This is the environmental transition discussed in Part I. In Period A, the demand for environmental protection is insufficient to justify the costs of implementing environmental protection measures. By Period B, however, the demand for environmental protection has risen due to increases in wealth and knowledge, among other factors. At the same time, increases in technical capacity and scientific understanding have reduced the cost of adopting environmental protections. As a result, in Period B a state will adopt Q[B] amount of environmental protection. n133 [\*100] The timing of Period A and Period B will vary from state to state. This is clearly the case as different states have enacted different environmental regulatory measures at different times--some before the adoption of federal environmental regulation, some after, and some not at all. Looking at the history of various environmental concerns, such as air quality, water quality, or wetlands, it is clear that many states moved from Period A to Period B for these environmental concerns at various times prior to the onset of federal regulations in the 1970s. In many other states, however, a federal regulatory floor was adopted before the onset of Period B. [\*101] For states that went through their environmental transition and entered Period B prior to the enactment of federal environmental protection, whether the adoption of a federal regulatory floor increased the aggregate level of environmental protection in that state depended upon whether preexisting state policies offered greater or lesser levels of protection than the relevant federal policies. For states in which the onset of Period B begins after the adoption of federal regulations, the enactment of a federal regulatory floor will, at the time of enactment, increase the aggregate level of environmental protection in that state. However, this may not be the case over time. In states that desire a greater level of protection than that provided by the relevant federal regulations, it is not clear that the existence of the federal regulatory floor will result in an equal or greater level of protection than would be adopted were it not for the federal regulations. This is because federal regulation will, **to some extent, act as a substitute for state regulation**. As a result, the adoption of federal regulation has the potential to reduce the demand for state regulation and, in some instances, even result in less aggregate regulation in a given state than would have been adopted absent federal intervention. In short, federal regulation can crowd out state regulation. **The potential for such a crowding-out effect is illustrated** in Figure 4. The existence of federal regulation will reduce the demand for state regulation by an amount equal to the extent to which federal regulation is a substitute for state regulation of the same environmental concern (Q[FReg]). This substitution effect will reduce the net benefit of adopting state-level environmental regulations from OCQ[B] to OC'Q'[B]. By reducing the net benefits of state-level environmental regulation in this manner, federal regulation has the potential to crowd out state-level environmental protections, even if the quantity of environmental protection demanded in the state is greater than that provided by the federal government. In such cases, the aggregate level of environmental protection will be lower with federal regulation than it would be without it. [\*102]

#### Perm fails – preemption means it’s net worse

Leshy 4 (John D., Distinguished Professor of Law – University of California Hastings College of the Law, “Natural Resources Policy in the Bush Administration: an Outsider's Somewhat Jaundiced Assessment,” Duke Environmental Law & Policy Forum, Spring, 14 Duke Envtl. L. & Pol'y F. 347, Lexis)

VI. Traditional conservative principles, like promoting free markets and **devolving governmental responsibilities to state and local governments**, have taken a back seat where they conflict with industry desires Perhaps the strongest indication of the administration's capture by industry is the manner in which it has kept the free-market ideologies of some of its key natural resource appointees firmly in check, readily sacrificing them where they conflict with industry demands. For example, in recent years, ideological conservatives, among others, have touted the resolution of longstanding conflicts over the environmental impacts of livestock grazing on arid federal lands by buying the ranches in consensual, market-based transactions, and retiring the federal lands their cattle has been grazing from livestock grazing in the future. n34 This has provided the administration with a great opportunity to put in place the principles of so-called "free-market environmentalism" favored by many of the Bush Administration's right-wing supporters. [\*356] But when the Grand Canyon Trust, a conservation group, went into the marketplace to purchase grazing permits on nearly a million acres of public lands in the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument in southern Utah, and sought to retire those lands from grazing, the Bush Administration balked. n35 The Interior Solicitor (a former official of the National Public Lands Council, a rancher trade association) issued legal opinions throwing up roadblocks to retirement, and the retirement proposal continues to languish inside the Department. n36 Even though Interior has acknowledged that retirement will improve the health of the land, n37 the administration is more concerned about placating the cattlemen's association and hard-bitten local opponents of the national monument who do not want to see even market-based land conservation. The unhappy result is that philanthropic money to invest in grazing retirements is harder to come by, much to the chagrin of free-market environmental groups, one of who recently gave the administration a "C-" in its report card on this point. n38 Another example is the administration's unwillingness to defer to state and local governments when their interests diverge from those of industry. Thus, the administration told a federal court in Nevada that federal mining law preempted efforts by a local county to regulate a proposed processing plant for federal minerals that would be located on private land. n39 The overriding federal interest here is somewhat mysterious, considering that the only use of the material being mined is to make kitty litter. n40 The administration has made a similar argument in opposing Los Angeles County's efforts to regulate a quarry on private land extracting sand and gravel owned by the federal government. n41 And it has aggressively (but so far unsuccessfully) [\*357] pushed the Congress to give it authority to preempt state regulation of rights-of-way for energy facilities. n42

#### Doesn’t solve

Zimmerman 1 (Joseph F., Professor of Political Science – State University of New York at Albany, Publius, Spring, p 16)

Examining this list, it becomes apparent that different institutional features of the federal structure are more or less important for securing these different values. Some of the values ‑ diversity, competition, and experimentalism ‑ appear to depend significantly on the existence of many states pursuing unique regulatory agendas. If all of the states pursued identical regulatory strategies, or were prevented from instituting meaningful agendas altogether, these values, as a logical matter, could not be promoted. Obviously there would be no regulatory diversity, because all of the states would structure the lives of their citizens in the same way. Moreover, this uniformity would prevent state competition and experimentation: people would have no incentive to "vote with their feet" if each state provided the same package of public goods, and experimentation by definition requires that different states attempt different solutions to the same social problems.

### A2: Perm do the CP

#### Clearly severs– the states reduce restrictions- federal action is bad

#### They have to defend only federal action

Webster’s 76 (New International Dictionary Unabridged, p. 883)

Federal government. Of or relating to the central government of a nation, having the character of a federation as distinguished from the governments of the constituent unites (as states or provinces).

#### Perm severs immediacy -

#### 'Substantial' must be at the present time

Words and Phrases 64 (40W&P 759)

The words" outward, open, actual, visible, substantial, and exclusive," in connection with a change of possession, mean substantially the same thing. They mean not concealed; not hidden; exposed to view; free from concealment, dissimulation, reserve, or disguise; in full existence; denoting that which not merely can be, but is opposed to potential, apparent, constructive, and imaginary; veritable; genuine; certain: absolute: real at present time, as a matter of fact, not merely nominal; opposed to fonn; actually existing; true; not including, admitting, or pertaining to any others; undivided; sole; opposed to inclusive.

#### “Should” means immediate

Summer 94 (Justice, Oklahoma Supreme Court, “Kelsey v. Dollarsaver Food Warehouse of Durant”, http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14)

4 The legal question to be resolved by the court is whether the word "should"[13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13) in the May 18 order connotes futurity or may be deemed a ruling in praesenti.[14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14) The answer to this query is not to be divined from rules of grammar;[15](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn15) it must be governed by the age-old practice culture of legal professionals and its immemorial language usage. To determine if the omission (from the critical May 18 entry) of the turgid phrase, "and the same hereby is", (1) makes it an in futuro ruling - i.e., an expression of what the judge will or would do at a later stage - or (2) constitutes an in in praesenti resolution of a disputed law issue, the trial judge's intent must be garnered from the four corners of the entire record.[16](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn16)  ¶5 Nisi prius orders should be so construed as to give effect to every words and every part of the text, with a view to carrying out the evident intent of the judge's direction.[17](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn17) The order's language ought not to be considered abstractly. The actual meaning intended by the document's signatory should be derived from the context in which the phrase to be interpreted is used.[18](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn18) When applied to the May 18 memorial, these told canons impel my conclusion that the judge doubtless intended his ruling as an in praesenti resolution of Dollarsaver's quest for judgment n.o.v. Approval of all counsel plainly appears on the face of the critical May 18 entry which is [885 P.2d 1358] signed by the judge.[19](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn19) True minutes[20](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn20) of a court neither call for nor bear the approval of the parties' counsel nor the judge's signature. To reject out of hand the view that in this context "should" is impliedly followed by the customary, "and the same hereby is", makes the court once again revert to medieval notions of ritualistic formalism now so thoroughly condemned in national jurisprudence and long abandoned by the statutory policy of this State. **[Continues – To Footnote]** [14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn14) In praesenti means literally "at the present time." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 792 (6th Ed. 1990). In legal parlance the phrase denotes that which in law is presently or immediately effective, as opposed to something that will or would become effective in the future [in futurol]. See Van Wyck v. Knevals, [106 U.S. 360](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=106&box2=U.S.&box3=360), 365, 1 S.Ct. 336, 337, 27 L.Ed. 201 (1882).

#### Voting issue – stable agent is the locus of all ground

#### This is preposterous. Confusing signals on energy production have no chance of undermining overall hegemony. The basic idea is clear, the fed will control other areas, and energy is a tiny subset of all policies. Plus, structural factors like a sweet military and economic strength overwhelm

#### “One voice” theory is outdated – federal exclusivity has no impact on U.S. leadership

Spiro 99 (Peter J., Associate Professor – Hofstra University Law School, “Role of the States in Foreign Affairs: Foreign Relations Federalism”, University of Colorado Law Review, Fall, 70 U. Colo. L. Rev. 1223, Lexis)

Foreign relations law has long been different. [**1**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n1) But difference is not the same as illegitimacy. To take a standard refrain from the law of equal protection, different things need not be treated as if they are the same. Context justifies difference; and the context of foreign relations has been different indeed. In the domestic realm, mistakes can be corrected and outliers brought to heel. By contrast, foreign relations law definitionally involves the presence of third parties - other nation-states - not within our direct control. Some of these third parties have been hostile, some so powerful that they might threaten our very existence as a nation. This context has weighed heavily against standard vindication of the constitutional values that undergird domestic authorities. Against survival, the virtues of separated powers and of individual rights are less compelling. Foreign relations law may be exceptional to the twentieth-century constitutional canon, [**2**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n2) but that difference has been largely justified. But the context that once rationalized the foreign relations differential is itself now changing in a way that demands reassessment. The world is no longer so neatly divided into sovereign boxes, locked in a zero-sum conflict that was buffered by few institutional restraints. The Cold War is over, and a democratic peace now prevails; [3](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n3) survival is no longer so clearly at  [\*1224]  stake in foreign relations decision making. That alone would undermine more extreme departures from domestic constitutional norms, especially in the realm of individual rights. But not only have the stakes diminished, the very nature of international society may have changed in such a way as to more completely undermine the foreign affairs differential. The nation has been disaggregated, [**4**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n4) so that the channels of contact across national boundaries are now myriad where they used to be singular. With such contacts comes an understanding of the internal allocation of authorities in other nations. In this new dynamic, other nations will be less likely to misascribe the position of one institution to that of another or of the nation as a whole. The conduct of one component is much less likely to destabilize international relationships than in an old world in which nations were presumed unitary. [**5**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n5) This disaggregation may undermine the centralizing institutional anomalies of the foreign affairs regime. Perhaps in no area has the foreign relations differential been as great as it has on issues of federalism. In recent decades, few have challenged the proposition that the states have little role to play on the international stage. The courts have slapped down state activity that poses even the potential to complicate the nation's foreign relations, and the commentators have been nearly unanimous in accepting this core presumption. [**6**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n6) The result has been what I will call the exclusivity principle, under which the federal government alone enjoys the capacity to conduct the nation's foreign relations. The principle's mantra: the need to "speak with one voice" in foreign rela [\*1225]  tions. [**7**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n7) The rule has been functionally justified as eliminating the serious externalities that will be inherent in state foreign policymaking activity. Without constraints on state power, the argument has gone, one state will take action for which other states or the whole nation will suffer the adverse consequences. [**8**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n8) The exclusivity principle has taken some recent knocks in both the cases [**9**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n9) and commentary. [**10**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n10) The purpose of this essay is to present a coherent explanation of why the doctrine was once appropriate, even imperative, but is fast becoming obsolete. In other words, I assert the historical contingency of federal exclusivity over foreign relations. The argument turns on the post-Cold War reconstruction of international society to include not only nation-states but also subnational governments. [**11**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d2876652253110b0798c58e6e0f1a585&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAl&_md5=19e16059b296681f2646787a7f8614ce#n11) Insofar as the states are recognized as autonomous players in global politics within their independent spheres of authority, and are subject to the discipline of a globalized international economy, there should no longer be a need to suppress their discrete preferences on international issues.

#### Heg doesn’t prevent conflict

Crawford 3 (Timothy W., Professor of Political Science – Boston College, Pivotal Deterrence: Third-Party Statecraft and the Pursuit of Peace, p. 209-210)

*Forward Engagement, Global Leadership, and U.S. Pivotal Deterrence*

As the preponderant power in a globalized and interdependent world, the United States—so we are told—must embrace "forward engagement" and "global leadership." Depending on one's preferred partisan formula, it must either "address problems early before they become crises," or "shape circumstances before crises emerge."9 In these slogans there is a strong whiff of an enduring nostrum. As an early twentieth century writer put it, "the secret of foreign policy" is that "a nation cannot be merely pas­sive ... a nation should in every line take the most vigorous initiative."10 Or, as President George W. Bush put it in September 2002, "In the world that we have entered, the only path to peace and security is the path of ac­tion."11 Those who trumpet such an activist posture tend only to see peaceful consequences resulting from forward engagement. For them "American power is now the linchpin of stability in every region, from Europe to Asia to the Persian Gulf to Latin America."12 They rarely concede that the strong prospect of U.S. involvement in regional conflicts may not always cause sta­bility but instead cause instability. But the incentives (if not the underlying motives) that lead some to aggress will often be shaped by optimism about outside involvement.13 We should not assume that the forces of globaliza­tion that justify U.S. activism and incline the international community toward intervention do not also play into the strategies of regional adver­saries. It is naive to think that they, with survival at stake, do not gird for war keenly aware of the opportunities as well as dangers posed by inter­vention by the United States or other outside actors. There is thus no reason to assume that forward U.S. engagement will re­inforce regional stability and promote peaceful change. Because the United States may significantly influence the outcome of many conflicts, that po­tential must be seen for what it is; something that, by looming so large, may encourage as well discourage revisionism. If the massive risks of running afoul of U.S. power are a deterrent "shaping" the intentions of some re­gional antagonists, the potential windfall of securing U.S. support will shape the intentions of others. Because the benefits of enlisting U.S. support in a war may be enormous, even the slim chance of doing so may goad a party to act provocatively, become inflexible in negotiations, or otherwise do things that make war likely. In sum, forward U.S. engagement may fuel disintegrative as well as integrative tendencies in world politics and "jiggle loose" as many deadly conflicts as it knits back together.

#### Heg is resilient

Wohlforth 7 (William, Professor of Government – Dartmouth College, “Unipolar Stability”, Harvard International Review, Spring, http://hir.harvard.edu/articles/1611/3/)

US military forces are stretched thin, its budget and trade deficits are high, and the country continues to finance its profligate ways by borrowing from abroad—notably from the Chinese government. These developments have prompted many analysts to warn that the United States suffers from “imperial overstretch.” And if US power is overstretched now, the argument goes, unipolarity can hardly be sustainable for long. The problem with this argument is that it fails to distinguish between actual and latent power. One must be careful to take into account both the level of resources that can be mobilized and the degree to which a government actually tries to mobilize them. And how much a government asks of its public is partly a function of the severity of the challenges that it faces. Indeed, one can never know for sure what a state is capable of until it has been seriously challenged. Yale historian Paul Kennedy coined the term “imperial overstretch” to describe the situation in which a state’s actual and latent capabilities cannot possibly match its foreign policy commitments. This situation should be contrasted with what might be termed “self-inflicted overstretch”—a situation in which a state lacks the sufficient resources to meet its current foreign policy commitments in the short term, but has untapped latent power and readily available policy choices that it can use to draw on this power. This is arguably the situation that the United States is in today. But the US government has not attempted to extract more resources from its population to meet its foreign policy commitments. Instead, it has moved strongly in the opposite direction by slashing personal and corporate tax rates. Although it is fighting wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and claims to be fighting a global “war” on terrorism, the United States is not acting like a country under intense international pressure. Aside from the volunteer servicemen and women and their families, US citizens have not been asked to make sacrifices for the sake of national prosperity and security. The country could clearly devote a greater proportion of its economy to military spending: today it spends only about 4 percent of its GDP on the military, as compared to 7 to 14 percent during the peak years of the Cold War. It could also spend its military budget more efficiently, shifting resources from expensive weapons systems to boots on the ground. Even more radically, it could reinstitute military conscription, shifting resources from pay and benefits to training and equipping more soldiers. On the economic front, it could raise taxes in a number of ways, notably on fossil fuels, to put its fiscal house back in order. No one knows for sure what would happen if a US president undertook such drastic measures, but there is nothing in economics, political science, or history to suggest that such policies would be any less likely to succeed than China is to continue to grow rapidly for decades. Most of those who study US politics would argue that the likelihood and potential success of such power-generating policies depends on public support, which is a function of the public’s perception of a threat. And as unnerving as terrorism is, there is nothing like the threat of another hostile power rising up in opposition to the United States for mobilizing public support. With latent power in the picture, it becomes clear that unipolarity might have more built-in self-reinforcing mechanisms than many analysts realize. It is often noted that the rise of a peer competitor to the United States might be thwarted by the counterbalancing actions of neighboring powers. For example, China’s rise might push India and Japan closer to the United States—indeed, this has already happened to some extent. There is also the strong possibility that a peer rival that comes to be seen as a threat would create strong incentives for the United States to end its self-inflicted overstretch and tap potentially large wellsprings of latent power.

### Ext – Modeling (Solar/Wind)

#### Federal government models state innovation on solar and wind projects

Klass 11 (Alexandra – Professor of Law, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and Solly Robins Distinguished Research Fellow, University of Minnesota Law School, “Property Rights on the New Frontier: Climate Change, Natural Resource Development, and Renewable Energy”, 2011, lexis)

This subpart explores the extent to which state and local governments have created, defined, and protected property rights in access to solar and wind as well as the extent to which they have removed local impediments to solar and wind development and created permitting, siting, and land use frameworks for such development. Regulatory activity in regards to solar and wind projects on private land has thus far occurred almost exclusively at the state and local levels, with the federal government limiting its involvement to financial assistance and permitting of solar and wind development on federal public lands. n153 Many states have created similar property structures and regulatory frameworks for solar and wind. There is also significant diversity among the states, however, revealing that productive state experimentation is taking place, and that these initiatives **can serve not only as potential models for other states but,** ultimately, for the federal government. 1. Solar Although the amount of solar energy generated in the United States currently represents less than one percent of annual U.S. electricity sales, n154 many state and local governments are attempting to facilitate the development of solar energy. Thus far, both the federal government and [\*96] state governments have created incentive programs, grants, and loans to promote its use. n155 Many state and local governments, however, drawing on historical natural resources law, have also created property rights in solar access.

### Federal Bureaucracy – 2NC

#### Federal bureaucracy dooms the plan – institutional failures mean zero solvency

Bryner 2 (Gary C. - Professor, Department of Political Science, Brigham Young University, and Research Associate, Natural Resources Law Center. University of Colorado School of Law., “ARTICLE: Policy Devolution and Environmental Law: Exploring the Transition to Sustainable Development”, Fall, 26 Environs Envtl. L. & Pol'y J. 1, lexis)

Devolution theory calls for increased policy authority and discretion to be delegated to state governments in order to improve the efficiency of public policies, ensure they effectively resolve specific problems, and foster political accountability. Devolution also gives different communities the opportunity to strike their own balance among the competing policy objectives of economic growth and reducing environmental risks. n10 Devolution to regulated industries promises to reduce the cost of regulation, create incentives for sources of pollution to find the most efficient and effective means of reducing emissions, encourage reductions that go beyond minimum mandates, and allow for flexibility in business decision making. Devolution to citizens is championed as a way to get the public involved in regulatory initiatives that will change the behavior of citizens. Reducing emissions through energy conservation and increased use of [\*5] mass transit, for example, require major commitments on the part of citizens to change their behavior, and that commitment cannot simply be mandated from the top down. Other forms of participatory policy making have been proposed to respond to the demands of citizens for a role in decisions that affect their health and quality of life. Advocates of devolution argue that the current federal regulatory structure is **plagued by burdensome procedures and a cumbersome chain of command**. The combination of environmental statutes, EPA regulations, and guidance documents result in **an impenetrable pyramid of paperwork, planning, and reports**. A tremendous amount of effort at all levels of governments is required to manage this process. Compliance with these requirements often replaces energy and resources that could be used to actually reduce pollution and improve environmental quality. Accountability is difficult to identify since **so many policy makers compete and jostle for influence**, that citizens do not know who to hold accountable when environmental goals are not achieved. Federal officials lay claim to credit for issuing ambitious environmental goals, while state and local officials bear the brunt of criticism for imposing regulatory burdens. The EPA seeks vainly to develop and impose national requirements on conditions that vary widely throughout the nation. n11 Critics have identified a **host of problems with centralized, command and control regulation**: it has not only failed to remedy many environmental problems and threats, but it has engendered significant opposition because of the restraints on freedom it imposes, the costs and burdens of compliance, and **the apparent ease by which some businesses are able to escape** liability and responsibility for their actions. n12 There are real limits to the power of government to promote and ensure the preservation of air, water, land, and other resources. Government agencies alone cannot accomplish these environmental goals, but must be combined with clear and effective economic incentives and with a widely held ethic of care for the land and resources on which all life is so dependent. But the dominant role the federal government plays in environmental policy making focuses too much attention on Washington, and **fails to encourage more local efforts**. n13 Other critics of the current structure of regulatory federalism argue that some state and local governments had a long tradition of ambitious environmental regulation and enacted ambitious pollution control legislation well before Congress or the executive branch acted. The first clean air laws in the United States were enacted by cities in the 1880s, [\*6] some 75 years before the first federal program aimed at air pollution. n14 Many states passed water pollution laws in the 1920 and 30s, and by 1948, every state had an environmental protection agency. n15 While it is true that many federal initiatives for air and water pollution predated the 1970 Earth Day, when the modern era of environmental regulation began, states are not newcomers to environmental regulation. Nor is federal regulation a clear success story. Federal environmental policy has been, **in many areas, problematic**, and has threatened environmental quality. Federal subsidies for road building in national forests, grazing on public lands, the development of fossil fuels, and the emptying of rivers and streams into reservoirs for irrigation, for example, have taken a tremendous toll on natural systems and resources and have encouraged waste, unsustainable consumption, and pollution. n16 One of the consequences of environmental federalism has been to place limitations on more aggressive state regulations. A major impetus for federal air pollution regulation, for example, was a concern by the auto industry that states would impose different emission standards on new vehicles; this fear of having to meet a maze of state regulatory requirements prompted Detroit to lobby for federal regulation of new vehicle emissions. n17 Another example, from the mid-1990s, is the development of federal emission standards for hazardous emissions from coke ovens that were less stringent than those devised in some states, such as Pennsylvania, where environmental advocates had pushed for and won more ambitious limits. n18

## 1NR vs Liberty LW

### DA Turns Case

#### Link alone turns case - Romney will roll back wind tax credits.

**The Hill**, 7/30/**2012** (Romney campaign: Let wind energy credit die this year, p. http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/241107-romney-campaign-let-wind-energy-credit-die-this-year)

Mitt Romney’s campaign said Monday that he wants longstanding tax credits that help finance wind energy projects to expire at year’s end, providing a stark political contrast with President Obama, who is pushing Congress to renew the incentive. Campaign aides confirmed that Romney wants the quick demise of the credits, which will lapse in less than six months absent congressional action, ending uncertainty about how he wants to phase out the credits.

### 2nc Uniqueness Wall

#### Obama will win the election --- Abramowitz prediction model proves. But dramatic events can still change the outcome.

**Ravi**, **9/13**/2012 (Anusha, Abramowitz Predicts 2012 Election Results, The Emory Wheel, p. http://www.emorywheel.com/abramowitz-predicts-2012-election-results/)

Alan Abramowitz, the Alben W. Barkley Professor of Political Science, has released his forecast for the outcome of the presidential election this November. Abramowitz, who has accurately predicted the popular vote winner of every presidential election since 1988, says incumbent President Barack Obama will win the election by a close margin of about 1.2 percent. Abramowitz based his forecast on statistical analysis composed of the candidate’s approval rating at the end of June, the growth of the economy and the value of the “incumbency factor,” which refers to the advantage a candidate will have simply for being the candidate that voters are familiar with. “The Democratic constituency is just larger than the Republicans’ and encompasses far more different types of people,” Abramowitz said. “Even if Romney receives the maximum turnout from white Republican voters, he won’t win.” In the past, the incumbency factor has meant more, according to Abramowitz. But more recently, the value of merely being the incumbent candidate has decreased because of the stark polarization — the division of voters into political extremes — of the American voting public. While Abramowitz has made his prediction about two months before the election takes place, he said that a very dramatic event would have to occur to change what he believes will be the outcome of the election.

#### Obama will win – Romney is not exploiting white voters.

**Cohn**, **8/8**/2012 (Nate – former Whitman debater and author of the Electionate, 90 Days Until the Election – And Obama Has the Advantage, The New Republic, p. <http://www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/105912/obama-has-the-advantage-90-days-go>)

Barack Obama has the advantage with 90 days to go until November 6, and the Romney campaign mostly has itself to blame. Four years after Obama’s decisive victory in 2008, a poor economy, dissatisfaction with the direction of the country, and mediocre approval ratings have conspired to endanger the president’s reelection chances. But a close race, which is what the polls show, is not the same as a dead heat. Romney is an imperfect candidate who has been poorly served by a strategy that has failed to contest Obama’s predictable attacks, leaving him poorly positioned heading into the conventions. Over the last four years, Obama’s coalition suffered deep enough losses to give his challenger a legitimate path to victory. But those losses were narrow and concentrated among white voters without a college degree, as Obama retains near-2008 levels of support among minorities and college-educated whites. As a wealthy former CEO of a private equity firm with an awkward cadence who could never call himself a great politican, Romney has never naturally appealed to white working class voters, and, as a result, Romney’s ability to capitalize on Obama’s biggest weakness requires him to overcome his own. With three months to go, these weaknesses are as pronounced as ever. The Obama campaign adopted a strategy to remedy their weakness among white working class voters by defining Romney as an out-of-touch, outsourcing plutocrat willing to close factories, fire workers, and avoid taxes to advance his self-interest. If the Romney campaign possessed effective tools to blunt Obama’s offensive, they weren’t properly employed. Instead, the Romney campaign inexplicably focused on attacking a well-defined incumbent president, while permitting Obama and his allies to broadcast unflattering and uncontested tales about an undefined challenger. Boston’s ill-advised strategy has endangered Romney’s chances. Romney’s unfavorable ratings remain high and he hasn’t yet consolidated the disaffected white working class voters with reservations about Obama’s performance. In Ohio—ground zero for the Obama campaign’s efforts—Romney’s numbers have plummeted to the low forties, an extremely weak showing in a must win state. Undecided voters harbor particularly unfavorable impressions of the Republican nominee. According to recent surveys, Romney’s favorables are in the teens among undecided voters, while a majority has already formulated a negative impression.

#### Obama is ahead in the approval and favorability poll.

**Cohn**, **8/8**/2012 (Nate – former Whitman debater and author of the Electionate, 90 Days Until the Election – And Obama Has the Advantage, The New Republic, p. <http://www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/105912/obama-has-the-advantage-90-days-go>)

If Romney was closer to fifty percent, he could more easily overcome these problems with undecided voters. But Obama has a consistent three-point edge in national surveys, with 47 or 48 percent of registered voters; this means that to fight to a tie, let alone to win, Romney will need to persuade the preponderance of undecided voters. And while many hold that Obama’s 47 or 48 percent approval rating suggests that a majority of voters are lined up to unconditionally select the challenger, reality is somewhat more complicated. Obama’s net approval is roughly even and a majority of voters usually say they have a favorable opinion of Obama, unlike Romney. While approval ratings are a great indicator of an incumbent’s chances, net-approval or favorability ratings also perform quite well. Once all the metrics are taken into account, it is not clear that a majority of voters are committed to voting against Obama.

### 2nc Link Wall

**Wind power could be a hot button issue in the election – conservative groups use it as a spotlight issue**

**Goldenberg 12** (Suzanne, US environment correspondent, “Conservative thinktanks step up attacks against Obama's clean energy strategy,” 5-8-12, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/may/08/conservative-thinktanks-obama-energy-plans>)

But conservative activists describe the ramp-up as **critical** to the effort to **defeat Obama in the elections**. "It's absolutely a campaign issue and it's a big one," said Dave Schwartz, who heads the Maryland chapter of Americans for Prosperity, a tea party group with Koch funds. "It absolutely is a contentious issue," he said. Kert Davies, Greenpeace research director, agrees. "They are going back to the states to create the space for an anti-Obama, anti-green energy thing. It is really a **political attack,**" he said. " What the right wing wants to perpetuate is that this is a type of energy that never works and requires massive government handouts." More than 30 local wind farm opponents, all selected by Droz, came to Washington at his invitation. Participants included members of conservative groups such as Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow and Tea Party Patriots. A number said they had come to DC for strategy tips and PR advice. Three used the same phraseology as Droz who said the decision to meet and pool strategies was to avoid having to continually "reinvent the wheel". "Everybody is amateur and everybody is learning from the ground up and re-inventing the wheel and the discussion among some of us was as to whether or not we could be a little more efficient and share resources and information," said Carolyn Gerwin an attorney and Tea Party activist from Pontiac Illinois who was among the participants. Gerwin has been active in both Illinois Wind Watch and the Tea Party Patriots, and lobbied against wind energy at the state and federal level, her sign-in questionnaire for the February meeting said. "I'd like to see us develop a **nationwide network** of wind warriors that can be mobilised on very short notice," she wrote in a questionnaire distributed to participants. There is evidence that network is already coming into being. Since the meeting, participants have pooled efforts to make phone calls and send email to **members of Congress.** Opposing Obama's energy policies was a natural fit for conservatives, said Marita Noon, a conservative activist from New Mexico who was at the meeting. "The American way, what made CostCo and Walmart a success, is to use more and pay less. That's the American way," The president's green policies however were the reverse, she said. "President Obama wants us to pay more and use less." That set the stage for a **confrontation** over wind farms and other clean energy issues in the elections, Noon argued. "I would say it's almost the issue," she said. "It's **going to be huge**."

#### No more bipartisan support for PTC

Styles 8/2 (Geoffrey, 8/2/12, Managing Director of GSW Strategy Group, LLC, an energy and environmental strategy consulting firm, MBA w/ BS in Chemical Engineering, “Last Hurrah for the Wind Power Tax Credit?” The Energy Collective, <http://theenergycollective.com/geoffrey-styles/99336/last-hurrah-wind-power-tax-credit?ref=popular_posts>)

Ahead of Thursday's meeting of the Senate Finance Committee, a bipartisan deal has apparently omitted the expiring production tax credit (PTC) for wind power from a package of "tax extenders"--various expiring federal tax provisions, including the annual "patch" for the Alternative Minimum Tax. This development might surprise some of the industry's supporters, but the politics of wind have changed since I last examined this issue in February. A measure that once enjoyed solid bi-partisan support is now caught between two presidential campaigns that hold diametrically opposed views on its fate.

<flow>

#### Offshore unpopularity in great lakes region underscores massive unpopularity nationwide

McDermott 10 (June 2, 2010 Mac, New York University's Center for Global Affairs Masters in Environment and Energy Policy, Editor, Treehugger, “Great Lakes Offshore Wind Farms Already Face NIMBY Opposition, Just Like Those in Saltwater” <http://www.treehugger.com/corporate-responsibility/great-lakes-offshore-wind-farms-already-face-nimby-opposition-just-like-those-in-saltwater.html>)

Developing offshore wind farms on the Great Lakes has been touted as an overlooked resource in a number of studies and indeed a few projects are in the planning stages. Which, seemingly on cue, has aroused opposition to them on the usual grounds, as the Detroit News reports: A Canadian company's plan to place hundreds of wind turbines in Lake St. Clair and Lake Erie has more than a few people on both sides of the border up in arms. Lynn Kotwicki is one of them. The Royal Oak resident has raced sailboats on Lake St. Clair for years and can't understand why anyone would think it was the right place to generate electricity from wind. "We've had three races canceled in the last 10 days," she said. "And each time, it was because there was no wind." The article goes on to describe the various groups opposed to putting wind turbines in the Great Lakes and their arguments against them. All are the usual suspects, with concerns about property values declining for those in sight of the turbines at the top of the list. "It's frustrating--you pay a premium for the land because it sits on the water and then you pay those taxes each year," said [Jennifer Hoover]..."And they can just come in and, on their own whim, decide to throw 50 windmills out in front of our homes." We've all heard this one before with both onshore and offshore wind farms. Thought putting offshore wind farms in the Great Lake would be easier than anywhere else? Nope.

### Winners Win

#### PTC is extremely controversial

Politico 7/31/12 (“Mitt Romney would blow off Wind Tax Credit” Andrew Restuccia <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0712/79227.html?hp=r8>)

Democrats pounced and fiscal conservatives voiced praise over Mitt Romney’s strongest statement yet that he would allow a key wind energy tax credit to expire at the end of the year. The news made waves Tuesday in Iowa — a state President Barack Obama carried in 2008 — with The Des Moines Register featuring a story on the candidates’ divide over the wind production tax credit on the front page. The Obama campaign is using Monday’s campaign announcement to bolster its long-standing claim that the GOP presidential candidate will put fossil fuels above renewables. “By opposing an extension to the wind production tax credit, Mitt Romney has come out against growth of the wind industry to support 100,000 jobs by 2016 and 500,000 jobs by 2030,” Obama campaign spokesman Adam Fetcher said in a statement, pointing to job estimates touted by the American Wind Energy Association, the wind industry’s lobbying group. “Meanwhile, he supports $4 billion in oil and gas subsidies for companies that have rarely been more profitable.” But Romney won praise from conservative groups. “Gov. Romney is absolutely correct to oppose an extension of the tax credit for wind production,” Club for Growth President Chris Chocola said in a statement. “Subsidies for the energy industry distort the marketplace and are simply bad policy. If a market exists for wind production, the private sector will create it, not government.” Americans for Tax Reform also applauded the decision.

#### Controversial wins bleed momentum not build it.

**Politico**, 1/20/**2010** (Obama's first year: What went wrong, p. http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=4DF829C9-18FE-70B2-A8381A971FA3FFC9)

Obama believed that early success would be self-reinforcing, building a powerful momentum for bold government action. This belief was the essence of the White House’s theory of the “big bang” — that success in passing a big stimulus package would lead to success in passing health care, which in turn would clear the way for major cap-and-trade environmental legislation and “re-regulation” of the financial services sector — all in the first year. This proved to be a **radical misreading** of the dynamics of power. The massive cost of the stimulus package and industry bailouts — combined with the inconvenient fact that unemployment went up after their passage — meant that Obama spent the year **bleeding momentum** rather than steadily increasing public confidence in his larger governing vision. That vision was further obscured for many Americans by the smoke from the bitter and seemingly endless legislative battle on Capitol Hill over health care.

### Texas

#### Wind farms could harm critical Texas wetlands which are key to aquifer recharge

DallasNews.Com 9 (Reporter Elizabeth Souder, The Dallas Morning News, 3 June 2009, “Do Wind Turbines Hurt the Environment” <http://energyandenvironmentblog.dallasnews.com/archives/2009/06/do-wind-turbines-hurt-the-envi.html>)

Despite the attraction of wind as a nearly pollution-free power source, a Texas Tech University wildlife ecologist cautions that a tsunami of modern wind turbines dotting the South Plains of Texas could have as yet unknown ecological consequences on critical wetlands known as playas. And there are plenty of playas on the Texas High Plains and in Eastern New Mexico - approximately 22,000, in fact. Indeed, it's the largest concentration in the world. Playas act as natural water storage sites, providing irrigation water and seasonally recharging the Ogallala, the nation's largest aquifer. "We don't have any information specific to this region about the effect of wind farm construction on wildlife, and that's a problem because the Panhandle and South Plains of Texas are going to be major players in the wind industry," said David Haukos, an adjunct wildlife ecology professor in Texas Tech's Department of Natural Resources Management.

#### Ogallala decline destroys irrigated crop production, which causes farmers to switch to risky dryland crops, decimating the agricultural sector, lowering employment, and tanking the regional economy

Terrell and Johnson 99 (Bonnie L, assistant director of agricultural investments for Mutual of New York, and Phillip N, Assistant professor in the department of agricultural and applied economics, Texas Tech University, paper presented at American Agricultural Economics Association Aug 8-11 1999, “Economic Impact of the Depletion of the Ogallala Aquifer: A Case Study of the Southern High Plains of Texas, <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/21589/1/sp99te01.pdf>)

The results of this study support the conclusion that as the saturated thickness of the Ogallala aquifer diminishes and pumping lifts of irrigation wells increase, the regional cropping patterns will begin to shift toward more dryland agriculture. As water availability decreases, fanners will reevaluate their traditional cropping patterns. When faced with reduced water availability, the results indicate that the optimal solution for producers will be to shift their focus to those crops that utilize less water during the growing season, and to adopt the most efficient irrigation technologies. Irrigated and dryland cotton were consistently the optimal choices. In comparing the net returns of all possible combinations of crops and technology, irrigated cotton surpasses all other crops. Although irrigated corn displayed high levels of gross returns, irrigation requirements and the associated costs of production caused its acreage to diminish within the region. The low profitability of irrigated and dryland grain sorghum and wheat caused these crops to decrease, although dryland wheat production increased in the latter years of the time horizon. As feed grain production declines in the SHP, the cattle feedlot sector of the regional economy may experience associated impacts. In 1997, the feedlot sector contributed approximately $2.655 billion in output value to the regional economy (Texas Agricultural Statistics Service, 1998). As production from the feed grain sector declines, this may negatively affect the cattle feeding industry in this region due to the symbiotic relationship between the two sectors. The results point to the conclusion that cotton is "king" in the SHP region and should be regarded as the crop of choice for producers. Yet, this analysis does not take into consideration the threat that boll weevil infestations present to an economy dominated by cotton production or possible changes in crop prices in the future. Recognizing these limitations, the results demonstrate important trends for the area's regional economy. Even producing at an optimal level dominated by cotton production, the contribution of agricultural production to the regional economy is reduced given a declining irrigation groundwater resource. This analysis represents a lower bound estimate in terms of the negative economic impacts resulting from the depletion of the Ogallala because of the assumption that all fanners will produce at the optimal level, which entails the willingness to make the transition to dryland farming and more efficient irrigation technology. Additionally, the optimization models are based on the assumption that as long as there is any positive net return a farmer will continue to produce, which is not necessarily the case. Not only will the sectors facing decreasing agricultural production be affected, but the economy as a whole will be affected due to the interdependence between all industries in an economy and the corresponding multiplier effects of any change within an economy. Once regional agricultural production peaks and begins to decline through diminished irrigated acreage, the entire economy would be affected. The direct effects from agricultural production will be reduced as dryland crops with their associated yields replace higher yielding irrigated crops. In turn, this reduction in the final demand within the agricultural sectors will ripple through the economy and effect virtually everyone within § Marked 08:26 § the region to some degree. This occurs through the indirect and induced effects of a change in final demand. Employment, and thus household consumption, will eventually be impacted as the regional economy dominated by agriculture begins to feel the effects of decreasing irrigated crop production.

### Wind Tanks Jobs

#### Wind destroys jobs which flips both internal links because it hurts the initial sector – driessen says that wind destroys jobs almost 2 to 1 – they say they solve short term jobs but shortterm they cause a DECLINE of 50% of jobs in the industry – tanks the advantage

#### Wind jobs cost $46,000 each

Bryce 12 (Robert, senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute, “Windy Disinformation”, <http://www.robertbryce.com/articles/461-windy-disinformation.html>, og)

A final point: Toward the end of his piece, Mr. Glotfelty says that the wind-energy sector is “providing much-needed jobs for American workers.” That may be true, but just how much are those jobs costing? I did a recent analysis for the Manhattan Institute that looked at the cost of tax preferences given to the oil-and-gas industry, and compared them with the ones given to the wind industry. The result: Each wind-energy-related job costs taxpayers between 9 and 39 times as much as a job created by the oil-and-gas sector. Each job in the wind sector costs taxpayers as much as $46,600. And that figure doesn’t count any of the $3.25 billion in tax-free grants that were given to the wind sector by the Treasury Department under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

### diversity

#### Redundancy checks genetic diversity

Marxen 3 (Craig S., Associate Professor of Economics – University of Nebraska, The Independent Review, 7(3), Winter, http://www.independent.org/pdf/tir/tir\_07\_3\_marxsen.pdf)

Carlos Davidson (2000), a biologist with an economics background, takes issue with what he perceives as Sagoff’s agnosticism concerning the existence of significant environmental destruction relevant to humankind’s well-being. He perceives that Sagoff risks overstatement of the environment’s robustness, and he argues that human activities clearly damage the environment, but not in a way that is likely to lead to catastrophe. According to Davidson, environmental damage is not so much like pulling rivets out of an airplane as it is like pulling threads out of a tapestry. The tapestry becomes more and more threadbare and damaged looking, but it never reaches some critical threshold of cataclysmic failure. The ecosystem is **brimming with redundancy**, and problems such as reductions in biodiversity do not threaten the viability of the simpler system that results. Like an old carpet, an increasingly damaged and dirty environment would show no tendency to resolve the deterioration trend catastrophically.

### Rising Powers Challenge

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

Miller 00 (Morris, Economist, Adjunct Professor in the Faculty of Administration – University of Ottawa, Former Executive Director and Senior Economist – World Bank, “Poverty as a Cause of Wars?”, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Winter, p. 273)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that
exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis – as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore **no relationship** to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

## 1NC vs Kentucky GS

### 1

#### A. Interpretation – a topical aff must reduce barriers that limit the quantity of extracted or capture energy.

#### Restrictions must change “quantity” of energy production, not “quality”

Browne 53 (Gerald Peter, “The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and the Distribution of Legislative Powers in the British North America Act, 1867,” University of British Columbia, October, p. 54-57, https://circle.ubc.ca/bitstream/handle/2429/40650/UBC\_1953\_A8%20B8%20J8.pdf?sequence=1)

If the argument based on the concluding words of 91 can be fairly successfully engaged, however, it is not so easy to counter the other argument based on the introductory words to that section. The main criticism of this argument is that it fails to give due weight to the expression, "but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of this section." By establishing the paramountcy of the enumerations of 91 over section 92, it is contended, the Judicial Committee not only disregarded this expression but actually introduced the very restriction it specifically forbids. At first glance this contention might seem of some validity but deeper consideration reveals its fallacy. For, to begin with, it will be noticed that the word "restrict" is ambiguous and is in fact capable of two quite different interpretations, each of which would affect the meaning of the expression in a quite different way. If, for instance, a restriction in what might be termed "quality" is meant--if, in other words, the idea that the enumerations of 91 are not to be considered as of greater weight than "peace, order, and good government"--then the three compartment scheme definitely violates this expression. If, on the other hand, the restriction is one of "quantity"--if, in other words, the idea is that enumerations of 91 are not to be considered as comprising all the power of the federal parliament which, in addition to the enumerated powers, also has a general residuary power--then no violation at all is involved by declaring the enumerations of 91 supplement rather than illustrate the scope of "peace, order, and good government." The question revolves, then, about the meaning of the word "restrict"--and here is where the phrase "in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces," as well as the word "exclusively," must be introduced into the controversy. For if the word "restrict" is defined in the first manner, that is, so as to make the enumerations of 91 merely illustrate the scope of "peace, order, and good government," the non obstante clause would immediately hurdle backwards over the semi-colo and would thus establish the paramountcy of "peace, order, and good government," as well as the enumeration of 91, over section 92. That in turn, however, would involve a plain and inevitable violation of the limitation place on these general power by the word "exclusively" and the phrase, "in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces." If, on the other hand, the second meaning of the word "restrict" is adopted--if, that is, the enumerations of 91 are held to supplement the scope of "peace, order, and good government"--no such violation would result. The two phrases, "but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of this section" and "in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces," as well as the word "exclusively," can all thus exist quite happily side by side, with no violation or contradiction whatsoever. For this reason, it will be apparent that the word "restrict" simply must be interpreted as a limitation in "quantity" rather in "quality," that enumerations of 91 must be admitted to supplement that that illustrate the scope of "peace, order, and good government," that the three-compartment scheme must be supported, and the foundation of which the Judicial Committee has based its interpretation of the distribution of legislative powers in Canada's constitution must be acknowledge not merely as a sound but, from a legal point of view, as the only possible foundation that can exist without a direction violation of the express and clear words used in the British North America Act. Legally, the Judicial Committee's interpretation is correct.

####  “On” requires direct relation

Dictionary.com (“On,” http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/on)

on   [on, awn] Show IPA

preposition

1. so as to be or remain supported by or suspended from: Put your package down on the table; Hang your coat on the hook.

2. so as to be attached to or unified with: Hang the picture on the wall. Paste the label on the package.

#### Energy production is extraction or capture for consumption

DOCC 8 (Australian Government’s Department of Climate Change, “National Greenhouse and Energy Reporting Guidelines,” http://www.climatechange.gov.au/government/initiatives/~/media/publications/greenhouse-report/nger-reporting-guidelines.ashx)

Energy Production

‘Energy production’ is defined in r. 2.23:

Production of energy, in relation to a facility, means any one of the following:

a. the extraction or capture of energy from natural sources for **final consumption** by or from the operation of the facility or for use other than in operation of the facility; 11

b. the manufacture of energy by the conversion of energy from one form to another form for final consumption by

or from the operation of the facility or for use other than in the operation of the facility.

Energy consumption

‘Energy consumption’ is defined in r. 2.23:

Consumption of energy, in relation to a facility, means the use or disposal of energy from the operation of the

facility including own-use and losses in extraction, production and transmission.

#### Must be on the energy producer

Words and Phrases 88 (Volume 4, p. 90)

It is, in my judgment, important to bear in mind that it is not strictly accurate to speak of restrictions affecting or imposed on property. It is the owner of the hereditament who is restricted---restricted, that is, in his freedom to use it as he likes. Some of the restrictions on him are of a perfectly general character. For instance, the owner of a house may not use it for an immoral purpose, nor so as to create a public or private nuisance; he may not contravene local by-laws in regard to building operations; he may not use it for harboring the King’s enemies or fugitive criminals. That is the first class of restrictions. This class…would include a prescribed building line, a requisitioning order, and similar **statutory or departmental restrictions** directed **against the property itself or the owner of it in particular**

#### B. Violation – the plan removes restrictions on financial incentives on oil and natural gas – this is not a direct restriction on the energy producer – it’s a restriction on the consumer – this is cross-x, the restriction is not on the ENERGY it’s on the INVESTOR

#### Prefer it –

#### Limits – there are tons of tiny financial burdens that change the quality of energy production – anything that makes any one of the energy sources economically viable is a restriction – that explodes the case list.

#### Effects – allowing for tiny changes that COULD affect energy production makes it impossible to predict what affs will be read because anything related to energy production functionally becomes topical. Limiting the aff to directly causal restrictions creates a fair division of ground and puts the neg on equal footing.

#### Err neg – “restrictions” is already hard to define, the financial incentive part of the topic is huge, and bidirectionality gives the aff strategic advantages. First and last speech plus infinite prep means limiting aff mechanism is the only remedy.

### 2

#### Obama will win --- a consensus of polls and forecasts prove.

**Silver**, **9/20**/2012 (Nate, Sept. 19: A Wild Day in the Polls, but Obama Ends Up Ahead, Five Thirty Eight, New York Times, p. <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/20/sept-19-a-wild-day-in-the-polls-but-obama-ends-up-ahead/#h>[])

There are also going to be some outliers — sometimes because of unavoidable statistical variance, sometimes because the polling company has a partisan bias, sometimes because it just doesn’t know what it’s doing. (And sometimes: because of all of the above.) By the end of Wednesday, however, it was clear that the preponderance of the evidence favored Mr. Obama. He got strong polls in Ohio, Florida, Michigan, Wisconsin and Virginia, all from credible pollsters. Mr. Obama, who had been slipping in our forecast recently, rebounded to a 75.2 percent chance of winning the Electoral College, up from 72.9 percent on Tuesday. The most unambiguously bearish sign for Mr. Romney are the poor polls he has been getting in swing states from pollsters that use a thorough methodology and include cellphones in their samples. There have been 16 such polls published in the top 10 tipping point states since the Democratic convention ended, all conducted among likely voters. Mr. Obama has held the lead in all 16 of these polls. With the exception of two polls in Colorado — where Mr. Obama’s polling has been quite middling recently — all put him ahead by at least four points. On average, he led by 5.8 percentage points between these 16 surveys. If this is what the post-convention landscape looks like, then Mr. Romney is in a great deal of trouble. Perhaps these polls imply that Mr. Obama’s lead is somewhere in the range of five percentage points in the popular vote — national polls suggest that it’s a bit less than that, but state polls provide useful information about the national landscape. Or perhaps they imply that Mr. Obama is overperforming slightly in the swing states. Either way, that’s a pretty big deficit for Mr. Romney to overcome. What’s more, Mr. Obama was at 49.4 percent of the vote on average between these 16 surveys, meaning that he’d need to capture only a tiny sliver of the undecided vote to get to an outright majority. (If we’re being technical, 49.4 percent might be sufficient for him to win these states on its own, since perhaps 1 or 2 percent of the vote will go to third-party candidates.) To be clear: I do not recommend that this is the only data you look at. The forecast model also evaluates polls that exclude cellphones, although it gives them slightly less weight. Those have not necessarily shown a great deal of strength for Mr. Obama. And just as the model looks at state polls to infer the national trend, it also does the reverse, using the national polls (and essentially the assumption of ”uniform swing”) to infer where the states stand. The national polls show a spread right now from an effective tie to an eight-point lead for Mr. Obama. Taken as a whole, they seem to imply more like a three or four point lead for Mr. Obama rather than something in the range of five points. (These distinctions really do make a difference, especially with so few undecided voters left.) The other questions, of course, are whether Mr. Obama’s bounce is fading, and if it might fade further. His FiveThirtyEight forecast remains off its high of about an 80 percent chance of victory, that he achieved late last week.

#### Permitting Chinese foreign investment in domestic energy supplies sparks a HUGE public backlash – SNOOC controversy proves

Burke 11 (John, Analyst @ BakerHostetler, "The United States Welcomes Chinese Foreign Direct Investment - The Handful of Deals Blocked by CFIUS are Aberrant," http://www.chinaustradelawblog.com/2011/02/articles/investment/the-united-states-welcomes-chinese-foreign-direct-investment-the-handful-of-deals-blocked-by-cfius-are-aberrant/)

The President of the United States may order the divestment of a foreigner’s controlling interest in a U.S. business should he determine that such control threatens U.S. “national security.” The CFIUS review system works through voluntary filings by those parties to proposed transactions who seek to take advantage of the safe harbor that a CFIUS approval prior to an acquisition provides. The safe harbor prevents the President from undoing the deal pursuant to his authority under FINSA.¶ The CFIUS process is disciplined by the authority FINSA provides CFIUS to self-initiate a review as to whether any “covered transaction” threatens U.S. national security at any time. That authority is seldom used, but its existence means that foreign acquirers should give serious consideration to voluntary CFIUS filings before any national security questions may be asked.¶ For most companies, CFIUS review takes only thirty days. By seeking it voluntarily before the acquisition is consummated, the foreign acquirer can obtain assurance that its investment would not be destroyed by a CFIUS review, perhaps years after the acquisition. For a small number of companies, CFIUS review may become an additional forty-five day in-depth investigation. Even at this stage, however, most acquisitions are approved, although often with conditions.¶ A handful of Chinese acquisitions of existing U.S. businesses have been stopped either as a result of the CFIUS review process, or as a result of intense political opposition. However, in each of those cases, circumstances unique to the particular transaction, and not any hostility to Chinese investment in general, are what caused the transaction to fail. For example, when Northwest Non Ferrous International Investment Co., Ltd. dropped its plans to acquire a Nevada mining company, the reason for the unfavorable CFIUS review was the extremely sensitive nature of U.S. military installations that were adjacent to the mines to be acquired. (See The United States Remains Open To Chinese Investment). Had those mines been located elsewhere, the acquisition likely would have sailed through with little opposition. There was no objection to Chinese acquisition of gold mines. The objection was to the proximity to military installations.¶ Another deal effectively blocked by a CFIUS review was the proposed acquisition in 2007 by Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd. (“Huawei”) of a significant ownership stake in 3Com Corporation. Two major concerns reportedly led CFIUS agencies to oppose the deal. The first was the inclusion in the deal of 3Com’s subsidiary Tipping Point, which sells network-based intrusion prevention equipment used by the Pentagon and U.S. intelligence agencies. The second was specific to Huawei. There were allegations in the press that Huawei had engaged in corporate espionage and intellectual property theft and was involved in high tech exports to Saddam Hussein’s regime and the Taliban. The combination of mission critical U.S. military technology and an acquirer with a particularly bad reputation from the perspective of U.S. national security interests caused that deal to fail, not any general opposition to Chinese companies acquiring specific U.S. businesses.¶ China National Offshore Oil Corporation’s (“CNOOC”) attempted acquisition in 2005 of Unocal, a U.S. energy company, was halted by congressional and public opposition before it could undergo a CFIUS review. That opposition arose because of concerns that critical energy supplies would pass out of US control. The fact that CNOOC is a Chinese state-owned enterprise did heighten those concerns. But it was the concern over access to critical energy supplies, and not anti-Chinese animus, that drove the opposition to that deal. Very few businesses that Chinese companies may seek to acquire will present these types of concerns. And, in hindsight, many observers think that, had CNOOC not pulled out, CFIUS would have approved. Unfortunately, CNOOC did not stay involved long enough to find out.

#### Obama reelection maintains the US/Russian reset --- Romney will collapse relations

**Weir**, 3/27/**2012** (Fred, Obama asks Russia to cut him slack until reelection, Minnesota Post, p. <http://www.minnpost.com/christian-science-monitor/2012/03/obama-asks-russia-cut-him-slack-until-reelection>)

Russian experts say there's little doubt the Kremlin would like to see Obama re-elected. Official Moscow has been pleased by Obama's policy of "resetting" relations between Russia and the US, which resulted in the new START treaty and other cooperation breakthroughs after years of diplomatic chill while George W. Bush was president. The Russian media often covers Obama's lineup of Republican presidential challengers in tones of horror, and there seems to be a consensus among Russian pundits that a Republican president would put a quick end to the Obama-era thaw in relations. "The Republicans are active critics of Russia, and they are extremely negative toward Putin and his return to the presidency," says Dmitry Babich, a political columnist with the official RIA-Novosti news agency. "Democrats are perceived as more easygoing, more positive toward Russia and Putin." Speaking on the record in Seoul, Mr. Medvedev said the years since Obama came to power "were the best three years in the past decade of Russia-US relations.… I hope this mode of relations will maintain between the Russian Federation and the United States and between the leaders." During Putin's own election campaign, which produced a troubled victory earlier this month, he played heavily on anti-Western themes, including what he described as the US drive to attain "absolute invulnerability" at the expense of everyone else. But many Russian experts say that was mostly election rhetoric, and that in office Putin will seek greater cooperation and normal relations with the West. "Russian society is more anti-American than its leaders are," says Pavel Zolotaryov, deputy director of the official Institute of USA-Canada Studies in Moscow. "Leaders have to take popular moods into account. But it's an objective fact that the US and Russia have more points in common than they have serious differences. If Obama wins the election, it seems likely the reset will continue."

#### US/Russian relations prevent nuclear war

**Elliott**, 5/15/**1995** (Michael, Why Russia Still Matters to America, Newsweek, p. lexis)

"Russia," says Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, "is a big country." That it is; lop off the newly independent states born within the old Soviet husk and you've still got a lot left -- a highly educated work force sitting on top of some of the globe's most valuable resources. True, much of that vast territory has an awful climate (climate matters-for different reasons than Russia's, it explains why Australia will never be a great power). But unlike India and China, two other "giant" states, Russia will be able to husband its vast resources without the additional strain of feeding -- and employing-more than a billion souls. It also, of course, is the only country that can launch a **devastating nuclear attack** on the United States. That kind of power demands respect. And sensitive handling. Stephen Sestanovich, head Russia watcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, argues that present U.S. policy is geared too much to "dismantling Russian military might" -- a policy that, since it breeds Russian resentment of Western meddling, is self-defeating. "We have to reorient Russian power," says Sestanovich, "not eliminate it. Because we can't eliminate it." Indeed, Washington should prefer a strong Russia. A Russia so weak, for example, that it could not resist a Chinese land grab of its Far East **without resorting to nuclear weapons** is a 21st-century nightmare. **All this implies a close U.S. -- Russian relationship** stretching into the future. American officials say it will be a "pragmatic" one, recognizing that Russian and U.S. national interests will sometimes collide. The danger, for the United States, is that a pragmatic relationship could be dominated by security issues. In Western Europe, some futurists say that in the coming decades Russia will talk to the United States about nuclear weapons but to the European Union about everything else-trade, economic development and the rest.

### 3

#### CP Text: The United States Federal Government should exclude crude oil production from Exon-Florio reviews.

#### Solves case – no reason oil alone is less sufficient - still sends a signal to solve both advantages

#### Natural gas prices will rise – supply decreasing

Finger 12 (Richard, Forbes Contributor, “We're Headed To $8 Natural Gas,” 7-22-12,

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/richardfinger/2012/07/22/were-headed-to-8-00-natural-gas/>)

The British Thermal Unit (btu) equivalent of one barrel of oil equals six thousand cubic feet of natural gas. Therefore if gas at $3.00 per mcf were to be at energy parity with oil, then oil would sell for $18.00. But WTI sells at $90 bbl. So gas must get more expensive or oil will get cheaper. As the gas rig count dwindles and evidence mounts that at least some of the shale plays are depleting much faster than projected, the result has been the aforementioned much lower than normal stockpile injection rates. With the disparity between oil and gas prices at such extremes, all available capital will continue to flow into drilling for gas liquids and oil. Some of the remaining dry gas drilling is probably just to maintain lease rights. Newton’s 3rd Law of Thermodynamics says for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. Natural Gas at $13.28 is too high and the April price of $1.89 is too low. The rubber band is becoming stretched in the direction of tight supply. It’s too cheap to drill for, so supplies will further dwindle until inexorably the shortage occurs and prices spike irrationally higher. That time is sooner than later. We had an abnormally warm 2011-12 winter season in the US which sank home heating gas demand to extremely low levels. Was it because of an El Nino effect or did global warming play the pivotal role? Or, most likely, it is a confluence of several factors. Whatever the cause, the jet streams carrying the traditional cold temperatures and accompanying snowstorms didn’t reach south as far and as often as usual. Conversely, Europe had an abnormally cold winter last season suggested causes being the abstruse North Atlantic Oscillation Index, low solar activity and attendant low sunspot numbers and associated solar magnetic flux. You understand, right. Natural Gas prices have spent all of 2012 below $3.00. Just the past three trading days, perhaps starting to reflect the fundamentals discussed herein, have seen spot prices nudge above the $3.00 level. So combine 13 year low gas rig counts, declining production levels with resultant ultralow storage injections, shut in gas production, faster than anticipated shale well declines, persistent switching from oil and coal to cheaper and cleaner gas alternatives…..Then consider unending hotter than normal summer temperatures, continued greater than normal nuclear plant outages, a hurricane or two that knocks out Gulf of Mexico natural gas production for a week or two, and a La Nina induced cold winter…….any one of these can light the fuse that pushes the tenuous supply/demand balance into cardiac arrest. That’s the chain and it’s going to lead us to $8.00 mcf natural gas by the approaching winter.

#### The aff causes sustained low prices

Ryan 12 (Sebastian, Property Mentor Group, “Low Natural Gas Prices Hurting The Independent Oil And Gas Industry,” 8-7-12, <http://www.propertymentorgroup.com/low-natural-gas-prices-hurting-the-independent-oil-and-gas-industry-atpg-gsx-fst-sm-kwk/121294/>)

Low natural gas prices and a weak global economy have weighed on the independent oil and gas industry and companies such as Chesapeake Energy Corporation (NYSE:CHK) and Noble Corporation (NYSE:NE). Excessive supply has dogged natural gas prices for much of 2012, and could keep doing so if demand does not rises. Many industry players have reported less than stellar numbers recently, which reflects the difficult times. Noble Energy in its latest quarter managed to increase its GAAP sales year-over-year while GAAP earnings per share contracted by 2.5%. Cheniere Energy, Inc. (AMEX:LNG) recently said it has received funds for a liquefied natural gas export plant in the state of Louisiana. The facility is estimated to be able to export more than 1 billion cubic feet per day before the end of 2015. Among decliners, ATP Oil & Gas Corporation (NASDAQ:ATPG) has been one of the worst performers in 2012 with a year-to-date performance of -80.03%. The stock, as of last close, traded 35.60% up from its 52 week low and was 89.85% behind its 52 week high. Its latest closing price was -77.50% down from the SMA200 while the distance from SMA 50 and SMA 20 was -60.12% and -39.52% respectively. ATPG engages in the acquisition, development, and production of oil and natural gas properties primarily in the Gulf of Mexico and the United Kingdom sector of the North Sea. Another worst performing stock Gasco Energy Inc (NYSE:GSX) operates as a natural gas and petroleum exploitation, development, and production company in the United States. Gasco Energy Inc has a performance down -47.83%. Its price, as of the latest close, was up 20.00% compared with the 52 week low and was 63.64% below the 52 week high.

#### Low natural gas prices kill Solar PV

Desmond 12 (James Christopher, Attorney at Law in Savannah, GA, J.D. at State University of New York at Buffalo - Law School, “Solar Economics & Politics In Real Time,” *Free Market Solar Power*, 8-22-12, <https://sites.google.com/site/freemarketsolarpower/home>)

Executive Summary: In the face of uncertainty over America's energy future and electricity prices (see also this), this "web-book" discusses grid-tied, Solar Photovoltaic (PV) power in consumer-economic terms, and whether it makes sense to subsidize it with tax- and rate-payer money. The discussion pivots on this point: Small-scale PV is still too expensive to make it in the free market without subsidies. And, as this article illuminates, those subsidies ("From 2007 to 2010, federal subsidies jumped to $14.7 billion from $5.1 billion"), are drying up. See also this piece on the debatable impact of subsidies. But are they a good idea in the first place? Many still advocate them in light of long-standing "brown power subsidies" (250 kinds, in fact, also click here, here, and here) and subsidies drove most of the 2011 solar market gains, totalling 1,855 megawatts (MW) of photovoltaic (PV) capacity for 2011 -- a year that set a record $257 billion in renewables investment. But they also, predictably, helped engender a projected industry-collapse and thus, as noted by the WSJ, "dark times." Helped because there are other causes, including cheap gas-powered electricity -- which perhaps will be Solar PV's the biggest nemesis (money quote: "Natural-gas-fired electricity now costs about 84 percent less than solar, and it cuts carbon-dioxide emissions compared to conventional coal by 30 percent to 50 percent"), and it looks like cheap natural gas will be here for a while (see also this analysis, as well as this, plus this piece, showing how it all affects the state of Georgia's "electricity politics").

#### Creates vulnerability to terrorism and natural disasters

Desmond 12 (James Christopher, Attorney at Law in Savannah, GA, J.D. at State University of New York at Buffalo - Law School, “Solar Economics & Politics In Real Time,” *Free Market Solar Power*, 8-22-12, <https://sites.google.com/site/freemarketsolarpower/home>)

Why residential Solar PV instead of those massive, utility-scale or even world-scale PV systems that you read about? Because distributed energy generation, in contrast to centralized, utility-scale energy generation, breeds unique benefits: \* It enables distributed energy independence (my refrigerated food won't spoil when the utility company's grid fails). "Distributed" means spread among individual owners (Joe), not monopolistic, concentrated wealth entities that can cop billions in subsidies and spread lobbying cash to politicians who give them turf-protecting legislation. \* It fosters distributed, cross-pollinating intelligence and upward-cascading technological enhancements: Billions of PC users were free to, and in fact developed, countless software/hardware innovations because no central source prevented smart users from innovating/improving PCs, which brought us $500 Billion in prosperity. The same phenomenon will accelerate higher-efficiency innovations with Solar PVs. Once "arrayed," 100 million "Joe Six Packs" will all be financially incentivized to relentlessly tweak their solar arrays to eke even more wealth out of them, especially if reverse-meter rates (more on that below) are kept competitive. Just look at the impact of just one fairly simple re-design of a wood stove will have on 3 billion people. Recall how splendidly fast PCs (and now i-Pads and other "i-minis") developed with hundreds of millions of users using/studying/tweaking them and their counterpart, the internet (just one example: over 350,000 apps written for the i-Phone, which has only existed since 2007). \* As will be further detailed below, it will harmoniously blend with existing utility grids because the average user will want to erect only enough of an array to cover his home's typical power needs, and only marginally bleed over excess energy into the local grid (and cop a reverse-meter credit for it). Compare that to the massive energy influx T. Boone Pickens's wind plan contemplated, which necessitated epic power grid reconfigurations (and he and his investors would control a mass load of power, while what is proposed here is "chicken in every pot" level, homeowner-controlled power). Relatedly, and good news for utility-scale Solar PV if this is true, this investment analysis says even big Solar PV projects can be better blended than wind and Concentrated Solar Thermal. This same concept is discussed for small wind farms, which not only alleviates transmission difficulties arising from large farms, but smooths net electricity flow since "the wind is almost always blowing somewhere." \* It will help form a second blend layer, that of peak load to base load (it will supply much of the "peak" amount of electricity a community demands, for example, on a hot sunny day, when the power company must buy or supply (at a more costly rate) it over the normal, "base load" demand letter -- as explained here and here. See also this analysis. \* It will generate distributed (not concentrated) wealth. Lots of it. Directly into Joe's pocket. Thousands, millions and then one hundred million Joes pocketing newly created (direct from the sun) wealth (free energy, reverse-meter payments) every day. That's wealth that Joe pockets, not some small group of utility owners/controllers. And unlike most forms of wealth (example: you've got to expend energy and create pollution to extract and burn coal to create electricity, then get money -- wealth -- from it), this is pure, cost-free new wealth (not government-printed money that feeds "economic multiplier" cycles in economists' heads). \* It also will deconcentrate electrical power generation, and thus deprive terrorists/tsunamis of targets and monopolists of concentrated-power-wealth manipulability. Indeed, it already is spreading to the 2.0 billion people who live off the grid, including some of the most desperate. As Seba says, "[h]alf a billion people in 500,000 villages in India alone are not connected to the grid. Two billion people around the world get their energy from kerosene or diesel at rates up to 10 times today’s PV cost." That market alone will spur greater economies of scale in Solar PV manufacturing -- to meet that demand. \* The self-consumed part of Solar PV energy obviously suffers no transmission loss, which can reach as high as 20% (hence, transmission alone packs a built-in energy waste). And, distributed "rooftop Solar PV" may well reduce the need for very expensive grid upgrades. It's been said that up to $11 billion in $55 billion in grid upgrading over the next 10 years could be avoided in Australia. Also, central power generation (big coal and nuke plants) loses 20% or more of its electricity just in its transmission to customers. If those same customers generate "distributed" energy and feed their local grid less transmission loss can result. \* It will be pre-positioned to fully exploit economically/ecologically feasible energy storage (envisioned here and discussed here) should anyone ever get around to inventing it. \* It can be arranged, when erected on a mass-commodity level scale (millions of homes), into a horizontal-management smart grid, if not a micro-grid, so that if clouds depress electricity generation on one side of town, and high-sun onthe other produces intense bursts of electricity, the smart-grid (or so techno-forecasters claim) can smooth the peaks and valleys to ensure a virtual base-load style electrical flow. This will help address the variable power, lack of temporary electrical storage problem that undermines Solar PV today (for more on this concept, click here, then here, and here). Utilities themselves can publish maps to show optimum blending with their grids. The White House is advancing its own smart grid initiative, by the way, and people are now conjuring up hybrid brown/green power combinations to stabilize output and claim base load status. Even vehicle-to-grid (V2G) technologists are charging into this area.

#### Terrorist attack on the grid kills heg

Merica 12 (Dan, reporter for CNN, “DoD official: Vulnerability of U.S. electrical grid is a dire concern,” CNN, 7-27-12, <http://security.blogs.cnn.com/2012/07/27/dod-official-vulnerability-of-u-s-electrical-grid-is-a-dire-concern/>)

Speaking candidly at the Aspen Security Forum, one defense department official expressed great concern about the possibility of a terrorist attack on the U.S. electric grid that would cause a “long term, large scale outage.” Paul Stockton, assistant secretary for Homeland Defense and Americas’ Security Affairs at the Department of Defense, said such an attack would affect critical defense infrastructure at home and abroad – a thought that Stockton said was keeping him up at night. “The DOD depends on infrastructure in order to be able to operate abroad. And to make those operations function, we depend on the electric grid,” Stockton said. The concern, Stockton continued, was that America’s adversaries would avoid attacking “the pointy end of the spear,” meaning combat troops, and would instead look for homeland, possibly non-military, targets. “Our adversaries, state and non-state, are not stupid. They are clever and adaptive,” Stockton said. “There is a risk that they will adopt a profoundly asymmetric strategy, reach around and attack us here at home, the critical infrastructure that is not owned by the Department of Defense.”

#### Global nuclear war

Khalilzad 11 (Zalmay, Counselor – Center for Strategic and International Studies, Former U.S. Permanent Representative – United Nations, Former U.S. Ambassador – Iraq, “The Economy and National Security”, National Review, 2-8, http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad)

The stakes are high. In modern history, the longest period of peace among the great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership. By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars. American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions.

### Solvency

#### China CAN and HAS put massive energy-related FDI into the US economy

Burke 11 (John, Analyst @ BakerHostetler, "The United States Welcomes Chinese Foreign Direct Investment - The Handful of Deals Blocked by CFIUS are Aberrant," http://www.chinaustradelawblog.com/2011/02/articles/investment/the-united-states-welcomes-chinese-foreign-direct-investment-the-handful-of-deals-blocked-by-cfius-are-aberrant/)

Direct Chinese investment in the United States would likely be even greater were it not for press reports that have created the impression that the United States is hostile to investment from China. The press is full of terms such as CFIUS (the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States) and FINSA (the Foreign Investment National Security Act), and tales of Chinese companies forced to abandon planned acquisitions of U.S. companies. Some Chinese companies have been forced to abandon their acquisition plans. However, each of those celebrated cases presented unique circumstances that would not exist for the vast majority of Chinese companies who may wish to set up operations in the United States. The reality is that the United States remains one of the world’s economies most open to foreign investment, including from China.

With a few very limited exceptions, such as airlines, foreigners are as free to invest in greenfield projects that create new businesses in the United States on the same basis as Americans. Recent Chinese greenfield investments in the United States include a $1 billion steel pipe mill that Tianjin Pipe is planning to build this year near Corpus Christi, Texas; Suntech Power Holdings’ solar panel assembly plant in Arizona; and American Yoncheng Gravure Cylinder plant in Spartanburg, South Carolina. These and many other Chinese greenfield investments have not faced any significant opposition and in many cases have been able to benefit from state and local government investment incentives.

#### US doesn’t restrict Chinese foreign direct investment now

Burke 11 (John, Analyst @ BakerHostetler, "The United States Welcomes Chinese Foreign Direct Investment - The Handful of Deals Blocked by CFIUS are Aberrant," http://www.chinaustradelawblog.com/2011/02/articles/investment/the-united-states-welcomes-chinese-foreign-direct-investment-the-handful-of-deals-blocked-by-cfius-are-aberrant/)

The United States remains committed to an open investment environment and treating foreign investors, including those from China, on an equal footing with their domestic competition in the vast majority of cases where the foreign investment does not threaten to impair the national security of the United States. It was for this reason that Congress set the initial CFIUS review deadline at thirty days, to coincide with the thirty day antitrust review period under the Hart-Scott-Rodino procedures.¶ Even after the implementation of FINSA, most cross-border mergers and acquisitions do not require a CFIUS review. Nevertheless, CFIUS national security reviews of proposed acquisitions of U.S. businesses are going to be a crucial part of the transaction for many foreign investments in existing U.S. businesses.¶ The most important considerations for success in a CFIUS review are understanding in advance the institutional and other concerns of the CFIUS member agencies, and creative thinking about how to demonstrate that those concerns are not threatened, or to mitigate them. In most cases early attention to the CFIUS process and to the legitimate concerns of the member agencies can ensure smooth and timely proceedings that result in CFIUS clearance without restrictions, or on terms that preserve the value of the transaction for all parties. Voluntary review, taking advantage of the law’s safe harbor provision, likely would have helped Chinese enterprises in all of the failed transactions, and sensitivity to possible political concerns would have contained the fallout and bruised feelings in those instances where national security legitimately prevailed.¶ To say the outcomes of such cases in China would have been no different or worse would not be good enough. The United States is not deliberately discriminating against foreign, nor specifically Chinese, investment, but like any sovereign it is mindful of its sovereignty, and its security.

### Investment

#### -- No internal link - Studies prove

Barbieri 96 (Katherine, Professor of Political Science – University of North Texas, Journal of Peace Research, February, p. 42-43)

This study provides **little empirical support** for the liberal proposition that trade provides a path to interstate peace. Even after controlling for the influence of conti­guity, joint democracy, alliance ties, and relative capabilities, the evidence suggests that in **most instances** trade fails to deter conflict. Instead, extensive economic inter­dependence increases the likelihood that dyads engage in militarized dispute; how­ever, it appears to have little influence on the incidence of war. The greatest hope for peace appears to arise from symmetrical trading relationships. However, the dampening effect of symmetry is offset by the expansion of interstate linkages. That is, extensive economic linkages, be they sym­metrical or asymmetrical, appear to pose the greatest hindrance to peace through trade. Although this article focuses exclusively on the pre-WWII period, elsewhere I provide evidence that the relationships revealed here are also observed in the post­WWII period and more extended period, 1870—1985 (Barbieri, 1995). Why do the findings differ from those presented in related studies of the trade—conflict re­lationship, which reveal an inverse relation­ship between trade and conflict? Several explanations, other than the temporal domain, can be offered. First, researchers differ in the phenomena they seek to explain, with many studies incorporating both conflictual and cooperative interstate behavior (e.g., Gasiorowski, 1986a, b; Gasiorowski & Polachek, 1982; Polachek, 1980, 1992; Polachek & McDonald, 1992). Studies that focus exclusively on extreme forms of conflict behavior, including dis­putes and wars, differ in their spatial and temporal domains, their level of analysis, and their measurement of central con­structs. Preliminary tests reveal that the composition of dyads in a given sample may have a more dramatic impact on the empiri­cal findings than variations in measurement. For example, the decision to focus exclusively on ‘politically relevant dyads’ may be one source of difference (Oneal et al., 19%). Perhaps the primary component missing from this and related research is the inclusion of a more adequate assessment of the costs and benefits derived from interdepen­dence. I have repeatedly argued that the conflictual or pacific elements of interdepen­dence are directly related to perceptions about trade’s costs and benefits. Yet, a more comprehensive evaluation of these costs and benefits is needed to see whether a link truly exists between the benefits enjoyed in a given trading relationship and the inhibition of conflict in that relationship, or con­versely, the presence of net costs for at least one trading partner and the presence of con­flict in that relationship. For example, are trading relationships that contain two partners believed to benefit from trade less conflict-prone than those containing at least one partner perceived to be worse off from trade? I have merely outlined the types of relationships believed to confer the greatest benefits, but such benefits and costs require a more rigorous investigation.

#### -- War collapses trade – no reverse link

Layne 98 (Christopher, Visiting Associate Professor of International Relations and Military Strategy – Naval Postgraduate School, Consultant – RAND Corporation, “Rethinking American Grand Strategy: Hegemony or Balance of Power in the Twenty-First Century”, World Policy Journal, 15(2), Infotrac)

These arguments notwithstanding, international economic interdependence does not cause peace. In fact, it has very serious adverse security consequences that its proponents either do not understand or will not acknowledge. Economic relations (whether domestic or international) never take place in a vacuum; on the contrary, they occur within a politically defined framework. International economic interdependence requires certain conditions in order to flourish, including a maximum degree of political order and stability. Just as the market cannot function within a state unless the state creates a stable “security” environment in which economic exchange can occur (by protecting property rights and enforcing contracts), the same is true in international relations. Because there is no world government, it falls to the dominant state to create the conditions under which economic interdependence can take hold (by providing security, rules of the game, and a reserve currency, and by acting as the global economy’s banker and lender of last resort). Without a dominant power to perform these tasks, economic interdependence does not happen. Indeed, free trade and interdependence have occurred in the modern international system only during the hegemonies of Victorian Britain and postwar America.

#### -- Trade is resilient – no collapse

Perroni and Whally 96 (Carlo, University of Warwick and John, University of Western Ontario, American Economic Review, 86(2), May, p. 60)

Furthermore, trade performance in the period since the late 1940’s also clearly stands in sharp contrast to the events of the 1930’s. The largest players, the United States and the EU have consistently displayed a determination to mediate their trade disputes in the 1980’s, triggered by EU enlargement. And today’s global economy is much more interdependent than it was in the 1930’s. Firms and industries have become more reliant on export markets, and there is more interindustry trade. There is also the major difference of the presence of the GATT/WTO, accompanied by bindings on tariffs achieved in eight rounds of negotiations; and, despite its weaknesses, a GATT/WTO dispute-settlement procedure has continued to function.

#### -- Trade conflicts won’t escalate

Nye 96 (Joseph, Dean of the Kennedy School of Government – Harvard University, Washington Quarterly, Winter)

The low likelihood of direct great power clashes does not mean that there will be no tensions between them. Disagreements are likely to continue over regional conflicts, like those that have arisen over how to deal with the conflict in the former Yugoslavia. Efforts to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction and means of their delivery are another source of friction, as is the case over Russian and Chinese nuclear cooperation with Iran, which the United States steadfastly opposes. The sharing of burdens and responsibilities for maintaining international security and protecting the natural environment are a further subject of debate among the great powers. Furthermore, in contrast to the views of classical Liberals, increased trade and economic interdependence can increase as well as decrease conflict and competition among trading partners. The main point, however, is that such disagreements are very unlikely to escalate to military conflicts.

#### Multiple thumpers to the US and global economies - Eurozone, China hard landing, emerging market recession, anemic US growth and budget fights, Iran

Roubini 9/13/12 (Nouriel, professor at NYU’s Stern School of Business and Chairman of Roubini Global Economics, "Fiddling at the Fire," http://www.project-syndicate.org/print/fiddling-at-the-fire-by-nouriel-roubini)

In the eurozone, euphoria followed the ECB’s decision to provide support with potentially unlimited purchases of distressed countries’ bonds. But the move is not a game changer; it only buys time for policymakers to implement the tough measures needed to resolve the crisis. And the policy challenges are daunting: the eurozone’s recession is deepening as front-loaded fiscal consolidation and severe credit rationing continues. And, as eurozone banks and public-debt markets become increasingly balkanized, establishing a banking union, a fiscal union, and an economic union while pursuing macroeconomic policies that restore growth, external balance, and competitiveness will be extremely difficult.¶ Even the ECB’s support is not obvious. Monetary hawks – the Bundesbank and several other core central banks – who were worried about a new open-ended ECB mandate pushed successfully for strict and effective conditionality for countries benefiting from the bond purchases. As a result, they can pull the plug on the program if its stringent criteria are not met.¶ Moreover, Greece could exit the eurozone in 2013, before Spain and Italy are successfully ring-fenced; Spain – like Greece – is spiraling into depression, and may need a full-scale bailout by the “troika” (the ECB, the European Commission, and the International Monetary Fund). Meanwhile, austerity fatigue in the eurozone periphery is increasingly clashing with bailout fatigue in the core.¶ Small wonder, then, that Germany, politically unable to vote on more bailout resources, has outsourced that job to the ECB, the only institution that can bypass democratically elected parliaments. But, again, liquidity provision alone – without policies to restore growth soon – would merely delay, not prevent, the breakup of the monetary union, ultimately taking down the economic/trade union and leading to the destruction of the single market.¶ In the United States, the latest economic data – including a weak labor market – confirm that growth is anemic, with output in the second half of 2012 unlikely to be significantly stronger than the 1.6% annual gain recorded in January-June. And, given America’s political polarization and policy gridlock, we can expect more fights on the budget and the debt ceiling, another rating downgrade, and no agreement on a path toward medium-term fiscal consolidation and sustainability – regardless of whether President Barack Obama is reelected in November. On the contrary, we should expect agreement only on the path of least political resistance: avoidance of tough fiscal choices until the bond vigilantes eventually wake up, spike long rates, and force fiscal adjustment on the political system.¶ In China, a hard economic landing looks increasingly likely as the investment bubble deflates and net exports shrink. Meanwhile, the reforms necessary to reduce savings and increase private consumption are being delayed. As in Europe and the US, the worst will be avoided in 2012 only by kicking the can down the road with more monetary, fiscal, and credit stimulus.¶ But a hard landing becomes more likely in 2013, as the stimulus fades, non-performing loans rise, the investment bust accelerates, and the problem of rolling over the debts of provincial governments and their special investment vehicles can no longer be papered over. And, given a new leadership’s caution as it establishes its power, reforms will occur at a snail’s pace, making social and political unrest more likely.¶ Meanwhile, Brazil, India, Russia, and other emerging economies are playing the same game. Many have not adjusted as advanced economies’ weakness reduces the room for export-led growth; and many delayed structural reforms needed to boost private-sector development and productivity growth, while embracing a model of state capitalism that will soon reveal its limits. So the recent slowdown of growth in emerging markets is not just cyclical, owing to weak growth or outright recession in advanced economies; it is also structural.¶ Similar dithering is apparent at the geopolitical level as well. The major global powers are still trying negotiations and sanctions to induce Iran to abandon its efforts to develop nuclear weapons. But Iran is playing for time and hoping to reach a zone of immunity. By 2013, an Israel that – rightly or wrongly – perceives Iran’s nuclear program to be an existential threat, and/or the US, which has rejected containment of a nuclear Iran, may decide to strike, leading to a war and a massive spike in oil prices.¶ Ineffective governments with weak leadership are at the root of the problem. In democracies, repeated elections lead to short-term policy choices. In autocracies like China and Russia, leaders resist the radical reforms that would reduce the power of entrenched lobbies and interests, thereby fueling social unrest as resentment against corruption and rent-seeking boils over into protest.¶ But, as everyone kicks the can down the road, the can is getting heavier and, in the major emerging markets and advanced economies alike, is approaching a brick wall. Policymakers can either crash into that wall, or they can show the leadership and vision needed to dismantle it safely.

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

Miller 00 (Morris, Economist, Adjunct Professor in the Faculty of Administration – University of Ottawa, Former Executive Director and Senior Economist – World Bank, “Poverty as a Cause of Wars?”, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Winter, p. 273)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that
exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis – as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore **no relationship** to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

#### -- History proves

Ferguson 6 (Niall, Professor of History – Harvard University, Foreign Affairs, 85(5), September / October, Lexis)

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out. Nazi Germany started the war in Europe only after its economy had recovered. Not all the countries affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression. In fact, no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole. Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

#### -- No timeframe

Russett 83 (Bruce, Dean Acheson Professor of International Relations and Political Science – Yale University, “Prosperity and Peace: Presidential Address”, International Studies Quarterly, 27(4), p. 384)

The ‘optimism’ argument seems strained to me, but elements of Blainey’s former thesis, about the need to mobilize resources before war can be begun, are more plausible, especially in the 20th century. Modern wars are fought by complex organizations, with complex and expensive weapons. It takes time to design and build the weapons that military commanders will require, and it takes time to train the troops who must use them. Large bureaucracies must plan and obtain some consensus on those plans; and even in a dictatorship the populace in general must be prepared, with clear images of who are their enemies and of the cause that will justify war with them. In short, preparations for war take time. Just how long a lag we should expect to find between an economic downturn and subsequent war initiation is unclear. But surely it will be **more than a year or two**, and war may well occur **only after** the economy is recovering.

#### -- Economy is resilient

Behravesh 06 (Nariman, most accurate economist tracked by USA Today and chief global economist and executive vice president for Global Insight, Newsweek, “The Great Shock Absorber; Good macroeconomic policies and improved microeconomic flexibility have strengthened the global economy's 'immune system.'” 10-15-2006, www.newsweek.com/id/47483)

The U.S. and global economies were able to withstand three body blows in 2005--one of the worst tsunamis on record (which struck at the very end of 2004), one of the worst hurricanes on record and the highest energy prices after Hurricane Katrina--without missing a beat. This resilience was especially remarkable in the case of the United States, which since 2000 has been able to shrug off the biggest stock-market drop since the 1930s, a major terrorist attack, corporate scandals and war. Does this mean that recessions are a relic of the past? No, but recent events do suggest that the global economy's "immune system" is now strong enough to absorb shocks that 25 years ago would probably have triggered a downturn. In fact, over the past two decades, recessions have not disappeared, but have become considerably milder in many parts of the world. What explains this enhanced recession resistance? The answer: a combination of good macroeconomic policies and improved microeconomic flexibility. Since the mid-1980s, central banks worldwide have had great success in taming inflation. This has meant that long-term interest rates are at levels not seen in more than 40 years. A low-inflation and low-interest-rate environment is especially conducive to sustained, robust growth. Moreover, central bankers have avoided some of the policy mistakes of the earlier oil shocks (in the mid-1970s and early 1980s), during which they typically did too much too late, and exacerbated the ensuing recessions. Even more important, in recent years the Fed has been particularly adept at crisis management, aggressively cutting interest rates in response to stock-market crashes, terrorist attacks and weakness in the economy. The benign inflationary picture has also benefited from increasing competitive pressures, both worldwide (thanks to globalization and the rise of Asia as a manufacturing juggernaut) and domestically (thanks to technology and deregulation). Since the late 1970s, the United States, the United Kingdom and a handful of other countries have been especially aggressive in deregulating their financial and industrial sectors. This has greatly increased the flexibility of their economies and reduced their vulnerability to inflationary shocks. Looking ahead, what all this means is that a global or U.S. recession will likely be avoided in 2006, and probably in 2007 as well. Whether the current expansion will be able to break the record set in the 1990s for longevity will depend on the ability of central banks to keep the inflation dragon at bay and to avoid policy mistakes. The prospects look good. Inflation is likely to remain a low-level threat for some time, and Ben Bernanke, the incoming chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, spent much of his academic career studying the past mistakes of the Fed and has vowed not to repeat them. At the same time, no single shock will likely be big enough to derail the expansion. What if oil prices rise to $80 or $90 a barrel? Most estimates suggest that growth would be cut by about 1 percent--not good, but no recession. What if U.S. house prices fall by 5 percent in 2006 (an extreme assumption, given that house prices haven't fallen nationally in any given year during the past four decades)? Economic growth would slow by about 0.5 percent to 1 percent. What about another terrorist attack? Here the scenarios can be pretty scary, but an attack on the order of 9/11 or the Madrid or London bombings would probably have an even smaller impact on overall GDP growth.

### Iran

#### Proliferation does not escalate to war. It de-escalates conflicts

**Tepperman**, 9/7/**2009** (John - journalist based in New York Cuty, Why obama should learn to love the bomb, Newsweek, p.lexis)

**A growing and compelling body of research** suggests that nuclear weapons may not, in fact, make the world more dangerous, as Obama and most people assume. The bomb may actually make us safer. In this era of rogue states and transnational terrorists, that idea sounds so obviously wrongheaded that few politicians or policymakers are willing to entertain it. But that's a mistake. Knowing the truth about nukes would have a profound impact on government policy. Obama's idealistic campaign, so out of character for a pragmatic administration, may be unlikely to get far (past presidents have tried and failed). But it's not even clear he should make the effort. There are more important measures the U.S. government can and should take to make the real world safer, and these mustn't be ignored in the name of a dreamy ideal (a nuke-free planet) that's both unrealistic and possibly undesirable. The argument that nuclear weapons can be agents of peace as well as destruction rests on two deceptively simple observations. First, nuclear weapons have not been used since 1945. Second, there's never been a nuclear, or even a nonnuclear, war between two states that possess them. Just stop for a second and think about that: it's hard to overstate how remarkable it is, especially given the singular viciousness of the 20th century. As Kenneth Waltz, the leading "nuclear optimist" and a professor emeritus of political science at UC Berkeley puts it, "We now have 64 years of experience since Hiroshima. It's striking and against all historical precedent that for that substantial period, there has not been any war among nuclear states." To understand why--and why the next 64 years are likely to play out the same way--you need to start by recognizing that all states are **rational on some basic level**. Their leaders may be stupid, petty, venal, even evil, but they tend to do things only when they're **pretty sure they can get away with them**. Take war: a country will start a fight only when it's almost certain it can get what it wants at an acceptable price. **Not even Hitler or Saddam** waged wars they didn't think they could win. The problem historically has been that leaders often make the **wrong gamble and underestimate** the other side--and millions of innocents pay the price. Nuclear weapons change all that by making the costs of war **obvious**, inevitable, **and unacceptable**. Suddenly, when both sides have the ability to turn the other to ashes with the push of a button--and everybody knows it--the basic math shifts. Even the **craziest tin-pot dictator** is forced to accept that war with a nuclear state is **unwinnable** and thus not worth the effort. As Waltz puts it, "**Why fight if you can't win and might lose everything**?" Why indeed? The iron logic of deterrence and mutually assured destruction is so compelling, it's led to what's known as the nuclear peace: the virtually unprecedented stretch since the end of World War II in which all the world's major powers have avoided coming to blows. They did fight proxy wars, ranging from Korea to Vietnam to Angola to Latin America. But these never matched the furious destruction of full-on, great-power war (World War II alone was responsible for some 50 million to 70 million deaths). And since the end of the Cold War, such bloodshed has declined precipitously. Meanwhile, the nuclear powers have scrupulously avoided direct combat, and there's very good reason to think they always will. There have been some near misses, but a close look at these cases is fundamentally reassuring--because in each instance, very different **leaders all came to the same safe conclusion**. Take the mother of all nuclear standoffs: the Cuban missile crisis. For 13 days in October 1962, the United States and the Soviet Union each threatened the other with destruction. But both countries soon stepped back from the brink when they recognized that a war would have **meant curtains** for everyone. As important as the fact that they did is the reason why: Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev's aide Fyodor Burlatsky said later on, "It is impossible to win a nuclear war, and both sides realized that, maybe for the first time." The record since then shows the same pattern repeating: nuclear-armed enemies slide toward war, **then pull back**, always for the same reasons. The best recent example is India and Pakistan, which fought three bloody wars after independence before acquiring their own nukes in 1998. Getting their hands on weapons of mass destruction didn't do anything to lessen their animosity. But it did **dramatically mellow their behavior**. Since acquiring atomic weapons, the two sides have never fought another war, **despite severe provocations** (like Pakistani-based terrorist attacks on India in 2001 and 2008). They have skirmished once. But during that flare-up, in Kashmir in 1999, both countries were careful to keep the fighting limited and to avoid threatening the other's vital interests. Sumit Ganguly, an Indiana University professor and coauthor of the forthcoming India, Pakistan, and the Bomb, has found that on both sides, officials' thinking was strikingly similar to that of the Russians and Americans in 1962. The prospect of war brought Delhi and Islamabad face to face with a nuclear holocaust, and leaders in each country did what they had to do to avoid it.

#### Proliferators are not aggressive – they care about the economy and regime survival

**Alagappa**, **2008** (Muthiah – distinguished senior fellow at the East-West Center, The Long Shadow, p. 508-509)

Another major conclusion of this study is that although nuclear weapons could have destabilizing consequences in certain situations, on net they have **reinforced national security and** regional **stability** in Asia. It is possible to argue that fledgling and small nuclear arsenals would be more vulnerable to preventive attacks; that the related strategic compulsion for early use may lead to early launch postures and crisis situations; that limited war under nuclear conditions to alter or restore the political status quo can intensify tensions and carry the risk of escalation to major war; that inadequate command, control, and safety measures could result in accidents; and that nuclear facilities and material may be vulnerable to terrorist attacks. These are legitimate concerns, but thus far nuclear weapons have not undermined national security and regional stability in Asia. Instead, they have **ameliorated national security concerns**, strengthened the status quo, **increased deterrence dominance**, prevented the outbreak of major wars, and reinforced the regional trend to reduce the salience of force in international politics. Nor have nuclear weapons had the predicted domino effect. These consequences have strengthened regional security and stability that rest on multiple pillars. The grim scenarios associated with nuclear weapons in Asia frequently rely on worst-case political and military situations; often they are seen in isolation from the national priorities of regional states that **emphasize economic development** and modernization through participation in regional and global economies and the high priority accorded to stability in domestic and international affairs. The primary goal of regional states is **not** aggrandizement through **military aggression** but preservation of national integrity, state or regime survival, economic growth and prosperity, increase in national power and international influence, preservation or incremental change in the status quo, and the construction of regional and global orders in which they are subjects rather than objects. Seen in this broader perspective, nuclear weapons and more generally military force are of **greater relevance in the defense, deterrence, and assurance roles than offensive ones**. This does not imply that offensive use of force or military clashes will not occur; only that force is not the first option, that military clashes will be infrequent, and that when they do occur they will be limited in scope and intensity. Security interaction in Asia increasingly approximates behavior associated with defensive realism.

#### No chain reactions – the domino effect never occurs

**Alagappa**, **2008** (Muthiah – distinguished senior fellow at the East-West Center, The Long Shadow, p. 521-522)

It will be useful at this juncture to address more directly the set of instability arguments advanced by certain policy makers and scholars: the domino effect of new nuclear weapon states, the probability of preventive action against new nuclear weapon states, and the compulsion of these states to use their small arsenals early for fear of losing them in a preventive or preemptive strike by a stronger nuclear adversary. On the domino effect, India's and Pakistan's nuclear weapon programs have not fueled new programs in South Asia or beyond. Iran's quest for nuclear weapons is not a reaction to the Indian or Pakistani programs. It is grounded in that country's security concerns about the United States and Tehran's regional aspirations. The North Korean test has evoked mixed reactions in Northeast Asia. Tokyo is certainly concerned; its reaction, though, has not been to initiate its own nuclear weapon program but to reaffirm and strengthen the American extended deterrence commitment to Japan. Even if the U.S. Japan security treaty were to weaken, it is not certain that Japan would embark on a nuclear weapon program. Likewise, South Korea has sought reaffirmation of the American extended deterrence commitment, but has firmly held to its nonnuclear posture. Without dramatic change in its political, economic, and security circumstances, South Korea is highly unlikely to embark on a covert (or overt) nuclear weapon program as it did in the 1970s. South Korea could still become a nuclear weapon state by inheriting the nuclear weapons of North Korea should the Kim Jong Il regime collapse. Whether it retains or gives up that capability will hinge on the security circumstances of a unified Korea. The North Korean nuclear test has not **spurred Taiwan or Mongolia to develop nuclear weapon capability**. The point is that each country's decision to embark on and sustain nuclear weapon programs is contingent on its particular security and other circumstances. **Though appealing, the domino theory is not predictive**; often it is employed to justify policy on the basis of **alarmist predictions**. § Marked 19:41 § The loss of South Vietnam, for example, did not lead to the predicted domino effect in Southeast Asia. In fact the so-called dominos became drivers of a vibrant Southeast Asia and brought about a fundamental transformation in that subregion (Lord 1993, 1996). In the nuclear arena, the nuclear programs of China, India, and Pakistan were part of a security chain reaction, not mechanically falling dominos. However, as observed earlier the Indian, Pakistani, and North Korean nuclear tests have thus far not had the domino effect predicted by alarmist analysts and policy makers. Great caution should be exercised in accepting at face value the sensational predictions of individuals who have a vested interest in **accentuating the dangers of nuclear proliferation**. Such analysts are now focused on the dangers of a nuclear Iran. A nuclear Iran may or may not have destabilizing effects. Such claims must be assessed on the basis of an objective reading of the drivers of national and regional security in Iran and the Middle East.

#### No risk of accidents – safety devices and conflict management prevent war

**Mueller**, **2009** (John – Woody Hayes chair of national security studies at Ohio State University, Atomic Obsession, p. 100-101)

It is a plausible argument that, all other things equal, if the number of nuclear weapons in existence increases, the likelihood one will go off by accident will also increase. In fact, all things haven't been equal. As nuclear weapons have increased in numbers and sophistication, **so have safety devices and procedures**. Precisely because the weapons are so dangerous, extraordinary efforts to keep them from going off by accident or by an unauthorized deliberate act have been instituted, and these measures have, so far, been effective: no one has been killed in a nuclear explosion since Nagasaki. Extrapolating further from disasters that have not occurred, many have been led to a concern that, triggered by a nuclear weapons accident, a war could somehow be started through an act of desperation or of consummate sloppiness. Before the invention of nuclear weapons, such possibilities were not perhaps of great concern, because no weapon or small set of weapons could do enough damage to be truly significant. Each nuclear weapon, however, is capable of destroying in an instant more people than have been killed in an average war, and the weapons continue to exist in the tens of thousands. However, even if a bomb, or a few bombs, were to go off, it does not necessarily follow that war would result. For that to happen, it is assumed, the accident would have to take place at a time of war-readiness, as during a crisis, when both sides are poised for action and when one side could perhaps be triggered – or panicked –into major action by an explosion mistakenly taken to be part of, or the prelude to, a full attack. This means that the unlikely happening –a nuclear accident – would have to coincide precisely with an event, a militarized international crisis, something that is **rare** to begin with, became more so as the cold war progressed, and has become even less likely since its demise. Furthermore, even if the accident takes place during a crisis, **it does not follow that escalation** or hasty response **is** inevitable, or even **very likely**. As Bernard Brodie points out, escalation scenarios essentially impute to both sides "a well-nigh limitless concern with saving face" and/or "a deal of ground-in automaticity of response and counterresponse." None of this was in evidence during the Cuban missile crisis when there were accidents galore. An American spy plane was shot down over Cuba, probably without authorization, and another accidentally went off course and flew threateningly over the Soviet Union. As if that weren’t enough, a Soviet military officer spying for the West sent a message, apparently on a whim, warning that the Soviets were about to attack.31 **None of these remarkable events triggered anything** in the way of precipitous response. They were duly evaluated and then ignored. Robert Jervis points out that "when critics talk of the impact of irrationality, they imply that all such deviations will be in the direction of emotional impulsiveness, of launching an attack, or of taking actions that are terribly risky. But irrationality could also lead a state to **passive acquiescence**." In moments of high stress and threat, people can be said to have three psychological alternatives: (1) to remain calm and rational, (2) to refuse to believe that the threat is imminent or significant, or to panic, lashing out frantically and incoherently at the threat. Generally, people react in one of the first two ways. In her classic study of disaster behavior, Martha Wolfenstein concludes, “The usual reaction is one of being unworried.” In addition, the historical record suggests that **wars simply do not begin by accident**. In his extensive survey of wars that have occurred since 1400, diplomat-historian Evan Luard concludes, "It is impossible to identify a single case in which it can be said that a war started accidentally; in which it was not, at the time the war broke out, the deliberate intention of at least one party that war should take place." Geoffrey Blainey, after similar study, very much agrees: although many have discussed "accidental" or "unintentional" wars, "it is difficult," he concludes, "to find a war which on investigation fits this description." Or, as Henry Kissinger has put it dryly, "Despite popular myths, large military units do not fight by accident."

**-- Iran won’t be aggressive – too many checks in the system**

**Boroujerdi 7** (Mehrzad, Associate Professor of Political Science and Director of the Middle Eastern Studies Program, “Iranian Nuclear Miasma”, Syracuse Law Review, 57 Syracuse L. Rev. 619, Lexis)

The potential for groupthink miscalculations is also **thwarted** by the existence of multiple consensus-based decision bodies within the overall multilayered structure. 18 While this complex process can sometimes make Iranian policy confusing and contradictory, it does not necessarily lend itself to high risk behavior. Even if one agent makes a hasty decision or issues an aggressive policy statement, it may be **immediately contradicted** by another authority. 19 Individual leaders also have difficulty muting [\*623] criticism within the regime and forcing all agents to agree on one course of action. While miscalculations and hasty behavior may be the rule at the micro-level, at the macro-level hasty action is **checked by** the **competing nodes of power**. While this structure could admittedly be problematic with regard to the nuclear program depending on what form of command and control system to control accidents and illicit transfer is established, it makes the prospect of Iran engaging in a boldly offensive or miscalculated action **less realistic**.

#### -- No impact to Iran prolif – zero risk of war

Sadr 5 (Ehsaneh, Dept of Government at the University of Maryland, Middle East Policy, Summer 2005)

In an article on U.S. options for a post- Cold War nuclear policy, Charles Glaser criticizes the work of foreign-policy analysts who “focus on a single criterion for evaluating U.S. security – the damage United States society would suffer in a war – but overlook other criteria for measuring U.S. security, specifically those criteria that measure the likelihood of war.”61 The same criticism might be leveled at Israeli security analysts whose preoccupation with the devastation a nuclear Iran could inflict upon the Jewish nation clouds their evaluation of the ways in which the acquisition of nuclear weapons affects the likelihood that Iran would initiate hostilities in the first place. The above analysis indicates that a nuclearized Iran is extremely unlikely to pose an existential threat to Israel. The doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction holds in the Iranian context: Iran’s clerical rulers, anxious to protect their own power, citizens and civilization, will not launch a war that will lead to their own destruction. Iran’s rulers are extremely unlikely to pass nuclear material on to terrorist actors whose loyalty they cannot ensure. They are also unlikely to step up conventional or terrorist harassment of Israel for fear of the escalation of hostilities to nuclear warfare. The impact of Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons upon Israel’s regional interests is less problematic than one might think. Although the regime-change option would be off the table, it is not clear that it has ever been a feasible alternative given current geopolitical realities. Any increase in domestic political support for the Iranian regime is likely to be temporary. Iran may indeed be empowered to pursue its own regional interests, but such pursuit is not necessarily bad for Israeli interests. Finally, it will be many years before Iran’s weapons stockpile begins to approach Israel’s and the latter is compelled to engage in an expensive arms race. Indeed, there is reason to believe that Iran’s access to nuclear weapons may increase the prospects for regional stability and even Middle East peace. Given the horrendous consequences of an accidental nuclear war, it will be imperative that Iran and Israel develop some sort of ability to communicate with one another directly. It is not outside the realm of possibility that the institutionalization of such communications may be the first step in the normalization of relations between the two countries and the future integration of Israel into its neighborhood.

#### No chance of Israeli strike – Iran is too strong

Dan Williams, 3/7/07 (http://www.capetimes.co.za/index.php?fArticleId=3717229)

JERUSALEM: Israel has long been the wild card in debates on the Iranian nuclear programme - a country that, while formally outside negotiations, has lobbying clout given its penchant for pre-emptive strikes.   But Israeli officials, once quick to project military menace in the face of what Prime Minister Ehud Olmert has called an "existential threat", are increasingly taking a softer public line on how to meet Iran's refusal to halt uranium enrichment.   It appears that many **Israelis have decided that Iran is too tough an enemy for their armed forces to take on alone - and that the international community senses this too.**   "**The last thing Israel is interested in is military action against Iran,**" said Avigdor Lieberman, the Israeli strategic affairs minister.

#### Israel will not strike Iran

Dan Williams, 3/7/07 (http://www.capetimes.co.za/index.php?fArticleId=3717229)

Like its US ally, Israel refuses to rule out pre-emptive strikes as a last-ditch means of curbing a nuclear programme, that Iran insists is peaceful. But unlike Iraq under Saddam Hussein, Iran's nuclear facilities may be too distant, numerous and fortified for Israel to tackle. The sense of tactical limitation was reinforced, throughout the region and beyond, by last year's inconclusive Israeli war against Lebanese Hezbollah guerrillas.   **"It is becoming increasingly clear that Israel has no viable military option on Iran, and is pinning its hopes on some sort of solution by the Americans,"** said Alon Ben-David, Israel analyst for Jane's Defence Weekly. "But **there is a growing number of Israelis who think the country will just have to live with a nuclear-armed Iran,**" he said.

#### Relations resilient

China Daily 3 (2-13, Lexis)

During President Jiang Zemin's visit to the United States last year, he and Bush stated that China and the United States had extensive and crucial common interests and should expand their exchanges and co-operation in various areas to develop a constructive and co-operative Sino-US relationship. Improving Sino-US relations thus became the inevitable option in Washington's China policy. Since the mid-1980s, economic and trade exchanges have been a vital factor in bilateral ties and remain the most resilient chain. Bearing in mind the huge economic interests arising from China's entry to the World Trade Organization (WTO), Bush emphasized the importance of Sino-US economic and trade relations, even when pursuing a hard-line China policy in the initial period of his tenure. History has proved that, despite some twists and turns, common interests have overweighed differences in Sino-US relations.

#### No spillover

IPS 3 (Inter-Press Service, 11-4, Lexis)

Indeed, it now appears that, despite rising tensions over the bilateral trade balance and the value of the yuan, the realists centered in the State Department have decisively taken control over U.S. China policy, thanks largely to Beijing's own behavior and rapidly growing influence. "The administration has come to the conclusion that strategic engagement is the only viable option on relations with China," says Garrett. That Washington's major problem today is over currency, he adds, illustrates the degree to which Sino-U.S. relations have stabilized. "This is the kind of problem we have with Japan," Garrett said. "We're at the point where we can have differences in one area without it threatening other aspects of the relationship."

#### U.S. nuclear primacy checks war

Lieber and Press 6 (Keir A., Assistant Professor of Political Science – Notre Dame and Daryl G., Associate Professor of Political Science – University of Pennsylvania, Foreign Affairs, March / April, Lexis)

For almost half a century, the world's most powerful nuclear states have been locked in a military stalemate known as mutual assured destruction (MAD). By the early 1960s, the nuclear arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union had grown so large and sophisticated that neither country could entirely destroy the other's retaliatory force by launching first, even with a surprise attack. Starting a nuclear war was therefore tantamount to committing suicide. During the Cold War, many scholars and policy analysts believed that MAD made the world relatively stable and peaceful because it induced great caution in international politics, discouraged the use of nuclear threats to resolve disputes, and generally restrained the superpowers' behavior. (Revealingly, the last intense nuclear standoff, the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, occurred at the dawn of the era of MAD.) Because of the nuclear stalemate, the optimists argued, the era of intentional great-power wars had ended. Critics of MAD, however, argued that it prevented not great-power war but the rolling back of the power and influence of a dangerously expansionist and totalitarian Soviet Union. From that perspective, MAD prolonged the life of an evil empire. This debate may now seem like ancient history, but it is actually more relevant than ever -- because the age of MAD is nearing an end. Today, for the first time in almost 50 years, the United States stands on the verge of attaining nuclear primacy. It will probably soon be possible for the United States to destroy the long-range nuclear arsenals of Russia or China with a first strike. This dramatic shift in the nuclear balance of power stems from a series of improvements in the United States' nuclear systems, the precipitous decline of Russia's arsenal, and the glacial pace of modernization of China's nuclear forces. Unless Washington's policies change or Moscow and Beijing take steps to increase the size and readiness of their forces, Russia and China -- and the rest of the world -- will live in the shadow of U.S. nuclear primacy for many years to come. One's views on the implications of this change will depend on one's theoretical perspective. Hawks, who believe that the United States is a benevolent force in the world, will welcome the new nuclear era because they trust that U.S. dominance in both conventional and nuclear weapons will help deter aggression by other countries. For example, as U.S. nuclear primacy grows, China's leaders may act more cautiously on issues such as Taiwan, realizing that their vulnerable nuclear forces will not deter U.S. intervention -- and that Chinese nuclear threats could invite a U.S. strike on Beijing's arsenal. But doves, who oppose using nuclear threats to coerce other states and fear an emboldened and unconstrained United States, will worry.

#### -- History proves no risk of China war – their cards are all hype

Dyer 9 (Gwynne, Ph.D. in War Studies – University of London and Board of Governors – Canada’s Royal Military College, “China Unlikely to Engage in Military Confrontation”, Jakarta Post, 4-29,

http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2005/03/12/china-unlikely-engage-military-confrontation.html)

Given America's monopoly or huge technological lead in key areas like stealth bombers, aircraft carriers, long-range sensors, satellite surveillance and even infantry body armor, Goss's warning is misleading and self-serving. China cannot project a serious military force even 200 miles (km) from home, while American forces utterly dominate China's ocean frontiers, many thousands of miles (kilometers) from the United States. But the drumbeat of warnings about China's ""military build-up"" continues. Just the other week U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld was worrying again about the expansion of the Chinese navy, which is finally building some amphibious landing ships half a century after Beijing's confrontation with the non-Communist regime on the island of Taiwan began. And Senator Richard Lugar, head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, warned that if the European Union ends its embargo on arms sales to China, the U.S. would stop military technology sales to Europe. It will come as no surprise, therefore, that the major U.S. defense review planned for this year will concentrate on the rising ""threat"" from China, or that this year for the first time the joint U.S.-Japanese defense policy statement named China as a ""security concern"", or that the Taiwan government urged the ""military encirclement"" of China to prevent any ""foreign adventures"" by Beijing. It comes as no surprise -- but it still makes no sense. China's defense budget this year is 247.7 billion yuan: Around US$30 billion at the official exchange rate. There are those in Washington who will say that it's more like $60 billion in purchasing power, but then there used to be ""experts"" who annually produced hugely inflated and frightening estimates of the Soviet defense budget. Such people will always exist: to justify a big U.S. defense budget, you need a big threat. It's true that 247.7 billion yuan buys an awful lot of warm bodies in military uniform in the low-wage Chinese economy, but it doesn't actually buy much more in the way of high-tech military systems. It's also true that the Chinese defense budget has grown by double-digit increases for the past fourteen years: This year it's up by 12.6 percent. But that is not significantly faster than the Chinese economy as a whole is growing, and it's about what you have to spend in order to convert what used to be a glorified peasant militia into a modern military force. It would be astonishing if China chose NOT to modernize its armed forces as the rest of the economy modernizes, and the end result is not going to be a military machine that towers above all others. If you project the current growth rates of military spending in China and the United States into the future, China's defense budget catches up with the United States about the same time that its Gross Domestic Product does, in the late 2030s or the early 2040s. As to China's strategic intentions, the record of the past is reassuring in several respects. China has almost never been militarily expansionist beyond the traditional boundaries of the Middle Kingdom (which do include Tibet in the view of most Chinese), and its border clashes with India, the Soviet Union and Vietnam in the first decades of Communist rule generally ended with a voluntary Chinese withdrawal from the disputed territories. The same moderation has usually applied in nuclear matters. The CIA frets that China could have a hundred nuclear missiles targeted on the United States by 2015, but that is actually evidence of China's great restraint. The first Chinese nuclear weapons test was forty years ago, and by now China could have thousands of nuclear warheads targeted on the U.S. if it wanted. (The United States DOES have thousands of nuclear warheads that can strike Chinese targets.) The Beijing regime is obsessed with economic stability, because it fears that a severe downturn would trigger social and political upheaval. The last thing it wants is a military confrontation with its biggest trading partner, the United States. It will go on playing the nationalist card over Taiwan to curry domestic political favor, but there is no massive military build-up and no plausible threat of impending war in East Asia.

#### -- Won’t go nuclear

PPG 4 (Pittsburgh Post-Gazette (Pennsylvania), 9-29, Lexis)

U.S. military capacity is now so overstretched by the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts that a Chinese move to realize its own top strategic objective, the scooping up of Taiwan to complete the hat trick with Hong Kong and Macao, would find the United States hard-pressed to be able to respond at all. A U.S. threat of a nuclear attack on China -- with China's inevitable nuclear counterstrike -- would be so wildly unacceptable in political terms in the United States itself as to be **out of the question** for any U.S. administration. The idea of causing Los Angeles to disappear because China had seized Taiwan would be a trade-off that no American leader would even dare contemplate. America is lucky so far that China has not yet sought to match its economic reach in Asia with a corresponding assertion of political influence. That doesn't mean that Asia will inevitably become a sphere of Chinese dominance. What will happen instead -- what is already happening, in fact -- is that other Asian powers such as Japan, Korea and India will increasingly take steps to check Chinese power by increasing their own military capacity. In other words, what was a situation in which the United States stood between Japan and Korea and the imposition of Chinese influence will now become one in which those countries will become more dependent on their own resources to defend themselves. The response of the Koreans could be said to be a move toward resolving the problems between South and North Korea to enable them to present a united front to the Chinese. The response of Japan that can be expected will be limited remilitarization. The health and peace of the region will depend on the degree to which the competition among these countries will be economic, rather than political and military. What will this modification of the balance of power in Asia mean for the United States? First of all, none of this will happen tomorrow. The extension of China's reach and the Japanese and Korean response will be gradual and spread out across the years, although there may well be some pinpricks at the extremities sooner rather than later. The Chinese themselves will avoid direct confrontation with the United States at all costs. It is not their way. Conflict between the two countries would be asymmetrical in the extreme in any case. Basically, the two can't attack each other. **Nuclear warfare is out**. The million-man People's Liberation Army isn't portable. The Chinese are definitely not into terrorism.

## 2NC vs Kentucky GS

### Producer – Interpretation – 2NC

#### Limits outweigh – they’re the vital access point for any theory impact – its key to fairness – huge research burdens mean we can’t prepare to compete – and its key to education – big topics cause hyper-generics, lack of clash, and shallow debate – and it destroys participation

Rowland 84 (Robert C., Debate Coach – Baylor University, “Topic Selection in Debate”, American Forensics in Perspective, Ed. Parson, p. 53-54)

The first major problem identified by the work group as relating to topic selection is the decline in participation in the National Debate Tournament (NDT) policy debate. As Boman notes: There is a growing dissatisfaction with academic debate that utilizes a policy proposition. Programs which are oriented toward debating the national policy debate proposition, so-called “NDT” programs, are diminishing in scope and size.4 This decline in policy debate is tied, many in the work group believe, to excessively broad topics. The most obvious characteristic of some recent policy debate topics is extreme breath. A resolution calling for regulation of land use literally and figuratively covers a lot of ground. Naitonal debate topics have not always been so broad. Before the late 1960s the topic often specified a particular policy change.5 The move from narrow to broad topics has had, according to some, the effect of limiting the number of students who participate in policy debate. First, the breadth of the topics has all but destroyed novice debate. Paul Gaske argues that because the stock issues of policy debate are clearly defined, it is superior to value debate as a means of introducing students to the debate process.6 Despite this advantage of policy debate, Gaske belives that NDT debate is not the best vehicle for teaching beginners. The problem is that broad policy topics terrify novice debaters, especially those who lack high school debate experience. They are unable to cope with the breadth of the topic and experience “negophobia,”7 the fear of debating negative. As a consequence, the educational advantages associated with teaching novices through policy debate are lost: “Yet all of these benefits fly out the window as rookies in their formative stage quickly experience humiliation at being caugh without evidence or substantive awareness of the issues that confront them at a tournament.”8 The ultimate result is that fewer novices participate in NDT, thus lessening the educational value of the activity and limiting the number of debaters or eventually participate in more advanced divisions of policy debate. In addition to noting the effect on novices, participants argued that broad topics also discourage experienced debaters from continued participation in policy debate. Here, the claim is that it takes so much times and effort to be competitive on a broad topic that students who are concerned with doing more than just debate are forced out of the activity.9 Gaske notes, that “broad topics discourage participation because of insufficient time to do requisite research.”10 The final effect may be that entire programs either cease functioning or shift to value debate as a way to avoid unreasonable research burdens. Boman supports this point: “It is this expanding necessity of evidence, and thereby research, which has created a competitive imbalance between institutions that participate in academic debate.”11 In this view, it is the competitive imbalance resulting from the use of broad topics that has led some small schools to cancel their programs.

#### Look – I wouldn’t be reading T if I knew I was wrong – they only reduce restrictions on people who want to give incentives – they don’t remove restrictions on energy production – the plan does not directly interact with companies – look anywhere in their case – its all based on countries who want to invest. This killed our strategy from the beginning of the round

#### They’ve already conceded that you should err neg – bidirectionality gives the aff strategic advantages, first and last speech plus infinite prep means limiting aff mechanism is the only remedy. This is especially true on the topic where people are backlashing against core generics like the States CP.

#### Independent from limits – our interp is still better –

#### A) Bright line – hard to draw the line what is a reasonable impediment. The only clear distinction is quantity and quality of energy production.

#### B) Precise Manageability – there are many interpretations of the word restriction, but our Browne evidence says “the foundation of this interpretation must be acknowledged as sound as THE ONLY possible foundation that can exist without a direct violation of words”

### Producer – Interpretation – Restrictions Mean Direct Relation

#### Restrictions require direct and immediate relation

SCI 62 (Supreme Court of India, “THE AUTOMOBILE TRANSPORT (RAJASTHAN) LTD. Vs. THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN AND OTHERS (And Connected Appeals),” 1962 AIR 1406, 1963 SCR (1) 491, 9-4, http://indiankanoon.org/doc/304499/)

The majority view differed from that of the learned Chief Justice in that it did not accept as correct the contention that tax laws were governed by the provisions of Part XII of the Constitution only and were outside Part XIII. The majority expressed the view that when Art. 301 provided that trade shall be free throughout the territory of India, it was the movement or transport part of the trade that must be free. The majority said: "It is a federal constitution which we are interpreting, and so the impact of Art. 301 must be judged accordingly. Besides, it is not irrelevant to remember in this connection that the Article we are construing imposes a constitutional limitation on the power of the Parliament and the State Legislatures to levy taxes, and generally, but for such limitation, the power of taxation would be presumed to be for public good and would not be subject to judicial review or scrutiny. Thus considered we think it would be reasonable and proper to hold that restrictions freedom from which is 509 guaranteed by Art. 301, would be such restrictions as directly and immediately restrict or impede the free flow or movement of trade. Taxes may and do amount to restrictions; but it is **only such taxes as directly and immediately restrict trade** that would fall within the purview of Art. 301. The argument that all taxes should be governed by Art. 301 whether or not their impact on trade is immediate or mediate, direct or remote, adopts, in our opinion, **an extreme approach which cannot be upheld**." (p. 860.)

### Producer – A2: We Meet – SCI 62 Evidence

#### Contextual definitions are bad –

#### No intent to define – that destroys precision and allows them to read contrived definitions. That makes it impossible to create a predictable limit that both sides can prepare for.

#### They also explode limits – reducing population density becomes an aff

DOE 8 (Department of Energy, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, “20% Wind Energy by 2030,” July, http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy08osti/41869.pdf)

In the next 10 years, the U.S. offshore wind market could play a more significant role in bringing new power generation online in selected regions of the country where electricity prices are higher than average, **population density restricts power plant installations**, shallow water sites are available, state governments have passed aggressive RPS requirements, and coastal communities support this energy option.

### Producer – A2: CI – Economic Obstacles

#### Massively explodes limits

SCI 62 (Supreme Court of India, “THE AUTOMOBILE TRANSPORT (RAJASTHAN) LTD. Vs. THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN AND OTHERS (And Connected Appeals),” 1962 AIR 1406, 1963 SCR (1) 491, 9-4, http://indiankanoon.org/doc/304499/)

The third view held by Shah, J., was that the freedom contemplated was freedom of trade, commerce and intercourse in ill their varied aspects inclusive of all activities which constitute commercial intercourse and not merely restrictions on the movement aspect. He said : "The guarantee of freedom of trade and commerce is not addressed merely against prohibitions, complete or partial; it is addressed to tariffs, licensing, marketing regulations, price-control, nationalization, economic or social planning, discriminatory tariffs, compulsory appropriation of goods, freezing or stand-still orders and similar other impediments operating directly and immediately on the freedom of commercial intercourse as well. Every sequence in the series of operations which constitutes trade or commerce is an act of trade or commerce and burdens or impediments imposed on any such step **are restrictions** on the freedom of trade commerce and intercourse. What is guaranteed is freedom in its widest amplitude-freedom from prohibition, control, burden or impediment in commercial intercourse." (p. 874.)

## 1NR vs Kentucky GS

### Impact

#### Disad outweights and turns the case Russia war -> no trade and probably increase protectionism

#### US/Russian nuclear war causes extinction – its categorically different than other impacts

Bostrom 2 (Nick, PhD Philosophy – Oxford University, “Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios”, Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, March, http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)

The unique challenge of existential risks Risks in this sixth category are a recent phenomenon. This is part of the reason why it is useful to distinguish them from other risks. We have not evolved mechanisms, either biologically or culturally, for managing such risks. Our intuitions and coping strategies have been shaped by our long experience with risks such as dangerous animals, hostile individuals or tribes, poisonous foods, automobile accidents, Chernobyl, Bhopal, volcano eruptions, earthquakes, draughts, World War I, World War II, epidemics of influenza, smallpox, black plague, and AIDS. These types of disasters have occurred many times and our cultural attitudes towards risk have been shaped by trial-and-error in managing such hazards. But tragic as such events are to the people immediately affected, in the big picture of things – from the perspective of humankind as a whole – even the worst of these catastrophes are **mere ripples** on the surface of the great sea of life. They haven’t significantly affected the total amount of human suffering or happiness or determined the long-term fate of our species. With the exception of a species-destroying comet or asteroid impact (an extremely rare occurrence), there were probably no significant existential risks in human history until the mid-twentieth century, and certainly none that it was within our power to do something about. The first manmade existential risk was the inaugural detonation of an atomic bomb. At the time, there was some concern that the explosion might start a runaway chain-reaction by “igniting” the atmosphere. Although we now know that such an outcome was physically impossible, it qualifies as an existential risk that was present at the time. For there to be a risk, given the knowledge and understanding available, it suffices that there is some subjective probability of an adverse outcome, even if it later turns out that objectively there was no chance of something bad happening. If we don’t know whether something is objectively risky or not, then it is risky in the subjective sense. The subjective sense is of course what we must base our decisions on.[[2]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html#_ftn2) At any given time we must use our best current subjective estimate of what the objective risk factors are.[[3]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html#_ftn3) A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as **global** and **terminal**. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[[4]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html#_ftn4)  Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

### Their Warming add on

#### US/Russia relations is the critical internal link to global warming

**Light, Wong and Charap**, 6/30/**2009** (Andrew – senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, Julian – senior policy analyst at CAP, and Samuel – fellow at CAP, U.S.-Russia Climate and Energy Efficiency Cooperation: A Neglected Challenge, Center for American Progress, p. http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/06/neglected\_challenge.html)

The summit between President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitri Medvedev in Moscow on July 6-8 comes in the middle of a packed international schedule of bilateral and multilateral meetings for the United States. on climate change. In the run up to the critical U.N. climate talks in Copenhagen at the end of this year, when the extension or successor to the existing Kyoto Protocol must be agreed upon, it is crucial that the United States and Russia—both major emitters of greenhouse gases and potentially leaders on this crucial issue—explore ways of working together to ensure a positive outcome at these talks. Enhancing cooperation on climate change and energy efficiency should be a major plank of U.S. Russia policy and should be discussed at the highest levels when President Obama meets with President Medvedev next week. Russia, like the United States, is a significant contributor to global warming. If the European Union is disaggregated Russia is the third-largest emitter of carbon dioxide behind the United States and China and still currently ahead of India. More importantly Russian per capita emissions are on the rise, and are projected at this point to approach America’s top rank as per capita emitter by 2030. Russia is also the third-largest consumer of energy and one of the world’s most energy-intensive economies. Making Russia a partner on these issues could be critical in order to **advance a sound global climate change agenda**.

#### Cooperation is the most effective warming solution --- solves in the short-term

**Light, Wong and Charap**, 6/30/**2009** (Andrew – senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, Julian – senior policy analyst at CAP, and Samuel – fellow at CAP, U.S.-Russia Climate and Energy Efficiency Cooperation: A Neglected Challenge, Center for American Progress, p. http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/06/neglected\_challenge.html)

One of the most striking features of Russia’s energy profile is its energy intensity—the amount of energy consumed per unit of gross domestic product—which is higher than any of the world’s 10-largest energy-consuming countries, 3.1 times greater than the European Union, and more than twice that of the United States. This massive potential for improvement makes working with the Russians to increase their energy efficiency the most effective short-term way to help them reduce emissions and points toward the clearest path for demonstrating the economic advantages of taking on climate change.

#### Romney election results in Iran strikes --- Obama reelection defuses the situation with diplomacy

**Daily Kos**, 4/16/**2012** (President Obama versus Romney on Iran, p. <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/04/16/1083726/-President-Obama-versus-Romney-on-Iran>)

3. Approach to foreign policy: Romney says he will “not apologize” for America and advocates a return to the Bush cowboy “my way or the highway” approach to dealing with other nations. When John Bolton is an endorser, that scares me. To me, however the biggest contrast is their approach to Iran. Binyamin Netanyahu by all accounts is a hawk who is pushing the United States to bomb Iran and has been doing so for a long time. He appears to see no need for negotiation. Granted, he has a right to protect his nation if he believes that its under threat. However, we all know how flawed the “intelligence” was for the Iraq war. And its important to let negotiations play out as far as possible before rushing to war, which would have many unintended consequences for years to come. (See the Iraq war). Here’s the big difference. Here’s Netanyahu’s recent response to the ongoing P5+1 talks: http://news.yahoo.com/... Netanyahu -- whose government has not ruled out a preemptive strike on Iranian nuclear facilities -- earlier said however that Tehran had simply bought itself some extra time to comply. "My initial impression is that Iran has been given a 'freebie'," Netanyahu said during talks with visiting US Senator Joe Lieberman, the premier's office reported. "It has got five weeks to continue enrichment without any limitation, any inhibition. I think Iran should take immediate steps to stop all enrichment, take out all enrichment material and dismantle the nuclear facility in Qom," he said. "I believe that the world's greatest practitioner of terrorism must not have the opportunity to develop atomic bombs," he said. Here’s President Obama’s response yesterday to Netanyahu (in a response to a journalist's question) at the press conference in Cartagena: But Obama refuted that statement, saying "The notion that we've given something away or a freebie would indicate that Iran has gotten something." "In fact, they got the toughest sanctions that they're going to be facing coming up in a few months if they don't take advantage of those talks. I hope they do," Obama said. "The clock is ticking and I've been very clear to Iran and our negotiating partners that we're not going to have these talks just drag out in a stalling process," Obama told reporters after an Americas summit in Colombia."But so far at least we haven't given away anything -- other than the opportunity for us to negotiate," he said. Obama in conjunction with world powers is negotiating with Iran, trying to prevent a needless war. You can be sure that Mitt Romney would bow to his buddy Netanyahu and attack Iran. He has previously said “We will not have an inch of difference between ourselves and Israel”. As he also said in a debate, before making any decision regarding Israel, he will call his friend Bibi. Bottom line, if somehow the American people elect Mitt Romney, expect more of the bombastic, Bush cowboy approach to foreign policy with a more than likely bombardment of Iran. If the American people are not fooled by this charlatan and they reelect Barack Obama, he will continue in his measured way to deal with the threats around the world, quietly, through the use of negotiation, and force if absolutely necessary, but only as a last resort, without bragging, and scaring the American people with needless terrorism alerts.

### Uniqueness debate – group it

#### Obama is winning now by a few points – all of their Romney leads args are specific to one or two polls but our sivler ev says the ovwhelming consensus – and our ev is just better there is literally one sentence highlighted in each of their ev and its not discussing consensus

#### Obama will win the election --- Abramowitz prediction model proves. But dramatic events can still change the outcome.

**Ravi**, **9/13**/2012 (Anusha, Abramowitz Predicts 2012 Election Results, The Emory Wheel, p. http://www.emorywheel.com/abramowitz-predicts-2012-election-results/)

Alan Abramowitz, the Alben W. Barkley Professor of Political Science, has released his forecast for the outcome of the presidential election this November. Abramowitz, who has accurately predicted the popular vote winner of every presidential election since 1988, says incumbent President Barack Obama will win the election by a close margin of about 1.2 percent. Abramowitz based his forecast on statistical analysis composed of the candidate’s approval rating at the end of June, the growth of the economy and the value of the “incumbency factor,” which refers to the advantage a candidate will have simply for being the candidate that voters are familiar with. “The Democratic constituency is just larger than the Republicans’ and encompasses far more different types of people,” Abramowitz said. “Even if Romney receives the maximum turnout from white Republican voters, he won’t win.” In the past, the incumbency factor has meant more, according to Abramowitz. But more recently, the value of merely being the incumbent candidate has decreased because of the stark polarization — the division of voters into political extremes — of the American voting public. While Abramowitz has made his prediction about two months before the election takes place, he said that a very dramatic event would have to occur to change what he believes will be the outcome of the election.

#### Challenger won’t get the undecided voters.

**Cohn**, **8/8**/2012 (Nate – former Whitman debater and author of the Electionate, 90 Days Until the Election – And Obama Has the Advantage, The New Republic, p. <http://www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/105912/obama-has-the-advantage-90-days-go>)

Contrary to conventional wisdom, history suggests that undecided voters are unlikely to uniformly flock toward the challenger: Candidates almost always finish above their share of the vote in summer polling. While there are examples of challengers sweeping undecided voters, as Reagan did in 1980, the “1980 or bust” position is hardly enviable. The economy is bad enough that the 1980 scenario can’t be discounted, but the differences between 1980 and 2012 are too great to count on it—especially given Romney’s astonishingly bad numbers among undecided voters.

#### Obama will win – Romney is not exploiting white voters.

**Cohn**, **8/8**/2012 (Nate – former Whitman debater and author of the Electionate, 90 Days Until the Election – And Obama Has the Advantage, The New Republic, p. <http://www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/105912/obama-has-the-advantage-90-days-go>)

Barack Obama has the advantage with 90 days to go until November 6, and the Romney campaign mostly has itself to blame. Four years after Obama’s decisive victory in 2008, a poor economy, dissatisfaction with the direction of the country, and mediocre approval ratings have conspired to endanger the president’s reelection chances. But a close race, which is what the polls show, is not the same as a dead heat. Romney is an imperfect candidate who has been poorly served by a strategy that has failed to contest Obama’s predictable attacks, leaving him poorly positioned heading into the conventions. Over the last four years, Obama’s coalition suffered deep enough losses to give his challenger a legitimate path to victory. But those losses were narrow and concentrated among white voters without a college degree, as Obama retains near-2008 levels of support among minorities and college-educated whites. As a wealthy former CEO of a private equity firm with an awkward cadence who could never call himself a great politican, Romney has never naturally appealed to white working class voters, and, as a result, Romney’s ability to capitalize on Obama’s biggest weakness requires him to overcome his own. With three months to go, these weaknesses are as pronounced as ever. The Obama campaign adopted a strategy to remedy their weakness among white working class voters by defining Romney as an out-of-touch, outsourcing plutocrat willing to close factories, fire workers, and avoid taxes to advance his self-interest. If the Romney campaign possessed effective tools to blunt Obama’s offensive, they weren’t properly employed. Instead, the Romney campaign inexplicably focused on attacking a well-defined incumbent president, while permitting Obama and his allies to broadcast unflattering and uncontested tales about an undefined challenger. Boston’s ill-advised strategy has endangered Romney’s chances. Romney’s unfavorable ratings remain high and he hasn’t yet consolidated the disaffected white working class voters with reservations about Obama’s performance. In Ohio—ground zero for the Obama campaign’s efforts—Romney’s numbers have plummeted to the low forties, an extremely weak showing in a must win state. Undecided voters harbor particularly unfavorable impressions of the Republican nominee. According to recent surveys, Romney’s favorables are in the teens among undecided voters, while a majority has already formulated a negative impression.

#### Obama is ahead in the approval and favorability poll.

**Cohn**, **8/8**/2012 (Nate – former Whitman debater and author of the Electionate, 90 Days Until the Election – And Obama Has the Advantage, The New Republic, p. <http://www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/105912/obama-has-the-advantage-90-days-go>)

If Romney was closer to fifty percent, he could more easily overcome these problems with undecided voters. But Obama has a consistent three-point edge in national surveys, with 47 or 48 percent of registered voters; this means that to fight to a tie, let alone to win, Romney will need to persuade the preponderance of undecided voters. And while many hold that Obama’s 47 or 48 percent approval rating suggests that a majority of voters are lined up to unconditionally select the challenger, reality is somewhat more complicated. Obama’s net approval is roughly even and a majority of voters usually say they have a favorable opinion of Obama, unlike Romney. While approval ratings are a great indicator of an incumbent’s chances, net-approval or favorability ratings also perform quite well. Once all the metrics are taken into account, it is not clear that a majority of voters are committed to voting against Obama.

### Link Debate

China bashing/link

#### Permitting Chinese foreign investment in domestic energy supplies sparks a HUGE public backlash – SNOOC controversy proves

Burke 11 (John, Analyst @ BakerHostetler, "The United States Welcomes Chinese Foreign Direct Investment - The Handful of Deals Blocked by CFIUS are Aberrant," http://www.chinaustradelawblog.com/2011/02/articles/investment/the-united-states-welcomes-chinese-foreign-direct-investment-the-handful-of-deals-blocked-by-cfius-are-aberrant/)

The President of the United States may order the divestment of a foreigner’s controlling interest in a U.S. business should he determine that such control threatens U.S. “national security.” The CFIUS review system works through voluntary filings by those parties to proposed transactions who seek to take advantage of the safe harbor that a CFIUS approval prior to an acquisition provides. The safe harbor prevents the President from undoing the deal pursuant to his authority under FINSA.¶ The CFIUS process is disciplined by the authority FINSA provides CFIUS to self-initiate a review as to whether any “covered transaction” threatens U.S. national security at any time. That authority is seldom used, but its existence means that foreign acquirers should give serious consideration to voluntary CFIUS filings before any national security questions may be asked.¶ For most companies, CFIUS review takes only thirty days. By seeking it voluntarily before the acquisition is consummated, the foreign acquirer can obtain assurance that its investment would not be destroyed by a CFIUS review, perhaps years after the acquisition. For a small number of companies, CFIUS review may become an additional forty-five day in-depth investigation. Even at this stage, however, most acquisitions are approved, although often with conditions.¶ A handful of Chinese acquisitions of existing U.S. businesses have been stopped either as a result of the CFIUS review process, or as a result of intense political opposition. However, in each of those cases, circumstances unique to the particular transaction, and not any hostility to Chinese investment in general, are what caused the transaction to fail. For example, when Northwest Non Ferrous International Investment Co., Ltd. dropped its plans to acquire a Nevada mining company, the reason for the unfavorable CFIUS review was the extremely sensitive nature of U.S. military installations that were adjacent to the mines to be acquired. (See The United States Remains Open To Chinese Investment). Had those mines been located elsewhere, the acquisition likely would have sailed through with little opposition. There was no objection to Chinese acquisition of gold mines. The objection was to the proximity to military installations.¶ Another deal effectively blocked by a CFIUS review was the proposed acquisition in 2007 by Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd. (“Huawei”) of a significant ownership stake in 3Com Corporation. Two major concerns reportedly led CFIUS agencies to oppose the deal. The first was the inclusion in the deal of 3Com’s subsidiary Tipping Point, which sells network-based intrusion prevention equipment used by the Pentagon and U.S. intelligence agencies. The second was specific to Huawei. There were allegations in the press that Huawei had engaged in corporate espionage and intellectual property theft and was involved in high tech exports to Saddam Hussein’s regime and the Taliban. The combination of mission critical U.S. military technology and an acquirer with a particularly bad reputation from the perspective of U.S. national security interests caused that deal to fail, not any general opposition to Chinese companies acquiring specific U.S. businesses.¶ China National Offshore Oil Corporation’s (“CNOOC”) attempted acquisition in 2005 of Unocal, a U.S. energy company, was halted by congressional and public opposition before it could undergo a CFIUS review. That opposition arose because of concerns that critical energy supplies would pass out of US control. The fact that CNOOC is a Chinese state-owned enterprise did heighten those concerns. But it was the concern over access to critical energy supplies, and not anti-Chinese animus, that drove the opposition to that deal. Very few businesses that Chinese companies may seek to acquire will present these types of concerns. And, in hindsight, many observers think that, had CNOOC not pulled out, CFIUS would have approved. Unfortunately, CNOOC did not stay involved long enough to find out.

If we win the link to politics, it turns the case

Burke 11 (John, Analyst @ BakerHostetler, "The United States Welcomes Chinese Foreign Direct Investment - The Handful of Deals Blocked by CFIUS are Aberrant," http://www.chinaustradelawblog.com/2011/02/articles/investment/the-united-states-welcomes-chinese-foreign-direct-investment-the-handful-of-deals-blocked-by-cfius-are-aberrant/)

Finally, CFIUS approval is not always the end of the story. It is important to pay attention to potential concerns of Congress and the general public. The law may authorize execution of a project. Popular opinion translated in Congress can still stop one.

### Group Ohio

Their ohio ev doesn’t apply in a world in which the plan gets spun as the overwhelming consensus finds it unpopular

#### Winning Ohio does not guarantee Romney the election.

**Sabato et. al**, 4/26/**2012** (Larry – director of the University of Virginia’s Center for Politics, Kyle Kondik – Director of Communications at the Center for Politics, Geoff Skelley – Media Relations Coordinator at the Center for Poltiics,Plan of Attack: Obama, Romney and the Electoral College, Crystal Ball, p. http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/plan-of-attack-obama-romney-and-the-electoral-college/)

• Would winning Ohio guarantee the presidency for Romney? Not necessarily. Richard Nixon won Ohio in 1960 but lost the presidency (just like Dewey in 1944). When Nixon in 1968 won his first presidential victory, his winning coalition was built on three big-state pillars: California (40 electoral votes) and Ohio and Illinois (both with 26 electoral votes). Ohio is now down to 18 electoral votes as its population growth has sagged. It remains a prize, but Obama has paths to victory without it. • One way of looking at this election is this: Obama took 52.87% of the popular vote in 2008, which was the best performance in the popular vote by a Democrat since 1964. In 23 of the 28 states he won (plus DC), Obama won a greater percentage of the vote than he did nationally. Conveniently for Obama, if he simply retains the states where he ran better than he did nationally, he will take 272 electoral votes — two more than necessary. This scenario assumes that Romney garners all 22 of John McCain’s states, plus Florida, Indiana, North Carolina, Ohio and Virginia.

#### Ohio is not a must win --- other states can open up. National trends matter more than swing states.

**Bernstein**, 7/8/**2012** (Jonathan – political scientist who contributes to the Washington Post blogs Plum Line and PostPartisan, Five myths about swing states, Tampa Bay Times, p. <http://www.tampabay.com/news/perspective/five-myths-about-swing-states/1239046>)

You'll hear plenty of similar pronouncements every election season. The Republicans have never won without Ohio, therefore they can't win without Ohio. Or: There is a "blue wall" of states that the Democrats have captured consistently since 1992, so the party has a built-in minimum in the electoral college. That could mean that any poll showing a strong Republican tilt in one of those states indicates that Obama is doomed — or that Gov. Scott Walker's recall victory in "blue wall" Wisconsin shows that Democrats are in trouble. Forget all these "rules." When Republicans won three consecutive presidential elections in the 1980s, pundits became convinced that the GOP had an electoral college lock. That view lasted exactly as long as the party's national vote lead did; as soon as Bill Clinton took the national lead in 1992, it turned out that some of the Republican "lock" states were swingers after all. Sure, if Romney wins Democratic California, he's going to win the election, but that's because if Romney wins California, he's going to be in the process of a huge national landslide. The United States has national elections, and what matters almost every time is the national results. Yes, a candidate must find 270 electoral votes in order to win. But in most years, the electoral college margin will be much larger than the popular vote difference. And the rare times, such as in 2000, when the popular vote is very close, it's not possible to guess in advance which states will be the one or two that really make a difference. So the campaigns will put their resources into those states they expect to be close, because it certainly doesn't hurt, but our elections are much more national than our obsession with swing states implies.

### China

#### China CAN and HAS put massive energy-related FDI into the US economy

Burke 11 (John, Analyst @ BakerHostetler, "The United States Welcomes Chinese Foreign Direct Investment - The Handful of Deals Blocked by CFIUS are Aberrant," http://www.chinaustradelawblog.com/2011/02/articles/investment/the-united-states-welcomes-chinese-foreign-direct-investment-the-handful-of-deals-blocked-by-cfius-are-aberrant/)

Direct Chinese investment in the United States would likely be even greater were it not for press reports that have created the impression that the United States is hostile to investment from China. The press is full of terms such as CFIUS (the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States) and FINSA (the Foreign Investment National Security Act), and tales of Chinese companies forced to abandon planned acquisitions of U.S. companies. Some Chinese companies have been forced to abandon their acquisition plans. However, each of those celebrated cases presented unique circumstances that would not exist for the vast majority of Chinese companies who may wish to set up operations in the United States. The reality is that the United States remains one of the world’s economies most open to foreign investment, including from China.

With a few very limited exceptions, such as airlines, foreigners are as free to invest in greenfield projects that create new businesses in the United States on the same basis as Americans. Recent Chinese greenfield investments in the United States include a $1 billion steel pipe mill that Tianjin Pipe is planning to build this year near Corpus Christi, Texas; Suntech Power Holdings’ solar panel assembly plant in Arizona; and American Yoncheng Gravure Cylinder plant in Spartanburg, South Carolina. These and many other Chinese greenfield investments have not faced any significant opposition and in many cases have been able to benefit from state and local government investment incentives.

#### US doesn’t restrict Chinese foreign direct investment now

Burke 11 (John, Analyst @ BakerHostetler, "The United States Welcomes Chinese Foreign Direct Investment - The Handful of Deals Blocked by CFIUS are Aberrant," http://www.chinaustradelawblog.com/2011/02/articles/investment/the-united-states-welcomes-chinese-foreign-direct-investment-the-handful-of-deals-blocked-by-cfius-are-aberrant/)

The United States remains committed to an open investment environment and treating foreign investors, including those from China, on an equal footing with their domestic competition in the vast majority of cases where the foreign investment does not threaten to impair the national security of the United States. It was for this reason that Congress set the initial CFIUS review deadline at thirty days, to coincide with the thirty day antitrust review period under the Hart-Scott-Rodino procedures.¶ Even after the implementation of FINSA, most cross-border mergers and acquisitions do not require a CFIUS review. Nevertheless, CFIUS national security reviews of proposed acquisitions of U.S. businesses are going to be a crucial part of the transaction for many foreign investments in existing U.S. businesses.¶ The most important considerations for success in a CFIUS review are understanding in advance the institutional and other concerns of the CFIUS member agencies, and creative thinking about how to demonstrate that those concerns are not threatened, or to mitigate them. In most cases early attention to the CFIUS process and to the legitimate concerns of the member agencies can ensure smooth and timely proceedings that result in CFIUS clearance without restrictions, or on terms that preserve the value of the transaction for all parties. Voluntary review, taking advantage of the law’s safe harbor provision, likely would have helped Chinese enterprises in all of the failed transactions, and sensitivity to possible political concerns would have contained the fallout and bruised feelings in those instances where national security legitimately prevailed.¶ To say the outcomes of such cases in China would have been no different or worse would not be good enough. The United States is not deliberately discriminating against foreign, nor specifically Chinese, investment, but like any sovereign it is mindful of its sovereignty, and its security.

### Iran Defense

#### No chance of Israeli strike – Iran is too strong

Dan Williams, 3/7/07 (http://www.capetimes.co.za/index.php?fArticleId=3717229)

JERUSALEM: Israel has long been the wild card in debates on the Iranian nuclear programme - a country that, while formally outside negotiations, has lobbying clout given its penchant for pre-emptive strikes.   But Israeli officials, once quick to project military menace in the face of what Prime Minister Ehud Olmert has called an "existential threat", are increasingly taking a softer public line on how to meet Iran's refusal to halt uranium enrichment.   It appears that many **Israelis have decided that Iran is too tough an enemy for their armed forces to take on alone - and that the international community senses this too.**   "**The last thing Israel is interested in is military action against Iran,**" said Avigdor Lieberman, the Israeli strategic affairs minister.

#### Israel will not strike Iran

Dan Williams, 3/7/07 (http://www.capetimes.co.za/index.php?fArticleId=3717229)

Like its US ally, Israel refuses to rule out pre-emptive strikes as a last-ditch means of curbing a nuclear programme, that Iran insists is peaceful. But unlike Iraq under Saddam Hussein, Iran's nuclear facilities may be too distant, numerous and fortified for Israel to tackle. The sense of tactical limitation was reinforced, throughout the region and beyond, by last year's inconclusive Israeli war against Lebanese Hezbollah guerrillas.   **"It is becoming increasingly clear that Israel has no viable military option on Iran, and is pinning its hopes on some sort of solution by the Americans,"** said Alon Ben-David, Israel analyst for Jane's Defence Weekly. "But **there is a growing number of Israelis who think the country will just have to live with a nuclear-armed Iran,**" he said.

### Conventional Wars

#### No answer to our external impact –

#### Proliferation prevents conventional wars from happening because the nuclear weapons make the cost of going to war too high – that causes more mellow actions and leaders will avoid going to war.

#### Conventional war outweighs nuclear war –

#### 1. Absent nuclear weapons, conventional war is more probable – it removes restraints on aggression

**Waltz**, **1981** (Kenneth – professor emeritus of political science at the University of California, Berkeley, The spread of nuclear weapons, Adelphi Papers, No. 171, p. http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/waltz1.htm)

A deterrent strategy promises less damage, should deterrence fail, than does the Schles­inger-Brown ‘countervailing’ strategy, a strat­egy which contemplates fighting a limited, strategic nuclear war. War-fighting strategies offer no clear place to stop short of victory for some and defeat for others. Deterrent strategies do, and that place is where one country threat­ens another’s vital interests. Deterrent strate­gies **lower the probability** that wars will be fought. If wars are nevertheless fought, deter­rent strategies lower the probability that they will become wars of high intensity. A war between the United States and the Soviet Union that did get out of control would be catastrophic. If they set out to destroy each other, they would greatly reduce the world’s store of developed resources while killing mil­lions outside of their own borders through fall­out. Even while destroying themselves, states with few weapons would do **less damage** to others. As ever, the biggest international dangers come from the strongest states. Fearing the world’s destruction, one may prefer a world of conventional great powers having a higher probability of fighting less destructive wars to a world of nuclear great powers having a lower probability of fighting more destructive wars. But that choice **effectively disappeared** with the production of atomic bombs by the United States during World War II. Since the great powers are **unlikely to be drawn into the nuclear wars** of others, the added global dangers posed by the spread of nuclear weapons are **small**.

#### 2. Magnitude – conventional wars are seven times more intense than World War Two

**Gabriel and Metz**, June **1992** (Richard - professor of political science at the U.S. Army War College, and Karen S. - research librarian at the University of Michigan Medical Center, A short history of war, p. http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/gabrmetz/gabr001f.htm)

In 1980 the U.S. Army estimated that modern non-nuclear conventional war had become 400 to **700 percent more lethal and intense** as it had been in World War II depending, of course, on the battle scenario. The increases in conventional killing power have been enormous, and far greater and more rapid than in any other period in man's history. The artillery firepower of a maneuver battalion, for example, has doubled since World War II while the "casualty effect" of modern artillery guns has increased 400 percent. Range has increased, on average, by 60 percent, and the "zone of destruction" of battalion artillery by 350 percent. Advances in metallurgy and the use of new chemical explosives has increased the explosive power of basic caliber artillery by many times. A single round from an 8-inch gun has the same explosive power as a World War II 250 pound bomb. Modern artillery is lighter, stronger, and more mobile than ever before. Computerized fire direction centers can range guns on target in only 15 seconds compared to 6 minutes required in World War II. The rates of fire of these guns are three times what they used to be. So durable are the new artillery guns that they can fire 500 rounds over a 4 hour period without incurring damage to the barrel. Range has increased to the point where the M-110 gun can fire a 203 millimeter shell 25 miles. The self-propelled gun has a travel range of 220 miles at a speed of 35 miles per hour. Area saturation artillery, in its infancy in World War II, has become very lethal. A single Soviet artillery battalion firing 18 BM-21 rocket launchers can place 35 tons of explosive rockets on a target 17 miles away in just 30 seconds. The American Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS) is a totally mobile self-contained artillery system that can place 8,000 M-77 explosive rounds on a target the size of six football fields in less than 45 seconds. Air defense guns have developed to where a single M-163 Vulcan cannon can fire 3,000 rounds of explosive 20-millimeter shot per minute with almost 100 percent accuracy within 2 miles of the gun position. Modern antiaircraft guns command 36 times the airspace around their position as they did in World War II. Tanks have improved in speed, reliability, and firepower. Modern tanks can make 40 miles per hour over a 300 mile range, or three times that of earlier tanks. A tank equipped with modern gunsights and a cannon stabilization system has a probability of scoring a first round hit of 98 percent, 13 times greater than World War II tanks. Modern battletanks, unlike any earlier variety, can also fire while on the move. Their probability of hitting the target while moving is almost 10 times greater than the probability of a World War II tank firing from a stabilized position. New propellants and ammunition design have increased the lethality of the modern tank. During the Iraqi-U.S. war in 1991, Armor Piercing Discarding Sabot (APDS) rounds moving at 5,467 feet per second pierced 4 feet of sand in bunkered berms and still destroyed enemy tanks. Tank gunsights, lasers connected to computers, can locate a target in the dark, smoke, rain, or snow at 2,000 yards. The armed combat helicopter has produced a revolution in tank and armor killing power available to the combat commander. These weapons can be configured to kill either troops or tanks, and are truly awesome weapons. The Apache gunship carries 16 Hellfire antitank missiles that need only minimal further direction after they are fired to home in on the target. New sights allow the helicopter to acquire its target from more than 5 miles away. The helicopter has added new mobility and stealth to the battlefield permitting a division commander to strike with troops or antitank weapons 60 miles to his front, four times the range in World War II. The infantry, too, has increased its range, mobility, and firepower with new armored personnel carriers and infantry fighting vehicles. Infantry can also bring to bear shoulder-fired antiaircraft missiles and Jeep and Hummer mounted TOW antitank missiles with devastating results. The modern battlefield is a lethal place indeed. To place the increased intensity of the modern non-nuclear conventional battlefield in perspective, one need only remember that, in World War II, heavy combat was defined as 2-4 combat pulses a day. Modern combat divisions are configured to routinely deliver 12-14 combat pulses a day and to fight around the clock by night operations. A modern U.S. or Soviet motorized division can deliver three times as much firepower at 10 times the rate as each could in World War II. By these and any other historical (or human) standard, even conventional weapons have in a very real sense become **quite unconventional**.

#### If we win deterrence, that turns all of their impacts because it is a terminal conflict mitigator.

#### Conventional wars escalate to nuclear war

**Posen**, Fall **1982** (Barry R. - Ford International Professor of Political Science at MIT, Inadvertent nuclear war?, International Security, p. 28-29)

Could a major East-West conventional war be kept conventional? American policymakers increasingly seem to think so. Recent discussions of such a clash reflects belief that protracted conventional conflict is possible, if only the West fields sufficient conventional forces and acquires an adequate industrial mobilization base. indeed, the Reagan Administration has embraced the idea of preparing for a long conventional war, as evidenced by its concern with the mobilization potential of the American defense industry.1 Underlying this policy is the belief that the United States should be prepared to fight a war that, in duration and character, **resembles World War II**. American decision-makers seem confident of their ability to avoid nuclear escalation if they so desire. That confidence is **dangerous and unwarranted**. It fails to take into account that **intense conventional operations** may cause nuclear escalation by threatening or destroying strategic nuclear forces. The operational requirements (or preferences) for conducting a conventional war may thus **unleash enormous, and possibly uncontrollable, escalatory pressures** despite the desires of American or Soviet policymakers. Moreover, the potential sources of such escalation are deeply rooted in the nature of the force structures and military strategies of the superpowers, as well as in the technological and geographical circumstances of large-scale East-West conflict. If the escalatory pressures that could attend a major conventional war are to be prevented from driving decision-makers towards decisions they neither intend nor wish to make, those pressures must be recognized and guarded against by the leaders of both superpowers.2

#### Proliferation reduces the likelihood of nuclear war

**Asal and Beardsley**, **2007** (Victor – assistant professor of political science at SUNY Albany, and Kyle – assistant professor of political science at Emory, Proliferation and international crisis behavior, Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 44, No. 2, p. 142)

Other, more optimistic, scholars see benefits to nuclear proliferation or, perhaps not actively advocating the development of more nuclear weapons and nuclear-weapon states, see that the presence of nuclear weapons has at least been stabilizing in the past. For example, some scholars are confident of the promise of the ‘nuclear peace’.4 While those who oppose proliferation present a number of arguments, those who contend that nuclear weapons would **reduce interstate wars** are fairly consistent in focusing on one key argument: nuclear weapons make the risk of war **unacceptable for states**. As Waltz argues, the higher the stakes and the closer a country moves toward winning them, the more surely that country invites retaliation and risks its own destruction. States are not likely to run major risks for minor gains. War between nuclear states may escalate as the loser uses larger and larger warheads. Fearing that, states will want to draw back. Not escalation but **deescalation becomes likely**. War remains possible, but victory in war is too dangerous to fight for. (Sagan & Waltz, 2003: 6–7) ‘Nuclear war simply makes the risks of war much higher and shrinks the chance that a country will go to war’ (Snyder & Diesing, 1977: 450). Using similar logic, Bueno de Mesquita & Riker (1982) demonstrate formally that a world with almost universal membership in the **nuclear club will be much less likely to experience nuclear war** than a world with only a few members.

#### Independently, European conventional wars are probable

**Kaiser**, 2/5/**2009** (Karl – director of the Program on Transatlantic Relations at the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs and adjunct professor of public policy at the Kennedy School, An alternative to nato membership, International Herald Tribune, p. lexis)

First, domestic conditions speak against membership. The **reckless engagement** with a superior Russian military by Georgia's president, Mikheil Saakashvili, although he had been thoroughly briefed by the United States about the Russian potential, demonstrated to NATO how bad leadership in combination with a very old conflict can **drag the Atlantic alliance into a war** it does not want. In Ukraine there is no majority support for membership among the general population; indeed, in the eastern part of the country there is strong opposition. If ever the leadership were to force this issue it would risk a deep split, with potentially disastrous consequences for the integrity of Ukraine. Second, contrary to the expectations at the end of the Cold War, large-scale conventional warfare in Europe has reappeared as a **threatening possibility**. The worst possible scenario for NATO would be that the alliance would be unable to defend an ally under Article V because of lack of political will (even now the majority of people in some NATO countries do not support going to war over Central European members), or for military reasons—as would be the case for Georgia and Ukraine under the present circumstances. This would expose NATO as a paper tiger and cause it to loose the essence of its credibility and meaning.

#### Conventional European wars escalate to nuclear war

**Axelrod**, **1990** (Robert - Institute of Public Policy Studies at the University of Michigan, The concept of stability in the context of conventional war in europe, Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 27, No. 3, p. 247)

Before proceeding, however, it is worth point out that studying conventional warfare is important not only for its own sake, but also for the avoidance of nuclear war. The outbreak of conventional war in Europe would entail a **risk of escalation to nuclear war**. The risk would be **substantial** because the stakes in Europe are so **high**, the combat could be **very intense** from the very beginning, thousands of tactical nuclear weapons makes command and control **difficult**, and in any case NATO is pledged to use nuclear weapons if necessary to prevent a Warsaw Pact victory.

### Prolif

#### The only use of nuclear weapons is deterrence, not actual use

**Waltz**, Spring/Summer **2007** (Kenneth, A nuclear iran, Journal of International Affairs, Vol. 60, No. 2, with Scott Sagan and Richard Betts, p. 144-145)

**No one has discovered how to use nuclear weapons other than for deterrence**. Let me amend that. There is a form of blackmail that might work, and that is blackmail for money. North Korea might have had that in mind. But when most people say "nuclear blackmail," they think of one country saying, "We have nuclear weapons, and unless you do this—whatever this is—we'll drop one on you." That's simply not plausible. Nobody has tried it, and, if anyone does, it won't work. There are many countries with nuclear weapons, the United States among them, and we haven't figured out how to do anything with these things, except to use them for deterrence. How is a relatively backward, dinky nuclear country going to manage to use its nuclear weapons for purposes other than deterrence? I don't see any possibility of that. It may be, as Scott says, that possessing nuclear weapons gives a country a little more freedom of action. But it certainly does not gain much ability to act in a conventional way because it has nuclear weapons. Again, nuclear weapons have **one purpose and only one purpose**, and that's deterrence.

### Accidents

#### No risk of accidents – safety devices and conflict management prevent war

**Mueller**, **2009** (John – Woody Hayes chair of national security studies at Ohio State University, Atomic Obsession, p. 100-101)

It is a plausible argument that, all other things equal, if the number of nuclear weapons in existence increases, the likelihood one will go off by accident will also increase. In fact, all things haven't been equal. As nuclear weapons have increased in numbers and sophistication, **so have safety devices and procedures**. Precisely because the weapons are so dangerous, extraordinary efforts to keep them from going off by accident or by an unauthorized deliberate act have been instituted, and these measures have, so far, been effective: no one has been killed in a nuclear explosion since Nagasaki. Extrapolating further from disasters that have not occurred, many have been led to a concern that, triggered by a nuclear weapons accident, a war could somehow be started through an act of desperation or of consummate sloppiness. Before the invention of nuclear weapons, such possibilities were not perhaps of great concern, because no weapon or small set of weapons could do enough damage to be truly significant. Each nuclear weapon, however, is capable of destroying in an instant more people than have been killed in an average war, and the weapons continue to exist in the tens of thousands. However, even if a bomb, or a few bombs, were to go off, it does not necessarily follow that war would result. For that to happen, it is assumed, the accident would have to take place at a time of war-readiness, as during a crisis, when both sides are poised for action and when one side could perhaps be triggered – or panicked –into major action by an explosion mistakenly taken to be part of, or the prelude to, a full attack. This means that the unlikely happening –a nuclear accident – would have to coincide precisely with an event, a militarized international crisis, something that is **rare** to begin with, became more so as the cold war progressed, and has become even less likely since its demise. Furthermore, even if the accident takes place during a crisis, **it does not follow that escalation** or hasty response **is** inevitable, or even **very likely**. As Bernard Brodie points out, escalation scenarios essentially impute to both sides "a well-nigh limitless concern with saving face" and/or "a deal of ground-in automaticity of response and counterresponse." None of this was in evidence during the Cuban missile crisis when there were accidents galore. An American spy plane was shot down over Cuba, probably without authorization, and another accidentally went off course and flew threateningly over the Soviet Union. As if that weren’t enough, a Soviet military officer spying for the West sent a message, apparently on a whim, warning that the Soviets were about to attack.31 **None of these remarkable events triggered anything** in the way of precipitous response. They were duly evaluated and then ignored. Robert Jervis points out that "when critics talk of the impact of irrationality, they imply that all such deviations will be in the direction of emotional impulsiveness, of launching an attack, or of taking actions that are terribly risky. But irrationality could also lead a state to **passive acquiescence**." In moments of high stress and threat, people can be said to have three psychological alternatives: (1) to remain calm and rational, (2) to refuse to believe that the threat is imminent or significant, or to panic, lashing out frantically and incoherently at the threat. Generally, people react in one of the first two ways. In her classic study of disaster behavior, Martha Wolfenstein concludes, “The usual reaction is one of being unworried.” In addition, the historical record suggests that **wars simply do not begin by accident**. In his extensive survey of wars that have occurred since 1400, diplomat-historian Evan Luard concludes, "It is impossible to identify a single case in which it can be said that a war started accidentally; in which it was not, at the time the war broke out, the deliberate intention of at least one party that war should take place." Geoffrey Blainey, after similar study, very much agrees: although many have discussed "accidental" or "unintentional" wars, "it is difficult," he concludes, "to find a war which on investigation fits this description." Or, as Henry Kissinger has put it dryly, "Despite popular myths, large military units do not fight by accident."

#### No risk of accidents – star this card

**Quinlan ‘9** (Michael, Former Permanent Under-Sec. State – UK Ministry of Defense, “Thinking about Nuclear Weapons: Principles, Problems, Prospects”, p. 63-69)

Even if initial nuclear use did not quickly end the fighting, the supposition of inexorable momentum in a developing exchange, with each side rushing to overreaction amid confusion and uncertainty, is implausible. **It fails to consider what the situation of the decisionmakers would really be**. **Neither side could want escalation**. Both would be appalled at what was going on. **Both would be desperately looking for signs that the other was ready to call a halt**. Both, given the capacity for evasion or concealment which modem delivery platforms and vehicles can possess, could have in reserve significant forces invulnerable enough not to entail use-or-lose pressures. (It may be more open to question, as noted earlier, whether newer nuclearweapon possessors can be immediately in that position; but it is within reach of any substantial state with advanced technological capabilities, and attaining it is certain to be a high priority in the development of forces.) As a result, neither side can have any predisposition to suppose, in an ambiguous situation of fearful risk, that the right course when in doubt is to go on copiously launching weapons. And **none of this analysis rests on any presumption of highly subtle or pre-concerted rationality**. The rationality required is plain. The argument is reinforced if we consider the possible reasoning of an aggressor at a more dispassionate level. Any substantial nuclear armoury can inflict destruction outweighing any possible prize that aggression could hope to seize. A state attacking the possessor of such an armoury must therefore be doing so (once given that it cannot count upon destroying the armoury pre-emptively) on a judgement that the possessor would be found lacking in the will to use it. If the attacked possessor used nuclear weapons, whether first or in response to the aggressor's own first use, this judgement would begin to look dangerously precarious. There must be at least a substantial possibility of the aggressor leaders' concluding that their initial judgement had been mistaken—that the risks were after all greater than whatever prize they had been seeking, and that for their own country's , survival they must call off the aggression. Deterrence planning such as that of NATO was directed in the first place to preventing the initial misjudgement and in the second, if it were nevertheless made, to compelling such a reappraisal. The former aim had to have primacy, because it could not be taken for granted that the latter was certain to work. But there was no ground for assuming in advance, for all possible scenarios, that the chance of its working must be negligible. An aggressor state would itself be at huge risk if nuclear war developed, as its leaders would know. It may be argued that a policy which abandons hope of physically defeating theznemy and simply hopes to get him to desist is pure gamble, a matter of who blinks first; and that the political and moral nature of most likely aggressors, almost ex hypothesi, makes them the less likely to blink. One response to this is to ask what is the alternative—it can only be surrender. But a more positive and hopeful answer lies in the fact that the criticism is posed in a political vacuum. Real-life conflict would have a political context. The context which concerned NATO during the cold war, for example, was one of defending vital interests against a postlated aggressor whose own vital interests would not be engaged, or would be less engaged. Certainty is not possible, but a clear asymmetry of vital interest is a legitimate basis for expecting an asymmetry, credible to both sides, of resolve in conflict. That places upon statesmen, as page 23 has noted, the key task in deterrence of building up in advance a clear and shared grasp of where limits lie. That was plainly achieved in cold-war Europe. If vital interests have been defined in a way that is dear, and also clearly not overlapping or incompatible with those of the adversary, a credible basis has been laid for the likelihood of greater resolve in resistance. It was also sometimes suggested by critics that whatever might be indicated by theoretical discussion of political will and interests, the military environment of nuclear warfare—particularly difficulties of communication and control—would drive escalation with overwhelming probability to the limit. But it is obscure why matters should be regarded as inevitably .so for every possible level and setting of action. Even if the history of war suggested (as it scarcely does) that military decision-makers are mostly apt to work on the principle 'When in doubt, lash out', the nuclear revolution creates an utterly new situation. The pervasive reality, always plain to both sides during the cold war, is `If this goes on to the end, we are all ruined'. Given that inexorable escalation would mean catastrophe for both, it would be perverse to suppose them permanently incapable of framing arrangements which avoid it. As page 16 has noted, NATO gave its military commanders no widespread delegated authority, in peace or war, to launch nuclear weapons without specific political direction. Many types of weapon moreover had physical safeguards such as PALs incorporated to reinforce organizational ones. There were multiple communication and control systems for passing information, orders, and prohibitions. Such systems could not be totally guaranteed against disruption if at a fairly intense level of strategic exchange—which was only one of many possible levels of conflict— an adversary judged it to be in his interest to weaken political control. It was far from clear why he necessarily should so judge. Even then, however, it remained possible to operate on a general fail-safe presumption: no authorization, no use. That was the basis on which NATO operated. If it is feared that the arrangements which 1 a nuclear-weapon possessor has in place do not meet such standards in some respects, the logical course is to continue to improve them rather than to assume escalation to be certain and uncontrollable, with all the enormous inferences that would have to flow from such an assumption. The likelihood of escalation can never be 100 per cent, and never zero. Where between those two extremes it may lie can never be precisely calculable in advance; and even were it so calculable, it would not be uniquely fixed—it would stand to vary hugely with circumstances. That there should be any risk at all of escalation to widespread nuclear war must be deeply disturbing, and decision-makers would always have to weigh it most anxiously. But a pair of key truths about it need to be recognized. The first is that the risk of escalation to large-scale nuclear war is inescapably present in any significant armed conflict between nuclear-capable powers, whoever may have started the conflict and whoever may first have used any particular category of weapon. The initiator of the conflict will always have physically available to him options for applying more force if he meets effective resistance. If the risk of escalation, whatever its degree of probability, is to be regarded as absolutely unacceptable, the necessary inference is that a state attacked by a substantial nuclear power must forgo military resistance. It must surrender, even if it has a nuclear armoury of its own. But the companion truth is that, as page 47 has noted, the risk of escalation is an inescapable burden also upon the aggressor. The exploitation of that burden is the crucial route, if conflict does break out, for managing it, to a tolerable outcome--the only route, indeed, intermediate between surrender and holocaust, and so the necessary basis for deterrence beforehand. The working out of plans to exploit escalation risk most effectively in deterring potential aggression entails further and complex issues. It is for example plainly desirable, wherever geography, politics, and available resources so permit without triggering arms races, to make provisions and dispositions that are likely to place the onus of making the bigger, and more evidently dangerous steps in escalation upon the aggressor volib wishes to maintain his attack, rather than upon the defender. (The customary shorthand for this desirable posture used to be 'escalation dominance'.) These issues are not further discussed here. But addressing them needs to start from acknowledgement that there are in any event no certainties or absolutes available, no options guaranteed to be risk-free and cost-free. Deterrence is not possible without escalation risk; and its presence can point to no automatic policy conclusion save for those who espouse outright pacifism and accept its consequences. Accident and Miscalculation Ensuring the safety and security of nuclear weapons plainly needs to be taken most seriously. Detailed information is understandably not published, but such direct evidence as there is suggests that it always has been so taken in every possessor state, with the inevitable occasional failures to follow strict procedures dealt with rigorously. Critics have nevertheless from time to time argued that the possibility of accident involving nuclear weapons is so substantial that it must weigh heavily in the entire evaluation of whether war-prevention structures entailing their existence should be tolerated at all. Two sorts of scenario are usually in question. The first is that of a single grave event involving an unintended nuclear explosion—a technical disaster at a storage site, for example, Dr the accidental or unauthorized launch of a delivery system with a live nuclear warhead. The second is that of some event—perhaps such an explosion or launch, or some other mishap such as malfunction or misinterpretation of radar signals or computer systems—initiating a sequence of response and counter-response that culminated in a nuclear exchange which no one had truly intended. No event that is physically possible can be said to be of absolutely zero probability (just as at an opposite extreme **it is absurd to claim,** as has been heard from distinguished figures, **that nuclear-weapon use can be guaranteed to happen within some finite future span despite not having happened for over sixty years**). But human affairs cannot be managed to the standard of either zero or total probability. We have to assess levels between those theoretical limits and weigh their reality and implications against other factors, in security planning as in everyday life. There have certainly been, across the decades since 1945, many known accidents involving nuclear weapons, from transporters skidding off roads to bomber aircraft crashing with or accidentally dropping the weapons they carried (in past days when such carriage was a frequent feature of readiness arrangements----it no longer is). A few of these accidents may have released into the nearby environment highly toxic material. None however has entailed a nuclear detonation. Some commentators suggest that this reflects bizarrely good fortune amid such massive activity and deployment over so many years. **A more rational deduction from the facts of this long experience would however be that the probability of any accident triggering a nuclear explosion is extremely low**. It might be further noted that the mechanisms needed to set off such an explosion are technically demanding, and that in a large number of ways the past sixty years have seen extensive improvements in safety arrangements for both the design and the handling of weapons. It is undoubtedly possible to see respects in which, after the cold war, some of the factors bearing upon risk may be new or more adverse; but some are now plainly less so. The years which the world has come through entirely without accidental or unauthorized detonation have included early decades in which knowledge was sketchier, precautions were less developed, and weapon designs were less ultra-safe than they later became, as well as substantial periods in which weapon numbers were larger, deployments more widespread and diverse, movements more frequent, and several aspects of doctrine and readiness arrangements more tense. Similar considerations apply to the hypothesis of nuclear war being mistakenly triggered by false alarm. Critics again point to the fact, as it is understood, of numerous occasions when initial steps in alert sequences for US nuclear forces were embarked upon, or at least called for, by, indicators mistaken or misconstrued. **In none of these instances**, it is accepted, **did matters get at all near to nuclear launch**--extraordinary good fortune again, critics have suggested. **But the rival and more logical inference from hundreds of events stretching over sixty years of experience presents itself once more: that the probability of initial misinterpretation leading far towards mistaken launch is remote**. Precisely because any nuclear-weapon possessor recognizes the vast gravity of any launch, release sequences have many steps, and human decision is repeatedly interposed as well as capping the sequences. **To convey that because a first step was prompted the world somehow came close to accidental nuclear war is wild hyperbole, rather like asserting, when a tennis champion has lost his opening service game, that he was nearly beaten in straight sets**. History anyway scarcely offers any ready example of major war started by accident even before the nuclear revolution imposed an order-of-magnitude increase in caution. It was occasionally conjectured that nuclear war might be triggered by the real but accidental or unauthorized launch of a strategic nuclear-weapon delivery system in the direction of a potential adversary. No such launch is known to have occurred in over sixty years. The probability of it is therefore very low. But even if it did happen, the further hypothesis of it initiating a general nuclear exchange is far-fetched. It fails to consider the real situation of decision-makers as pages 63-4 have brought out. The notion that cosmic holocaust might be mistakenly precipitated in this way **belongs to science fiction**.

#### The nature of a small arsenal makes a proliferator’s arsenal accident-safe

**Mueller**, **2009** (John – Woody Hayes chair of national security studies at Ohio State University, Atomic Obsession, p. 101-102)

This dilemma is not present to nearly the same degree in the case of the acquisition of nuclear weapons by states that are less militarily pretentious. In particular, the exquisite hair-trigger niceties of the first strike/second strike consideration –maintaining "crisis stability," as discussed in chapter 5 – scarcely holds where a country, or pair of rival countries, builds a **relatively small arsenal** of nuclear weapons and keeps them in reserve as a sort of final equalizer, something sometimes known as the "bomb in basement" approach. Countries in that situation are scarcely concerned about being able instantly to retaliate to a nuclear attack, and they are unlikely to have the sophisticated delivery system required to destroy their atomic capacity in a surprise attack in any case. Accordingly, the cold war contestants, such countries have the luxury of making their bombs **exceedingly safe** from accidental detonation. For example, when it had a small nuclear arsenal, South Africa disassembled its weapons and stored the parts in separate secure locations, an approach currently utilized by Pakistan and perhaps others. Judicious efforts to further reduce the danger of an accidental detonation, like those devoted to dissuading new states from nuclear weapons, are certainly justified. But the myopic hype and hysteria that have so routinely accompanied such efforts are not.

#### Prefer our arguments because it assumes small nuclear arsenals that are manageable. Ignore their evidence because it assumes bloated arsenals that outpace the ability of the state to spend resources