# GSU Aff Cards

## **General 1ACs**

### Plan – 1AC

#### The United States Federal Government should reduce access restrictions on federal lands in the Outer Continental Shelf for natural gas production.

### Inherency – 1AC

#### **Contention 1: Inherency**

#### The Department of Interior’s leasing plan effectively restricts offshore natural gas drilling on federal lands

New 6-30 (Bill, President – New Industires, \*Offers Steel Fabrication Services to Offshore Drilling Projects, “Letters: New Leasing Plan a Step Backward,” The Advocate, 2012, http://theadvocate.com/news/opinion/3484480-123/letters-new-leasing-plan-a)

In late June, the U.S. Department of the Interior released its long-awaited outer continental shelf leasing plan, which effectively blocks offshore oil and natural gas exploration in any new areas for the next five years. Unfortunately, the proposal is a step backward in our effort to achieve energy independence. Under the plan, 85 percent of America’s OCS would be off-limits at a time when exploring every possible energy source is critical to boosting our nation’s economy and creating jobs. Instead of finding out what might be available to us in expansive unexplored areas off our coasts, we will be left to search for oil and natural gas in the same, relatively small portion of the OCS we’ve been exploring for four decades. Not only does this plan run counter to President Barack Obama’s “all of the above” strategy for energy independence, but it shows an outright disregard for the requests of the Gulf Coast states –— including Louisiana — to increase domestic oil production when the Interior Department released a draft of the plan late last year. Interestingly, the Interior Department chose to release this latest version of the OCS plan on the day the Supreme Court announced its health care decision — a thinly veiled attempt to bury it in news coverage of the ruling. But that didn’t keep right-thinking lawmakers from taking notice and working on ways to get America’s economy going using sound energy policies. U.S. Rep. Doc Hastings, R-Wash., chairman of the House Natural Resource Committee, has written legislation that sensibly revises the plan. While the Interior Department’s plan is to hold just 12 oil and gas lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico, and three in offshore Alaska from 2012 to 2017, the Hastings plan would schedule 28 lease sales total, dramatically increasing drilling opportunities off the Alaskan coast and including a sale of offshore leases in a potentially rich area off the coast of Virginia. The United States is producing more oil and natural gas than ever thanks to increased production on state-owned or private land. However, production on federal onshore land is down 14 percent in the last two years, and down 17 percent on federal offshore areas. Imagine what could happen if we enact legislation that allows us to open new offshore areas.

#### Current legislation is insufficient – removing access restrictions allows for expanded energy production – certainty is key

Loris 8-6 (Nicolas, Fellow in the Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies – Heritage Foundation “Senate Energy Bill: Good Start, Room for Improvement,” Heritage Foundation, 2012, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/08/domestic-energy-and-jobs-act-good-start-room-for-improvement)

Senator John Hoeven (R–ND) recently introduced the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act (DEJA), which would greatly expand access to energy and simplify burdensome regulations that prevent projects from coming online in a timely manner. While the legislation could be improved by further increasing access and removing the top-down energy planning, DEJA would still spur economic growth and drive energy production. Increasing Access to Energy DEJA would accept the State Department’s environmental review of the Keystone XL pipeline as sufficient and allow the state of Nebraska to reroute the pipeline to meet the state’s environmental concerns. The State Department studied and addressed risks to soil, wetlands, water resources, vegetation, fish, wildlife, and endangered species and concluded that construction of the pipeline would pose minimal environmental risk.[1] The construction of Keystone XL would allow up to 830,000 barrels of oil per day to come from Canada to the Gulf Coast and create thousands of jobs. DEJA also directs the Department of the Interior (DOI) to conduct a lease sale off the coast of Virginia. The 2.9 million acres 50 miles off the coast has an estimated 130 million barrels of oil and 1.14 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Opening access off Virginia’s coast is long overdue, and the legislation **only opens up a small portion of America’s territorial waters that are off limits**. The Offshore Petroleum Expansion Now (OPEN) Act of 2012, also co-sponsored by Senator Hoeven, would replace President Obama’s 2012–2017 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program with a much more robust plan that opens areas in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, in the Gulf of Mexico, and off Alaska.[2] Both DEJA and OPEN increase the royalties that states would receive from energy production, but both could go further to increase state involvement in offshore drilling decisions. Since onshore states already receive 50 percent of the royalties, Congress should also implement a 50/50 royalty-sharing program between federal and state governments involved in offshore drilling. Efficient Permitting and Leasing for All Energy Projects Another important component of DEJA is that it streamlines the permitting of all energy projects. Receiving a permit for any energy project, not just fossil fuels, takes entirely too long. Duplicative and unnecessary regulations slow the process and drive up costs. Furthermore, environmental activists delay new energy projects by filing endless administrative appeals and lawsuits. DEJA would create a manageable time frame for permitting for all energy sources to increase supply at lower costs and stimulate economic activity. DEJA also calls for an end to the lengthy permit process in the Natural Petroleum Reserve area of Alaska. It would require the DOI to approve drilling permits within 60 days and infrastructure permits within six months. Lease certainty is another critical issue. The act states that the DOI cannot cancel or withdraw a lease sale after the winning company pays for the lease. Ensuring that the federal government does not pull the rug out from under a company that wins the lease sale would provide the **certainty necessary to pursue energy projects**. Freeze and Study Environmental Regulations DEJA would also create transparency and accountability for Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations by establishing an interagency committee that would report on the full economic impact of the rules implemented by the EPA that affect fuel prices. This includes any part of the production process that would be affected by greenhouse gas regulations. DEJA delays the implementation of Tier 3 fuel standards (designed to replace the Tier 2 regulations issued in 2000) that would lower the amount of sulfur in gasoline but could add 6–9 cents per gallon to the cost of manufacturing gasoline. The EPA has declared no measurable air quality benefits from these standards. DEJA delays the New Source Performance Standards for refineries, which would drive up the cost of gasoline for no measurable change in the earth’s temperature.[3] It would also delay new national ambient air quality standards for ozone, which are unnecessary because the ozone standard set by the EPA is already more than stringent enough to protect human health. Though the delays contained in DEJA underscore the problems with these regulations, the preferred approach would be to prohibit the implementation of these three standards altogether. DEJA would also prevent the DOI from issuing any rule under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 before 2014 that would adversely affect coal employment, reduce revenue from coal production, reduce coal for domestic consumption or export, designate areas as unsuitable for surface mining and reclamation, or expose the U.S. to liability by taking privately owned coal through regulation. While this temporary fix recognizes the federal overreach in coal production, a better approach would be to create a framework that restricts overregulation, empowers the states, balances economic growth and environmental well-being, and creates a timely permitting process for all aspects of coal production.[4] Energy Central Planning Unneeded DEJA would require the federal government to create production objectives for fossil fuels and renewable energy and allow the relevant agencies to make additional lands available to meet those objectives. The bill would also require the U.S. Geological Survey to establish a critical minerals list and create comprehensive policies to increase critical mineral production. A much simpler and effective solution would be to open all federal lands for energy production of all sources and allow the private sector to determine what sources of energy and what technologies meet America’s electricity and transportation fuel demand. Too often the use of critical minerals has been used as cover for subsidies and extensive government intervention in a major industry. If there are clear military needs for certain critical materials, these should be met by government action. Absent that, streamlining the bureaucracy that has expanded around mining and **opening access is the only necessary federal action surrounding critical minerals**.

### Solvency – 1AC

#### Contention 4 is Solvency –

#### Lifting access restrictions on federal lands solves – federal authority is key

Griles 3 (Lisa, Deputy Secretary – Department of the Interior, “Energy Production on Federal Lands,” Hearing before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 4-30)

Mr. GRILES. America’s public lands have an abundant opportunity for exploration and development of renewable and nonrenewable energy resources. Energy reserves contained on the Department of the Interior’s onshore and offshore Federal lands are very important to meeting our current and future estimates of what it is going to take to continue to supply America’s energy demand. Estimates suggest that these lands contain approximately 68 percent of the undiscovered U.S. oil resources and 74 percent of the undiscovered natural gas resources. President Bush has developed a national energy policy that laid out a comprehensive, long-term energy strategy for America’s future. That strategy recognizes we need to raise domestic production of energy, both renewable and nonrenewable, to meet our dependence for energy. For oil and gas, the United States uses about 7 billion barrels a year, of which about 4 billion are currently imported and 3 billion are domestically produced. The President proposed to open a small portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to environmentally responsible oil and gas exploration. Now there is a new and environmentally friendly technology, similar to directional drilling, with mobile platforms, self-containing drilling units. These things will allow producers to access large energy reserves with almost no footprint on the tundra. Each day, even since I have assumed this job, our ability to minimize our effect on the environment continues to improve to where it is almost nonexistent in such areas as even in Alaska. According to the latest oil and gas assessment, ANWR is the largest untapped source of domestic production available to us. The production for ANWR would equal about 60 years of imports from Iraq. The National Energy Policy also encourages development of cleaner, more diverse portfolios of domestic renewable energy sources. The renewable policy in areas cover geothermal, wind, solar, and biomass. And it urges research on hydrogen as an alternate energy source. To advance the National Energy Policy, the Bureau of Land Management and the DOE’s National Renewable Energy Lab last week announced the release of a renewable energy report. It identifies and evaluates renewable energy resources on public lands. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit this for the record.\* This report, which has just come out, assess the potential for renewable energy on public lands. It is a very good report that we hope will allow for the private sector, after working with the various other agencies, to where can we best use renewable resource, and how do we take this assessment and put it into the land use planning that we are currently going, so that right-of-ways and understanding of what renewable resources can be done in the West can, in fact, have a better opportunity. The Department completed the first of an energy inventory this year. Now the EPCA report, which is laying here, also, Mr. Chairman, is an estimate of the undiscovered, technically recoverable oil and gas. Part one of that report covers five oil and gas basins. The second part of the report will be out later this year. Now this report, it is not—there are people who have different opinions of it. But the fact is we believe it will be a good guidance tool, as we look at where the oil and gas potential is and where we need to do land use planning. And as we update these land use plannings and do our EISs, that will help guide further the private sector, the public sector, and all stakeholders on how we can better do land use planning and develop oil and gas in a sound fashion. Also, I have laying here in front of me the two EISs that have been done on the two major coal methane basins in the United States, San Juan Basis and the Powder River Basin. Completing these reports, which are in draft, will increase and offer the opportunity for production of natural gas with coal bed methane. Now these reports are in draft and, once completed, will authorize and allow for additional exploration and development. It has taken 2 years to get these in place. It has taken 2 years to get some of these in place. This planning process that Congress has initiated under FLPMA and other statutes allows for a deliberative, conscious understanding of what the impacts are. We believe that when these are finalized, that is in fact what will occur. One of the areas which we believe that the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management is and is going to engage in is coordination with landowners. Mr. Chairman, the private sector in the oil and gas industry must be good neighbors with the ranchers in the West. The BLM is going to be addressing the issues of bonding requirements that will assure that landowners have their surface rights and their values protected. BLM is working to make the consultation process with the landowners, with the States and local governments and other Federal agencies more efficient and meaningful. But we must assure that the surface owners are protected and the values of their ranches are in fact assured. And by being good neighbors, we can do that. In the BLM land use planning process, we have priorities, ten current resource management planning areas that contain the major oil and gas reserves that are reported out in the EPCA study. Once this process is completed, then we can move forward with consideration of development of the natural gas. We are also working with the Western Governors’ Association and the Western Utilities Group. The purpose is to identify and designate right-of-way corridors on public lands. We would like to do it now as to where right-of-way corridors make sense and put those in our land use planning processes, so that when the need is truly identified, utilities, energy companies, and the public will know where they are Instead of taking two years to amend a land use plan, hopefully this will expedite and have future opportunity so that when the need is there, we can go ahead and make that investment through the private sector. It should speed up the process of right-of-way permits for both pipelines and electric transmission. Now let me switch to the offshore, the Outer Continental Shelf. It is a huge contributor to our Nation’s energy and economic security. The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, everything you have talked about so far is onshore. Mr. GRILES. That is correct. The CHAIRMAN. You now will speak to offshore. Mr. GRILES. Yes, sir, I will. Now we are keeping on schedule the holding lease sales in the areas that are available for leasing. In the past year, scheduled sales in several areas were either delayed, canceled, or **put under moratoria**, even though they were in the 5-year plan. It undermined certainty. It made investing, particularly in the Gulf, more risky. We have approved a 5-year oil and gas leasing program in July 2002 that calls for 20 new lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico and several other areas of the offshore, specifically in Alaska by 2007. Now our estimates indicate that these areas contain resources up to 22 billion barrels of oil and 61 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. We are also acting to raise energy production from these offshore areas by providing royalty relief on the OCS leases for new deep wells that are drilled in shallow water. These are at depths that heretofore were very and are very costly to produce from and costly to drill to. We need to encourage that exploration. These deep wells, which are greater than 15,000 feet in depth, are expected to access between 5 to 20 trillion cubic feet of natural gas and can be developed quickly due to existing infrastructure and the shallow water. We have also issued a final rule in July 2002 that allows companies to apply for a lease extension, giving them more time to analyze complex geological data that underlies salt domes. That is, where geologically salt overlays the geologically clay. And you try to do seismic, and the seismic just gets distorted. So we have extended the lease terms, so that hopefully those companies can figure out where and where to best drill. Vast resources of oil and natural gas lie, we hope, beneath these sheets of salt in the OCS in the Gulf of Mexico. But it is very difficult to get clear seismic images. We are also working to create a process of reviewing and permitting alternative energy sources on the OCS lands. We have sent legislation to Congress that would give the Minerals Management Service of the Department of the Interior clear authority to lease parts of the OCS for renewable energy. The renewables could be wind, wave, or solar energy, and related projects that are auxiliary to oil and gas development, such as offshore staging facilities and emergency medical facilities. We need this authority in order to be able to **truly give the private sector what are the rules to play from and buy**, so they can have certainty about where to go.

## Energy Revolution 1ACs

### Energy Revolution – 1AC

#### Contention 2: The Energy Revolution

#### The energy transition is failing – fracking requires massive amounts of water that drives up costs and makes new natural gas uneconomical – access to new conventional natural gas makes the transition sustainable

Dorsey 12 (Gregory, Managing Editor – Leeb’s Income Performance Letter, “Fractured Logic: The Myth of Abundant Natural Gas,” Leeb’s Market Forecast, 5-9, http://leebsmarketforecast.com/content/fractured-logic-myth-abundant-natural-gas)

A popular meme these days is the idea that natural gas is America’s salvation on the road to energy independence. Production of the clean burning fuel has reached record levels in this country and stockpiles are bursting at the seams. Natural gas prices recently dipped to their lowest level since the late 1990s below $2 before clawing their way back to $2.50. The supply glut has occurred thanks to an extraction technique known as hydraulic fracturing, or “fracking,” as it’s commonly known. In contrast to the conventional method where companies merely drill into the earth to exploit natural gas and oil deposits below the surface, fracturing entails pumping a highly pressurized mixture of water, sand and chemicals into the well. The highly pressurized cocktail opens up cracks in tight rock formations, facilitating the flow of natural gas and other hydrocarbons from the source rock. Since fracking was approved for energy production through its exemption from the 2005 Safe Drinking Water Act, its popularity has grown immensely. Fracking has allowed producers to exploit resources that were otherwise considered too difficult to access. However, we would **stop short of calling fracking a true energy revolution** for a number of reasons, just one of which we want to address today. What’s typically overlooked is the huge amount of water resources required for hydraulic fracturing. While many believe fresh water to be an abundant resource, it’s actually anything but. As we’ve pointed out in the past, natural resources tend to be inter-correlated through the energy required to extract and process them. As one resource becomes scarcer, it will affect the cost or availability of other resources as well. In the long run, we see natural gas extraction from unconventional sources as no exception. And fresh water is the key connection. The mainstream political opposition to fracking comes from the environmental concern that the chemicals injected into the ground can leak into the groundwater, contaminating an important source of drinking water. We’ll leave the environmental argument to the experts in that field, but what has become increasingly clear in our research is that the amount of fresh water required for large-scale hydraulic fracturing is massive, far surpassing any estimates put forward by the oil and gas industry today. Depending on which numbers you use, unconventional shale fracking uses between six and 50 times the amount of water as conventional gas drilling. And the bulk of that water is required up front, as opposed to being used throughout the extraction process. The higher figures come from actual operational data, while the lower estimates are just that: estimates. As a result, many of the US shale plays that have been lauded as an abundant source of clean energy may produce far less natural gas than current forecasted estimates after all costs and resource inputs are accounted for. If these unconventional shale plays require much more water than conventional wisdom expects, as we suspect they will, there will be much less gas coming on line in the future than expected. And the cost of much of the gas that may eventually be extracted will be much higher than anticipated. Either way, the result is the same, causing the natural gas market to tighten and prices to rise. So if you heat and cool your home with natural gas, enjoy the current bonanza while it lasts. The takeaway for investors, meanwhile, is not simply to pile into the energy stocks most leveraged to natural gas prices, as tempting as that may be from a contrarian perspective. Unconventional gas deposits that will require fracking now make up a large portion of total natural gas assets for many E&P companies. And while higher water requirements will drive natural gas prices northward, it will also drive up costs for unconventional producers. The result for those producers will not be pretty. We would therefore stick with conventional natural gas producers who will benefit from higher gas prices. For safety sake, companies that also have a healthy exposure to crude oil earn the highest honors.

#### **Natural gas abundance is a myth – shale gas is declining and studies don’t assume increased production**

Berman 12 (Art, Former Editor – Oil and Gas Journal, Geological Consultant – American Association of Petroleum Geologists, “After the Gold Rush: A Perspective on Future U.S. Natural Gas Supply and Price,” Oil Drum, 2-8, http://www.theoildrum.com/node/8914)

For several years, we have been asked to believe that less is more, that more oil and gas can be produced from shale than was produced from better reservoirs over the past century. We have been told more recently that the U.S. has enough natural gas to last for 100 years. We have been presented with an improbable business model that has no barriers to entry except access to capital, that provides a source of cheap and abundant gas, and that somehow also allows for great profit. Despite three decades of experience with tight sandstone and coal-bed methane production that yielded low-margin returns and less supply than originally advertised, we are expected to believe that poorer-quality shale reservoirs will somehow provide superior returns and make the U.S. energy independent. Shale gas advocates point to the large volumes of produced gas and the participation of major oil companies in the plays as indications of success. But advocates rarely address details about profitability and they never mention failed wells. Shale gas plays are an important and permanent part of our energy future. We need the gas because there are fewer remaining plays in the U.S. that have the potential to meet demand. A careful review of the facts, however, casts doubt on the extent to which shale plays can meet supply expectations except at much higher prices. One Hundred Years of Natural Gas The U.S. does not have 100 years of natural gas supply. There is a difference between resources and reserves that many outside the energy industry fail to grasp. A resource refers to the gas or oil in-place that can be produced, while a reserve must be commercially producible. The Potential Gas Committee (PGC) is the standard for resource assessments because of the objectivity and credentials of its members, and its long and reliable history. In its biennial report released in April 2011, three categories of technically recoverable resources are identified: probable, possible and speculative. The President and many others have taken the PGC total of all three categories (2,170 trillion cubic feet (Tcf) of gas) and divided by 2010 annual consumption of 24 Tcf. This results in 90 and not 100 years of gas. Much of this total resource is in accumulations too small to be produced at any price, is inaccessible to drilling, or is too deep to recover economically. More relevant is the Committee’s probable mean resources value of 550 (Tcf) of gas (Exhibit 4). If half of this supply becomes a reserve (225 Tcf), the U.S. has approximately 11.5 years of potential future gas supply at present consumption rates. When proved reserves of 273 Tcf are included, there is an additional 11.5 years of supply for a total of almost 23 years. It is worth noting that proved reserves include proved undeveloped reserves which may or may not be produced depending on economics, so even 23 years of supply is tenuous. If consumption increases, this supply will be exhausted in less than 23 years. Revisions to this estimate will be made and there probably is more than 23 years but based on current information, 100 years of gas is not justified. Shale Gas Plays May Not Provide Sustainable Supply Several of the more mature shale gas plays are either in decline or appear to be approaching peak production. Exhibit 5 shows that total Barnett Shale production is approximately 5.7 Bcf per day (Bcf/d) and cumulative gas production is more than 10 trillion cubic feet (Tcf) of gas. It also shows that production may be approaching a peak at current gas prices despite the constant addition of new wells. Exhibit 5. Barnett Shale Total Production. Source: HPDI. The Haynesville Shale surpassed the Barnett during 2011 as the most productive gas play in North America, with present daily rates of almost 7 Bcf/d and cumulative production of 3.5 Tcf (Exhibit 6). This play is most responsible for the current over-supply of gas with the average well producing 3.3 million cubic feet per day (Mcf/d) compared to only 0.4 Mdf/d in the Barnett. It is too early to say for sure, but the Haynesville Shale may also be approaching peak production. The Marcellus Shale is presently producing 2.4 Bcf/d and has produced a total of about 0.8 Tcf (Exhibit 7). In this play, production shows no sign of leveling off, as it does in the Barnett and Haynesville, and production in the Fayetteville Shale may also be approaching a peak (Exhibit 8). The Woodford Shale is already in decline (Exhibit 9). If some existing shale gas plays are approaching peak production after only a few years since the advent of horizontal drilling and multi-stage hydraulic fracturing, what is the basis for long-term projections of abundant gas supply?

#### Claims of abundant natural gas are industry bias and use manipulated data

Hughes 11 (J. David, Fellow in Fossil Fuels – Post Carbon Institute, Geoscientist – Geological Survey of Canada, and Team Leader – Canadian Gas Potential Committee, Abstract by Richard Heinberg, Senior Fellow-in-Residence – Post Carbon Institute, “Will Natural Gas Fuel America in the 21st Century?” Post Carbon Institute, May, http://www.postcarbon.org/reports/PCI-report-nat-gas-future-plain.pdf)

As this report details, all of these assumptions and recommendations need to be re-thought. What emerges from the data is a very different assessment. But if this report is right, then how could mainstream energy analysts have gotten so much so wrong? It is not our purpose to analyze in detail the social, political, and economic process whereby public relations became public policy. Nevertheless it is fairly easy to trace the convergence of interests among major players. First, the shale gas industry was motivated to hype production prospects in order to attract large amounts of needed investment capital; it did this by drilling the best sites first and extrapolating initial robust results to apply to more problematic prospective regions. The energy policy establishment, desperate to identify a new energy source to support future economic growth, accepted the industry’s hype uncritically. This in turn led Wall Street Journal, Time Magazine, 60 Minutes, and many other media outlets to proclaim that shale gas would transform the energy world. Finally, several prominent environmental organizations, looking for a way to lobby for lower carbon emissions without calling for energy cutbacks, embraced shale gas as a necessary “bridge fuel” toward a renewable energy future. Each group saw in shale gas what it wanted and needed. The stuff seemed too good to be true—and indeed it was. The biggest losers in this misguided rush to anoint shale gas as America’s energy savior are members of the public, who need sound energy policy based on realistic expectations for future supply, as well as sound assessments of economic and environmental costs.

#### The energy revolution changes everything – the plan makes hegemony sustainable and promotes economic growth that solves global tensions

Mead 12 (Walter Russell, James Clark Chase Professor of Foreign Affairs and Humanities – Bard College and Editor-at-Large – American Interest, “Energy Revolution 3: The New American Century,” American Interest, 7-18, http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2012/07/18/energy-revolution-3-the-new-american-century/)

Get ready for an American century: that appears to be the main consequence of the energy revolution that is now causing economic and political experts to **tear up their old forecasts all over the world**. The new American century won’t be a repeat of the last one, but in some very important ways the world now looks more likely to continue in the direction of global liberal capitalism that the US—like Britain before us—has seen as its geopolitical goal for many years. Energy was critical to the geopolitics of the 20th century; energy shortages shaped some of the strategic decisions that led both Germany and Japan to defeat in World War II, and the struggle over the energy-rich Middle East played an important role in the Cold War. The assumption that the world was at or near “peak oil” has been a driving force behind predictions that the 21st century would be an era of U.S.-China competition as China’s desperate quest for more energy resources led it to push an aggressive global energy policy that would conflict with vital U.S. interests. The assumption that there were few major discoveries left to be made also led many to forecast that the Middle East and especially the Gulf region would continue to be a major fulcrum in global affairs; indeed, countries like Saudi Arabia, with the ability to increase production to meet the thirst of an oil-starved world, would become more important than ever as the geopolitics of oil scarcity took hold. But as I’ve been writing recently, none of that looks true anymore. Advances in extraction technology have changed our understanding of the world’s energy future. As I wrote in my last post, the U.S. and Canada each may have more energy potential than the entire Middle East. China also has significant resources. So do Israel and Brazil. It is too soon to tell just how much of this potential can be unlocked, but for several years now it has begun to look as if much more of these unconventional resources will be available much sooner than thought, and serious people now argue that the US could pass Saudi Arabia to become the world’s leading oil producer by 2020. Even if some of the new sources prove difficult to extract at a reasonable economic and environmental price, the amount of available energy out there may be even greater than we now think. Because the extraction technology is new, and because it is still developing, much of the world has not been surveyed for these unconventional deposits. Both on land and under the sea, there is a lot of territory still to explore. It’s going to take time for us to develop a clear picture of what the new energy future looks like, but there is more than enough information already available to start thinking through some of the important consequences of the new energy situation for 21st century politics and policy. In the first of these energy posts I identified some geopolitical losers; in the second I took a look at the domestic implications of the new energy situation for the United States. In this post I’ll sketch out some initial thoughts about how the new energy picture—if it isn’t a mirage—will affect American foreign policy. The effects won’t be trivial. Changes this profound in the energy outlook imply major changes in world politics and given the unique global role of the United States and the global scale of its interests, those changes matter hugely for American foreign policy. Much of the punditry of the last ten years is looking suddenly obsolete; a number of writers are going to hope that some of the books and articles they’ve recently published will be quickly forgotten. They shouldn’t worry; the public is quick to forget, and most prophets of decline and Malthusian struggle will have little trouble in **reinventing themselves as analysts of abundance**. The U.S. may not be the biggest geopolitical winner in the new dispensation; that title may go to Israel if it’s energy potential proves out. If Israel’s potential as an energy superpower is actually realized, the Jewish state will be like a pudgy orphan girl who inherits a billion dollar trust fund and suddenly tranforms from social pariah to belle of the ball. Not only will it replace or supplement Arab countries as a principle source of oil and gas for Europe, it will see the weight of its most serious enemies in world politics decline as the Gulf becomes only one of a number of energy-rich regions. But on the bigger stage of world politics, it’s the United States that benefits most from the energy revolution. To begin with, the core objective of the United States—a **reasonably stable, orderly and liberal global system**—is a lot easier to achieve in an era of energy abundance than in one of tough resource competition. Oil is a lubricant, and the more the world has, the more smoothly things are likely to run. A world in which jealous, competing states are trying to elbow each other aside to access the last few remaining pools of oil is a much nastier place than one in which the whole oil question is a lot more laid back. Abundant energy will also promote global economic growth, an effect that **strengthens and stabilizes the world system**. It is easier for countries to cooperate when their economies are doing well. There is less nationalist pressure inside countries driving political leaders to take confrontational stands, and it is easier to negotiate win-win solutions and build functioning international institutions when all parties are relatively optimistic about their prospects.

#### Hegemonic collapse causes great power war

**Kagan 12** (Robert – senior fellow of foreign policy at the Center on the United States and Europe, America Has Made the World Freer, Safer and Wealthier, 3-14, p. http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2012/0314\_us\_power\_kagan.aspx)

We take a lot for granted about the way the world looks today -- the widespread freedom, the unprecedented global prosperity (even despite the current economic crisis), and the absence of war among great powers. In 1941 there were only a dozen democracies in the world. Today there are more than 100. For four centuries prior to 1950, global GDP rose by less than 1 percent a year. Since 1950 it has risen by an average of 4 percent a year, and billions of people have been lifted out of poverty. The first half of the 20th century saw the two most destructive wars in the history of mankind, and in prior centuries war among great powers was almost constant. But for the past 60 years no great powers have gone to war. This is the world America made when it assumed global leadership after World War II. Would this world order survive if America declined as a great power? Some American intellectuals insist that a "Post-American" world need not look very different from the American world and that all we need to do is "manage" American decline. But that is wishful thinking. If the balance of power shifts in the direction of other powers, the world order will inevitably change to suit their interests and preferences. Take the issue of democracy. For several decades, the balance of power in the world has favored democratic governments. In a genuinely post-American world, the balance would shift toward the great power autocracies. Both China and Russia already protect dictators like Syria's Bashar al-Assad. If they gain greater relative influence in the future, we will see fewer democratic transitions and more autocrats hanging on to power. What about the free market, free trade economic order? People assume China and other rising powers that have benefited so much from the present system would have a stake in preserving it. They wouldn't kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. But China's form of capitalism is heavily dominated by the state, with the ultimate goal being preservation of the ruling party. Although the Chinese have been beneficiaries of an open international economic order, they could end up undermining it simply because, as an autocratic society, their priority is to preserve the state's control of wealth and the power it brings. They might kill the goose because they can't figure out how to keep both it and themselves alive. Finally, what about the long peace that has held among the great powers for the better part of six decades? Many people imagine that American predominance will be replaced by some kind of multipolar harmony. But multipolar systems have historically been **neither stable nor peaceful**. War among the great powers was a common, if not constant, occurrence in the long periods of multipolarity in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries. The 19th century was notable for two stretches of great-power peace of roughly four decades each, punctuated, however, by major wars among great powers and culminating in World War I, the most destructive and deadly war mankind had known up to that point. The era of American predominance has shown that there is no better recipe **for great-power peace than certainty about who holds the upper hand**. Many people view the present international order as the inevitable result of human progress, a combination of advancing science and technology, an increasingly global economy, strengthening international institutions, evolving "norms" of international behavior, and the gradual but inevitable triumph of liberal democracy over other forms of government -- forces of change that transcend the actions of men and nations. But there was nothing inevitable about the world that was created after World War II. International order is not an evolution; it is an imposition. It is the domination of one vision over others -- in America's case, the domination of liberal free market principles of economics, democratic principles of politics, and a peaceful international system that supports these, over other visions that other nations and peoples may have. The present order will last only as long as those who favor it and benefit from it retain the will and capacity to defend it. If and when American power declines, the institutions and norms American power has supported will decline, too. Or they may collapse altogether as we transition into another kind of world order, or into disorder. We may discover then that the United States was essential to keeping the present world order together and that the alternative to American power was not peace and harmony but chaos and catastrophe -- which was what the world looked like right before the American order came into being.

#### Those wars go nuclear

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 United States back in under unfavorable circumstances.

#### Economic collapse causes 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.

#### US winning the natural gas race solves all conflict – AND our truth claims are true – international relations can ONLY be explained by natural gas

Gjelten 12 (Tom, Diplomatic Correspondent – NPR, “The Dash for Gas: The Golden Age of an Energy Game-Changer,” World Affairs, Jan/Feb, http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/article/dash-gas-golden-age-energy-game-changer)

For a fresh perspective on geopolitical trends, look at the world through the lens of the natural gas trade. One of the reasons for Israeli unease with the Arab Spring is that the democratic uprising that took down Hosni Mubarak also brought interruptions in Israel’s supply of natural gas, much of which since 2008 has come from Egypt. Wondering about China’s new interest in Australia and Qatar? It’s about their abundant gas supplies and China’s tremendous energy needs. Desperate for signs of cooperation from North Korea? Check out reports that Kim Jong-il may agree to the construction of a natural gas pipeline that would link Russia, Pyongyang, and Seoul. From Asia to the Middle East to North America, a boom in natural gas usage is rearranging international connections, with major repercussions for global politics. Energy consumers see that natural gas is relatively inexpensive, provided it can be transported efficiently, and abundant, especially if it can be harvested from shale rock and other unconventional deposits. The International Energy Agency (IEA) predicts that over the next twenty-five years gas will be the fastest-growing energy source, overtaking coal as soon as 2030. Around the world, natural gas is fast becoming the fuel of choice for electric power generation, especially with nuclear losing its appeal in the aftermath of the Fukushima disaster. Energy experts predict gas could even displace oil in the transportation sector, as car and truck engines are redesigned. The trend has so impressed IEA analysts that the agency in 2011 boldly predicted that the world is entering “a golden age of gas.” The implications are significant. Because gas is somewhat cleaner than other fossil fuels, its rise as a fuel source should have environmental benefits. Because it is cheaper than oil, its increased use would lower energy costs and bring energy to millions of people who lack access to it now. But among the most striking consequences of a dramatic growth in natural gas consumption would be its effect on international relations. The energy trade is an important determinant of the global balance of power, and the shift to natural gas will introduce **a new set of winners and losers**, bringing greater independence to many countries and reducing the energy leverage that oil producers have traditionally enjoyed. After chairing an advisory panel on the subject for the Department of Energy, former CIA director John Deutch concluded that the prospective geopolitical shifts amount to no less than “a natural gas revolution” in global affairs. A big difference between gas and oil is the trading infrastructure. While oil can be shipped in tankers, gas has moved mainly through pipelines, thus confining it largely to regional markets. Liquefied natural gas (LNG) is facilitating the development of a global market in gas, but it is still traded largely on a country-to-country basis, with negotiated prices that are specified in contracts. As gas usage has grown, these gas deals have grown more important. In Bolivia, for instance, a determination to use natural gas wealth for political ends has affected relations with its neighbors for most of the past decade. Privately financed exploration in the late 1990s revealed that the country’s proven gas reserves were six times greater than what was previously believed, but Bolivian leaders could not agree on how to exploit them. A public outcry forced President Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada to resign and leave the country in 2003 after he proposed to export natural gas to Mexico and the United States through a terminal in Chile, where it was to have been liquefied. (Anti-Chilean sentiment has run deep in Bolivia ever since a war with Chile in 1879 cost the country its Pacific access.) Bolivian gas is now sold instead to Brazil and Argentina, but disputes with Brazil over the terms of the gas contract have cast a shadow over that relationship in recent years, and management of the country’s gas exports is probably Bolivia’s top foreign-policy challenge. The Bolivian case shows how the natural gas trade is more likely to be complicated by resource nationalism than the oil business would be. In a pique, Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez can say he is prepared to cut off oil sales to the United States, but because oil is a globally traded commodity managed by middlemen, the threat is largely meaningless. For every buyer, there will always be a seller. State-to-state gas deals, by contrast, are more likely to carry geopolitical overtones. In 2005, for example, Egypt took the bold step of agreeing to sell natural gas to Israel. The gas began flowing in 2008 through a pipeline that runs across the Sinai peninsula and continues undersea to the Israeli port of Ashkelon. Israel depends on natural gas for much of its power generation, and the deal with Egypt has provided the country with more than forty percent of its gas needs. The notion of exporting gas to Israel has been highly unpopular in Egypt, however, and in the months following the collapse of the Mubarak regime, the Sinai pipeline has been repeatedly blown up, forcing Israel to fire up unused coal plants and convert several gas-fueled generating stations to run on fuel oil or diesel instead, at a cost of several million dollars. But the country had a possible solution: In December 2010, a Houston-based energy exploration company announced “a significant natural gas discovery” about eighty miles off Israel’s coast. Preliminary measurements suggested it could be the world’s biggest deepwater gas discovery in ten years and could provide Israel with enough gas to become a net exporter, providing it with more clout in its regional energy relationships. South Korea also relies on imported energy sources and is keen on natural gas, which explains its interest in a Russian proposal to build a pipeline that would carry Russian gas from Siberia across the Korean peninsula. The idea has been floated for years, but North Korean leader Kim Jong-il apparently gave the proposal his firm support during a meeting in August 2011 with Russian President Dmitri Medvedev. South Korean President Lee Myung-bak subsequently agreed to work closely with the Russians to make the project a reality. The South Koreans have offered to build a natural gas power generating plant in the north as compensation for Pyongyang’s support for the pipeline. The key to the project’s success would be a design that would reassure Seoul that the North Korean authorities had no incentive to steal the gas or cut off the supply before it reaches the south. The textbook illustration of a link between geopolitics and the natural gas trade is Russia. As of 2010, the country was the world’s top gas producer (after briefly being surpassed by the United States), with one state-controlled company, Gazprom, accounting for about eighty percent of the country’s production. Originally part of the Soviet Union’s Ministry of Gas Industry, Gazprom is in effect a state monopoly, and its power and reach are without comparison in the energy world. The company has its own armed forces, with as many as twenty thousand armed security guards and a private fleet of unmanned drones, used mainly to monitor pipelines and production facilities. The company effectively operates as an arm of the Russian state, and the company’s gas deals in Europe and Asia can legitimately be seen as an extension of Russian foreign policy, exemplifying the growing importance of “gas diplomacy.” Though its relative importance as a gas provider to Europe has diminished over the past ten years, Russia still meets about a quarter of Europe’s needs, more than any other supplier, and European governments have long been uneasy about their dependence on Russian gas. About eighty percent of the Russian gas shipment to Europe goes through Ukraine, and the flow has been cut on two major occasions at least in part because of geopolitical wrangling. In January 2006, after Kiev resisted price increase demands, Gazprom reduced the flow of gas to Ukraine, causing shortages in other European countries that received gas through Ukraine. Politics seems to have played a role in the Russian move. Ukraine at the time was moving closer to the West, and Ukrainian leaders charged that Moscow, with its price increase demands, was trying to “blackmail” Ukraine into changing its political course. The gas flow was cut once again in January 2009, causing a severe midwinter gas shortage across Europe. The two episodes convinced many European leaders that Russia was ready and willing to use Gazprom’s clout in what it considered its “privileged sphere of influence,” with the goal of bringing the former Soviet republics back under Moscow’s control. Joschka Fischer, the German foreign minister and vice chancellor from 1998 to 2005, spoke for many European observers when he wrote in 2010, “The primary goal of Russian gas policy isn’t economic but political, namely to further the aim of revising the post-Soviet order in Europe.” The eagerness of European countries to reduce their dependence on Russian gas has prompted ongoing efforts to find alternative supply routes. Iraq and the former Soviet republics of Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan are promising sources, and for about a decade European authorities have been scheming to develop a gas pipeline that would bypass Russia. The Nabucco pipeline project, launched in 2002, would bring gas from the Caspian basin across Turkey to a hub in Austria. In addition, BP and two Italian companies have been promoting pipeline projects of their own along that southern corridor. The European Commission and the United States have both given strong backing to the Nabucco project, but the pipeline planners have had a difficult time lining up the supply commitments needed to make the project economically worthwhile. Moscow has put pressure on the Central Asian states to send their gas to Russia rather than Europe, and China is pursuing supply deals of its own in the region. Among the major new developments has been the construction of new facilities to liquefy natural gas. Petroleum engineers have long known how to convert gas into liquid form through extreme cooling, but only in recent years has the LNG industry expanded to the point that it has altered gas trading patterns. The construction of dozens of new liquefaction and regasification plants around the world, along with the introduction of LNG tanker ships, has made it possible for island nations like Australia to become major gas exporters, and it has given gas-consuming countries new supply sources. The United States, Japan, China, and European countries were all quick to embrace the industry. (In the US alone, twelve new terminals have been built to receive LNG, with plants to regasify the LNG for shipment through pipelines around the country.) The development has been rapid. The International Energy Agency predicts that between 2008 and 2020 total liquefaction capacity will double. Qatar, which opened its first LNG plant in 1997, by 2006 had become the world’s top LNG producer and was investing in LNG terminals around the world. For European countries with terminals, importing LNG from Qatar or Algeria or Nigeria is another way to reduce dependence on Russian supplies. By 2035, for example, LNG is expected to supply about half of the United Kingdom’s natural gas needs, with imports from Qatar leading the way. British Prime Minister David Cameron’s February 2011 visit to Qatar, culminating in a new gas deal, put Moscow on notice that Europe had alternatives to Russian gas. Qatar and other LNG exporters have an even more inviting market in Asia. The IEA foresees China’s gas consumption growing by nearly six percent annually up to 2035. Japan, having lost much of its nuclear generating capacity as a result of the March 2011 earthquake and tsunami, is now a huge gas market as well, and LNG imports from Australia, Qatar, and the other gas exporting countries will be essential to its energy mix. Such developments were not foreseen twenty years ago. The LNG industry has diversified the gas trade, introducing new producers into the picture and giving gas importers more supply choices just as their demand for gas is growing. Without a doubt, the most revolutionary recent development in the natural gas world has been an improvement in the ability to extract gas from shale rock and other unconventional sources. Geologists have known for two hundred years that shale contains combustible gas, but the tightness of the shale formation meant that the gas was generally considered unrecoverable. In the last decade, however, energy companies in the United States have found that it is economically possible to harvest shale gas through the use of hydraulic fracturing (“fracking”), by which large amounts of water mixed with sand and chemicals are injected at high pressure into the rock formations in order to free the gas trapped inside. In addition, gas producers are now employing horizontal drilling techniques, turning their drill bits in a horizontal direction after reaching a deep shale reservoir and thus reaching more deposits from a single well. These developments have proven so promising that analysts are dramatically increasing their estimates of how much shale gas can be recovered around the world. In the United States, shale accounted for almost no gas production as recently as 2000. It now provides about twenty percent of the total production, and within twenty years it could be half. The US government’s Energy Information Administration has estimated that if recoverable shale gas reserves are included, the United States may have enough natural gas to meet US needs for the next hundred years, at current consumption rates. Such estimates are imprecise and may well be adjusted downward, but the production of shale gas has already dramatically altered the US energy picture. Just a few years ago, it was assumed that the United States would be a net importer of natural gas, with much of it arriving as LNG. But the terminals and regasification facilities that were built to facilitate LNG imports are now going largely unused. The successful production of shale gas could even mean the United States will soon be a net gas exporter. Some of the existing regasification facilities, built for LNG imports, could actually be converted to liquefaction plants, so that excess domestic gas production can be exported as LNG. If the United States became self-sufficient in natural gas, there would be significant geopolitical implications. When Arab states in 1973 imposed an embargo on oil shipments to the United States as punishment for US support of Israel, American consumers learned how vulnerable their country was to the “oil weapon” when used by potentially hostile states. As the United States moves toward energy independence, **if only in gas**, that vulnerability disappears. There would also be geopolitical effects overseas. With the United States no longer importing LNG, that gas could go to European consumers instead, and Europe’s dependence on Russia for its gas supply would diminish. In 2000, Russia was supplying about forty percent of Europe’s gas; some estimates have the Russian share sliding to ten percent by 2040. Whether the United States can maintain a sharply upward trend in shale gas production **depends on whether the reserves are as promising as they now appear to be**, whether the gas price is sufficient to cover production costs, and especially whether environmental concerns associated with shale drilling are addressed. Hydraulic fracturing requires enormous amounts of water, and recycling or disposal of the waste water can be problematic. There have been cases where shale well casings have proved defective, and contamination of the surrounding soil or water has occurred. Authorities in New York, New Jersey, and Maryland have imposed temporary moratoria on fracking in order to assess the practice and determine whether it imposes any risks to drinking water or human health.

### Additional Hegemony Card – Rd. 8 vs. Iowa DH

#### American power facilitates status bargaining – our impact is supported by interdisciplinary studies

**Wohlforth 09**

– Professor of government @ Dartmouth College [[William C. Wohlforth](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html#back), “Unipolarity, Status Competition, and Great Power War,” World Politics, Volume 61, Number 1, January 2009]

Second, I question the dominant view that status quo evaluations are relatively independent of the distribution of capabilities. If the status of states depends in some measure on their relative capabilities, and if states derive utility from status, then different distributions of capabilities may affect levels of satisfaction, just as different income distributions may affect levels of status competition in domestic settings. [6](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f6) Building on research in psychology and sociology, I argue that even capabilities distributions among major powers foster ambiguous status hierarchies, which generate more **dissatisfaction and clashes** over the status quo. And the more stratified the distribution of capabilities, the less likely such status competition is. Unipolarity thus generates far fewer incentives than either bipolarity or multipolarity for direct great power positional competition over status. Elites in the other major powers continue to prefer higher status, but in a unipolar system they face comparatively weak incentives to translate that preference into costly action. And the absence of such incentives matters because social status is a positional good—something whose value depends on how much one has in relation to others.[7](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f7) “If everyone has high status,” Randall Schweller notes, “no one does.”[8](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f8) While one actor might increase its status, all cannot simultaneously do so. High status is thus inherently scarce, and competitions for **status tend to be zero sum**.[9](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f9) I begin by describing the puzzles facing predominant theories that status competition might solve. Building on recent research on social identity and status seeking, I then show that under certain conditions the ways decision makers identify with the states they represent may prompt them to frame issues as positional disputes over status in a social hierarchy. I develop hypotheses that tailor this scholarship to the domain of great power politics, showing how the probability of status competition is likely to be linked to polarity. The rest of the article investigates whether there is sufficient evidence for these hypotheses to warrant further refinement and testing. I pursue this in three ways: by showing that the theory advanced here is **consistent** with what we know about large-scale patterns of **great power conflict** through **history**; by [End Page 30] demonstrating that the causal mechanisms it identifies did drive relatively secure major powers to military conflict in the past (and therefore that they might do so again if the world were bipolar or multipolar); and by showing that observable evidence concerning the major powers’ identity politics and grand strategies under unipolarity are consistent with the theory’s expectations. Puzzles of Power and War Recent research on the connection between the distribution of capabilities and war has concentrated on a hypothesis long central to systemic theories of power transition or hegemonic stability: that **major war** arises out of a **power shift** in favor of a rising state dissatisfied with a status quo defended by a declining satisfied state.[10](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f10) Though they have garnered substantial empirical support, these theories have yet to solve two intertwined empirical and theoretical puzzles—each of which might be explained by positional concerns for status. First, if the material costs and benefits of a given status quo are what matters, why would a state be dissatisfied with the very status quo that had abetted its rise? The rise of China today naturally prompts this question, but it is hardly a novel situation. Most of the best known and most consequential power transitions in history featured rising challengers that were prospering mightily under the status quo. In case after case, historians argue that these revisionist powers sought recognition and standing rather than specific alterations to the existing rules and practices that constituted the order of the day. In each paradigmatic case of hegemonic war, the claims of the rising power are hard to reduce to instrumental adjustment of the status quo. In R. Ned Lebow’s reading, for example, Thucydides’ account tells us that the rise of Athens posed unacceptable threats not to the security or welfare of Sparta but rather to its identity as leader of the Greek world, which was an important cause of the Spartan assembly’s vote for war.[11](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f11) The issues that inspired Louis XIV’s and Napoleon’s dissatisfaction with the status quo were many and varied, but most accounts accord [End Page 31] independent importance to the drive for a position of unparalleled primacy. In these and other hegemonic struggles among leading states in post-Westphalian Europe, the rising challenger’s dissatisfaction is often difficult to connect to the material costs and benefits of the status quo, and much contemporary evidence revolves around issues of recognition and status.[12](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f12) Wilhemine Germany is a fateful case in point. As Paul Kennedy has argued, underlying material trends as of 1914 were set to propel Germany’s continued rise indefinitely, so long as Europe remained at peace.[13](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f13) Yet Germany chafed under the very status quo that abetted this rise and its elite focused resentment on its chief trading partner—the great power that presented the least plausible threat to its security: Great Britain. At fantastic cost, it built a battleship fleet with no plausible strategic purpose other than to stake a claim on global power status.[14](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f14) Recent historical studies present strong evidence that, far from fearing attacks from Russia and France, German leaders sought to provoke them, knowing that this would lead to a long, expensive, and sanguinary war that Britain was certain to join.[15](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f15) And of all the motivations swirling round these momentous decisions, no serious historical account fails to register German leaders’ oft-expressed yearning for “a place in the sun.” The second puzzle is bargaining failure. Hegemonic theories tend to model war as a conflict over the status quo without specifying precisely what the status quo is and what flows of benefits it provides to states.[16](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f16) Scholars generally follow Robert Gilpin in positing that the underlying issue concerns a “desire to redraft the rules by which relations among nations work,” “the nature and governance of the system,” and “the distribution of territory among the states in the system.”[17](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f17) If these are the [End Page 32] issues at stake, then systemic theories of hegemonic war and power transition confront the puzzle brought to the fore in a seminal article by James Fearon: what prevents states from striking a bargain that avoids the costs of war? [18](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f18) Why can’t states renegotiate the international order as underlying capabilities distributions shift their relative bargaining power? Fearon proposed that one answer consistent with strict rational choice assumptions is that such bargains are infeasible when the issue at stake is indivisible and cannot readily be portioned out to each side. Most aspects of a given international order are readily divisible, however, and, as Fearon stressed, “both the intrinsic complexity and richness of most matters over which states negotiate and the availability of linkages and side-payments suggest that intermediate bargains typically will exist.”[19](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f19) Thus, most scholars have assumed that the indivisibility problem is trivial, focusing on two other rational choice explanations for bargaining failure: uncertainty and the commitment problem.[20](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f20) In the view of many scholars, it is these problems, rather than indivisibility, that likely explain leaders’ inability to avail themselves of such intermediate bargains. Yet recent research inspired by constructivism shows how issues that are physically divisible can become socially indivisible, depending on how they relate to the identities of decision makers.[21](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f21) Once issues surrounding the status quo are framed in positional terms as bearing on the disputants’ relative standing, then, to the extent that they value their standing itself, they may be unwilling to pursue intermediate bargaining solutions. Once linked to status, easily divisible issues that theoretically provide opportunities for linkages and side payments of various sorts may themselves be seen as indivisible and thus unavailable as avenues for possible intermediate bargains. The **historical record** surrounding **major wars** is **rich with evidence** suggesting that positional **concerns over status frustrate bargaining**: expensive, protracted conflict over what appear to be minor issues; a propensity on the part of decision makers to frame issues in terms of relative rank even when doing so makes bargaining harder; decision-makers’ [End Page 33] inability to accept feasible divisions of the matter in dispute even when failing to do so imposes high costs; demands on the part of states for observable evidence to confirm their estimate of an improved position in the hierarchy; the inability of private bargains to resolve issues; a frequently observed compulsion for the public attainment of concessions from a higher ranked state; and stubborn resistance on the part of states to which such demands are addressed even when acquiescence entails limited material cost. The literature on bargaining failure in the context of power shifts remains inconclusive, and it is premature to take any empirical pattern as necessarily probative. Indeed, Robert Powell has recently proposed that indivisibility is not a rationalistic explanation for war after all: fully rational leaders with perfect information should prefer to settle a dispute over an indivisible issue by resorting to a lottery rather than a war certain to destroy some of the goods in dispute. What might prevent such bargaining solutions is not indivisibility itself, he argues, but rather the parties’ inability to commit to abide by any agreement in the future if they expect their relative capabilities to continue to shift.[22](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f22) This is the credible commitment problem to which many theorists are now turning their attention. But how it relates to the information problem that until recently dominated the formal literature remains to be seen.[23](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f23) The larger point is that positional concerns for status may help account for the puzzle of bargaining failure. In the rational choice bargaining literature, war is puzzling because it destroys some of the benefits or flows of benefits in dispute between the bargainers, who would be better off dividing the spoils without war. Yet what happens to these models if what matters for states is less the flows of material benefits themselves than their implications for relative status? The salience of this question depends on the relative importance of positional concern for status among states. Do Great Powers Care about Status? Mainstream theories generally posit that states come to blows over an international status quo only when it has implications for their security or material well-being. The guiding assumption is that a state’s satisfaction [End Page 34] with its place in the existing order is a function of the material costs and benefits implied by that status.[24](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f24) By that assumption, once a state’s status in an international order ceases to affect its material wellbeing, its relative standing will have no bearing on decisions for war or peace. But the assumption is undermined by **cumulative research** **in disciplines ranging from neuroscience** and **evolutionary biology** to **economics, anthropology, sociology, and psychology** that human beings are powerfully motivated by the desire for favorable social status comparisons. This research suggests that the preference for status is a basic disposition rather than merely a strategy for attaining other goals.[25](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html" \l "f25) People often seek tangibles not so much because of the welfare or security they bring but because of the social status they confer. Under certain conditions, the search for status will cause people to behave in ways that directly contradict their material interest in security and/or prosperity. Pg. 33-35

## Export 1ACs

### Exports – 1AC

#### Contention 3: LNG Exports

#### Currently, inadequate supply of natural gas causes domestic infighting over LNG exports – new, sustainable supply is key to export feasibility

Ebinger et al 12 (Charles, Senior Fellow and Director of the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, Kevin Massy, Assistant Director of the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, and Govinda Avasarala, Senior Research Assistant in the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, “Liquid Markets: Assessing the Case for U.S. Exports of Liquefied Natural Gas,” Brookings Institution, Policy Brief 12-01, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2012/5/02%20lng%20exports%20ebinger/0502\_lng\_exports\_ebinger.pdf)

For an increase in U.S. exports of LNG to be considered feasible, there has to be an adequate and sustainable domestic resource base to support it. Natural gas currently accounts for approximately 25 percent of the U.S. primary energy mix.3 While it currently provides only a minority of U.S. gas supply, shale gas production is increasing at a rapid rate: from 2000 to 2006, shale gas production increased by an average annual rate of 17 percent; from 2006 to 2010, production increased by an annual average rate of 48 percent (see Figure 2).4 According to the Energy Information Adminis- tration (EIA), shale gas production in the United States reached 4.87 trillion cubic feet (tcf) in 2010, or 23 percent of U.S. dry gas production. By 2035, it is estimated that shale gas production will account for 46 percent of total domestic natural gas production. Given the centrality of shale gas to the future of the U.S. gas sector, much of the discussion over potential exports **hinges on the prospects for its sustained availability and development**. For exports to be feasible, gas from shale and other unconventional sources needs to both offset declines in conventional production and **compete with new and incumbent domestic end uses**. There have been a number of reports and studies that attempt to identify the total amount of technically recoverable shale gas resources—the volumes of gas retrievable using current technology irrespective of cost—available in the United States. These estimates vary from just under 700 trillion cubic feet (tcf) of shale gas to over 1,800 tcf (see table 1). To put these numbers in context, the United States consumed just over 24 tcf of gas in 2010, suggesting that the estimates for the shale gas resource alone would be enough to satisfy between 25 and 80 years of U.S. domestic demand. The estimates for recoverable shale gas resources also compare with an estimate for total U.S. gas resources (onshore and offshore, including Alaska) of 2,543 tcf. Based on the range of estimates below, shale gas could therefore account for between 29 percent and 52 percent of the total technically recoverable natural gas resource in the United States. In addition to the size of the economically recoverable resources, two other major factors will have an impact on the sustainability of shale gas production: the productivity of shale gas wells; and the demand for the equipment used for shale gas production. The productivity of shale gas wells has been a subject of much recent debate, with some industry observers suggesting that undeveloped wells may prove to be less productive than those developed to date. However, a prominent view among independent experts is that sustainability of shale gas production is not a cause for serious concern, owing to the continued rapid improvement in technologies and production processes.

#### Perception is key – new supply removes uncertainty over shale gas – that makes LNG exports economical

Ebinger et al 12 (Charles, Senior Fellow and Director of the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, Kevin Massy, Assistant Director of the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, and Govinda Avasarala, Senior Research Assistant in the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, “Liquid Markets: Assessing the Case for U.S. Exports of Liquefied Natural Gas,” Brookings Institution, Policy Brief 12-01, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2012/5/02%20lng%20exports%20ebinger/0502\_lng\_exports\_ebinger.pdf)

Aside from the price impact of potential U.S. LNG exports, a major concern among opponents is that such exports would diminish U.S. “energy security”; that exports would deny the United States of a strategically important resource. The extent to which such concerns are **valid** depends on several factors, including the size of the domestic resource base, and the liquidity and functionality of global trade. As Part I of this report notes, geological evidence suggests that the volumes of LNG export under consideration would not materially affect the availability of natural gas for the domestic market. Twenty years of LNG exports at the rate of 6 bcf/day, phased in over the course of 6 years, would increase demand by approximately 38 tcf. As presented in Part I, four existing estimates of total technically recoverable shale gas resources range from 687 tcf to 1,842 tcf; therefore, exporting 6 bcf/day of LNG over the course of twenty years would consume between 2 and 5.5 percent of total shale gas resources. While the estimates for **shale gas reserves are uncertain**, in a scenario where reserves are perceived to be lower than expected, domestic natural gas prices would increase and exports would almost immediately become uneconomic. In the long-term, it is possible that U.S. prices and international prices will converge to the point at which they settle at similar levels. In that case, the United States would have more than adequate import capacity (through bi-directional import/export facilities) to import gas when economic.

#### Lifting federal restrictions diversifies US energy portfolio – natural gas firms would export any surplus supply

Hartley and Medlock 7 (Dr. Peter, Professor of Economics – Rice University, Rice Scholar – Baker Institute for Public Policy, and Dr. Kenneth B., Fellow in Energy Policy – Baker Institute for Public Policy, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Economics – Rice University, “North American Security of Natural Gas Supply in a Global Market,” James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy, November, <http://www.bakerinstitute.org/programs/energy-forum/publications/energy-studies/docs/natgas/ng_security-nov07.pdf>)

Higher Lower 48 production as a result of opening access also results in lower imports of LNG. Figure 13 depicts the change in LNG imports when access restrictions are lifted and all other factors remain unchanged. Total LNG imports into the United States in 2015 fall by about 0.85 tcf (or from about 2.4 tcf to 1.55 tcf) and in 2030 by 1.6 tcf (or from 8.8 tcf to 7.3 tcf). This figure includes pipeline imports to the United States from Mexico and Canada that are being reshipped from LNG import terminals from those countries. The decline under this scenario is represents a fall in LNG market share in the United States from just over 31 percent in the Reference Case in 2030 to 22 percent. The LNG receiving terminals that are most directly affected by the opening of access for drilling are those that are closest to these newly opened areas of the Atlantic, Pacific and east Gulf of Mexico OCS. For example, the terminals at Baja, New Brunswick, Pascagoula, Cove Point, and Delaware Bay see the largest volume reductions, in some years accounting for over 80 percent of the difference in overall import flows. This, like the situation with Alaska, represents some cannibalization of market share as companies who might drill in the now restricted OCS would be the same firms whose LNG would be **pushed out of the U.S. market**. One offsetting factor to the loss of market share for LNG and Alaskan supplies is that fact that lower average prices give a slight boost to overall U.S. demand. When access restrictions are lifted, lower prices encourage a modest increase in demand of about 1.3 bcfd by 2030, of which 1.0 bcfd is added natural gas demand in the power generation sector. While the change in average annual prices under this unrestricted scenario is not large, open access also allows existing demand to be served at lower cost. Thus, the net surplus benefits (including added consumer welfare) associated with expanded use of gas at lower prices can be quite large. For example, the benefit to consumers of a $0.42 reduction in price in 2017 (the maximum decrease seen over the modeling period) results in an annual saving of $10.3 billion for natural gas consumers. Of course, the benefits are lower in other years, but cumulative benefits still range into the many billions of dollars. Open access also brings other potential benefits, such as providing a degree of diversification that **mitigates the extent to which a cartel in international natural gas markets can operate effectively to threaten U.S. energy security**. This increased diversification is evident in Figure 14, which depicts the changes in LNG imports by major regions around the world. We see that when access restrictions are removed, the resulting decline in North American LNG imports is accompanied by an increase in LNG imports in other regions around the world. This occurs as global prices are reduced and demand is encouraged. Thus, both energy security benefits as well as welfare benefits accrue to nations outside the United States **as a result of eliminating access restrictions**. 30 In addition, when access restrictions are removed, LNG exports from the more marginal producers, which tend to be OPEC countries (Iran, other Middle East exporters, Venezuela, and to a lesser extent countries in North and West Africa), decline at the margin, falling collectively by 0.27 tcf in 2015, and as much as 0.43 tcf by 2030 (see Figure 15). Even though the volumes are small, the analysis suggests that this **less constrained supply picture** for the global market can contribute to rendering the United States and its allies **less vulnerable to the will** of any one producer, or the collective will of any group of producers, by enhancing the diversification of supply options. The wider swath of alternative supplies for Europe and northeast Asia translates into significantly reduced potential for producers in Russia and the Middle East to exert market power.

#### Global export contracts are being renegotiated – now is key to get the US in the LNG export game

Ebinger et al 12 (Charles, Senior Fellow and Director of the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, Kevin Massy, Assistant Director of the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, and Govinda Avasarala, Senior Research Assistant in the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, “Liquid Markets: Assessing the Case for U.S. Exports of Liquefied Natural Gas,” Brookings Institution, Policy Brief 12-01, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2012/5/02%20lng%20exports%20ebinger/0502\_lng\_exports\_ebinger.pdf).

LNG exports will help to sustain market liquidity in what looks to be an increasingly tight LNG market beyond 2015 (see Figure 10). Should LNG exports from the United States continue to be permitted, they will add to roughly 10 bcf/day of LNG that is expected to emerge from Australia between 2015 and 2020. Nevertheless, given the projected growth in demand for natural gas in China and India and assuming that some of Japan’s nuclear capacity remains offline, demand for natural gas will outpace the incremental supply. This makes U.S. LNG even more valuable on the international market. Although it will be important to global LNG markets, it is unlikely that the emergence of the United States as an exporter of LNG will change the existing pricing structure overnight. Not only is the market still largely dependent on long-term contracts, the overwhelming majority of new liquefaction capacity emerging in the next decade (largely from Australia) has already been contracted for at oil-indexed rates.108 The incremental LNG volumes supplied by the United States at floating Henry Hub rates will be small in comparison. But while U.S. LNG will not have a transformational impact, by establishing an alternate lower price for LNG derived through a different market mechanism, U.S. exports may be central in catalyzing future changes in LNG contract structure. As previously mentioned, this impact is already being felt in Europe. A number of German utilities have either renegotiated contracts or are seeking arbitration with natural gas suppliers in Norway and Russia. The Atlantic Basin will be a more immediate beneficiary of U.S. LNG exports than the Pacific Basin as many European contracts allow for periodic revisions to the oil-price linkage.109 In the Pacific Basin this contractual arrangement is not as common and most consumers are tied to their respective oil-linkage formulae for the duration of the contract.110 Despite the increasing demand following the Fukushima nuclear accident, however, Japanese LNG consumers are actively pursuing new arrangements for LNG contracts.111 There are other limits to the extent of the impact that U.S. LNG will have on global markets. It is unlikely that many of the LNG export facilities under consideration will reach final investment decision. Instead, it is more probable that U.S. natural gas prices will have rebounded sufficiently to the point that exports are not commercially viable beyond a certain threshold. (Figure 11 illustrates the estimated costs of delivering LNG to Japan in 2020.) This threshold, expected by many experts to be roughly 6 bcf/day by 2025, is modest in comparison to the roughly 11 bcf/day of Australian LNG export projects that have reached final investment decision and are expected to be online by 2020.

#### Scenario 1: Trade Leadership

#### Globally, bilateral trade agreements are inevitable. However, the US is losing out – reinvigorated support for US-based FTAs solidifies our global trade leadership

Smith 11 (Rod, Editor – Feedstuffs, “US Trade Leadership Slipping,” Feedstuffs Food Link, 6-24, http://www.feedstuffsfoodlink.com/ME2/dirmod.asp?sid=&nm=&type=news&mod=News&mid=9A02E3B96F2A415ABC72CB5F516B4C10&tier=3&nid=FAA1AC2A45944313AAC3C0F446B2E2C4)

THE number of bilateral and regional free trade agreements (FTAs) being negotiated by countries around the world has increased significantly in recent years, creating new trade between parties to the agreements as consumers respond to lower-priced imports and to products and services not otherwise available domestically. This is a good result for those countries involved, but FTAs also divert trade from efficient non-members to less-efficient members that receive preferential treatment in the form of lower or no tariffs. This is happening now to the U.S., according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service (ERS). When countries agree to reduce tariffs and other trade barriers within an FTA, those trade barriers remain in place for other exporting countries, often **adversely affecting their competitiveness**, ERS researchers said in an article in the June issue of the agency's Amber Waves magazine. A recent ERS analysis of bilateral trade flows from 1975 to 2005 found empirical evidence that FTAs increase trade among agreement members and reduce trade between members and non-members, suggesting that the increasingly "large number of FTAs that do not include the U.S. may be eroding the U.S. presence in global markets," the researchers said. Another ERS study focused specifically on three FTAs: (1) the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)-Australia/New Zealand FTA, (2) the ASEAN-China FTA and (3) the Colombia-Mercosur FTA. The study found that the U.S., which is not a party to the agreements, was affected only modestly by the ASEAN pacts but was affected more negatively by the Colombia-Mercosur FTA, the researchers said. ASEAN, Australian and New Zealand tariffs on U.S. products and services, including agricultural and food products, are low to begin with, and the U.S. has an FTA with Australia that has opened Australia's markets to the U.S., they explained. However, U.S. products and services are exposed to high tariffs in Colombia and the Mercosur region, they said. The ASEAN region encompasses Brunei, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos and Burma. The Mercosur countries include Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay. Slipping vanguard The ERS researchers, citing World Trade Organization data, noted that there were 290 FTAs in force as of Dec. 1, 2010, and more than two-thirds of them were put in place in the last decade (Figure). This trend will continue as a number of additional agreements are being negotiated, they said. Almost all countries are now party to at least one FTA, the researchers said, but the U.S., "once in the vanguard of countries creating FTAs," has decreased its emphasis on trade pacts in recent years. Between 2003 and 2007, the U.S. negotiated and implemented eight FTAs with 13 countries, they said, but for almost four years, important pacts that were negotiated with South Korea, Colombia and Panama have not been submitted to Congress for ratification. The share of the world's trade involving FTA members has been increasing in recent years, the researchers said, noting that 54% of the world's agricultural trade was between FTA partners in 2009 but that only 41% of U.S. agricultural trade was with FTA partners. Major agricultural producers such as Canada and the European Union have been "particularly active" in negotiating more FTAs than the U.S., they said. The primary purpose of an FTA is to achieve preferential access to a market, thereby securing "a competitive edge" over other exporters, but non-economic objectives also are important, including geopolitical achievements leading to peace, stability and development in a region, the researchers explained. Additionally, uncertainties associated with successfully concluding the current multilateral WTO Doha Round have likely prompted many nations to seek bilateral relationships, they noted. Damaged vanguard Returning to the ASEAN and Colombia-Mercosur FTAs, the ERS researchers reported that U.S. agricultural exports to the ASEAN nations totaled $20 billion in 2009 -- almost 50% of which was for soybeans, with cotton and oilseed products accounting for another 12%. The U.S. will lose only about 6% of its ASEAN market, they said. However, the Colombia-Mercosur pact "appears to be an example of appreciable damage" to U.S. exports to Colombia, they said, causing a loss of $305 million in sales of corn and wheat alone, or about 25% of total U.S. agricultural sales to Colombia. The difference between the two ASEAN agreements and the Colombian FTA is that Colombia has imposed higher tariffs on principal U.S. exports than ASEAN has, the researchers said. Consequently, U.S. exporters to Colombia face heavy competition from Mercosur exporters, which are major producers of corn, soybeans and wheat and are exempt from the Colombian tariffs, they said. When the U.S. is not a partner, the effect FTAs have on U.S. agricultural exports varies depending on how high the tariffs are on U.S. products, how much tariffs were decreased on partner products and the degree to which partners can provide the products that the U.S. previously supplied, the researchers said. The U.S. advantages in being a large, low-cost and reliable supplier "are not automatically canceled" by such FTAs, they said, but FTAs always provide their members with "a margin of tariff preference" over the U.S. that, in many cases, "can lead to serious declines" in U.S. agricultural exports. Here's our point: U.S. trade leadership slipping TRADE works. Trade creates economic positives, allowing producers to be profitable and sustainable and to expand; trade creates jobs and strong, vibrant economies for exporting nations. Trade also helps nations develop and promote peace. However, the U.S., once the world's vanguard in negotiating trade agreements and urging fair and free trade, is rapidly sliding into the background as other countries and regions implement trade pacts in which the U.S. is not a member. This not only affects our economic health but **our leadership in the world**.

#### LNG exports are key – gives the US leverage in trade negotiations

Levi 12 (Michael, Senior Fellow for Energy and Environment – Council on Foreign Relations, “A Strategy for U.S. Natural Gas Exports,” Hamilton Project – Brookings Institute, June, Discussion Paper 2012-04, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/6/13%20exports%20levi/06\_exports\_levi)

U.S. law distinguishes between LNG exports to countries with which the United States has relevant free trade agreements (FTAs), which are fast tracked for approval, and exports to other countries, which face more rigorous review and must be judged to be consistent with the U.S. national interest. Some have argued that this distinction should be abolished, since it interferes with free trade. The United States should maintain the distinction, which can **give it leverage in trade negotiations** without entailing any economic costs. U.S. natural gas exports can also provide a platform for more effective U.S. foreign and trade policy. To that end, the United States should use foreign access to U.S. gas exports as leverage in trade negotiations, and actively seek to steer global gas trade toward greater transparency and market-based pricing.

#### Impact is great power wars and accesses every impact

**Panitchpakdi 4** (DG Supachai, Former Director-General – World Trade Organization, “American Leadership and the World Trade Organization: What is the Alternative?”, National Press Club, 2-26, http://www.wto.org/french/ news\_f/spsp\_f/spsp22\_f.htm)

I can sum up my message today in three sentences: The United States, more than any single country, created the world trading system. The US has never had more riding on the strength of that system. And US leadership — especially in the current Doha trade talks — is indispensable to the system's success. It is true that as the WTO's importance to the world economy increases, so too does the challenge of making it work: there are more countries, more issues, trade is in the spot light as never before. But the fiction that there is an alternative to the WTO — or to US leadership — is both naïve and dangerous. Naïve because it fails to recognize that multilateralism has become more — not less — important to advancing US interests. Dangerous because it risks undermining the very objectives the US seeks — freer trade, stronger rules, a more open and secure world economy. The Doha Round is a crucial test. The core issues — services, agriculture, and industrial tariffs — are obviously directly relevant to the US. America is highly competitive in services — the fastest growing sector of the world economy, and where the scope for liberalization is greatest. In agriculture too the US is competitive across many commodities — but sky-high global barriers and subsidies impede and distort agricultural trade. Industrial tariffs also offer scope for further liberalization — especially in certain markets and sectors. But what is at stake in these talks is more than the economic benefits that would flow from a successful deal. The real issue is the relevance of the multilateral trading system. Its expanded rules, broader membership, and binding dispute mechanism means that the new WTO — created less than ten years ago — is pivotal to international economic relations. But this means that the costs of failure are also higher — with ramifications that can be felt more widely. Advancing the Doha agenda would confirm the WTO as the focal point for global trade negotiations, and as the key forum for international economic cooperation. The credibility of the institution would be greatly enhanced. But if the Doha negotiations stumble, doubts may grow, not just about the WTO's effectiveness, but about the future of multilateralism in trade. This should be a major concern to the US for two reasons: First, the US is now integrated with the world economy as never before. A quarter of US GDP is tied to international trade, up from 10 per cent in 1970 — the largest such increase of any developed economy over this period. A third of US growth since 1990 has been generated by trade. And America's trade is increasingly global in scope — 37 per cent with Canada and Mexico, 23 per cent with Europe, 27 per cent with Asia. Last year alone, exports to China rose by almost 30 per cent. The US has also grown more reliant on the rules of the multilateral system to keep world markets open. Not only has it initiated more WTO dispute proceedings than any other country — some 75 since 1995 — according to USTR it has also won or successfully settled most of the cases it has brought. The point is this: even the US cannot achieve prosperity on its own; it is increasingly dependent on international trade, and the rules-based economic order that underpins it. As the biggest economy, largest trader and one of the most open markets in the world, it is axiomatic that the US has the greatest interest in widening and deepening the multilateral system. Furthermore, expanding international trade through the WTO generates increased global prosperity, in turn creating yet more opportunities for the US economy. The second point is that strengthening the world trading system is essential to America's wider global objectives. Fighting terrorism, reducing poverty, improving health, integrating China and other countries in the global economy — all of these issues are linked, in one way or another, to world trade. This is not to say that trade is the answer to all America's economic concerns; only that meaningful solutions are inconceivable without it. The world trading system is the linchpin of today's global order — underpinning its security as well as its prosperity. A successful WTO is an example of how multilateralism can work. Conversely, if it weakens or fails, much else could fail with it. This is something which the US — at the epicentre of a more interdependent world — cannot afford to ignore. These priorities must continue to guide US policy — as they have done since the Second World War. America has been the main driving force behind eight rounds of multilateral trade negotiations, including the successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round and the creation of the WTO. The US — together with the EU — was instrumental in launching the latest Doha Round two years ago. Likewise, the recent initiative, spearheaded by Ambassador Zoellick, to re-energize the negotiations and move them towards a successful conclusion is yet another example of how essential the US is to the multilateral process — signalling that the US remains committed to further liberalization, that the Round is moving, and that other countries have a tangible reason to get on board. The reality is this: when the US leads the system can move forward; when it withdraws, the system drifts. The fact that US leadership is essential, does not mean it is easy. As WTO rules have expanded, so too has as the complexity of the issues the WTO deals with — everything from agriculture and accounting, to tariffs and telecommunication. The WTO is also exerting huge gravitational pull on countries to join — and participate actively — in the system. The WTO now has 146 Members — up from just 23 in 1947 — and this could easily rise to 170 or more within a decade. Emerging powers like China, Brazil, and India rightly demand a greater say in an institution in which they have a growing stake. So too do a rising number of voices outside the system as well. More and more people recognize that the WTO matters. More non-state actors — businesses, unions, environmentalists, development NGOs — want the multilateral system to reflect their causes and concerns. A decade ago, few people had even heard of the GATT. Today the WTO is front page news. A more visible WTO has inevitably become a more politicized WTO. The sound and fury surrounding the WTO's recent Ministerial Meeting in Cancun — let alone Seattle — underline how challenging managing the WTO can be. But these challenges can be exaggerated. They exist precisely because so many countries have embraced a common vision. Countries the world over have turned to open trade — and a rules-based system — as the key to their growth and development. They agreed to the Doha Round because they believed their interests lay in freer trade, stronger rules, a more effective WTO. Even in Cancun the great debate was whether the multilateral trading system was moving fast and far enough — not whether it should be rolled back. Indeed, it is critically important that we draw the right conclusions from Cancun — which are only now becoming clearer. The disappointment was that ministers were unable to reach agreement. The achievement was that they exposed the risks of failure, highlighted the need for North-South collaboration, and — after a period of introspection — acknowledged the inescapable logic of negotiation. Cancun showed that, if the challenges have increased, it is because the stakes are higher. The bigger challenge to American leadership comes from inside — not outside — the United States. In America's current debate about trade, jobs and globalization we have heard a lot about the costs of liberalization. We need to hear more about the opportunities. We need to be reminded of the advantages of America's openness and its trade with the world — about the economic growth tied to exports; the inflation-fighting role of imports, the innovative stimulus of global competition. We need to explain that freer trade works precisely because it involves positive change — better products, better job opportunities, better ways of doing things, better standards of living. While it is true that change can be threatening for people and societies, it is equally true that the vulnerable are not helped by resisting change — by putting up barriers and shutting out competition. They are helped by training, education, new and better opportunities that — with the right support policies — can flow from a globalized economy. The fact is that for every job in the US threatened by imports there is a growing number of high-paid, high skill jobs created by exports. Exports supported 7 million workers a decade ago; that number is approaching around 12 million today. And these new jobs — in aerospace, finance, information technology — pay 10 per cent more than the average American wage. We especially need to inject some clarity — and facts — into the current debate over the outsourcing of services jobs. Over the next decade, the US is projected to create an average of more than 2 million new services jobs a year — compared to roughly 200,000 services jobs that will be outsourced. I am well aware that this issue is the source of much anxiety in America today. Many Americans worry about the potential job losses that might arise from foreign competition in services sectors. But it’s worth remembering that concerns about the impact of foreign competition are not new. Many of the reservations people are expressing today are echoes of what we heard in the 1970s and 1980s. But people at that time didn’t fully appreciate the power of American ingenuity. Remarkable advances in technology and productivity laid the foundation for unprecedented job creation in the 1990s and there is no reason to doubt that this country, which has shown time and again such remarkable potential for competing in the global economy, will not soon embark again on such a burst of job-creation. America's openness to service-sector trade — combined with the high skills of its workforce — will lead to more growth, stronger industries, and a shift towards higher value-added, higher-paying employment. Conversely, closing the door to service trade is a strategy for killing jobs, not saving them. Americans have never run from a challenge and have never been defeatist in the face of strong competition. Part of this challenge is to create the conditions for global growth and job creation here and around the world. I believe Americans realize what is at stake. The process of opening to global trade can be disruptive, but they recognize that the US economy cannot grow and prosper any other way. They recognize the importance of finding global solutions to shared global problems. Besides, what is the alternative to the WTO? Some argue that the world's only superpower need not be tied down by the constraints of the multilateral system. They claim that US sovereignty is compromised by international rules, and that multilateral institutions limit rather than expand US influence. Americans should be deeply sceptical about these claims. Almost none of the trade issues facing the US today are any easier to solve unilaterally, bilaterally or regionally. The reality is probably just the opposite. What sense does it make — for example — to negotiate e-commerce rules bilaterally? Who would be interested in disciplining agricultural subsidies in a regional agreement but not globally? How can bilateral deals — even dozens of them — come close to matching the economic impact of agreeing to global free trade among 146 countries? Bilateral and regional deals can sometimes be a complement to the multilateral system, but they can never be a substitute. There is a bigger danger. By treating some countries preferentially, bilateral and regional deals exclude others — fragmenting global trade and distorting the world economy. Instead of liberalizing trade — and widening growth — they carve it up. Worse, they have a domino effect: bilateral deals inevitably beget more bilateral deals, as countries left outside are forced to seek their own preferential arrangements, or risk further marginalization. This is precisely what we see happening today. There are already over two hundred bilateral and regional agreements in existence, and each month we hear of a new or expanded deal. There is a basic contradiction in the assumption that bilateral approaches serve to strengthen the multilateral, rules-based system. Even when intended to spur free trade, they can ultimately risk undermining it. This is in no one's interest, least of all the United States. America led in the creation of the multilateral system after 1945 precisely to avoid a return to hostile blocs — blocs that had done so much to fuel interwar instability and conflict. America's vision, in the words of Cordell Hull, was that “enduring peace and the welfare of nations was indissolubly connected with the friendliness, fairness and freedom of world trade”. Trade would bind nations together, making another war unthinkable. Non-discriminatory rules would prevent a return to preferential deals and closed alliances. A network of multilateral initiatives and organizations — the Marshal Plan, the IMF, the World Bank, and the GATT, now the WTO — would provide the institutional bedrock for the international rule of law, not power. Underpinning all this was the idea that freedom — free trade, free democracies, the free exchange of ideas — was essential to peace and prosperity, a more just world. It is a vision that has emerged pre-eminent a half century later. Trade has expanded twenty-fold since 1950. Millions in Asia, Latin America, and Africa are being lifted out of poverty, and millions more have new hope for the future. All the great powers — the US, Europe, Japan, India, China and soon Russia — are part of a rules-based multilateral trading system, greatly increasing the chances for world prosperity and peace. There is a growing realization that — in our interdependent world — sovereignty is constrained, not by multilateral rules, but by the absence of rules. All of these were America’s objectives. The US needs to be both clearer about the magnitude of what it has achieved, and more realistic about what it is trying to — and can — accomplish. Multilateralism can be slow, messy, and tortuous. But it is also indispensable to managing an increasingly integrated global economy. Multilateralism is based on the belief that all countries — even powerful countries like the United States — are made stronger and more secure through international co-operation and rules, and by working to strengthen one another from within a system, not outside of it. Multilateralism's greatest ideal is the ideal of negotiation, compromise, consensus, not coercion. As Churchill said of democracy, it is the worst possible system except for all the others. I do not believe America's long-term economic interests have changed. Nor do I believe that America's vision for a just international order has become blurred. If anything, the American vision has been sharpened since the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington; sharpened by the realization that there is now a new struggle globally between the forces of openness and modernity, and the forces of separatism and reaction. More than ever, America's interests lie in an open world economy resting on the foundation of a strong, rules-based multilateral system. More and more, America's growth and security are tied to the growth and security of the world economy as a whole. American leadership today is more — not less — important to our increasingly interconnected planet. A recent successful, and much needed, example is the multilateral agreement on intellectual property rights and access to medicines for poor countries, in which the US played a pivotal role. It would be a tragic mistake if the Doha Round, which offers the world a once-in-a-generation opportunity to eliminate trade distortions, to strengthen trade rules, and open markets across the world, were allowed to founder. We need courage and the collective political will to ensure a balanced and equitable outcome. What is the alternative? It is a fragmented world, with greater conflict and uncertainty. A world of the past, not the future — one that America turned away from after 1945, and that we should reject just as decisively today. America must lead. The multilateral trading system is too important to fail. The world depends on it. So does America.

#### Scenario 2: Chinese Rare Earth

#### Absent LNG exports, China will win tougher restrictions on rare earth exports

Levi 12 (Michael, Senior Fellow for Energy and Environment – Council on Foreign Relations, “A Strategy for U.S. Natural Gas Exports,” Hamilton Project – Brookings Institute, June, Discussion Paper 2012-04, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/6/13%20exports%20levi/06\_exports\_levi)

Potential U.S. exports might also be exploited for wider strategic gain under the right conditions. Current U.S. law makes approval of exports to markets with which the United States has free-trade agreements essentially automatic, but requires extensive review and subsequent approval for exports to others. This ought to give the United States leverage in broader trade negotiations with would-be importers. For example, Japanese officials and market participants have noticed that the recent U.S.-South Korea free-trade agreement will give South Korea special access to U.S. natural gas exports, and have inquired as to whether Japanese participation in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) trade arrangement would give them similar privileges (Interviews 2011). Regardless of whether Japanese and other policymakers are wise in wanting direct access to U.S. exports, this sort of dynamic can only strengthen the U.S. hand in international trade negotiations, which can lead to broader gains for U.S. consumers and firms. Conversely, if the United States were to restrain LNG exports, it would almost certainly face wider trade-related problems. The consequences could be broad, affecting support for open trade in general, but they would likely have special impact on **other resource-related disputes**. Article XI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) prohibits sustained quantitative restrictions on energy exports unless they are related “to the conservation of exhaustible natural resources if such measures are made effective in conjunction with restrictions on domestic production or consumption” (Selivanova 2007). U.S. policy would be the opposite: it would be made in conjunction with efforts to encourage both domestic production and consumption of natural gas. Indeed, the United States has recently joined Europe and Japan in challenging Chinese restrictions on exports of **rare earth metals**—which are critical to a variety of defense, electronics, and energy technologies—at the World Trade Organization (WTO) (Palmer 2011). The arguments that the United States would need to invoke in order to restrain LNG exports—particularly the prospects of environmental damage and harm to domestic industry—are precisely those that China would like to use to defend its own restrictions on rare earths exports; China could all but take the U.S. justification of curbs on LNG exports, change a few words, and use it in its own defense. It would likely be difficult for the United States to sustain limits to U.S. LNG exports while fighting Chinese limits on exports of rare earth metals.

#### Even if exports don’t get approved, the plan alone removes US hypocrisy towards rare earth

Tamny 12 (John, “China's "Rare Earths", and the Hypocrisy of the Obama Administration,” Forbes, 3-25, http://www.forbes.com/sites/johntamny/2012/03/25/chinas-rare-earths-and-the-hyprocrisy-of-the-obama-administration/)

As is well known now, the Obama administration recently joined the EU and Japan in a lawsuit filed at the World Trade Organization over China’s alleged restrictions on the export of rare earth elements. For those who’ve properly ignored what until now should have been a non-story, “rare earths” are metals essential for the production of everything from smart phones, to hybrid cars, to military equipment. At present, China produces roughly 95% of rare earths, and it’s of course assumed that the high price of these obscure metals has resulted from export restrictions. Obama et al really ought to look in the mirror on this one, and once they do, leave China alone. To see why, let’s think for a moment about what this is all about. The U.S. and others are telling China – the country – that it must sell more of what is endemic to China. The hypocrisy here is impressive, particularly considering the **myriad restrictions our own government puts on the exploration** for and mining of, nearly everything. What the Obama administration is doing here is the equivalent of China going to the WTO with a lawsuit demanding that we open up more of Alaska and other oil rich locales controlled by the U.S., not to mention reduce the various regulations controlling the mining of other commodities that the U.S. is rich in. If the Chinese were to do so, there’s no telling what the negative reaction would be from the U.S. political class, not to mention its citizenry. We’d be rightfully offended for another country nosing in on what should be a U.S. matter. It’s arguable that what makes the U.S. great is our collective lack of self-awareness that often reveals itself through some of the most disruptive entrepreneurial innovations known to mankind, but goodness, aren’t we crossing the line when we meddle in the affairs of other countries; essentially saying to them “Mine what we tell you to, and then sell to us”? A little humility is surely in order, for one.

#### **Hypocrisy is key – it’s the sole reason for Chinese protectionism**

Deas 8 (Destiny, JD – Duke University, Board of Community Disaster Relief Fund in Shrevport, “The Costs of Perceived Hypocrisy: the Impact of U.S. Treatment of Foreign Acquisitions of Domestic Enterprises,” Duke Law Journal, 57 Duke L.J. 1795, Lexis)

Both the Chinese and U.S. acquisition rules may also run afoul of World Trade Organization (WTO) commitments. The United States has argued that its own acquisition n11 rules are no more restrictive than necessary to maintain national security. n12 Even if this argument is accepted, the perceived hypocrisy of the United States blocking politically unpopular acquisitions of U.S. entities by Chinese companies while simultaneously urging more openness in the global market undermines American influence and credibility. The costs of [\*1798] this perceived hypocrisy are not always clearly defined or restricted to national borders. Part I of this Note examines the relationship between the U.S. and Chinese policies regarding acquisitions of domestic enterprises by foreign investors. It describes how U.S. policies have triggered **heightened protectionism in China**. Part II analyzes the legality of U.S. and Chinese acquisition rules in light of both countries' commitments to the WTO's General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). It concludes that both countries have violated their obligations under the GATS, and it argues that these violations carry potential costs to the United States, China, and the world economy. Given U.S. commitments to free trade in services through the GATS, the United States must consider the impact of the perception of its own seemingly anti-free trade policies on the rest of the world, both in terms of developing the policies of their trading partners and in terms of the economic costs of violating treaty obligations.

#### China will price the US out by the end of 2012 – collapsing civilization

**Adams 10** (Mike, Editor – NaturalNews, “Global Supply of Rare Earth Elements Could Be Wiped Out by 2012”, 1-26, <http://www.naturalnews.com/028028_rare_earth_elements_mining.html>)

It's the bubble you've probably never heard of: The *rare earth bubble*. And it's due to pop in 2012, potentially devastating the industries of western nations that depend on these rare elements. What industries are those? The automobile industry uses tens of thousands of tons of rare earth elements each year, and advanced military technology depends on these elements, too. Lots of "green" technologies depend on them, including wind turbines, low-energy light bulbs and hybrid [car](http://www.naturalnews.com/car.html) batteries. In fact, much of western civilization depends on rare earth elements such as terbium, lanthanum and neodymium. So what's the problem with these rare elements? 97 percent of the world's supply comes from mines in China, and China is prepared to simply stop exporting these strategic elements to the rest of the world by [2012](http://www.naturalnews.com/2012.html). If that happens, the western world will be crippled by the collapse of available rare earth elements. Manufacturing of everything from computers and [electronics](http://www.naturalnews.com/electronics.html) to farm machinery will grind to a halt. Electronics will disappear from the shelves and [prices](http://www.naturalnews.com/prices.html) for manufactured goods that depend on these rare elements will skyrocket. These 17 rare earth elements (REE) -- all of which are metals -- are strategic resources upon which entire nations are built. In many ways, they are similar to rubber -- a resource so valuable and important to the world that many experts call it the "fourth most important [natural](http://www.naturalnews.com/natural.html) resource in the world," right after [water](http://www.naturalnews.com/water.html), steel and oil. Without rubber, you couldn't drive your car to work or water your lawn. Many medical technologies would cease to work and virtually all commercial construction would grind to a halt. Many of the strategic battles fought in World War II were fought, in fact, over control of rubber, most of which now comes through Singapore and its surrounding regions (Malaysia and Indonesia). Global shortage of Rare Earth Elements coming... Now, by threatening to cut off the world's supply of rare earth elements, China appears to be attempting to monopolize this extremely important strategic resource. According to information received by The Independent, by 2012 China may cease all exports of rare earth elements, reserving them for its own economic expansion. An article in that paper quotes REE expert Jack Lifton as saying, "A real crunch is coming. In [America](http://www.naturalnews.com/America.html), Britain and elsewhere we have not yet woken up to the fact that there is an urgent need to secure the supply of rare earths from sources outside China." And yet virtually no one has heard of this problem! People are familiar with peak [oil](http://www.naturalnews.com/oil.html), global warming, ocean acidification, the national debt and the depletion of fossil water, but very few are aware of the looming crisis in rare metals... upon which much of western civilization rests.

#### And --- it crushes hard power in Asia

**Richardson 10** (Michael, Visiting Senior Research Fellow – Institute of South East Asian Studies (Singapore), “China’s Chokehold on Rare-Earth Minerals Raises Concerns”, 10-8, http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/chinas-rare-earth-minerals)

Yet China could keep its dominant grip on the rare-earths industry for some years. It holds 35 percent of global reserves, but supplies over 95 percent of demand for rare-earth oxides, of which 60 percent is domestic, according to Industrial Minerals Company of Australia, a consultancy. Just as important, Chinese companies, many of them state-controlled, have advanced in their quest to make China the world leader in processing rare-earth metals into finished materials. Success in this quest could give China a decisive advantage not just in civilian industry, including clean energy, but also in military production if Chinese manufacturers were given preferential treatment over foreign competitors. Cerium is the most abundant of the 17 rare earths, all of which have similar chemical properties. A cerium-based coating is non-corrosive and has significant military applications. The Pentagon is due to finish a report soon on the risks of US military dependence on rare earths from China. Their use is widespread in the defense systems of the US, its allies, and other countries that buy its weapons and equipment. In a report to the US Congress in April, the Government Accountability Office said that it had been told by officials and defense industry executives that where rare-earth alloys and other materials were used in military systems, they were “responsible for the functionality of the component and would be difficult to replace without losing performance.” For example, fin actuators in precision-guided bombs are specifically designed around the capabilities of neodymium iron boron rare-earth magnets. The main US battle tank, the M1A2 Abrams, has a reference and navigation system that relies on samarium cobalt magnets from China. An official report last year on the US national defense stockpile said that shortages of four rare earths – lanthanum, cerium, europium and gadolinium – had already caused delays in producing some weapons. It recommended further study to determine the severity of the delays.

#### Nuclear war

**Walton 7** (C. Dale, Lecturer in International Relations and Strategic Studies – University of Reading, Geopolitics and the Great Powers in the 21st Century, p. 49)

Obviously, it is of vital importance to the United States that the PRC does not become the hegemon of Eastern Eurasia. As rioted above, however, regardless of what Washington does. China’s success in such an endeavor is not as easily attainable as pessimists might assume. The PRC appears to be on track to be a very great power indeed. hut geopolitical conditions are not favorable for any Chinese effort to establish sole hegemony; a robust multipolar system should suffice to keep China in check, even with only minimal American intervention in local squabbles. The more worrisome danger is that Beijing will cooperate with a great power partner, establishing a very muscular axis. Such an entity would present a critical danger to the balance of power, thus both necessitating very active American intervention in Eastern Eurasia and creating the underlying conditions for a massive, and probably nuclear, great power war. Absent such a “super—threat,” however, the demands on American leaders ill be far more subtle: creating the conditions for Washington’s gentle decline from playing the role of unipolar quasi-hegemony to being “merely” the greatest of time worlds powers, while aiding in the creation of a healthy multipolar system that is not marked by close great power alliances.

#### Rare earth access is key to first-strike missile guidance

**Kennedy 10** (J., President – Wings Enterprise, “Critical and Strategic Failure of Rare Earth Resources”, March, http://www.smenet.org/rareEarthsProject/TMS-NMAB-paperV-3.pdf)

The national defense issues are equally important. Rare earths are critical components for military jet engines, guided missiles and bombs, electrical countermeasures, anti-missile systems, satellite communication systems and armor, yet the U.S. has no domestic sources. Innovation Drives Industry – Industry Carries the EconomyAdvances in Materials Science are a result of tireless innovation; innovation seeking improvements in the performance and characteristics of material properties or a change in their form or function. Much of this work must eventually translate into commercial and military applications. Today many advances in material science are achieved through the application of rare earth oxides, elements and alloys. This group of elements, also known as the lanthanide series, represents the only known bridge to the next level of improved performance in the material properties for many metallurgical alloys, electrical conductivity, and instrument sensitivity and in some cases a mechanical or physical change in function. These lanthanides hold unique chemical, magnetic, electrical, luminescence and radioactive shielding characteristics. Combined with other elements they can help maintain or alter physical and structural characteristics under changing conditions. Today, these rare earth elements are essential to every computer hard drive, cell phone, energy efficient light bulb, many automotive pollution control devices and catalysts, hybrid automobiles and most, if not all, military guidance systems and advanced armor. Tomorrow, they will be used in ultra capacity wind turbines, magnetic refrigeration, zero emission automobiles, superconductors, sub-light-speed computer processors, nano-particle technologies for material and metallurgical applications, structurally amorphous metals, next generation military armor and TERFENOL-D Radar. America must lead in these developments. The entire U.S. defense system is completely interdependent upon REO enhanced technologies for our most advanced weapons guidance systems, advanced armor, secure communications, radar, advanced radar systems, weapons triggering systems and un-manned Drones. REO dependent weapons technologies are predominantly represented in our ‘first strike’ and un-manned capabilities. This national defense issue is not a case of limited exposure for first-strike capabilities. This first-strike vulnerability translates into risk exposure in every level of our national defense system, as the system is built around our presumptive technological and first-strike superiority. Yet the DoD has abandon its traditional procurement protocols for “strategic and critical” materials and components for weapons systems in favor of “the principles of free trade vii.”

#### Future conflicts are inevitable and will draw-in the U.S. --- effective guidance is key to prevent escalation and nuclear war in Korea, Taiwan, and the Mideast

**Lieber and Press 9** (Keir A., Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program – Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and Daryl G., Associate Professor of Government – Dartmouth College, “The Nukes We Need”, Foreign Affairs, November/December, 88(6), Ebsco)

Unfortunately, deterrence in the twenty-first century may be far more difficult for the United States than it was in the past, and having the right mix of nuclear capabilities to deal with the new challenges will be crucial. The United States leads a global network of alliances, a position that commits Washington to protecting countries all over the world. Many of its potential adversaries have acquired, or appear to be seeking, nuclear weapons. Unless the world's major disputes are resolved--for example, on the Korean Peninsula, across the Taiwan Strait, and around the Persian Gulf--or the U.S. military pulls back from these regions, the United States will sooner or later find itself embroiled in conventional wars with nuclear-armed adversaries. Preventing escalation in those circumstances will be far more difficult than peacetime deterrence during the Cold War. In a conventional war, U.S. adversaries would have powerful incentives to brandish or use nuclear weapons because their lives, their families, and the survival of their regimes would be at stake. Therefore, as the United States considers the future of its nuclear arsenal, it should judge its force not against the relatively easy mission of peacetime deterrence but against the demanding mission of deterring escalation during a conventional conflict, when U.S. enemies are fighting for their lives. Debating the future of the U.S. nuclear arsenal is critical now because the Obama administration has pledged to pursue steep cuts in the force and has launched a major review of U.S. nuclear policy. (The results will be reported to Congress in February 2010.) The administration's desire to shrink the U.S. arsenal is understandable. Although the force is only one-fourth the size it was when the Cold War ended, it still includes roughly 2,200 operational strategic warheads--more than enough to retaliate against any conceivable nuclear attack. Furthermore, as we previously argued in these pages ("The Rise of U.S. Nuclear Primacy," March/April 2006), the current U.S. arsenal is vastly more capable than its Cold War predecessor, particularly in the area of "counterforce"--the ability to destroy an adversary's nuclear weapons before they can be used. Simply counting U.S. warheads or measuring Washington's counter-force capabilities will not, however, reveal what type of arsenal is needed for deterrence in the twenty-first century. The only way to determine that is to work through the grim logic of deterrence: to consider what actions will need to be deterred, what threats will need to be issued, and what capabilities will be needed to back up those threats. The Obama administration is right that the United States can safely cut its nuclear arsenal, but it must pay careful attention to the capabilities it retains. During a war, if a desperate adversary were to use its nuclear force to try to coerce the United States--for example, by threatening a U.S. ally or even by launching nuclear strikes against U.S. overseas bases--an arsenal comprised solely of high-yield weapons would leave U.S. leaders with terrible retaliatory options. Destroying Pyongyang or Tehran in response to a limited strike would be vastly disproportionate, and doing so might trigger further nuclear attacks in return. A deterrent posture based on such a dubious threat would lack credibility. Instead, a credible deterrent should give U.S. leaders a range of retaliatory options, including the ability to respond to nuclear attacks with either conventional or nuclear strikes, to retaliate with strikes against an enemy's nuclear forces rather than its cities, and to minimize casualties. The foundation for this flexible deterrent exists. The current U.S. arsenal includes a mix of accurate high- and low-yield warheads, offering a wide range of retaliatory options--including the ability to launch precise, very low-casualty nuclear counterforce strikes. The United States must preserve that mix of capabilities--especially the low-yield weapons--as it cuts the size of its nuclear force. [DETERRENCE IN DARK TIMES](http://web.ebscohost.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/ehost/detail?vid=3&hid=113&sid=4a8087ff-fe77-45d2-b2bb-70d04b414572%40sessionmgr111&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#toc)  THE PRIMARY purpose of U.S. nuclear forces is to deter nuclear attacks on the United States and its allies. During peacetime, this is not a demanding mission. The chance that leaders in Beijing, Moscow, or even Pyongyang will launch a surprise nuclear attack tomorrow is vanishingly small. But peacetime deterrence is not the proper yardstick for measuring the adequacy of U.S. nuclear forces. Rather, the United States' arsenal should be designed to provide robust deterrence in the most difficult of plausible circumstances: during a conventional war against a nuclear-armed adversary. In the coming decades, the United States may find itself facing nuclear-armed states on the battlefield. U.S. alliances span the globe, and the United States is frequently drawn into regional conflicts. Washington has launched six major military operations since the fall of the Berlin Wall: in Panama, Somalia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and twice in Iraq. Furthermore, most of the United States' potential adversaries have developed--or seem to be developing--nuclear weapons. Aside from terrorism, the threats that dominate U.S. military planning come from China, North Korea, and Iran: two members of the nuclear club, and one intent on joining it. The central problem for U.S. deterrence in the future is that even rational adversaries will have powerful incentives to introduce nuclear weapons--that is, threaten to use them, put them on alert, test them, or even use them--during a conventional war against the United States. If U.S. military forces begin to prevail on the battlefield, U.S. adversaries may use nuclear threats to compel a cease-fire or deny the United States access to allied military bases. Such threats might succeed in pressuring the United States to settle the conflict short of a decisive victory. Such escalatory strategies are rational. Losing a conventional war to the United States would be a disastrous outcome for any leader, and it would be worth taking great risks to force a cease-fire and avert total defeat. The fate of recent U.S. adversaries is revealing. The ex-dictator of Panama, Manuel Noriega, remains in a Miami prison. The former Bosnian Serb leader, Radovan Karadzic, awaits trial in The Hague, where Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic died in detention three years ago. Saddam Husseins punishment for losing the 2003 war was total: his government was toppled, his sons were killed, and he was hanged on a dimly lit gallows, surrounded by enemies. Even those leaders who have eluded the United States--such as the Somali warlord Muhammad Farah Aidid and Osama bin Laden--have done so despite intense U.S. efforts to capture or kill them. The United States' overseas conflicts are limited wars only from the U.S. perspective; to adversaries, they are existential. It should not be surprising if they use every weapon at their disposal to stave off total defeat. Coercive nuclear escalation may sound like a far-fetched strategy, but it was NATO'S policy during much of the Cold War. The Western allies felt that they were hopelessly outgunned in Europe at the conventional level by the Warsaw Pact. Even though NATO harbored little hope of prevailing in a nuclear war, it planned to initiate a series of escalating nuclear operations at the outbreak of war--alerts, tactical nuclear strikes, and wider nuclear attacks--to force the Soviets to accept a cease-fire. The United States' future adversaries face the same basic problem today: vast conventional military inferiority. They may adopt the same solution. Leaders in Beijing may choose gradual, coercive escalation if they face imminent military defeat in the Taiwan Strait--a loss that could weaken the Chinese Communist Party's grip on power. And if U.S. military forces were advancing toward Pyongyang, there is no reason to expect that North Korean leaders would keep their nuclear weapons on the sidelines. Layered on top of these challenges are two additional ones. First, U.S. conventional military doctrine is inherently escalatory. The new American way of war involves launching simultaneous air and ground attacks throughout the theater to blind, confuse, and overwhelm the enemy. Even if the United States decided to leave the adversary's leaders in power (stopping short of regime change so as to prevent the confrontation from escalating), how would Washington credibly convey the assurance that it was not seeking regime change once its adversary was blinded by attacks on its radar and communication systems and command bunkers? A central strategic puzzle of modern war is that the tactics best suited to dominating the conventional battlefield are the same ones most likely to trigger nuclear escalation. Furthermore, managing complex military operations to prevent escalation is always difficult. In 1991, in the lead-up to the Persian Gulf War, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker assured Iraq's foreign minister, Tariq Aziz, that the United States would leave Saddam's regime in power as long as Iraq did not use its chemical or biological weapons. But despite Baker's assurance, the U.S. military unleashed a major bombing campaign targeting Iraq's leaders, which on at least one occasion nearly killed Saddam. The political intent to control escalation was not reflected in the military operations, which nearly achieved a regime change. In future confrontations with nuclear-armed adversaries, the United States will undoubtedly want to prevent nuclear escalation. But the leaders of U.S. adversaries will face life-and-death incentives to use their nuclear arsenals to force a cease-fire and remain in power. [THE CASE FOR COUNTERFORCE](http://web.ebscohost.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/ehost/detail?vid=3&hid=113&sid=4a8087ff-fe77-45d2-b2bb-70d04b414572%40sessionmgr111&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#toc)  IF THE United States hopes to deter nuclear attacks during conventional wars, it must figure out how it might respond to such attacks, and it must retain the nuclear forces to do so. The most horrific retaliatory threat that the United States might issue--to destroy cities if enemy leaders brandish or use nuclear weapons--is a poor foundation for deterrence. First, this threat lacks credibility. Destroying cities would be a vastly disproportionate response if an enemy used nuclear weapons against a purely military target, such as a U.S. carrier group at sea or even a U.S. base located away from a major city (such as the U.S. airfields on Guam or Okinawa). During recent wars, the United States has labored to minimize enemy civilian casualties. It is hard to believe that Washington would reverse course and intentionally slaughter hundreds of thousands of civilians, especially if no U.S. or allied city has been destroyed. Moreover, a retaliatory strike on an enemy city would not even achieve critical military objectives, so the horrendous consequences would be inflicted for little purpose. If an enemy used nuclear weapons, the most pressing U.S. objective would be to prevent further nuclear attacks. Destroying one of the enemy's cities--even its capital--would neither eliminate its nuclear forces nor even necessarily kill its leaders. Nor could the United States respond to an enemy's limited nuclear strike simply by marching to its capital city to capture and hang its leaders; that would leave time for more strikes on allies' cities. In such a crisis, the United States would need to stop the enemy's nuclear attacks immediately. Of course, no one knows how a U.S. president would respond in such dark circumstances. It is possible that the United States would retaliate by attacking enemy cities--fear or anger might prevail over reason. But that mere possibility is a perilous foundation for deterrence. A credible deterrent must give U.S. leaders acceptable options in the event an enemy were to use nuclear weapons. An arsenal that can only destroy cities fails that test. The least bad option in the face of explicit nuclear threats or after a limited nuclear strike may be a counterforce attack to prevent further nuclear use. A counterforce strike could be conducted with either conventional or nuclear weapons, or a mix of the two. The attack could be limited to the enemy's nuclear delivery systems--for example, its bombers and missile silos--or a wider range of sites related to its nuclear program. Ideally, a U.S. counterforce strike would completely destroy the enemy's nuclear forces. But if an adversary had already launched a nuclear attack against the United States or its allies, a response that greatly reduced the adversary's nuclear force could save countless lives, and it could open the door to decisive military actions (such as conquest and regime change) to punish the enemy's leadership for using nuclear weapons. During the last decades of the Cold War, the nuclear arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union were too big to be completely destroyed in a disarming strike, and, in any case, their nuclear delivery systems were not accurate enough to destroy large numbers of hardened targets. But the world has changed. Washington's potential adversaries field much smaller arsenals. Meanwhile, U.S. delivery systems have grown vastly more accurate. [MODELING THE UNTHINKABLE](http://web.ebscohost.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/ehost/detail?vid=3&hid=113&sid=4a8087ff-fe77-45d2-b2bb-70d04b414572%40sessionmgr111&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#toc)  To ILLUSTRATE the growth in U.S. counterforce capabilities, we applied a set of simple formulas that analysts have used for decades to estimate the effectiveness of counterforce attacks. We modeled a U.S. strike on a small target set: 20 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMS) in hardened silos, the approximate size of China's current long-range, silo-based missile force. The analysis compared the capabilities of a 1985 Minuteman ICBM to those of a modern Trident II submarine-launched ballistic missile.[1] In 1985, a single U.S. ICBM warhead had less than a 60 percent chance of destroying a typical silo. Even if four or five additional warheads were used, the cumulative odds of destroying the silo would never exceed 90 percent because of the problem of "fratricide," whereby incoming warheads destroy each other. Beyond five warheads, adding more does no good. A probability of 90 percent might sound high, but it falls far short if the goal is to completely disarm an enemy: with a 90 percent chance of destroying each target, the odds of destroying all 20 are roughly 12 percent. In 1985, then, a U.S. ICBM attack had little chance of destroying even a small enemy nuclear arsenal. Today, a multiple-warhead attack on a single silo using a Trident II missile would have a roughly 99 percent chance of destroying it, and the probability that a barrage would destroy all 20 targets is well above 95 percent. Given the accuracy of the U.S. military's current delivery systems, the only question is target identification: silos that can be found can be destroyed. During the Cold War, the United States worked hard to pinpoint Soviet nuclear forces, with great success. Locating potential adversaries' small nuclear arsenals is undoubtedly a top priority for U.S. intelligence today. The revolution in accuracy is producing an even more momentous change: it is becoming possible for the United States to conduct low- yield nuclear counterforce strikes that inflict relatively few casualties. A U.S. Department of Defense computer model, called the Hazard Prediction and Assessment Capability (HPAC), estimates the dispersion of deadly radioactive fallout in a given region after a nuclear detonation. The software uses the warhead's explosive power, the height of the burst, and data about local weather and demographics to estimate how much fallout would be generated, where it would blow, and how many people it would injure or kill. HPAC results can be chilling. In 2006, a team of nuclear weapons analysts from the Federation of American Scientists (FAS) and the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) used HPAC to estimate the consequences of a U.S. nuclear attack using high-yield warheads against China's ICBM field. Even though China's silos are located in the countryside, the model predicted that the fallout would blow; over a large area, killing 3-4 million people. U.S. counterforce capabilities were useless, the study implied, because even a limited strike would kill an unconscionable number of civilians. But the United States can already conduct nuclear counterforce strikes at a tiny fraction of the human devastation that the FAS/NRDC study predicted, and small additional improvements to the U.S. force could dramatically reduce the potential collateral damage even further. The United States' nuclear weapons are now so accurate that it can conduct successful counterforce attacks using the smallest-yield warheads in the arsenal, rather than the huge warheads that the FAS/NRDC simulation modeled. And to further reduce the fallout, the weapons can be set to detonate as airbursts, which would allow most of the radiation to dissipate in the upper atmosphere. We ran multiple HPAC scenarios against the identical target set used in the FAS/NRDC study but modeled low-yield airbursts rather than high-yield groundbursts. The fatality estimates plunged from 3-4 million to less than 700--a figure comparable to the number of civilians reportedly killed since 2006 in Pakistan by U.S. drone strikes. One should be skeptical about the results of any model that depends on unpredictable factors, such as wind speed and direction. But in the scenarios we modeled, the area of lethal fallout was so small that very few civilians would have become ill or died, regardless of which way the wind blew. Critics may cringe at this analysis. Many of them, understandably, say that nuclear weapons are--and should remain--unusable. But if the United States is to retain these weapons for the purpose of deterring nuclear attacks, it needs a force that gives U.S. leaders retaliatory options they might actually employ. If the only retaliatory option entails killing millions of civilians, then the U.S. deterrent will lack credibility. Giving U.S. leaders alternatives that do not target civilians is both wise and just. A counterforce attack--whether using conventional munitions or low- or high-yield nuclear weapons--would be fraught with peril. Even a small possibility of a single enemy warhead's surviving such a strike would undoubtedly give any U.S. leader great pause. But in the midst of a conventional war, if an enemy were using nuclear threats or limited nuclear attacks to try to coerce the United States or its allies, these would be the capabilities that would give a U.S. president real options. [GOOD THINGS IN SMALL PACKAGES](http://web.ebscohost.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/ehost/detail?vid=3&hid=113&sid=4a8087ff-fe77-45d2-b2bb-70d04b414572%40sessionmgr111&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#toc)  As THE United States restructures its nuclear arsenal and overall strategic posture, it should ensure that it has three distinct capabilities. First, it still needs some high-yield nuclear weapons (such as those deployed on land-based missiles and in submarines), although fewer than it currently possesses. If the U.S. military had to destroy an enemy's nuclear force in circumstances so dire that collateral damage was not a major concern, these weapons would provide the best odds of success. They maximize the odds of getting the target, albeit at the cost of enormous collateral damage. The United States also needs conventional counterforce weapons. The U.S. military already fields precision nonnuclear weapons that can destroy nuclear targets, and the Pentagon has wisely made conventional capabilities a key element of its "global strike" mission, which seeks the capacity to hit any target anywhere in the world in less than an hour. Conventional weapons permit the United States to conduct a counterforce strike without crossing the nuclear threshold, and without killing millions. To illustrate the promise of conventional counterforce, we modeled an attack on 20 land-based silos using B-2 bombers and bombs guided by GPS. If GPS signals were not jammed, an attack would destroy most of the silos and have about a 50-50 chance of destroying them all. The problem with conventional counterforce weapons is that, lacking the destructive power of nuclear weapons, they depend on pinpoint accuracy. If an enemy can jam GPS signals near the target, the odds of destroying all 20 silos with current bombs are essentially nil. In short, conventional weapons offer the ability to destroy an enemy's nuclear forces with minimal collateral damage, although with only a fair chance of success. For the third leg of the U.S. strategic force, the United States should retain the lowest-yield warheads in its nuclear arsenal and (if it has not already done so) enhance their accuracy. If the low-yield nuclear bombs and cruise missiles, which reportedly use inertial guidance systems, were even half as accurate as their conventional, GPS-guided cousins, they could match the effectiveness of high-yield nuclear weapons while inflicting casualties more akin to those caused by conventional bombs. Improving the accuracy of the United States' low-yield nuclear bombs and cruise missiles may not be as simple as attaching GPS guidance systems. The Pentagon has been reluctant to use GPS on nuclear weapons because adversaries might conduct intense GPS jamming near their high-value targets or disrupt GPS transmissions with high-altitude nuclear detonations. But GPS may still have a role. The United States has overcome local GPS jamming in the past. More important, the enhanced accuracy gained by having GPS guidance during even half of a weapon's flight time--before the signal is lost--would be enough in many circumstances to permit a highly effective, low-casualty counterforce strike. Whether the slight accuracy improvements come from GPS, next-generation inertial guidance, or other technologies, high-accuracy delivery systems with low-yield weapons should form the backbone of the U.S. nuclear deterrent. [CONFRONTING NUCLEAR REALITIES](http://web.ebscohost.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/ehost/detail?vid=3&hid=113&sid=4a8087ff-fe77-45d2-b2bb-70d04b414572%40sessionmgr111&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#toc)  CRITICS MAY object to such calculations on the grounds that this approach evaluates the U.S. nuclear arsenal by measuring its capability to carry out nuclear strikes when the real purpose of the arsenal should be to deter wars, not fight them. According to this criticism, whether U.S. nuclear forces can destroy Chinese, North Korean, or (in the future) Iranian nuclear targets during a war is irrelevant, and planning for such contingencies is macabre. But this criticism is incoherent. Deterrence depends on the capacity to carry out threats. Retaining that capacity is not a sign that the United States has moved beyond deterrence to a war-fighting posture for its nuclear arsenal; rather, the capacity to execute threats is the very foundation of deterrence. Of course, a deterrent threat also needs to be credible--that is, an adversary needs to be convinced that a retaliatory threat will actually be executed. If not backed by the capability and the credibility to execute threats, deterrence is merely a dangerous bluff. A deterrent force should therefore provide decision-makers with options they would conceivably execute if their redlines were crossed. Otherwise, allies will question U.S. assurances, adversaries will doubt U.S. threats, and a U.S. president may confront an escalating crisis without any acceptable options. More broadly, any analyst or policymaker who proposes a nuclear posture for the United States must answer four fundamental questions: What enemy actions are to be deterred? Under what circumstances might those actions be taken? What threats would a U.S. president wish to issue? And does the proposed arsenal give the president the ability to carry out those threats? Without working through the grim realities of deterrence, the United States risks creating a force that gives the president no acceptable choices and therefore will not reliably deter U.S. enemies. A second criticism of the argument for retaining and improving certain counterforce capabilities is that the cure could be worse than the disease. Counterforce capabilities may mitigate escalation during a conflict--for example, by dissuading adversaries from nuclear saber rattling, by reassuring allies that the United States can defend them, and, if necessary, by giving the United States the ability to pursue regime change if adversaries brandish or use nuclear weapons. But they may also exacerbate the problem of controlling escalation if an adversary feels so threatened that it adopts a hair-trigger nuclear doctrine. Specifically, the United States' ability to launch a disarming strike without killing millions of civilians might increase the escalatory pressures that already exist because of the nature of the U.S. military's standard wartime strategy. Conventional air strikes on radar systems, communication links, and leadership bunkers may look even more like the precursors of a preemptive disarming strike if adversaries know that the United States possesses a well-honed nuclear counter-force capability.

#### Escalates to great power nuclear war

**Caves 10** (John P. Jr., Senior Research Fellow in the Center for the Study of Weapons of Mass Destruction – National Defense University, “Avoiding a Crisis of Confidence in the U.S. Nuclear Deterrent”, Strategic Forum, No. 252, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/docUploaded/SF%20252\_John%20Caves.pdf)

Perceptions of a compromised U.S. nuclear deterrent as described above would have profound policy implications, particu­larly if they emerge at a time when a nuclear-armed great power is pursuing a more aggressive strategy toward U.S. allies and partners in its region in a bid to enhance its regional and global clout.

■ A dangerous period of vulnerability would open for the United States and those nations that depend on U.S. protection while the United States attempted to rectify the problems with its nuclear forces. As it would take more than a decade for the United States to produce new nuclear weapons, ensuing events could preclude a return to anything like the status quo ante.

■ The assertive, nuclear-armed great power, and other major adversaries, could be willing to challenge U.S. interests more directly in the expectation that the United States would be less prepared to threaten or deliver a military response that could lead to direct conflict. They will want to keep the United States from reclaiming its earlier power position.

■ Allies and partners who have relied upon explicit or implicit assurances of U.S. nuclear protection as a foundation of their security could lose faith in those assur­ances. They could compensate by accom­modating U.S. rivals, especially in the short term, or acquiring their own nuclear deter­rents, which in most cases could be accom­plished only over the mid- to long term. A more nuclear world would likely ensue over a period of years.

■ Important U.S. interests could be com­promised or abandoned, or a major war could occur as adversaries and/or the United States miscalculate new boundaries of deterrence and provocation. At worst, war could lead to state-on-state employment of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) on a scale far more catastrophic than what nuclear-armed terror­ists alone could inflict.

#### Export infrastructure exists – we can use import terminals to export

Levi 12 (Michael, Senior Fellow for Energy and Environment – Council on Foreign Relations, “A Strategy for U.S. Natural Gas Exports,” Hamilton Project – Brookings Institute, June, Discussion Paper 2012-04, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/6/13%20exports%20levi/06\_exports\_levi)

Additional gains would be realized because natural gas exports would exploit existing LNG infrastructure (i.e. some parts of existing import terminals) that would otherwise go unused and thus be worthless. These gains should approximately equal the value of the utilized LNG terminals (not including the value of their regasification facilities, which are not useful for exports), which are typically on the order of $1 billion for each billion cubic feet a day of capacity. Spread over a notional fifteen-year use period, this would add approximately $70 million a year for each billion cubic feet a day of exports. This brings the total estimated surplus from six billion cubic feet a day of exports to $3.1 billion to $3.7 billion.

### New Exports Impact – Rd. 8 vs. Iowa DH

#### Scenario : Chinese Rare Earth

#### Absent LNG exports, China will win tougher restrictions on rare earth exports

Levi 12 (Michael, Senior Fellow for Energy and Environment – Council on Foreign Relations, “A Strategy for U.S. Natural Gas Exports,” Hamilton Project – Brookings Institute, June, Discussion Paper 2012-04, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/6/13%20exports%20levi/06\_exports\_levi)

Potential U.S. exports might also be exploited for wider strategic gain under the right conditions. Current U.S. law makes approval of exports to markets with which the United States has free-trade agreements essentially automatic, but requires extensive review and subsequent approval for exports to others. This ought to give the United States leverage in broader trade negotiations with would-be importers. For example, Japanese officials and market participants have noticed that the recent U.S.-South Korea free-trade agreement will give South Korea special access to U.S. natural gas exports, and have inquired as to whether Japanese participation in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) trade arrangement would give them similar privileges (Interviews 2011). Regardless of whether Japanese and other policymakers are wise in wanting direct access to U.S. exports, this sort of dynamic can only strengthen the U.S. hand in international trade negotiations, which can lead to broader gains for U.S. consumers and firms. Conversely, if the United States were to restrain LNG exports, it would almost certainly face wider trade-related problems. The consequences could be broad, affecting support for open trade in general, but they would likely have special impact on **other resource-related disputes**. Article XI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) prohibits sustained quantitative restrictions on energy exports unless they are related “to the conservation of exhaustible natural resources if such measures are made effective in conjunction with restrictions on domestic production or consumption” (Selivanova 2007). U.S. policy would be the opposite: it would be made in conjunction with efforts to encourage both domestic production and consumption of natural gas. Indeed, the United States has recently joined Europe and Japan in challenging Chinese restrictions on exports of **rare earth metals**—which are critical to a variety of defense, electronics, and energy technologies—at the World Trade Organization (WTO) (Palmer 2011). The arguments that the United States would need to invoke in order to restrain LNG exports—particularly the prospects of environmental damage and harm to domestic industry—are precisely those that China would like to use to defend its own restrictions on rare earths exports; China could all but take the U.S. justification of curbs on LNG exports, change a few words, and use it in its own defense. It would likely be difficult for the United States to sustain limits to U.S. LNG exports while fighting Chinese limits on exports of rare earth metals.

#### Even if exports don’t get approved, the plan alone removes US hypocrisy towards rare earth

Tamny 12 (John, “China's "Rare Earths", and the Hypocrisy of the Obama Administration,” Forbes, 3-25, http://www.forbes.com/sites/johntamny/2012/03/25/chinas-rare-earths-and-the-hyprocrisy-of-the-obama-administration/)

As is well known now, the Obama administration recently joined the EU and Japan in a lawsuit filed at the World Trade Organization over China’s alleged restrictions on the export of rare earth elements. For those who’ve properly ignored what until now should have been a non-story, “rare earths” are metals essential for the production of everything from smart phones, to hybrid cars, to military equipment. At present, China produces roughly 95% of rare earths, and it’s of course assumed that the high price of these obscure metals has resulted from export restrictions. Obama et al really ought to look in the mirror on this one, and once they do, leave China alone. To see why, let’s think for a moment about what this is all about. The U.S. and others are telling China – the country – that it must sell more of what is endemic to China. The hypocrisy here is impressive, particularly considering the **myriad restrictions our own government puts on the exploration** for and mining of, nearly everything. What the Obama administration is doing here is the equivalent of China going to the WTO with a lawsuit demanding that we open up more of Alaska and other oil rich locales controlled by the U.S., not to mention reduce the various regulations controlling the mining of other commodities that the U.S. is rich in. If the Chinese were to do so, there’s no telling what the negative reaction would be from the U.S. political class, not to mention its citizenry. We’d be rightfully offended for another country nosing in on what should be a U.S. matter. It’s arguable that what makes the U.S. great is our collective lack of self-awareness that often reveals itself through some of the most disruptive entrepreneurial innovations known to mankind, but goodness, aren’t we crossing the line when we meddle in the affairs of other countries; essentially saying to them “Mine what we tell you to, and then sell to us”? A little humility is surely in order, for one.

#### **Hypocrisy is key – it’s the sole reason for Chinese protectionism**

Deas 8 (Destiny, JD – Duke University, Board of Community Disaster Relief Fund in Shrevport, “The Costs of Perceived Hypocrisy: the Impact of U.S. Treatment of Foreign Acquisitions of Domestic Enterprises,” Duke Law Journal, 57 Duke L.J. 1795, Lexis)

Both the Chinese and U.S. acquisition rules may also run afoul of World Trade Organization (WTO) commitments. The United States has argued that its own acquisition n11 rules are no more restrictive than necessary to maintain national security. n12 Even if this argument is accepted, the perceived hypocrisy of the United States blocking politically unpopular acquisitions of U.S. entities by Chinese companies while simultaneously urging more openness in the global market undermines American influence and credibility. The costs of [\*1798] this perceived hypocrisy are not always clearly defined or restricted to national borders. Part I of this Note examines the relationship between the U.S. and Chinese policies regarding acquisitions of domestic enterprises by foreign investors. It describes how U.S. policies have triggered **heightened protectionism in China**. Part II analyzes the legality of U.S. and Chinese acquisition rules in light of both countries' commitments to the WTO's General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). It concludes that both countries have violated their obligations under the GATS, and it argues that these violations carry potential costs to the United States, China, and the world economy. Given U.S. commitments to free trade in services through the GATS, the United States must consider the impact of the perception of its own seemingly anti-free trade policies on the rest of the world, both in terms of developing the policies of their trading partners and in terms of the economic costs of violating treaty obligations.

#### China will price the US out by the end of 2012 – collapsing civilization

**Adams 10** (Mike, Editor – NaturalNews, “Global Supply of Rare Earth Elements Could Be Wiped Out by 2012”, 1-26, <http://www.naturalnews.com/028028_rare_earth_elements_mining.html>)

It's the bubble you've probably never heard of: The *rare earth bubble*. And it's due to pop in 2012, potentially devastating the industries of western nations that depend on these rare elements. What industries are those? The automobile industry uses tens of thousands of tons of rare earth elements each year, and advanced military technology depends on these elements, too. Lots of "green" technologies depend on them, including wind turbines, low-energy light bulbs and hybrid [car](http://www.naturalnews.com/car.html) batteries. In fact, much of western civilization depends on rare earth elements such as terbium, lanthanum and neodymium. So what's the problem with these rare elements? 97 percent of the world's supply comes from mines in China, and China is prepared to simply stop exporting these strategic elements to the rest of the world by [2012](http://www.naturalnews.com/2012.html). If that happens, the western world will be crippled by the collapse of available rare earth elements. Manufacturing of everything from computers and [electronics](http://www.naturalnews.com/electronics.html) to farm machinery will grind to a halt. Electronics will disappear from the shelves and [prices](http://www.naturalnews.com/prices.html) for manufactured goods that depend on these rare elements will skyrocket. These 17 rare earth elements (REE) -- all of which are metals -- are strategic resources upon which entire nations are built. In many ways, they are similar to rubber -- a resource so valuable and important to the world that many experts call it the "fourth most important [natural](http://www.naturalnews.com/natural.html) resource in the world," right after [water](http://www.naturalnews.com/water.html), steel and oil. Without rubber, you couldn't drive your car to work or water your lawn. Many medical technologies would cease to work and virtually all commercial construction would grind to a halt. Many of the strategic battles fought in World War II were fought, in fact, over control of rubber, most of which now comes through Singapore and its surrounding regions (Malaysia and Indonesia). Global shortage of Rare Earth Elements coming... Now, by threatening to cut off the world's supply of rare earth elements, China appears to be attempting to monopolize this extremely important strategic resource. According to information received by The Independent, by 2012 China may cease all exports of rare earth elements, reserving them for its own economic expansion. An article in that paper quotes REE expert Jack Lifton as saying, "A real crunch is coming. In [America](http://www.naturalnews.com/America.html), Britain and elsewhere we have not yet woken up to the fact that there is an urgent need to secure the supply of rare earths from sources outside China." And yet virtually no one has heard of this problem! People are familiar with peak [oil](http://www.naturalnews.com/oil.html), global warming, ocean acidification, the national debt and the depletion of fossil water, but very few are aware of the looming crisis in rare metals... upon which much of western civilization rests.

#### And --- it crushes hard power in Asia

**Richardson 10** (Michael, Visiting Senior Research Fellow – Institute of South East Asian Studies (Singapore), “China’s Chokehold on Rare-Earth Minerals Raises Concerns”, 10-8, http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/chinas-rare-earth-minerals)

Yet China could keep its dominant grip on the rare-earths industry for some years. It holds 35 percent of global reserves, but supplies over 95 percent of demand for rare-earth oxides, of which 60 percent is domestic, according to Industrial Minerals Company of Australia, a consultancy. Just as important, Chinese companies, many of them state-controlled, have advanced in their quest to make China the world leader in processing rare-earth metals into finished materials. Success in this quest could give China a decisive advantage not just in civilian industry, including clean energy, but also in military production if Chinese manufacturers were given preferential treatment over foreign competitors. Cerium is the most abundant of the 17 rare earths, all of which have similar chemical properties. A cerium-based coating is non-corrosive and has significant military applications. The Pentagon is due to finish a report soon on the risks of US military dependence on rare earths from China. Their use is widespread in the defense systems of the US, its allies, and other countries that buy its weapons and equipment. In a report to the US Congress in April, the Government Accountability Office said that it had been told by officials and defense industry executives that where rare-earth alloys and other materials were used in military systems, they were “responsible for the functionality of the component and would be difficult to replace without losing performance.” For example, fin actuators in precision-guided bombs are specifically designed around the capabilities of neodymium iron boron rare-earth magnets. The main US battle tank, the M1A2 Abrams, has a reference and navigation system that relies on samarium cobalt magnets from China. An official report last year on the US national defense stockpile said that shortages of four rare earths – lanthanum, cerium, europium and gadolinium – had already caused delays in producing some weapons. It recommended further study to determine the severity of the delays.

#### Nuclear war

**Walton 7** (C. Dale, Lecturer in International Relations and Strategic Studies – University of Reading, Geopolitics and the Great Powers in the 21st Century, p. 49)

Obviously, it is of vital importance to the United States that the PRC does not become the hegemon of Eastern Eurasia. As rioted above, however, regardless of what Washington does. China’s success in such an endeavor is not as easily attainable as pessimists might assume. The PRC appears to be on track to be a very great power indeed. hut geopolitical conditions are not favorable for any Chinese effort to establish sole hegemony; a robust multipolar system should suffice to keep China in check, even with only minimal American intervention in local squabbles. The more worrisome danger is that Beijing will cooperate with a great power partner, establishing a very muscular axis. Such an entity would present a critical danger to the balance of power, thus both necessitating very active American intervention in Eastern Eurasia and creating the underlying conditions for a massive, and probably nuclear, great power war. Absent such a “super—threat,” however, the demands on American leaders ill be far more subtle: creating the conditions for Washington’s gentle decline from playing the role of unipolar quasi-hegemony to being “merely” the greatest of time worlds powers, while aiding in the creation of a healthy multipolar system that is not marked by close great power alliances.

#### Rare earth access is key to first-strike missile guidance

**Kennedy 10** (J., President – Wings Enterprise, “Critical and Strategic Failure of Rare Earth Resources”, March, http://www.smenet.org/rareEarthsProject/TMS-NMAB-paperV-3.pdf)

The national defense issues are equally important. Rare earths are critical components for military jet engines, guided missiles and bombs, electrical countermeasures, anti-missile systems, satellite communication systems and armor, yet the U.S. has no domestic sources. Innovation Drives Industry – Industry Carries the EconomyAdvances in Materials Science are a result of tireless innovation; innovation seeking improvements in the performance and characteristics of material properties or a change in their form or function. Much of this work must eventually translate into commercial and military applications. Today many advances in material science are achieved through the application of rare earth oxides, elements and alloys. This group of elements, also known as the lanthanide series, represents the only known bridge to the next level of improved performance in the material properties for many metallurgical alloys, electrical conductivity, and instrument sensitivity and in some cases a mechanical or physical change in function. These lanthanides hold unique chemical, magnetic, electrical, luminescence and radioactive shielding characteristics. Combined with other elements they can help maintain or alter physical and structural characteristics under changing conditions. Today, these rare earth elements are essential to every computer hard drive, cell phone, energy efficient light bulb, many automotive pollution control devices and catalysts, hybrid automobiles and most, if not all, military guidance systems and advanced armor. Tomorrow, they will be used in ultra capacity wind turbines, magnetic refrigeration, zero emission automobiles, superconductors, sub-light-speed computer processors, nano-particle technologies for material and metallurgical applications, structurally amorphous metals, next generation military armor and TERFENOL-D Radar. America must lead in these developments. The entire U.S. defense system is completely interdependent upon REO enhanced technologies for our most advanced weapons guidance systems, advanced armor, secure communications, radar, advanced radar systems, weapons triggering systems and un-manned Drones. REO dependent weapons technologies are predominantly represented in our ‘first strike’ and un-manned capabilities. This national defense issue is not a case of limited exposure for first-strike capabilities. This first-strike vulnerability translates into risk exposure in every level of our national defense system, as the system is built around our presumptive technological and first-strike superiority. Yet the DoD has abandon its traditional procurement protocols for “strategic and critical” materials and components for weapons systems in favor of “the principles of free trade vii.”

#### Future conflicts are inevitable and will draw-in the U.S. --- effective guidance is key to prevent escalation and nuclear war in Korea, Taiwan, and the Mideast

**Lieber and Press 9** (Keir A., Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program – Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and Daryl G., Associate Professor of Government – Dartmouth College, “The Nukes We Need”, Foreign Affairs, November/December, 88(6), Ebsco)

Unfortunately, deterrence in the twenty-first century may be far more difficult for the United States than it was in the past, and having the right mix of nuclear capabilities to deal with the new challenges will be crucial. The United States leads a global network of alliances, a position that commits Washington to protecting countries all over the world. Many of its potential adversaries have acquired, or appear to be seeking, nuclear weapons. Unless the world's major disputes are resolved--for example, on the Korean Peninsula, across the Taiwan Strait, and around the Persian Gulf--or the U.S. military pulls back from these regions, the United States will sooner or later find itself embroiled in conventional wars with nuclear-armed adversaries. Preventing escalation in those circumstances will be far more difficult than peacetime deterrence during the Cold War. In a conventional war, U.S. adversaries would have powerful incentives to brandish or use nuclear weapons because their lives, their families, and the survival of their regimes would be at stake. Therefore, as the United States considers the future of its nuclear arsenal, it should judge its force not against the relatively easy mission of peacetime deterrence but against the demanding mission of deterring escalation during a conventional conflict, when U.S. enemies are fighting for their lives. Debating the future of the U.S. nuclear arsenal is critical now because the Obama administration has pledged to pursue steep cuts in the force and has launched a major review of U.S. nuclear policy. (The results will be reported to Congress in February 2010.) The administration's desire to shrink the U.S. arsenal is understandable. Although the force is only one-fourth the size it was when the Cold War ended, it still includes roughly 2,200 operational strategic warheads--more than enough to retaliate against any conceivable nuclear attack. Furthermore, as we previously argued in these pages ("The Rise of U.S. Nuclear Primacy," March/April 2006), the current U.S. arsenal is vastly more capable than its Cold War predecessor, particularly in the area of "counterforce"--the ability to destroy an adversary's nuclear weapons before they can be used. Simply counting U.S. warheads or measuring Washington's counter-force capabilities will not, however, reveal what type of arsenal is needed for deterrence in the twenty-first century. The only way to determine that is to work through the grim logic of deterrence: to consider what actions will need to be deterred, what threats will need to be issued, and what capabilities will be needed to back up those threats. The Obama administration is right that the United States can safely cut its nuclear arsenal, but it must pay careful attention to the capabilities it retains. During a war, if a desperate adversary were to use its nuclear force to try to coerce the United States--for example, by threatening a U.S. ally or even by launching nuclear strikes against U.S. overseas bases--an arsenal comprised solely of high-yield weapons would leave U.S. leaders with terrible retaliatory options. Destroying Pyongyang or Tehran in response to a limited strike would be vastly disproportionate, and doing so might trigger further nuclear attacks in return. A deterrent posture based on such a dubious threat would lack credibility. Instead, a credible deterrent should give U.S. leaders a range of retaliatory options, including the ability to respond to nuclear attacks with either conventional or nuclear strikes, to retaliate with strikes against an enemy's nuclear forces rather than its cities, and to minimize casualties. The foundation for this flexible deterrent exists. The current U.S. arsenal includes a mix of accurate high- and low-yield warheads, offering a wide range of retaliatory options--including the ability to launch precise, very low-casualty nuclear counterforce strikes. The United States must preserve that mix of capabilities--especially the low-yield weapons--as it cuts the size of its nuclear force. [DETERRENCE IN DARK TIMES](http://web.ebscohost.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/ehost/detail?vid=3&hid=113&sid=4a8087ff-fe77-45d2-b2bb-70d04b414572%40sessionmgr111&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#toc)  THE PRIMARY purpose of U.S. nuclear forces is to deter nuclear attacks on the United States and its allies. During peacetime, this is not a demanding mission. The chance that leaders in Beijing, Moscow, or even Pyongyang will launch a surprise nuclear attack tomorrow is vanishingly small. But peacetime deterrence is not the proper yardstick for measuring the adequacy of U.S. nuclear forces. Rather, the United States' arsenal should be designed to provide robust deterrence in the most difficult of plausible circumstances: during a conventional war against a nuclear-armed adversary. In the coming decades, the United States may find itself facing nuclear-armed states on the battlefield. U.S. alliances span the globe, and the United States is frequently drawn into regional conflicts. Washington has launched six major military operations since the fall of the Berlin Wall: in Panama, Somalia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and twice in Iraq. Furthermore, most of the United States' potential adversaries have developed--or seem to be developing--nuclear weapons. Aside from terrorism, the threats that dominate U.S. military planning come from China, North Korea, and Iran: two members of the nuclear club, and one intent on joining it. The central problem for U.S. deterrence in the future is that even rational adversaries will have powerful incentives to introduce nuclear weapons--that is, threaten to use them, put them on alert, test them, or even use them--during a conventional war against the United States. If U.S. military forces begin to prevail on the battlefield, U.S. adversaries may use nuclear threats to compel a cease-fire or deny the United States access to allied military bases. Such threats might succeed in pressuring the United States to settle the conflict short of a decisive victory. Such escalatory strategies are rational. Losing a conventional war to the United States would be a disastrous outcome for any leader, and it would be worth taking great risks to force a cease-fire and avert total defeat. The fate of recent U.S. adversaries is revealing. The ex-dictator of Panama, Manuel Noriega, remains in a Miami prison. The former Bosnian Serb leader, Radovan Karadzic, awaits trial in The Hague, where Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic died in detention three years ago. Saddam Husseins punishment for losing the 2003 war was total: his government was toppled, his sons were killed, and he was hanged on a dimly lit gallows, surrounded by enemies. Even those leaders who have eluded the United States--such as the Somali warlord Muhammad Farah Aidid and Osama bin Laden--have done so despite intense U.S. efforts to capture or kill them. The United States' overseas conflicts are limited wars only from the U.S. perspective; to adversaries, they are existential. It should not be surprising if they use every weapon at their disposal to stave off total defeat. Coercive nuclear escalation may sound like a far-fetched strategy, but it was NATO'S policy during much of the Cold War. The Western allies felt that they were hopelessly outgunned in Europe at the conventional level by the Warsaw Pact. Even though NATO harbored little hope of prevailing in a nuclear war, it planned to initiate a series of escalating nuclear operations at the outbreak of war--alerts, tactical nuclear strikes, and wider nuclear attacks--to force the Soviets to accept a cease-fire. The United States' future adversaries face the same basic problem today: vast conventional military inferiority. They may adopt the same solution. Leaders in Beijing may choose gradual, coercive escalation if they face imminent military defeat in the Taiwan Strait--a loss that could weaken the Chinese Communist Party's grip on power. And if U.S. military forces were advancing toward Pyongyang, there is no reason to expect that North Korean leaders would keep their nuclear weapons on the sidelines. Layered on top of these challenges are two additional ones. First, U.S. conventional military doctrine is inherently escalatory. The new American way of war involves launching simultaneous air and ground attacks throughout the theater to blind, confuse, and overwhelm the enemy. Even if the United States decided to leave the adversary's leaders in power (stopping short of regime change so as to prevent the confrontation from escalating), how would Washington credibly convey the assurance that it was not seeking regime change once its adversary was blinded by attacks on its radar and communication systems and command bunkers? A central strategic puzzle of modern war is that the tactics best suited to dominating the conventional battlefield are the same ones most likely to trigger nuclear escalation. Furthermore, managing complex military operations to prevent escalation is always difficult. In 1991, in the lead-up to the Persian Gulf War, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker assured Iraq's foreign minister, Tariq Aziz, that the United States would leave Saddam's regime in power as long as Iraq did not use its chemical or biological weapons. But despite Baker's assurance, the U.S. military unleashed a major bombing campaign targeting Iraq's leaders, which on at least one occasion nearly killed Saddam. The political intent to control escalation was not reflected in the military operations, which nearly achieved a regime change. In future confrontations with nuclear-armed adversaries, the United States will undoubtedly want to prevent nuclear escalation. But the leaders of U.S. adversaries will face life-and-death incentives to use their nuclear arsenals to force a cease-fire and remain in power. [THE CASE FOR COUNTERFORCE](http://web.ebscohost.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/ehost/detail?vid=3&hid=113&sid=4a8087ff-fe77-45d2-b2bb-70d04b414572%40sessionmgr111&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#toc)  IF THE United States hopes to deter nuclear attacks during conventional wars, it must figure out how it might respond to such attacks, and it must retain the nuclear forces to do so. The most horrific retaliatory threat that the United States might issue--to destroy cities if enemy leaders brandish or use nuclear weapons--is a poor foundation for deterrence. First, this threat lacks credibility. Destroying cities would be a vastly disproportionate response if an enemy used nuclear weapons against a purely military target, such as a U.S. carrier group at sea or even a U.S. base located away from a major city (such as the U.S. airfields on Guam or Okinawa). During recent wars, the United States has labored to minimize enemy civilian casualties. It is hard to believe that Washington would reverse course and intentionally slaughter hundreds of thousands of civilians, especially if no U.S. or allied city has been destroyed. Moreover, a retaliatory strike on an enemy city would not even achieve critical military objectives, so the horrendous consequences would be inflicted for little purpose. If an enemy used nuclear weapons, the most pressing U.S. objective would be to prevent further nuclear attacks. Destroying one of the enemy's cities--even its capital--would neither eliminate its nuclear forces nor even necessarily kill its leaders. Nor could the United States respond to an enemy's limited nuclear strike simply by marching to its capital city to capture and hang its leaders; that would leave time for more strikes on allies' cities. In such a crisis, the United States would need to stop the enemy's nuclear attacks immediately. Of course, no one knows how a U.S. president would respond in such dark circumstances. It is possible that the United States would retaliate by attacking enemy cities--fear or anger might prevail over reason. But that mere possibility is a perilous foundation for deterrence. A credible deterrent must give U.S. leaders acceptable options in the event an enemy were to use nuclear weapons. An arsenal that can only destroy cities fails that test. The least bad option in the face of explicit nuclear threats or after a limited nuclear strike may be a counterforce attack to prevent further nuclear use. A counterforce strike could be conducted with either conventional or nuclear weapons, or a mix of the two. The attack could be limited to the enemy's nuclear delivery systems--for example, its bombers and missile silos--or a wider range of sites related to its nuclear program. Ideally, a U.S. counterforce strike would completely destroy the enemy's nuclear forces. But if an adversary had already launched a nuclear attack against the United States or its allies, a response that greatly reduced the adversary's nuclear force could save countless lives, and it could open the door to decisive military actions (such as conquest and regime change) to punish the enemy's leadership for using nuclear weapons. During the last decades of the Cold War, the nuclear arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union were too big to be completely destroyed in a disarming strike, and, in any case, their nuclear delivery systems were not accurate enough to destroy large numbers of hardened targets. But the world has changed. Washington's potential adversaries field much smaller arsenals. Meanwhile, U.S. delivery systems have grown vastly more accurate. [MODELING THE UNTHINKABLE](http://web.ebscohost.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/ehost/detail?vid=3&hid=113&sid=4a8087ff-fe77-45d2-b2bb-70d04b414572%40sessionmgr111&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#toc)  To ILLUSTRATE the growth in U.S. counterforce capabilities, we applied a set of simple formulas that analysts have used for decades to estimate the effectiveness of counterforce attacks. We modeled a U.S. strike on a small target set: 20 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMS) in hardened silos, the approximate size of China's current long-range, silo-based missile force. The analysis compared the capabilities of a 1985 Minuteman ICBM to those of a modern Trident II submarine-launched ballistic missile.[1] In 1985, a single U.S. ICBM warhead had less than a 60 percent chance of destroying a typical silo. Even if four or five additional warheads were used, the cumulative odds of destroying the silo would never exceed 90 percent because of the problem of "fratricide," whereby incoming warheads destroy each other. Beyond five warheads, adding more does no good. A probability of 90 percent might sound high, but it falls far short if the goal is to completely disarm an enemy: with a 90 percent chance of destroying each target, the odds of destroying all 20 are roughly 12 percent. In 1985, then, a U.S. ICBM attack had little chance of destroying even a small enemy nuclear arsenal. Today, a multiple-warhead attack on a single silo using a Trident II missile would have a roughly 99 percent chance of destroying it, and the probability that a barrage would destroy all 20 targets is well above 95 percent. Given the accuracy of the U.S. military's current delivery systems, the only question is target identification: silos that can be found can be destroyed. During the Cold War, the United States worked hard to pinpoint Soviet nuclear forces, with great success. Locating potential adversaries' small nuclear arsenals is undoubtedly a top priority for U.S. intelligence today. The revolution in accuracy is producing an even more momentous change: it is becoming possible for the United States to conduct low- yield nuclear counterforce strikes that inflict relatively few casualties. A U.S. Department of Defense computer model, called the Hazard Prediction and Assessment Capability (HPAC), estimates the dispersion of deadly radioactive fallout in a given region after a nuclear detonation. The software uses the warhead's explosive power, the height of the burst, and data about local weather and demographics to estimate how much fallout would be generated, where it would blow, and how many people it would injure or kill. HPAC results can be chilling. In 2006, a team of nuclear weapons analysts from the Federation of American Scientists (FAS) and the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) used HPAC to estimate the consequences of a U.S. nuclear attack using high-yield warheads against China's ICBM field. Even though China's silos are located in the countryside, the model predicted that the fallout would blow; over a large area, killing 3-4 million people. U.S. counterforce capabilities were useless, the study implied, because even a limited strike would kill an unconscionable number of civilians. But the United States can already conduct nuclear counterforce strikes at a tiny fraction of the human devastation that the FAS/NRDC study predicted, and small additional improvements to the U.S. force could dramatically reduce the potential collateral damage even further. The United States' nuclear weapons are now so accurate that it can conduct successful counterforce attacks using the smallest-yield warheads in the arsenal, rather than the huge warheads that the FAS/NRDC simulation modeled. And to further reduce the fallout, the weapons can be set to detonate as airbursts, which would allow most of the radiation to dissipate in the upper atmosphere. We ran multiple HPAC scenarios against the identical target set used in the FAS/NRDC study but modeled low-yield airbursts rather than high-yield groundbursts. The fatality estimates plunged from 3-4 million to less than 700--a figure comparable to the number of civilians reportedly killed since 2006 in Pakistan by U.S. drone strikes. One should be skeptical about the results of any model that depends on unpredictable factors, such as wind speed and direction. But in the scenarios we modeled, the area of lethal fallout was so small that very few civilians would have become ill or died, regardless of which way the wind blew. Critics may cringe at this analysis. Many of them, understandably, say that nuclear weapons are--and should remain--unusable. But if the United States is to retain these weapons for the purpose of deterring nuclear attacks, it needs a force that gives U.S. leaders retaliatory options they might actually employ. If the only retaliatory option entails killing millions of civilians, then the U.S. deterrent will lack credibility. Giving U.S. leaders alternatives that do not target civilians is both wise and just. A counterforce attack--whether using conventional munitions or low- or high-yield nuclear weapons--would be fraught with peril. Even a small possibility of a single enemy warhead's surviving such a strike would undoubtedly give any U.S. leader great pause. But in the midst of a conventional war, if an enemy were using nuclear threats or limited nuclear attacks to try to coerce the United States or its allies, these would be the capabilities that would give a U.S. president real options. [GOOD THINGS IN SMALL PACKAGES](http://web.ebscohost.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/ehost/detail?vid=3&hid=113&sid=4a8087ff-fe77-45d2-b2bb-70d04b414572%40sessionmgr111&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#toc)  As THE United States restructures its nuclear arsenal and overall strategic posture, it should ensure that it has three distinct capabilities. First, it still needs some high-yield nuclear weapons (such as those deployed on land-based missiles and in submarines), although fewer than it currently possesses. If the U.S. military had to destroy an enemy's nuclear force in circumstances so dire that collateral damage was not a major concern, these weapons would provide the best odds of success. They maximize the odds of getting the target, albeit at the cost of enormous collateral damage. The United States also needs conventional counterforce weapons. The U.S. military already fields precision nonnuclear weapons that can destroy nuclear targets, and the Pentagon has wisely made conventional capabilities a key element of its "global strike" mission, which seeks the capacity to hit any target anywhere in the world in less than an hour. Conventional weapons permit the United States to conduct a counterforce strike without crossing the nuclear threshold, and without killing millions. To illustrate the promise of conventional counterforce, we modeled an attack on 20 land-based silos using B-2 bombers and bombs guided by GPS. If GPS signals were not jammed, an attack would destroy most of the silos and have about a 50-50 chance of destroying them all. The problem with conventional counterforce weapons is that, lacking the destructive power of nuclear weapons, they depend on pinpoint accuracy. If an enemy can jam GPS signals near the target, the odds of destroying all 20 silos with current bombs are essentially nil. In short, conventional weapons offer the ability to destroy an enemy's nuclear forces with minimal collateral damage, although with only a fair chance of success. For the third leg of the U.S. strategic force, the United States should retain the lowest-yield warheads in its nuclear arsenal and (if it has not already done so) enhance their accuracy. If the low-yield nuclear bombs and cruise missiles, which reportedly use inertial guidance systems, were even half as accurate as their conventional, GPS-guided cousins, they could match the effectiveness of high-yield nuclear weapons while inflicting casualties more akin to those caused by conventional bombs. Improving the accuracy of the United States' low-yield nuclear bombs and cruise missiles may not be as simple as attaching GPS guidance systems. The Pentagon has been reluctant to use GPS on nuclear weapons because adversaries might conduct intense GPS jamming near their high-value targets or disrupt GPS transmissions with high-altitude nuclear detonations. But GPS may still have a role. The United States has overcome local GPS jamming in the past. More important, the enhanced accuracy gained by having GPS guidance during even half of a weapon's flight time--before the signal is lost--would be enough in many circumstances to permit a highly effective, low-casualty counterforce strike. Whether the slight accuracy improvements come from GPS, next-generation inertial guidance, or other technologies, high-accuracy delivery systems with low-yield weapons should form the backbone of the U.S. nuclear deterrent. [CONFRONTING NUCLEAR REALITIES](http://web.ebscohost.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/ehost/detail?vid=3&hid=113&sid=4a8087ff-fe77-45d2-b2bb-70d04b414572%40sessionmgr111&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#toc)  CRITICS MAY object to such calculations on the grounds that this approach evaluates the U.S. nuclear arsenal by measuring its capability to carry out nuclear strikes when the real purpose of the arsenal should be to deter wars, not fight them. According to this criticism, whether U.S. nuclear forces can destroy Chinese, North Korean, or (in the future) Iranian nuclear targets during a war is irrelevant, and planning for such contingencies is macabre. But this criticism is incoherent. Deterrence depends on the capacity to carry out threats. Retaining that capacity is not a sign that the United States has moved beyond deterrence to a war-fighting posture for its nuclear arsenal; rather, the capacity to execute threats is the very foundation of deterrence. Of course, a deterrent threat also needs to be credible--that is, an adversary needs to be convinced that a retaliatory threat will actually be executed. If not backed by the capability and the credibility to execute threats, deterrence is merely a dangerous bluff. A deterrent force should therefore provide decision-makers with options they would conceivably execute if their redlines were crossed. Otherwise, allies will question U.S. assurances, adversaries will doubt U.S. threats, and a U.S. president may confront an escalating crisis without any acceptable options. More broadly, any analyst or policymaker who proposes a nuclear posture for the United States must answer four fundamental questions: What enemy actions are to be deterred? Under what circumstances might those actions be taken? What threats would a U.S. president wish to issue? And does the proposed arsenal give the president the ability to carry out those threats? Without working through the grim realities of deterrence, the United States risks creating a force that gives the president no acceptable choices and therefore will not reliably deter U.S. enemies. A second criticism of the argument for retaining and improving certain counterforce capabilities is that the cure could be worse than the disease. Counterforce capabilities may mitigate escalation during a conflict--for example, by dissuading adversaries from nuclear saber rattling, by reassuring allies that the United States can defend them, and, if necessary, by giving the United States the ability to pursue regime change if adversaries brandish or use nuclear weapons. But they may also exacerbate the problem of controlling escalation if an adversary feels so threatened that it adopts a hair-trigger nuclear doctrine. Specifically, the United States' ability to launch a disarming strike without killing millions of civilians might increase the escalatory pressures that already exist because of the nature of the U.S. military's standard wartime strategy. Conventional air strikes on radar systems, communication links, and leadership bunkers may look even more like the precursors of a preemptive disarming strike if adversaries know that the United States possesses a well-honed nuclear counter-force capability.

#### Escalates to great power nuclear war

**Caves 10** (John P. Jr., Senior Research Fellow in the Center for the Study of Weapons of Mass Destruction – National Defense University, “Avoiding a Crisis of Confidence in the U.S. Nuclear Deterrent”, Strategic Forum, No. 252, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/docUploaded/SF%20252\_John%20Caves.pdf)

Perceptions of a compromised U.S. nuclear deterrent as described above would have profound policy implications, particu­larly if they emerge at a time when a nuclear-armed great power is pursuing a more aggressive strategy toward U.S. allies and partners in its region in a bid to enhance its regional and global clout.

■ A dangerous period of vulnerability would open for the United States and those nations that depend on U.S. protection while the United States attempted to rectify the problems with its nuclear forces. As it would take more than a decade for the United States to produce new nuclear weapons, ensuing events could preclude a return to anything like the status quo ante.

■ The assertive, nuclear-armed great power, and other major adversaries, could be willing to challenge U.S. interests more directly in the expectation that the United States would be less prepared to threaten or deliver a military response that could lead to direct conflict. They will want to keep the United States from reclaiming its earlier power position.

■ Allies and partners who have relied upon explicit or implicit assurances of U.S. nuclear protection as a foundation of their security could lose faith in those assur­ances. They could compensate by accom­modating U.S. rivals, especially in the short term, or acquiring their own nuclear deter­rents, which in most cases could be accom­plished only over the mid- to long term. A more nuclear world would likely ensue over a period of years.

■ Important U.S. interests could be com­promised or abandoned, or a major war could occur as adversaries and/or the United States miscalculate new boundaries of deterrence and provocation. At worst, war could lead to state-on-state employment of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) on a scale far more catastrophic than what nuclear-armed terror­ists alone could inflict.

## 2AC vs Iowa AK

### T – Restrictions – 2AC

#### That’s what the restrictions are

Hartley and Medlock 7 (Dr. Peter, Professor of Economics – Rice University, Rice Scholar – Baker Institute for Public Policy, and Dr. Kenneth B., Fellow in Energy Policy – Baker Institute for Public Policy, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Economics – Rice University, “North American Security of Natural Gas Supply in a Global Market,” James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy, November, <http://www.bakerinstitute.org/programs/energy-forum/publications/energy-studies/docs/natgas/ng_security-nov07.pdf>)

**Access restrictions** in the United States are in place due to explicit federal prohibition of drilling in environmentally sensitive areas or burdensome conditions required to secure drilling permits in other areas. In this section, we discuss the nature of such restrictions in the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) and the Rocky Mountain region (RMR), and the quantity of resources that are effectively off-limits. Figure 1 and Table 1 illustrate the geographic extent, with the exception of Alaska, and the quantity of resources that are effectively stranded. It is these quantities that we either include or remove from consideration in the scenario analyses outlined below.

#### **CI – “Restrictions” means “regulations” – this evidence is energy specific**

Davies 30 (Major George, “CLAUSE 1.—(Scheme regulating production, supply and sale of coal.),” February, vol 235 cc2453-558, http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1930/feb/27/clause-1-scheme-regulating-production)

Major GEORGE DAVIES The hon. Member says he has heard no reason advanced for this Amendment. I am willing to give him one, and I will tell him that the reason why the benches are not full, as they were a short time ago, is that man cannot live by bread alone and, as there is a rule against the introduction of newspapers and foodstuffs, it is necessary for some of us to refresh ourselves after a late Division. I am not going to transgress the ruling of the Chair, as we have been given very great latitude, but I want to confine myself to the point at issue, which is the regulation of sale. I have had experience in the past of efforts to regulate the sale of sugar. Like the coal industry to-day, there has been in the past an over-production of many of the fundamental articles of the life of a nation. I will not dwell on the case of rubber, but the sugar situation was entirely on all fours with this situation, as it was a question of the regulation of sale. Facing a situation very similar in kind and not dissimilar in degree to the problem now before us, those connected with that particular industry in certain countries thought it an advantage to control and regulate the sale. As soon as you use the word "regulation" in this connection it is idle to suggest that it does not mean restriction. Obviously, that is the point—to restrict—and, while 2541 it is true the word "restrict" is not in this particular Clause, and cannot be argued in connection with this Amendment, yet behind the word "regulate" is the word "restrict," in other words, controlling what has been uncontrolled, production thrown on markets not able to receive it.

#### Natural gas drilling is energy production

CMP No Date (Conservation Measures Partnership, “3 Energy Production & Mining,” *Threats & Actions Taxonomies*, http://www.conservationmeasures.org/initiatives/threats-actions-taxonomies/threats-taxonomy/3-energy-production-mining)

3 Energy Production & Mining

Definition: Threats from production of non-biological resources

Exposition: Various forms of water use (for example, dams for hydro power) could also be put in this class, but these threats seemed more related to other threats that involve alterations to hydrologic regimes. As a result, they should go in 7.2 Dams & Water Management/Use.

3.1 Oil & Gas Drilling

Definition: Exploring for, developing, and producing petroleum and other liquid hydrocarbons

Exposition: Oil and gas pipelines go into 4.2 Utility & Service Lines. Oil spills that occur at the drill site should be placed here; those that come from oil tankers or pipelines should go in 4. Transportation & Service Corridors or in 9.2 Industrial & Military Effluents, depending on your perspective.

Examples:

oil wells

deep sea natural gas drilling

3.2 Mining & Quarrying

Definition: Exploring for, developing, and producing minerals and rocks

Exposition: It is a judgment call whether deforestation caused by strip mining should be in this category or in 5.3 Logging & Wood Harvesting – it depends on whether the primary motivation for the deforestation is access to the trees or to the minerals. Sediment or toxic chemical runoff from mining should be placed in 9.2 Industrial & Military Effluents if it is the major threat from a mining operation.

Examples:

coal strip mines

alluvial gold panning

gold mines

rock quarries

sand/salt mines

coral mining

deep sea nodules

guano harvesting

dredging outside of shipping lanes

3.3 Renewable Energy

Definition: Exploring, developing, and producing renewable energy

Exposition: Hydropower should be put in 7.2 Dams & Water Management/Use.

Examples:

geothermal power production

solar farms

wind farms (including birds flying into windmills)

tidal farms

### Courts CP – 2AC

#### Perm – do both

Perine 8 (Katherine, Staff – CQ Politics, “Congress Unlikely to Try to Counter Supreme Court Detainee Ruling”, 6-12, http://www.cqpolitics.com/wmspage.cfm?docID=news-000002896528&cpage=2)

Thursday’s decision, from a Supreme Court dominated by Republican appointees, gives Democrats further cover against GOP sniping. “This is something that the court has decided, and very often the court gives political cover to Congress,” said Ross K. Baker, a Rutgers Universitiy political science professor. “You can simply point to a Supreme Court decision and say, ‘The devil made me do it.’ ”

#### Perm – do the counterplan – we don’t spec an agent. The CP does not disprove the desirability of the plan.

#### **Saying “Federal Government” doesn’t mean “all three branches” – any one body acts as it**

Chicago 7 (University of Chicago Manual of Style, “Capitalization, Titles”, http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/CMS\_FAQ/CapitalizationTitles/CapitalizationTitles30.html)

Q. When I refer to the government of the United States in text, should it be U.S. Federal Government or U.S. federal government? A. The government of the United States is not a single official entity. Nor is it when it is referred to as the federal government or the U.S. government or the U.S. federal government. It’s just a government, which, like those in all countries, has some official bodies that act and operate in the name of government: the Congress, the Senate, the Department of State, etc.

#### Reduce means to diminish the strength of

OED 89 (Oxford English Dictionary, “Reduce,” Volume 13, p. 433)

21. e. **to diminish the strength of** (spirit).

#### Doesn’t solve –

#### Court natural gas decisions are unpredictable - they are made on a case by case basis and leave many questions unanswered

Neese 5 (Angela – Candidate for Juris Doctor, University of Colorado School of Law, 2005; B.S.B.A., University of Denver, “THE BATTLE BETWEEN THE COLORADO OIL AND GAS CONSERVATION COMMISSION AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS: A CALL FOR A NEW AND COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH”, 2005, 76 U. Colo. L. Rev. 561, lexis)

These two leading Colorado Supreme Court decisions, Bowen/Edwards and Voss, were decided over a decade ago, and yet these cases "leave many questions unanswered." n185 For example, the court did not adequately define "operational conflict," n186 and "it left to speculation the type of local regulation which will offend the principles articulated in those cases." n187 What these Colorado Supreme Court decisions did, in effect, was create a regime in which each occurrence of stringent local regulation of the oil and gas industry **must be examined by the courts on a case-by-case basis**. Because the court held that state preemption of local regulation is not total, "each provision of a local oil and gas regulation must be examined to determine whether it presents a conflict." n188 For the past decade, the Colorado Supreme Court has declined to hear any further cases on the issue of state preemption of local government oil and gas regulation, thereby foreclosing any possibility of providing more direct guidelines for the COGCC and local governments. As a result, this case-by-case system of preemption analysis has led to more than a decade worth of costly litigation, with no end in sight. The case-by-case regime leads to a high **degree of unpredictability and puts natural gas developers** and local governments constantly at odds. n189 The litigation that often results, when the industry and the local governments are forced to look to the courts to determine which regulations are controlling, is costly to the industry (**and thus to natural gas consumers**) and to local governments (and thus to the taxpayers). n190 The lack of predictability, the high costs of litigation, and **the resulting delays in production are proof** that the Colorado Supreme Court has done the state a disservice by not providing a workable framework on the issue of state preemption of oil and gas regulation. n191 Bowen/Edwards is considered the determinative case as to preemption, yet both sides cite this case in their briefs and point to the same language as suggestive that they will prevail. n192 The lack of clear guidelines under the current Colorado [\*585] case law results in a number of unanswered questions that will likely lead to future legal battles.

#### CP undermines legitimacy – takes out solvency.

**Bentley**, **2007** (Curt, Constrained by the liberal tradition, Brigham Young University Law Review, p. lexis)

This institutional limitation theory focuses primarily on the constraints imposed on the Court because of its relationship with the other branches of government. The Supreme Court is not wholly dependent upon other branches of government; the unique legitimacy given its interpretations of the Constitution by the American people provides it with real influence of its own. n116 However, the institutional limitation theory posits that since the Court possesses neither the purse nor the sword, n117 it relies upon its  [\*1745]  legitimacy in the eyes of the American people in order to pressure the legislative and executive branches to **enforce its decrees**: The Supreme Court ... possesses some bases of power of its own, the most important of which is the unique legitimacy attributed to its interpretations of the Constitution. This legitimacy the Court jeopardizes if it **flagrantly opposes the major policies** of the dominant alliance; such a course of action, as we have seen, is one in which the Court will not normally be tempted to engage. n118 **Without legitimacy** in the eyes of the public, both Congress and the President might feel justified in **resisting the ruling of the Court** either through jurisdiction-stripping n119 or by simply refusing to enforce its decrees. n120 **There is precedent for both in American history**. n121 The Court risks becoming substantially weakened, or even irrelevant, when the political branches ignore judicial decrees and where it nonetheless doggedly pursues the counter-majoritarian course. n122

#### -- No solvency: delay

Klein 84 (Mitchell S. G., MA and Ph.D in Political Science – Northwestern University, Law, Courts, and Policy, p. 117-118)

The aphorism “Justice delayed is justice denied” finds support from nay court analysts. Court delay is a significant administrative problem in the judiciary. As H. Ted Rubin observes: “Far too many courts operate essentially in the same fashion as fifty years ago … Too many judges have failed to effectively administer control of their own court calendar.” (1976, p. 185) A number of problems associated with court delay have been noted by Hans Zeisel and associates (1959, pp. xxii-xxiii). For example, delay in the courtroom jeopardizes justice because evidence may deteriorate over time. It also causes severe hardship to some parties, even depriving some of a basic public service. Finally, court delay also produces an unhealthy emphasis on the desirability of settling out of court.

#### CP Tanks Biz Con

Woellert 5 (Lorraine, Legal Correspondent – Business Week, “Forget Roe and the Framers. Let’s Talk Business”, Washington Post, 10-16, Lexis)

Friends and peers trying to describe Miers and Roberts like to use the P-word -- pragmatic. That's sweet music to business ears: Corporations worship pragmatism and don't give a whit about judicial philosophy. But it's rank heresy to many on the right, who have had it up to here with jurists who weigh social and cultural mores when crafting opinions. Religious and other social conservatives want justices who will apply a very narrow "strict constructionist" interpretation to the Constitution and not read new rights -- such as the right to privacy found in Roe v. Wade -- into the framers' text. Roberts already has disappointed them. "Judges take a more practical and pragmatic approach when deciding the rule of law," rather than sticking to a strict philosophy, he told the Senate Judiciary Committee. "The Framers were aware they were drafting for the future." Roberts also tipped his hat to the importance of legal precedent and the need to avoid enacting rapid and radical changes in law: "It is a jolt to the legal system to override precedent." Translation: Roe might be here to stay, but business can take comfort. What corporate America wants from the judicial branch more than anything else is consistency and predictability -- tools for planning in the short term. That's one reason CEOs mourned the resignation of Sandra Day O'Connor. Legal scholars have scoffed at her philosophical inconsistency, but business execs lauded her practicality and her frequent acknowledgments of real-world situations in opinions that often made their 9-to-5 workday a little easier.

#### Recession results

Braithwaite 4 (John, Australian Research Council Federation fellow, Australian National University, and chair of the Regulatory Institutions Network, The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 592 Annals 79, March, Lexis)

The challenge of designing institutions that simultaneously engender emancipation and hope is addressed within the assumption of economic institutions that are fundamentally capitalist. This contemporary global context gives more force to the hope nexus because we know capitalism thrives on hope. When business confidence collapses, capitalist economies head for recession. This dependence on hope is of quite general import; business leaders must have hope for the future before they will build new factories; consumers need confidence before they will buy what the factories make; investors need confidence before they will buy shares in the company that builds the factory; bankers need confidence to lend money to build the factory; scientists need confidence to innovate with new technologies in the hope that a capitalist will come along and market their invention. Keynes's ([1936]1981) General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money lamented the theoretical neglect of "animal spirits" of hope ("spontaneous optimism rather than . . . mathematical expectation" (p. 161) in the discipline of economics, a neglect that continues to this day (see also Barbalet 1993).

#### Nuclear war

**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.

#### Court rulings on energy policy link to elections

**Sunstein**, Fall **2006** (Cass – Distinguished Service Professor in the Law School and Department of Political Science at the University of Chicago, Timing Controversial Decisions, Hofstra Law Review, 35 Hofstra L. Rev. 1, p. Lexis)

In any election, voters have a large menu of items on which to focus. They might be concerned about national security, unemployment, climate change, abortion, energy independence, the stock market, the price of gasoline, or some combination of these. If there is a highly salient event immediately before the election, it might have a large role, simply because of its immediacy. Such an "external shock" might well affect numerous votes. 1 Suppose, for example, that the nation faces a terrorist attack a month before a presidential election; that a natural disaster, two months before the election, devastates a city; that gasoline prices fall dramatically in the previous three months; or that the unemployment rate, in that time, suddenly spikes up. The idea of the "October Surprise" signals the possibility that events of this kind might be expected to influence electoral outcomes. We know enough about human cognition to know that a salient incident can have a significant effect on people's judgments. A great deal remains to be learned about this subject. Let us simply stipulate that in imaginable circumstances, such an effect is likely. But perhaps there is nothing wrong with that effect. Perhaps voters are simply updating on the basis of new information. If a terrorist strike occurs, voters learn that the nation is more vulnerable than they had [\*3] thought. If unemployment jumps, the economy is apparently weaker than had appeared. If voters are rationally incorporating new information, then any external shock provides a legitimate and perhaps an invaluable input into voter decisions. We might make some distinctions here. If the relevant event is not self-consciously timed by anyone, then there is no effort to manipulate the system - and if voters will rationally incorporate the relevant information, nothing is amiss. But suppose that some person or institution has deliberately triggered a salient event, and done so at the appropriate time for maximum effect. The problem here is that voters might be deceived, in a way that will affect their judgments. If voters are unaware of the manipulation, they might believe that, for example, gas prices or unemployment rates are falling, even though these effects are temporary ones, made visible by self-interested politicians who are unable or unwilling to maintain them for the long run. If a terrorist has been caught two weeks before the election, and if the timing of this event has been orchestrated to convince voters that an incumbent administration is winning the war on terror, then voters might be manipulated to believe that a victory is occurring when in reality it is not. Consider in this regard the controversial 2006 decision, by the Internal Revenue Service, to delay in the collection of back taxes until after the election, in part to avoid negative publicity. 2 Perhaps the political market can expose any real efforts at manipulation. Perhaps the market functions well enough to ensure that such efforts will be revealed as such. But suppose that political markets cannot be expected to work this well. Even if so, the conclusion does not speak to my question here: No one is arguing that courts should deliberatively time their announcements in order to influence the outcome of elections. Everyone agrees that any such effort would be illicit. The question is whether courts should deliberately time their announcements so as not to influence the outcome of elections. The discussion of the effect of manipulation of events shows why an affirmative answer is not implausible. The risk is that a recent judicial decision may distort voter behavior, simply because its timing gives undue salience to a particular issue. No one doubts that recent events can have large effects on public judgments. Consider the fact that public concern about risks usually tracks changes in the actual fluctuations in those risks. But public concern outruns actual fluctuations in the [\*4] important case of "panics," bred by vivid illustrations that do not reflect changes in levels of danger. 3 A "particularly vivid case or new finding that receives considerable media attention" played a major role in those leaps in public concern. 4 Legislation itself is often fueled by identifiable events, putting issues on the agenda that would otherwise be ignored. "Availability cascades" occur when an available event spreads through the public, spurring attention to an issue that had formerly been neglected. 5 To take just one example, legislation calling for disclosure of toxic releases was spurred by a chemical accident at Bhopal, India, which focused media attention on the safety issues and led members of Congress to introduce right-to-know legislation. 6 The relevant legislation could not possibly have been enacted without the highly publicized Bhopal disaster. These points should be enough to suggest the possibility that in a genuinely close election, a salient judicial decision will have a large impact, perhaps even altering its outcome. Even if it is agreed that a highly visible event can have a large effect on political processes, we might insist that the effect can be salutary and sensible, as voters and representatives respond to a problem that had received too little concern. Undoubtedly sensible responses often occur. Unfortunately, the optimistic view seems unwarranted, for at least some of the time, the recent event produces a distorted judgment and undesirable law. 7 Let me therefore sketch a highly tentative principle: To the extent that salient judicial decisions can significantly affect voters' judgments, such decisions should not be issued in the period immediately before an election. Of course this position would be vulnerable if a great deal were to be lost by the delay. But in ordinary circumstances, any delay will produce no harm at all; it is not important for a judicial decision to be announced in October rather than December. If the delay is costless, and if it avoids a potential distortion, why should courts refuse to delay?

### Federalism

#### -- Uniqueness overwhelms – nothing will destroy federalism

Young 3 (Ernest, Professor of Law – University of Texas, Texas Law Review, May, Lexis)

One of the privileges of being a junior faculty member is that senior colleagues often feel obligated to read one's rough drafts. On many occasions when I have written about federalism - from a stance considerably more sympathetic to the States than Judge Noonan's - my colleagues have responded with the following comment: "Relax. The States retain vast reserves of autonomy and authority over any number of important areas. It will be a long time, if ever, before the national government can expand its authority far enough to really endanger the federal balance. Don't make it sound like you think the sky is falling."

#### -- Federalism is resilient

Swaine 3 (Edward T., Assistant Professor in the Wharton School – University of Pennsylvania, “Does Federalism Constrain the Treaty Power?”, Columbia Law Review, April, 103 Colum. L. Rev. 403, Lexis)

Federalism is the **vampire** of U.S. foreign relations law: officially deceased or moribund at best, but in reality **surprisingly resilient** and **prone to recover** at unsettling intervals. Linked with a dark period in our constitutional prehistory, foreign relations federalism was supposedly given a lasting burial by the Constitution's nationalization of foreign affairs authority; in foreign relations, the orthodox position held, states [1](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=b9a9decddafeb57b9aa157e1c6d50814&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtb-zSkAl&_md5=fce06e5d7e81c456da1d4098ede9599f" \l "n1" \t "_self) simply ceased to exist. [2](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=b9a9decddafeb57b9aa157e1c6d50814&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtb-zSkAl&_md5=fce06e5d7e81c456da1d4098ede9599f" \l "n2" \t "_self) Nonetheless, rumors of their twilight existence persist.  [\*405]  With lingering memories of previous scares, [3](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=b9a9decddafeb57b9aa157e1c6d50814&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtb-zSkAl&_md5=fce06e5d7e81c456da1d4098ede9599f" \l "n3" \t "_self) frightened law professors have begun to huddle together in symposia to discuss a rash of recent sightings - especially in the form of state-conducted foreign relations, obstacles to compliance with international agreements, and special exemptions in treaties and implementing statutes. [4](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=b9a9decddafeb57b9aa157e1c6d50814&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtb-zSkAl&_md5=fce06e5d7e81c456da1d4098ede9599f" \l "n4" \t "_self)

### Renewables DA – 2AC

#### Warming 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.

#### No tradeoff – natural gas investment doesn’t tradeoff with renewables

Lacey 12 (Stephen, “Top Three Reasons Cheap Natural Gas Won’t Kill Renewable Energy”, 2/21, http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/02/21/421319/top-three-reasons-cheap-natural-gas-wont-kill-renewable-energy/?mobile=nc)

Over the years, the conversation around gas has changed dramatically in renewable energy circles. For example, up until 2008 when gas prices were at their peak and wind development was soaring, the industry’s message was simple: We’re a far more cost-effective, reliable investment than gas. But the tide turned in 2009, when gas prices started their precipitous drop. I remember the American Wind Energy Association’s annual conference in 2010, when shale gas dominated the CEO roundtable discussion. “Our single biggest challenge is improving technologies to compete with these low prices,” said one executive. The industry clearly took the challenge seriously. Today, due to bigger turbines, more reliable equipment and better materials, the cost of wind has dropped to record lows. In fact, some developers are even signing long-term power purchase agreements in the 3 cents a kilowatt-hour range. And last fall, Bloomberg New Energy Finance projected that wind would be “fully competitive with energy produced from combined-cycle gas turbines by 2016″ under fair wind conditions. The same technological improvements and maturation in project development in wind are driving down the cost of solar PV as well. For example, in California, solar developers have signed contracts for power below the projected price of natural gas from a 500-MW combined cycle power plant. (That projection does include a carbon price). These trends are driving record levels of interest from investors. In 2011, for the first time ever, global investments in renewable energy **surpassed investments in fossil fuels**. The bottom line: the price of renewable energy continues to come down while the projected price of natural gas is only expected to rise. We do have to be realistic about the situation: assuming gas prices stay near record low levels for a long period of time — which they likely won’t — renewables deployment won’t grow at the rate we need it to. But if you look at the where large-scale renewables stack up with the cost of energy from peaking gas plants and combined cycle plants (chart above), you can see that the industry is still nipping at the heels of gas — even with a “revolution” underway in accessing shale resources. That’s something that can’t be ignored.

#### Natural gas acts as a bridge fuel—spurring broad renewable development

Ju 12 (Anne Ju – senior science writer for the Cornell Chronicle) July 17, 2012 “Study Proves Natural Gas Can Bridge the Gap to a Clean Energy Economy” http://oilprice.com/Energy/Natural-Gas/Study-Proves-Natural-Gas-Can-Bridge-the-Gap-to-a-Clean-Energy-Economy.html)

**Natural gas is a good transition step on the road to greener energy sources like wind, solar, and nuclear power**, says a new study. Lawrence M. Cathles, Cornell University professor of earth and atmospheric sciences, says natural gas is a smart move in the battle against global climate change. Published in the most recent edition of the journal Geochemistry, Geophysics and Geosystems, Cathles’ study reviews the most recent government and industry data on natural gas “leakage rates” during extraction, as well as recently developed climate models. He concludes that regardless of the time frame considered, substituting natural gas energy for all coal and some oil production provides **about 40 percent of the global warming benefit** that a complete switch to low-carbon sources would deliver. “From a greenhouse point of view, it would be better to replace coal electrical facilities with nuclear plants, wind farms, and solar panels, but replacing them with natural gas stations will be faster, cheaper, and achieve 40 percent of the low-carbon-fast benefit,” Cathles writes in the study. “Gas is a natural transition fuel that could represent the biggest stabilization wedge available to us.” Cathles’ study includes additional findings about expanding the use of natural gas as an energy source, as well as the climate impact of “unconventional” gas drilling methods, including hydraulic fracturing in shale formations. They include the following: • Although a more rapid transition to natural gas from coal and some oil produces a greater overall benefit for climate change, the 40 percent of low-carbon energy benefit remains no matter how quickly the transition is made, and no matter the effect of ocean modulation or other climate regulating forces. • Although some critics of natural gas as a transition fuel have cited leakage rates as high as 8 percent or more of total production during drilling—particularly hydraulic fracturing extraction—more recent industry data and a critical examination of Environmental Protection Agency data supports leakage rates closer to 1.5 percent for both conventional and hydrofractured wells. • Even at higher leakage rates, using natural gas as a transition to low-carbon energy sources is still a better policy than “business as usual” with coal and oil, due to the different rates of decay (and hence long-term global warming effect) of carbon dioxide released in greater amounts by burning coal and oil and any methane released during natural gas extraction. • Using natural gas as a transition fuel supports the push to low-carbon sources **by providing the “surge capacity” when needed, or a buffer when solar and wind production wanes.** “The most important message of the calculations reported here is that substituting natural gas for coal and oil is a significant way to reduce greenhouse forcing, regardless of how long the substitution takes,” Cathles writes. “A faster transition to low-carbon energy sources would decrease greenhouse warming further, but the substitution of natural gas for other fossil fuels is equally beneficial in percentage terms no matter how fast the transition.”

#### Turn – conventional gas reduces emissions

Howarth et al 11 (Robert W. Professor of Ecology & Environmental Biology – Cornell, Renee Santoro, Research Aide for Howarth – Cornell, Anthony Ingraffea, Professor of Engineering – Cornell, “Methane and the Greenhouse-Gas Footprint of Natural Gas from Shale Formations,” Climatic Change, 106(4), p.679-690, Springer Link, <http://www.springerlink.com/content/e384226wr4160653/?MUD=MP>)

We evaluate the greenhouse gas footprint of natural gas obtained by highvolume hydraulic fracturing from shale formations, focusing on methane emissions. Natural gas is composed largely of methane, and 3.6% to 7.9% of the methane from shale-gas production escapes to the atmosphere in venting and leaks over the lifetime of a well. These methane emissions are at least 30% more than and perhaps more than twice as great as those from conventional gas. The higher emissions from shale gas occur at the time wells are hydraulically fractured—as methane escapes from flow-back return fluids—and during drill out following the fracturing. Methane is a powerful greenhouse gas, with a global warming potential that is far greater than that of carbon dioxide, particularly over the time horizon of the first few decades following emission. Methane contributes substantially to the greenhouse gas footprint of shale gas on shorter time scales, dominating it on a 20-year time horizon. The footprint for shale gas is greater than that for conventional gas or oil when viewed on any time horizon, but particularly so over 20 years. Compared to coal, the footprint of shale gas is at least 20% greater and perhaps more than twice as great on the 20-year horizon and is comparable when compared over 100 years.

**No investment in renewables**

**Seeking Alpha 12**

[“ Why Alternative Energy Will Never Achieve Widespread Use In Our Lifetime”, 8/13/12, <http://seekingalpha.com/article/802141-why-alternative-energy-will-never-achieve-widespread-use-in-our-lifetime>]

The biggest issue comes with adapting these new resources. Aside from the fact that it would be a major pain for companies to make the switch, cost is the real problem. Building fossil fuel plants and resources, as well as actually using them, is a cheaper option for most big businesses. Alternative energy costs more to install and maintain, and with natural gas prices sitting so low and the supply growing by the day, you would be hard pressed to convince corporate America (or anywhere else in the world for that matter) that switching to clean energy is better for their business. It may help the environment, but it often hurts bottom line returns. Our addiction to fossil fuels is worse than that of our addiction to quantitative easing. Weening off natural gas and oil will take decades if not longer. Another major issue is the need for government subsidies to keep these programs going, as we all saw what happens when those programs run dry a la Solyndra. That brings us to the investing side of the equation, as many have utilized alternative energy in long-term portfolios in hopes of racking up strong gains.

#### Warming doesn’t cause extinction – past temperature fluctuations prove

**Stampf 7** (Olaf, staff writer for Spiegel Online, 5/5. “Not the End of the World as we Know it,” <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,481684,00.html>)

But even this moderate warming would likely have far fewer apocalyptic consequences than many a prophet of doom would have us believe. For one thing, the more paleontologists and geologists study the history of the earth's climate, the more clearly do they recognize just how much temperatures have fluctuated in both directions in the past. Even major fluctuations appear to be completely natural phenomena. Additionally, some environmentalists doubt that the large-scale extinction of animals and plants some have predicted will in fact come about. "A warmer climate helps promote species diversity," says Munich zoologist Josef Reichholf. Also, more detailed simulations have allowed climate researchers to paint a considerably less dire picture than in the past -- gone is the talk of giant storms, the melting of the Antarctic ice shield and flooding of major cities. Improved regionalized models also show that climate change can bring not only drawbacks, but also significant benefits, especially in northern regions of the world where it has been too cold and uncomfortable for human activity to flourish in the past. However it is still a taboo to express this idea in public. For example, countries like Canada and Russia can look forward to better harvests and a blossoming tourism industry, and the only distress the Scandinavians will face is the guilty conscience that could come with benefiting from global warming.

### Elections DA – Obama Good – 2AC

#### Energy is not a key election issues --- other issues outweigh.

**The Washington Post**, 6/27/**2012** (Energy ads flood TV in swing states, p. http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/energy-ads/2012/06/27/gJQAD5MR7V\_story.html)

Energy issues don’t spark much excitement among voters, ranking below health care, education and the federal budget deficit — not to mention jobs and the economy. And yet those same voters are being flooded this year with campaign ads on energy policy. Particularly in presidential swing states, the airwaves are laden with messages boosting oil drilling and natural gas and hammering President Obama for his support of green energy. The Cleveland area alone has heard $2.7 million in energy-related ads. The disconnect between what voters say they care about and what they’re seeing on TV lies in the money behind the ads, much of it coming from oil and gas interests. Those funders get the double benefit of attacking Obama at the same time they are promoting their industry. Democrats also have spent millions on the subject, defending the president’s record and tying Republican candidate Mitt Romney to “Big Oil.” Overall, more than $41 million, about one in four of the dollars spent on broadcast advertising in the presidential campaign, has gone to ads mentioning energy, more than a host of other subjects and just as much as health care, according to ad-tracking firm Kantar Media/Cmag. In an election focused heavily on jobs and the economy, all of this attention to energy seems a bit off topic. But the stakes are high for energy producers and environmentalists, who are squared off over how much the government should regulate the industry. And attention has been heightened by a recent boom in production using new technologies such as fracking and horizontal drilling, as well as a spike in gas prices this spring just as the general election got underway. When asked whether energy is important, more than half of voters say yes, according to recent polls. But asked to rank their top issues, fewer than 1 percent mention energy.

#### -- Obama will lose –

#### Key polls and undecided voters

**Chambers**, **9/19**/2012 (Dean, Mitt Romney likely win in presidential election shown by three key polls, Examiner, p. http://www.examiner.com/article/mitt-romney-likely-win-presidential-election-shown-by-three-key-polls)

Rasmussen Reports has released today, three key polls that show Mitt Romney's likely win in this year's presidential election over President Obama. The Rasmussen Reports Presidential Daily Tracking Poll released today shows Romney leading 47 percent to 46 percent over Obama. Rasmussen's Daily Swing State Tracking Poll of 11 key swing states won by President Obama in 2008 shows Romney leading them by the exact same percentages. The latest Rasmussen poll of New Hampshire released today shows Romney leading there 48 percent to 45 percent. New Hampshire is a key swing state that could make a difference with its four electoral votes, and George W. Bush would have reached 270 electoral voters in 2000 without having won this state. New Hampshire had narrowly favored Obama in many polls over the last few months and while the analysis conduced here by this columnist has consistently predicted Mitt Romney will win the state (based in part on knowledge of local politics in the state having lived in New England for years), most projected have shaded New Hampshire blue and predicted it will go for Obama. This Rasmussen survey is key in that it likely shows movement in New Hampshire in the direction of Mitt Romney. In the instance of an incumbent president who enjoys just about 100 percent name recognition and is seeking reelection, most of the undecided voters are likely to swing to the challenger by election day. This is especially true when the challenger remains still less known to the public than the incumbent, as is true with former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney. By election day, those other nine percent not favoring Romney or Obama in the Rasmussen Daily Tracking poll are likely include less than one percent voting for third party candidates and five or six percent of those nine will likely vote for Mitt Romney. That would indicate a popular vote win by Romney of about 53 percent to 46 percent, or the reverse of Obama's win in 2008. This would lead to an electoral college total of more than 300 electoral votes for Romney. The 11 swing states tracked by Rasmussen in it's swing state tracking poll show Romney leading 47 percent to 46 percent, where some weeks ago the two candidates were tied at 45 percent in the Rasmussen tracking poll of these 11 key swing states. President Obama won these same states collectively by a 53 percent to 46 percent margin in 2008. Now he is seven percent behind that finish now in these states. Romney is likely to capture most of the undecided votes and could win these states collectively by at least a 52 percent to 47 percent margin. That would likely lead to Romney winning Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia and Wisconsin while having a competitive chance in Michigan and Pennsylvania. If President Obama can only win Michigan and Pennsylvania among those 11 swing states, he can not be reelected to the presidency. As these polls stand today, the election of Mitt Romney as our next president looks likely.

#### Plan cuts against Romney’s “dirty fuel” narrative – helps Obama win swing states

LeVine 12 (Steve, “How Dirty is Romney Prepared to Get to Win Election?” Foreign Policy, 6-13, 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. Romney grants that Obama is not precisely Mr. Clean -- while the president has championed clean energy technologies, he has also stewarded over the greatest buildup in U.S. fossil fuel production since the 1990s. But Romney insists he will be dirtier: He vows to **open more land to oil and gas drilling**, approve the import of more Canadian oil sands to Gulf Coast refineries, and allow more coal mining. As for Obama, Romney recently told a Colorado coal community, he isn't dirty enough to deserve a second presidential term. The president has "made it harder to get coal out of the ground; he's made it harder to get natural gas out of the ground; he's made it harder to get oil out of the ground," Romney said. The approach aligns with a campaign by the American Petroleum Institute, the U.S. oil industry's main lobbying arm, called "Vote4Energy." The API campaign, which consists of big political events and advertisements, targets 15 or so mostly swing states, those that both Obama and Romney will most need to muster the 270 electoral votes required to win. Marty Durbin, executive vice president at API, told me that the Vote4energy campaign is deliberately not backing any specific candidate or party, but attempting to centrally fix the subject of greater fossil-fuel drilling in voters' minds. "We're using this to highlight the importance of energy to the broader policy, that with the right energy policies we can have job creation, economic growth, energy security, government revenue. If voters have these realities in their mind when they go to the ballot box, that's what is going to move us forward in having a more rational national energy policy," he said. Already, he said, "the energy conversation is no longer just production and energy security. This is about job creation on a state-by-state level." Notwithstanding Durbin's disclaimer, the API campaign seems to weave seamlessly into the GOP strategy. And Maisano told me that he sees grist for GOP success in the targeted states. "Energy plays a huge role in those states, and I see it as a huge problem for Obama," he said. "It's going to be hard for him to win these states that he has to win, like North Carolina, like Florida and Michigan and Ohio and Missouri and Wisconsin. Energy undercuts him in those economies." Some analysts think the dirty campaign will ultimately fizzle. "The Romney campaign has positioned itself to beat the job-creation drum better than the Obama campaign has," said Kyle Saunders, a professor at Colorado State University, but an improvement in job numbers could undermine the GOP narrative. In addition, said John Sides, a professor at George Washington University, **Obama's incorporation of fossil fuels in his energy policy may muddle the picture for voters**. "I'm not sure that there is a lot of daylight between Obama and Romney," Sides told me. Yet my own impression is that the Republican strategy may be working, at least partly and at least for now. Given the stakes, Obama and the main environmental lobby seem more lethargic than they might be. When I sought comment for this story, API responded almost immediately with an offer to speak with Durbin. Not so much the Sierra Club, the principal bulwark of U.S. environmentalists. A spokeswoman missed a couple of emails sent over a couple of days, then by phone said she would try to scare up someone to speak. Finally, I finally received a message: "I haven't been able to track down our political team today." **In an election that may be decided on the margins,** advantage: fossil fuels.

#### Offshore drilling has massive support – outweighs all other energies

**Dixon**, 3/19/**2012** (Darius – energy reporter at Politico, Poll: Support rises for offshore drilling, Politico, p. http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0312/74185.html)

Interest in alternative energy sources like wind and solar over has waned among Americans the last year, while support for offshore oil and gas drilling has climbed back up to pre-BP oil spill levels, according to a poll released Monday. Fifty-two percent of those surveyed by the Pew Research Center support alternative energy, down 11 percent compared with March 2011. However, interest in developing oil, coal and natural gas resources rose by 10 percent, while the remainder to those who said they supported both or didn’t know. Support for offshore oil and gas drilling in U.S. waters has also recovered to its levels prior to the 2010 BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. Nearly two-thirds of those surveyed now favor allowing increased offshore drilling, up from 57 percent a year ago and 44 percent in June 2010, during the spill. The partisan divide on renewable energy versus oil, coal and natural gas development has also become more pronounced over the last year. Eighty-nine percent of Republicans favor allowing more offshore oil and gas drilling while only half of Democrats agree, according the survey. However, a 64 percent of independents support increased drilling off the U.S. coast.

#### No link – plan doesn’t happen till after the election

Lightman and Douglas 9/21 (David and William, “Unproductive Congress breaks until after November election”, 2012, <http://www.adn.com/2012/09/20/2633147/unproductive-congress-breaks-until.html>\_

Lawmakers spent Thursday pointing fingers and charging opponents with cynical political posturing. Among Congress' last decisions was a characteristic 2012 judgment: Punt action until later. It will let the farm bill, a broad measure that sets the nation's agriculture and food and nutrition assistance policies, expire Sept. 30. Congress also exits without any serious effort to edge away from the "fiscal cliff," the prospect of economy-damaging budget chaos if it doesn't act by year's end. Bush-era tax cuts are due to expire, and automatic spending cuts will take effect unless alternatives are passed. The public is noticing, as the legislative failures stir uncertainty and further roil an already-weak economy. This Congress' approval ratings were stuck at 13 percent in a Gallup survey Sept. 6-9, the lowest the pollster has ever logged this late in an election year since such measurements began in 1974. Yet **lawmakers are slinking out of town**, after a September session that was on and off for less than two weeks, following a summer recess that ran from Aug. 3 to Sept. 10. Congress is expected to return Nov. 13.

#### **Republicans and natural gas industry loves the plan**

Clark 12 (Aaron, “Obama Stance on Fossil Fuel Angers Industry,” Bloomberg, 1-24, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-01-24/obama-claiming-credit-for-fossil-fuel-gains-angers-industry.html)

President Barack Obama is taking credit for higher U.S. oil and gas production and lower imports, angering industry groups and Republicans who say he is working against domestic energy production. American energy will be a major theme of Obama’s State of the Union address to Congress tonight, Jay Carney, the White House spokesman, said in a briefing yesterday. In his first campaign ad this year, Obama boasts that U.S. dependence on foreign oil is below 50 percent for the first time in 13 years. Since Obama took office, U.S. natural gas production averaged 1.89 trillion cubic feet a month through October, 13 percent higher than the average during President George W. Bush’s two terms, according to Energy Department data. Crude oil production is 2 percent higher, the department said. “To be sure that is not because the White House meant for that to happen,” said Pavel Molchanov, an analyst at Raymond James & Associates Inc. Republicans say the numbers are misleading. Onshore oil and gas production on federal lands directly under Obama’s control is down 40 percent compared to 10 years ago, according to Spencer Pederson, a spokesman for Representative Doc Hastings, a Washington Republican and chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee. In 2010, the U.S. signed the fewest number of offshore drilling leases since 1984. ‘Drill Baby Drill’ “The president is responding to what America’s gut feeling is, that we should be less dependent on foreign oil, and he’s trying to take credit for it,” Hastings said in an interview. “His policies are exactly the opposite.” Four years ago, Obama campaigned against Republican vice presidential nominee Sarah Palin’s rally to “Drill Baby Drill.” Today he is highlighting fossil fuel gains to blunt charges that his policies are contributing to higher energy costs, according to Tyson Slocum, energy program director for Public Citizen, a Washington-based consumer advocacy group, said in an interview. “The Republican narrative is that Obama is shoveling huge amounts of money to his cronies in the renewable industry, and blocking the real energy that American needs,” Slocum said in an interview. “It’s a false narrative. The administration has been focused on green energy, but they haven’t been against fossil fuels.” Federal Leases In a January report, the American Petroleum Institute in Washington said that in two years the number of new leases to drill on federal lands declined 44 percent to 1,053 in 2010. The report blamed “new rules, policies and administrative actions that are not conducive to oil and natural gas production.” Lower imports are the result of lower demand, and increasing production has come despite Obama’s policies, according to Jack Gerard, American Petroleum Institute President. The U.S. needs a “course correction” on energy policy that includes faster permitting on federal lands in the West and in the Gulf of Mexico, he said. The group, whose members include Exxon Mobil Corp., the largest U.S. oil company, convened a conference call with reporters today to comment on what Obama is expected to say on domestic energy in tonight’s address. “We hope that the actions match the words,” Gerard said on the call. “The truth is that the administration has sometimes paid lip service to more domestic energy development, including more oil and natural gas development.” Offshore Drilling The American Enterprise Institute, a Washington group that supports free markets, called Obama’s Jan. 18 decision to deny a permit for TransCanada Corp. (TRP)’s $7 billion Keystone XL oil pipeline, part of his “crusade against fossil fuels.” “The losses due to the Obama administration’s death-grip on offshore drilling and its unwillingness to open federal lands or issue timely permits for exploration far outweigh any energy gains that the White House may tout this week,” Thomas Pyle, president of the Washington-based Institute for Energy Research, said in a statement. Obama last year called on Congress to eliminate “billions in taxpayer” subsidies for oil companies and to invest instead in renewable sources of power. In 2010, he proposed drilling for oil and natural gas off the U.S. East Coast, weeks before BP Plc (BP/)’s Macondo well in the Gulf of Mexico failed, spewing 4.9 million barrels of oil and triggering a temporary administration ban on offshore exploration.

#### Nat gas lobbyists swing the election and shield blame

Browning and Clifford 11 (James, Regional State Director – Common Cause, and Pat, Stone Senior Fellow – HUC-UC Ethics Center, “Fracking for Support: Natural Gas Industry Pumps Cash Into Congress,” Common Cause, 11-10, http://www.commoncause.org/site/pp.asp?c=dkLNK1MQIwG&b=7831813)

Natural gas interests have spent more than $747 million during a 10-year campaign – stunningly successful so far – to avoid government regulation of hydraulic “fracking,” a fast-growing and environmentally risky process used in Ohio and at least a dozen other states to tap underground gas reserves, according to a new study by Common Cause. A faction of the natural gas industry has directed more than $20 million to the campaigns of current members of Congress – including $600,000 to Ohioans -- and put $726 million into lobbying aimed at shielding itself from oversight, according to the report, the third in a series of “Deep Drilling, Deep Pockets” reports produced by the non-profit government watchdog group. Rep. John Boehner led Ohio’s Congressional delegation with $186,900 raised from fracking interests, followed Sen. Rob Portman with $91,000, Rep. Steve Chabot with $59,050, and Rep. Steve Stivers with $51,250. “Players in this industry have pumped cash into Congress in the same way they pump toxic chemicals into underground rock formations to free trapped gas,” said Common Cause President Bob Edgar. “And as fracking for gas releases toxic chemicals into groundwater and streams, the industry’s political fracking for support is toxic to efforts for a cleaner environment and relief from our dependence on fossil fuels.” The report also tracks $2.8 million in campaign contributions to Ohio’s state elected officials and notes that Ohio’s fracking regulations are among the weakest of any state. Gov. John Kasich was the leading individual recipient with $213,519, followed by former Gov. Ted Strickland with $87,450 and Secretary of State John Husted with $84,750. In Congress, the industry’s political giving heavily favors lawmakers who supported the 2005 Energy Policy Act, which exempted fracking from regulation under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Current members who voted for the bill received an average of $73,433, while those who voted against the bill received an average of $10,894. The report comes as the Environmental Protection Agency is scheduled to publish new, preliminary findings in 2012 about the potential dangers of fracking. That gives the industry a powerful incentive to increase political spending now in an attempt to shape public opinion and the debate over fracking in Congress, as well as affect the outcome of the 2012 congressional elections. “Thanks to the Supreme Court and its Citizens United decision, the natural gas industry will be free to spend whatever it likes next year to elect a Congress that will do its bidding,” Edgar said. “The industry’s political investments already have largely freed it from government oversight. Controlling the flow of that money and other corporate spending on our elections is critical to protecting our environment for this and future generations.”

#### Link is self-correcting --- Obama will October Surprise if he is behind.

**Whittington**, **6/14**/2012 (Mark, Obama’s October Surprise Could Be Legalizing Pot, Yahoo! News, p. http://news.yahoo.com/obamas-october-surprise-could-legalizing-pot-191100768.html

The Atlantic Wire believes that it has hit upon President Obama's surefire October Surprise to change his political fortunes and get him re-elected for a second term. That October surprise would be for him to support the legalization of pot. This last-minute gambit has an advantage to starting a war, being that no one would get killed. The theory is that young voters, disenchanted with Obama because of the fact they are still living in their parents' garage three years after graduation and can't get a job, will be motivated to turn out for him because he supports legalized dope smoking. The Washington Post related David Maraniss' claims of Barack Obama being a pothead during his high school days. The gambit would also answer Penn Jillette's recent rant on the hypocrisy of Obama, a self-admitted former doper, enforcing drug laws that put people like he used to be in jail. The idea that Obama can get potheads motivated enough to turn off "The Daily Show," get off the couch, and go to the polls is a very charming one. To be sure, people voting while stoned could explain a lot of election results -- the re-election of Jerry Brown as governor of California comes to mind. But the legalized pot gambit has some pitfalls. Millions of people, likely more than who toke while laughing hysterically at Bill Maher, are against legalized drug use. Rasmussen suggested that a plurality of 47 percent of Americans favor legalizing marijuana and taxing it, which makes the say yes to drugs gambit just a little tempting to a president facing defeat in November. But such a move could be turned back on Obama fairly quickly. Mitt Romney, whose skill at the political riposte has become well known, would have lots of fun with an Obama legalize dope initiative. What next, he will ask. Selling crystal meth to school kids from vending machines? And if Obama proposed taxing pot at the same time, Romney would think that the good lord really does want him to be president. The conservative base likes few things less, besides gays getting married, than legalized dope and raising taxes, even on legalized dope. What, Obama would ask, does this have to do with a bad economy? One hope would be left for Obama: a stimulus package for pot growers. It may be his only hope.

#### Voters will forget events in a month.

**Carlson**, 9/18/**2012** (Margaret, Why Romney can still win, Star Tribune, p. http://www.startribune.com/opinion/commentaries/170184556.html?refer=y)

Besides, we live in the United States of Amnesia, where no one (except maybe the press) remembers Romney's mistakes if they happened more than a month ago. Who can forget when he criticized the British, our closest ally, for not being as good at running the Olympics as he was (turned out it was)? Or his $10,000 bet with Texas Gov. Rick Perry over his health-care plan? Or his comment that "corporations are people, my friend"? Or his failure to release years of tax returns? Soon everyone may even forget the video in which he says of the poor, "My job is not to worry about those people."

#### The plan will not affect the election --- the Minimal Effect Model proves.

**Farhi**, 7/6/**2012** (Paul – reporter for the Washington Post, Do campaigns really change voters’ minds?, The Washington Post, p. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/do-campaigns-really-change-voters-minds/2012/07/06/gJQAEljyRW_story.html>)

How can anyone accurately estimate the outcome of an election more than three months ahead of time — before the conventions, the debates, and the twists and turns of the fall campaign? Primarily because Abramowitz’s forecasting model disregards the fall campaign altogether. His method acknowledges something that political operatives, journalists and candidates rarely do: Presidential campaigns don’t matter much in determining winners and losers. Despite all the noise from the campaign trail — from the onslaught of TV ads to the daily rallies to the frenzied news coverage — factors beyond either candidate’s control largely determine the result, according to this school of thought. So much is already baked into a presidential contest that even the best managed and most effective campaign (or the most incompetent one) can’t move the needle too far. This idea has been around since at least the 1940s and has been so thoroughly studied that it has its own wonky name, the Minimal Effects Model. Simply stated, the model says that presidential campaigns have a highly limited effect on how people vote. Because of partisan loyalties and other structural factors, millions of voters have made up their minds long before the most intense electioneering begins, leaving only a disengaged few for the candidates to persuade. “When you’re in the middle of a campaign, there’s a tendency for people, especially the media, to overestimate the importance of certain events,” Abramowitz says. These include high-profile gaffes, vice presidential selections, controversial ads and other moments that capture so much attention. Except, he adds, “those things have no measurable impact [on voters’ decisions]. The media are interested in getting people’s attention, but a lot of the stories you read or see are focusing on things that are trivial. The way campaigns play out is largely determined by fundamentals.”

#### GOP will steal the election --- six warrants

**Fitrakis and Wasserman**, 9/5/**2012** (Bob – Professor of Political Science in the Social and Behavioral Sciences Department at Columbus State Community College and Harvey – senior advisor to Greenpeace USA and the Nuclear Information and Resource Service, Will the GOP Steal America’s 2012 Election, Daily Kos, p. <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/09/05/1128300/-Will-the-GOP-Steal-America-s-2012-Election>)

The Republican Party could steal the 2012 US Presidential election with relative ease. Six basic factors make this year’s theft a possibility: The power of corporate money, now vastly enhanced by the US Supreme Court’s Citizens’ United decisions; The Electoral College, which narrows the number of votes needed to be moved to swing a presidential election; The systematic disenfranchisement of---according to the Brennan Center---ten million or more citizens, most of whom would otherwise be likely to vote Democratic. More than a million voters have also been purged from the rolls in Ohio, almost 20% of the total vote count in 2008; The accelerating use of electronic voting machines, which make election theft a relatively simple task for those who control them, including their owners and operators, who are predominantly Republican; The GOP control of nine of the governorships in the dozen swing states that will decide the outcome of the 2012 campaign; and, The likelihood that the core of the activist “election protection” community that turned out in droves to monitor the vote for Barack Obama in 2008 has not been energized by his presidency and is thus unlikely to work for him again in 2012.

#### No impact – Romney will copy Obama on foreign policy

Miller 12 (Aaron David Miller, 5-23-2012; distinguished scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars; “Barack O’Romney”, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/05/23/barack_oromney>)

And that brings up an extraordinary fact. What has emerged in the second decade after 9/11 **is a remarkable consensus among Democrats and Republicans on a core approach to the nation's foreign policy**. It's certainly not a perfect alignment. But rarely since the end of the Cold War has there been this level of consensus. Indeed, while Americans may be divided, polarized and dysfunctional about issues closer to home, **we are really quite united in how we see the world and what we should do about it.** Ever wondered why foreign policy hasn't figured all that prominently in the 2012 election campaign? Sure, the country is focused on the economy and domestic priorities. And yes, Obama has so far avoided the kind of foreign-policy disasters that would give the Republicans easy free shots. But there's more to it than that: Romney has had a hard time identifying Obama's foreign-policy vulnerabilities because there's just not that much difference between the two. **A post 9/11 consensus is emerging that has bridged the ideological divide** of the Bush 43 years. And it's going to be pretty durable. Paradoxically, both George W. Bush's successes and failures helped to create this new consensus. His tough and largely successful approach to counterterrorism -- specifically, keeping the homeland safe and keeping al Qaeda and its affiliates at bay through use of special forces, drone attacks, aggressive use of intelligence, and more effective cooperation among agencies now forms a virtually unassailable bipartisan consensus. As shown through his stepped-up drone campaign, Barack Obama has become George W. Bush on steroids. And Bush 43's failed policies -- a discretionary war in Iraq and a mismanaged one in Afghanistan -- have had an equally profound effect. These adventures created a counter-reaction against ill-advised military campaigns that is now bipartisan theology as well. To be sure, there are some differences between Romney and Obama. But with the exception of Republicans taking a softer line on Israel and a tougher one on Russia -- both stances that **are unlikely to matter much in terms of actual policy implementation** -- there's a much greater convergence.

## 2AC vs Dartmouth DY

### Fracking Unsustainable

**Shale gas not infinite – 8-10 years at best, after that the wells fizzle out**

**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 earliest horizontal resource drilling was done by Mitchell Energy (now part of DVN) in 2005 in the Barnett Shale which is in and around Fort Worth, Texas. Horizontal fracturing into shale has become much more sophisticated since those early days, with enhanced recovery of gas in place, although at much greater cost per well. An average 20 stage horizontal dry gas well in the South Texas Eagle Ford Shale or the East Texas/North Louisiana Haynesville play may cost $8.5 to $12 million. It will be drilled to vertical depths of 8,000 to 12,000 feet below surface. I have examined production data for over 50 wells that have been operating for 9 months to over a year and a half. Now let’s do some arithmetic. Let’s assume an average well cost of $10 million with an estimated ultimate recovery (EUR) of 6 bcf. At $2.00 per mcf gross expected revenues are $12 million and at $3.00 mcf revenues are $18 million and so on. Don’t forget about the expense side of the ledger. There is the mineral owner royalty payment which is often ¼ or 25% which comes right off the top. There are state severance taxes which vary from state to state but in Texas are 7.5%. There are ad valorem taxes of about 2% as well. Operating expenses will average $120,000 to $160,000 per well per year. Then the gas must be “cleaned” to make it conform to pipeline specifications. The highly toxic H2S (hydrogen sulfide) and CO2 (carbon dioxide) are removed along with excess water to get the gas below 7 ppm (parts per million). Only then is it ready to go into a KMP or EPD main high pressure sales pipeline. Estimated price tag for this gas prep is at least $.25 per mcf. Then after some number of years the well pressure will fall below certain levels and a compressor will need to be installed. If gas prices are low (like now) and the well’s gas production has declined to a small fraction of its original flow rates, the calculation is made as to which is more economic; install the compressor or shut in the production all together. The latter is the decision reached by hundreds of producers across the country. You are welcome to check my calculations but you lose a whole lot of money at $2.00 gas, lose some money at $3.00 gas, and make less than a 5% return at $4.00 gas. And all this assumes you can make an average of 6 bcf per well. The debate on this issue is becoming quite spirited. Recent data now suggest that many of these deep multistage horizontal wells are declining at greater thananticipated rates of 80% to as much as 90% in the first year. This was the case for almost all the well data that I inspected. So this means if production began at 5mmcf (million cubic feet) per day that by the end of year one that number may be reduced to 500 mcf to 750 mcf per day. The equally consequential part of this dispute is how long does this production last. The certain answer is that nobody knows for sure. The technology is so new that there aren’t any deep (below 10,000 feet) multistage horizontals that have been on production for 10 years or even 5 years. But if, and it is if, the “tail” in these shale wells fizzles out and the well becomes uneconomic after 8 or even 12 years instead of the projected 25 year life then the entire economics of the shale boom must be revisited.

#### Regulations are increasing – both at federal and state level

Malewitz 12 (Jim, “States Scramble to Regulate Fracking”, 5/9, <http://www.pewstates.org/projects/stateline/headlines/states-scramble-to-regulate-fracking-85899385716>)

Vermont lawmakers last week made an emphatic statement on the issue of fracking: Not in our state, at least not yet. In the final vote of its legislative session, the state’s House of Representatives overwhelmingly approved a bill that would make Vermont the first state to ban hydraulic fracturing, the controversial method used to extract natural gas stored in shale deposits. The practice, commonly known as fracking, involves blasting millions of gallons of water mixed with sand and toxic chemicals deep into wells, freeing the gas. Vermont doesn’t have any proven natural gas reserves, but geologists say that a shale formation in the state’s northwest corner is similar to the gas-rich shale across the border in the Canadian province of Quebec. The possibility that the state sits atop some natural gas adds meaning to a vote on an issue that’s been hotly debated across the country and has grown increasingly politicized. This year alone, 24 states have considered at least 127 bills dealing specifically with hydraulic fracturing, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures. **At least seven states have enacted regulatory laws**, although none is as strict as the one in Vermont. Meanwhile, rulemaking continues at the agency level in several other states. Proposed rules deal with a range of issues, including chemical disclosure, protection of water quality and fees on the industry. Dueling Studies All told, 32 states host natural gas drllers, and the industry is looking to expand, as new technology unlocks resources that weren’t accessible in the past. Environmental groups say fracking leaves local water supplies vulnerable to contamination — a claim disputed by energy industry representatives, who insist the process is safe and hasn't been directly linked to the pollution of drinking water. That controversy has sparked numerous studies of fracking’s impact on state economies, air and water quality and public health. But those studies, many of which are narrowly focused or agenda-driven, combine to paint a confusing picture of the issue. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is currently studying the effect of fracking on drinking water, but a draft of the EPA’s report isn’t expected to be released until the end of 2012, and announcements of the agency’s initial finding — that the practice may have polluted water in the town of Pavillion, Wyoming — have already proved controversial. “We don’t want to allow [fracking] until we get the science straight,” State Representative David Deen, a Vermont Democrat, told Stateline minutes after casting one of 103 votes in support of Vermont’s fracking ban. “The science is very poor at giving us assurances that ground water and surface water wouldn’t be contaminated.” Governor Peter Shumlin is expected to sign the bill, which instructs the state to study fracking’s full impact on the environment and on public health until 2016, when the state may revisit the issue. New Technology Outside of Vermont, natural gas-rich states such as Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Texas, Wyoming and Colorado aren’t waiting to tap into their plentiful resources. Spurred by the promise of adding jobs and tax revenue, policy makers in these and other states have already given fracking the go-ahead. But even there, officials have recognized a need to manage a technology that’s transforming the country’s landscape. “This is such a huge issue. It really is a balancing act,” says Jacquelyn Pless, who tracks fracking policy for the National Conference of State Legislatures. “Every state is looking at it differently.” The natural gas industry has been fracking in the U.S. for decades, but new technology has transformed the process. In the past, companies practiced vertical fracking — drilling straight down and blowing small holes around wells. But the new technique is horizontal fracking, in which drillers bore straight down and then make a turn, giving them access to more rock. That requires the use of more chemicals and more water — up to 10 times as much as is used in vertical fracking. “This is not like previous drilling regimes,” says Henry Henderson of the National Resources Defense Council (NRDC). “A whole new set of practices brings a whole new set of things that need to be understood.” James Morton, a state oil and gas regulator in West Virginia, agrees. Horizontal fracking was practiced for several years in West Virginia before the state updated its rules. But in July 2011, Governor Earl Ray Tomblin ordered the state Department of Environmental Protection to issue emergency rules focused on fracking, while lawmakers continued more than a year’s work crafting more permanent regulations, which were enacted after a special session. Neither environmentalists nor drillers wholeheartedly endorsed the wide-ranging policy, which includes regulations on permits, well construction, drilling location and water withdrawals. But Morton says West Virginia is “in a much better position now. The [previous] regulatory framework was not built for this kind of activity.” Regulatory Catch-up Though the federal government has recently moved on two fracking rules — one meant to cut down on methane emissions and a proposal announced just last Friday that would regulate drilling on federal land — natural gas drilling largely falls outside of federal air and water laws. With such a broad set of fracking-related issues to regulate, state lawmakers have been largely unable to enact rules that both sides can agree upon. That’s been the case in Ohio, for instance, where Governor John Kasich — a Republican — has reached out to the National Resources Defense Council, saying he wants to craft regulations that other states might follow. “We’re going to have to have very tough regulations,” Kasich told reporters earlier this year. “We can have economic success in

#### 98% of offshore natural gas potential is locked up

Pyle 12 (Thomas – president of the Institute for Energy Research, “Energy Department sneaks offshore moratorium past public”, 7/9, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/jul/9/energy-department-sneaks-offshore-moratorium-past-/)

While the Obama administration was taking a victory lap last week after the 5-4 Supreme Court decision to uphold the president’s signature legislative accomplishment, Obamacare, the Interior Department was using the media black hole to release a much-awaited five-year plan for offshore drilling. That plan reinstitutes **a 30-year moratorium on offshore energy exploration** that will keep our most promising resources locked away until long after President Obama begins plans for his presidential library. Given the timing, it is clear that the self-described “all of the above” energy president didn’t want the American people to discover that he was denying access to nearly 98 percent of America’s vast energy potential on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA) of 1953 provided the interior secretary with the authority to administer mineral exploration and development off our nation’s coastlines. At its most basic level, the act empowers the interior secretary - in this case, former U.S. Sen. Kenneth L. Salazar of Colorado - to provide oil and gas leases to the highest-qualified bidder while establishing guidelines for implementing an oil and gas exploration-and-development program for the Outer Continental Shelf. In 1978, in the wake of the oil crisis and spiking gasoline prices, Congress amended the act to require a series of five-year plans that provide a schedule for the sale of oil and gas leases to meet America’s national energy needs. But since taking office, Mr. Obama and Mr. Salazar have worked to restrict access to our offshore oil and gas resources by canceling lease sales, delaying others and creating an atmosphere of uncertainty about America’s future offshore development that has left job creators looking for other countries’ waters to host their offshore rigs. More than 3 1/2 years into the Obama regime, nearly 86 billion barrels of undiscovered oil on the Outer Continental Shelf remain off-limits to Americans. Alaska alone has about 24 billion barrels of oil in unleased federal waters. The Commonwealth of Virginia - where Mr. Obama has reversed policies that would have allowed offshore development - is home to 130 million barrels of offshore oil and 1.14 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. But thanks to the president, Virginians will have to wait at least another five years before they can begin creating the jobs that will unlock their offshore resources. Once you add those restrictions to the vast amount of shale oil that is being blocked, the administration has embargoed nearly 200 years of domestic oil supply. No wonder the administration wanted to slip its plan for the OCS under the radar when the whole country was focused on the health care decision. But facts are stubborn things, and the Obama administration cannot run forever from its abysmal energy record. In the past three years, the government has collected more than 250 times less revenue from offshore lease sales than it did during the last year of the George W. Bush administration - down from $9.48 billion in 2008 to a paltry $36 million last year. Meanwhile, oil production on federal lands dropped 13 percent last year, and the number of annual leases is down more than 50 percent from the Clinton era. Under the new Obama plan, those numbers will only get worse. The 2012-17 plan leaves out the entire Atlantic and Pacific coasts and the vast majority of OCS areas off Alaska. It cuts in half the average number of lease sales per year, requires higher minimum bids and shorter lease periods and dramatically reduces lease terms. Yet, somehow, we’re supposed to believe that our “all of the above” president is responsible for increased production and reduced oil import. With oil hovering around $85 a barrel and nationwide gas prices nearly double what they were when Mr. Obama took office, you’d think the administration might implement a sensible plan to promote robust job creation and safe offshore energy development. Instead, what we get is the latest phase in the Obama administration’s war on affordable energy, filed under cover of media darkness while the nation was swallowing its Obamacare medicine.

### Russia-Ukraine War

#### US LNG exports solve Russia-Ukraine war

Ebinger et al 12 (Charles, Senior Fellow and Director of the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, Kevin Massy, Assistant Director of the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, and Govinda Avasarala, Senior Research Assistant in the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, “Liquid Markets: Assessing the Case for U.S. Exports of Liquefied Natural Gas,” Brookings Institution, Policy Brief 12-01, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2012/5/02%20lng%20exports%20ebinger/0502\_lng\_exports\_ebinger.pdf).

A large increase in U.S. LNG exports would have the potential to increase U.S. foreign policy interests in both the Atlantic and Pacific basins. Unlike oil, natural gas has traditionally been an infrastructure-constrained business, giving geographical proximity and political relations between producers and consumers a high level of importance. Issues of “pipeline politics” have been most directly visible in Europe, which relies on Russia for around a third of its gas. Previous disputes between Moscow and Ukraine over pricing have led to major gas shortages in several E.U. countries in the winters (when demand is highest) of both 2006 and 2009. Further disagreements between Moscow and Kiev over the terms of the existing bilateral gas deal have the potential to escalate again, with negative consequences for E.U. consumers. The risk of high reliance on Russian gas has been a principal driver of European energy policy in recent decades. Among central and eastern European states, particularly those formerly aligned with the Soviet Union such as Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, the issue of reliance on imports of Russian gas is a primary energy security concern and has inspired energy policies aimed at diversification of fuel sources for power generation. From the U.S. perspective such Russian influence in the affairs of these democratic nations is an impediment to efforts at political and economic reform. The market power of Gazprom, Russia’s state-owned gas monopoly, is evident in these countries. Although they are closer to Russia than other consumers of Russian gas in Western Europe, many countries in Eastern and Central Europe pay higher contract prices for their imports, as they are more reliant on Russian gas as a proportion of their energy mixes. In the larger economies of Western Europe, which consume most of Russia’s exports, there are efforts to diversify their supply of natural gas. The E.U. has formally acknowledged the need to put in place mechanisms to increase supply diversity. These include market liberalization approaches such as rules mandating third-party access to pipeline infrastructure (from which Gazprom is demanding exemption), and commitments to complete a single market for electricity and gas by 2014, and to ensure that no member country is isolated from electricity and gas grids by 2015.112 Despite these formal efforts, there are several factors retarding the E.U.’s push for a unified effort to reduce dependence on Russian gas. National interest has been given a higher priority than collective, coordinated E.U. energy policy: the gas cutoffs in 2006 and 2009 probably contributed to the acceptance of the Nord Stream project, which carries gas from Russia into Germany. Germany’s decision to phase out its fleet of nuclear reactors by 2022 will result in far higher reliance on natural gas for the E.U.’s biggest economy. The environmental imperative to reduce carbon emissions— codified in the E.U.’s goal of essentially decarbonizing its power sector by the middle of century—mean that natural gas is being viewed by many as the short-to medium fuel of choice in power generation. Finally, the prospects for European countries to replicate the unconventional gas “revolution” that has resulted in a glut of natural gas in the United States look uncertain. Several countries, including France and the U.K., have encountered stiff public opposition to the techniques used in unconventional gas production, while those countries, such as Poland and Hungary, that have moved ahead with unconventional- gas exploration have generally seen disappointing early results. Collectively, these factors suggest that the prospects for reduced European reliance on Russian gas appear dim. The one factor that has been working to the advantage of advocates of greater European gas diversity has been the increased liquidity of the global LNG market, discussed above. Russia’s dominant position in the European gas market is being eroded by the increased availability of LNG. Qatar’s massive expansion in LNG production in 2008, coupled with the rise in unconventional gas production in the United States as well as a drop in global energy demand due to the global recession, produced a global LNG glut that saw many cargoes intended for the U.S. market diverted into Europe. As mentioned previously, with an abundant source of alternative supply, some European consumers, mainly Gazprom’s closest partners, were able to renegotiate their oil-linked, takeor- pay contracts with Gazprom. As Figure 10 illustrates, however, in the wake of the Fukushima natural disaster and nuclear accident in Japan and a return to growth in most industrialized economies, the LNG market is projected to tighten considerably in the short-term, potentially returning market power to Russia. However, there is a second, structural change to the global gas market that may have more lasting effects to Russia’s market power in the European gas market. LNG is one of the fastest growing segments of the energy sector. The growth of the LNG market, both through long-term contract and spot-market sales, is likely to put increasing pressure on incumbent pipeline gas suppliers. A significant addition of U.S. LNG exports will **accelerate this trend**. In addition to adding to the size of the market, U.S. LNG contracts are likely to be determined on a “floating” basis, with sales terms tied to the price of a U.S. benchmark such as Henry Hub, **eroding the power of providers of long-term oil linked contract suppliers such as Russia**. While U.S. LNG will not be a direct tool of U.S. foreign policy—the destination of U.S. LNG will be determined according to the terms of individual contracts, the spot-price-determined demand, and the LNG traders that purchase such contracts—the addition of a large, market-based producer will **indirectly** serve to increase gas supply diversity in Europe, thereby providing European consumers with increased flexibility and market power.

#### Russia-Ukraine war goes nuclear – draws in the US

**Kingston 9** (Brian, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs – CIFP, “Ukraine: A Risk Assessment Report”, February, http://www.carleton.ca/cifp/app/serve.php/1214.pdf)

Russia: Russia seeks to influence the weakened Ukraine, inflaming ethnic-Russian separatism; Crimea declares independence; Ukraine resists, perhaps seeing an external war as a distraction from internal strife; Russia comes to the aid of Crimea/ethnic-Russians resulting in open warfare between Russia and Ukraine. The West: The West also suffers from the global recession, but (perhaps following a period of inward looking protectionism) realizes that it cannot allow Russian success in Ukraine; open hostilities erupt between Russian and NATO forces **triggering World War III** and the strong possibility of **nuclear war**, or at least the drawing in of many other countries.

### Hegemony

#### US leadership ensures effective response to proliferation **Mandelbaum 6** (Michael, Prof of the American Foreign Policy Program @ Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, Foreign Policy, “David’s friend Goliath” Jan 1 ln)

The United States has also assumed responsibility for coping with the foremost threat to contemporary international security,the spread of nuclear weapons to "rogue" states and terrorist organizations. The U.S.-sponsored Cooperative Threat Reduction program is designed to secure nuclear materials and weapons in the former Soviet Union. A significant part of the technical and human assets of the American intelligence community is devoted to the surveillance of nuclear weapons-related activities around the world. Although other countries may not always agree with how the United States seeks to prevent proliferation, they all endorse the goal, and none of them makes as significant a contribution to achieving that goal as does the United States.

#### Hegemony solves wars throughout Europe

Walt 2 [Stephen, Professor of International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, “American Primacy: Its Prospects and Pitfalls” Naval War College Review, Spring]

A second consequence of U.S. primacy is a decreased danger of great-power rivalry and a higher level of overall international tranquility. Ironically, those who argue that primacy is no longer important, because the danger of war is slight, overlook the fact that **the extent of American primacy is one of the main reasons why the risk of great-power war is** as **low** as it is. For most of the past four centuries, relations among the major powers have been intensely competitive, often punctuated by major wars and occasionally by all-out struggles for hegemony. In the first half of the twentieth century, for example, great-power wars killed over eighty million people. Today, however, the dominant position of the United States places significant limits on the possibility of great-power competition, for at least two reasons. One reason is that because the United States is currently so far ahead, other major powers are not inclined to challenge its dominant position. Not only is there no possibility of a "hegemonic war" (because there is no potential hegemon to mount a challenge), but the risk of war via miscalculation is reduced by the overwhelming gap between the United States and the other major powers. Miscalculation is more likely to lead to war when the balance of power is fairly even, because in this situation both sides can convince themselves that they might be able to win. When the balance of power is heavily skewed, however, the leading state does not need to go to war and weaker states dare not try.8 The second reason is that the continued deployment of roughly two hundred thousand troops in Europe and in Asia provides a further barrier to conflict in each region. So long as U.S. troops are committed abroad, regional powers know that launching a war is likely to lead to a confrontation with the United States. Thus, states within these regions do not worry as much about each other, because the U.S. presence effectively prevents regional conflicts from breaking out. What Joseph Joffe has termed the "American pacifier" is not the only barrier to conflict in Europe and Asia, but it is an important one. This tranquilizing effect is not lost on America's allies in Europe and Asia. They resent U.S. dominance and dislike playing host to American troops, but they also do not want "Uncle Sam" to leave.9 Thus, U.S. primacy is of benefit to the United States, and to other countries as well, because it dampens the overall level of international insecurity. World politics might be more interesting if the United States were weaker and if other states were forced to compete with each other more actively, but a more exciting world is not necessarily a better one. A comparatively boring era may provide few opportunities for genuine heroism, but it is probably a good deal more pleasant to live in than "interesting" decades like the 1930s or 1940s.

#### European war escalates and goes nuclear

Glaser 93 [Charles, Assistant Professor in the Graduate School of Public Policy Studies at the University of Chicago, International Security, Summer]

However, although the lack of an imminent Soviet threat eliminates the most obvious danger, U.S. security has not been entirely separated from the future of Western Europe. The ending of the Cold War has brought many benefits, but has not eliminated the possibility of major power war, especially since such a war could grow out of a smaller conflict in the East. And, although nuclear weapons have greatly reduced the threat that a European hegemon would pose to U.S. security, a sound case nevertheless remains that a major European war could threaten U.S. security. The United States could be drawn into such a war, even if strict security considerations suggested it should stay out. A major power war could escalate to a nuclear war that, especially if the United States joins, could include attacks against the American homeland. Thus, the United States should not be unconcerned about Europe’s future.

### Lift Exports CP

#### Exports are feasible – increased supply is key to overwhelm domestic opposition – we wouldn’t export in the world of the CP if we have domestic natural gas demand

Ebinger et al 12 (Charles, Senior Fellow and Director of the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, Kevin Massy, Assistant Director of the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, and Govinda Avasarala, Senior Research Assistant in the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, “Liquid Markets: Assessing the Case for U.S. Exports of Liquefied Natural Gas,” Brookings Institution, Policy Brief 12-01, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2012/5/02%20lng%20exports%20ebinger/0502\_lng\_exports\_ebinger.pdf)

This report, the result of a year-long study, addresses the merits of increased LNG exports through an examination of the feasibility of exports and their likely implications. It concludes that, given current information on resources, increased LNG exports from the United States are technically feasible. While new policies may serve to change the logistics or economics of shale gas production, under current circumstances, the challenges to LNG exportation, including physical and human capacity and demands for natural gas from competing domestic sectors, are not insurmountable. It also finds that, in light of current global supply and demand projections, some amount of U.S. LNG exports is likely to be competitive in global markets. The study finds that U.S. LNG exports are likely to have a modest upward impact on domestic prices, and a limited impact on the competitiveness of U.S. industry and job creation. It finds that U.S. LNG is likely to make a positive, albeit relatively small, contribution to the U.S. gross domestic product (GDP), trade balance, and that the potential for U.S. LNG exports to make a positive impact on global greenhouse gas emissions is minimal. It further finds that there is potential for positive foreign policy impacts from U.S. entry in the global gas market, through both increased supply diversity for strategic gas-importing allies, and as a contributory factor in weakening the oillinked contract pricing structure that works to the advantage of rent-seeking energy suppliers.

### Shipbuilding

#### Increasing offshore natural gas production is key to the shipbuilding industry

Mason 9 (Joseph R. – Louisiana State University Endowed Chair of Banking and nationally-renowned economist , “The Economic Contribution of Increased Offshore Oil Exploration and Production to Regional and National Economies”, February, <http://www.americanenergyalliance.org/images/aea_offshore_updated_final.pdf>)

Offshore oil and gas production **has a significant effect** on local onshore economies as well as the national economy. There are broadly three “phases” of development that contribute to state economic growth: (1) the initial exploration and development of offshore facilities; (2) the extraction of oil and gas resources; and (3) refining crude oil into finished petroleum products. Industries supporting those phases are most evident in the sections of the Gulf of Mexico that are currently open to offshore drilling. For example, the U.S. shipbuilding industry — based largely in the Gulf region – **benefits significantly** from initial offshore oil exploration efforts.9 Exploration and development also **requires specialized exploration and drilling vessels**, **floating drilling rigs**, and miles and miles of **steel pipe**, as well as **highly educated and specialized labor** to staff the efforts. The onshore support does not end with production. A recent report prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy indicates that the Louisiana economy is “highly dependent on a wide variety of industries that depend on offshore oil and gas production”10 and that offshore production supports onshore production in the chemicals, platform fabrication, drilling services, transportation, and gas processing.11 Fleets of helicopters and U.S.- built vessels also supply offshore facilities with a wide range of industrial and consumer goods, from industrial spare parts to groceries. As explained in Section IV.G, however, the distance between offshore facilities and onshore communities can affect the relative intensity of the local economic effects. The economic effects in the refining phase are even more diffuse than the effects for the two preceding phases. Although significant capacity is located in California, Illinois, New Jersey, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington, additional U.S. refining capacity is spread widely around the country.12 As a result, refinery jobs, wages, and tax revenues are even more likely to extend into other areas of the country, including non-coastal states like Illinois.

#### Prevents multiple great power conflicts --- risk of escalation high

Crospey 12 (Dr. Seth – Senior Fellow at Hudson Institute, Former Assistant to the Secretary of Defense and Deputy Undersecretary of the Navy, ““The U.S. Navy Shipbuilding Plan: Assumptions and Associated Risks to National Security”, Statement before the Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Oversight & Investigations U.S. House of Representatives, 4/18, http://www.hudson.org/files/publications/SethCropsey--USNavyShipbuildingPlan--Testimony041812.pdf)

If the Navy’s assumption is mistaken that current political leadership will agree to large future increases in shipbuilding we will be headed toward a kind of naval holiday. The equally optimistic expectation that average ship costs can be maintained at $2 billion dollars per vessel prolongs the holiday. This will not be a pleasant holiday. China’s economy has its problems but it continues to perform. Janes Defence Forecasts says that China will double its defense budget between now and 2015.iii Russia plans a $160 billion dollar naval expansion in the Pacific which is to include 36 new submarines and 40 surface ships.iv If a couple postpones needed repairs on their home for a decade and then decides to fix all that has broken they will be very lucky to finish the job in a year. They will also be fortunate because other more prudent owners will have sustained the home repair industry. Our shipbuilding industry **does not have the benefit of other purchasers** who can sustain it if Navy budgets prove unequal to the task. For the industrial base that supports U.S. shipbuilding a budget-induced naval holiday would be a disaster that could take decades—**if ever**—from which to recover. Knowledge of shipbuilding remains part of American manufacturing. But accelerating cost, an ageing workforce, reduced orders for warships, and an uncertain future risk the nation’s ability to turn out sufficient numbers of vessels at affordable prices and profitably enough to keep shipbuilding companies alive. The destabilization of the American shipbuilding industrial base is one reason that the cost of warships is outpacing the rate of inflation. The Navy’s reduced procurement of ships over the past twenty years has caused the industry to contract, lay off workers, and in general to become less reliable. This has driven up the cost of labor and the cost of construction materials. The fewer ships the Navy buys, the less lucrative the industry is for skilled workers. As the cost of labor rises shipbuilders are increasingly pressed to attract and train qualified personnel. The negative trends reinforce each other. As younger workers are dissuaded from seeking employment or remaining in the industry by the prospects of sporadic employment those who remain—the existing workers—age. The cycle is self-defeating. Paying older workers increases overhead costs and makes it increasingly expensive to invest in the training and education of a younger workforce. The destabilization of the industrial base also causes costs to rise since many of the materials and products that go into building Navy ships are not useful for other purposes. Since the Navy is buying far fewer ships now than it did in the 1980s, many shipyards rely on a single source for necessary materials. With a virtual monopoly on these products, the suppliers have in large part the ability to name their price. The inefficient manner in which the shipyards acquire these materials drives up labor and overhead costs. The solution lies in stabilizing the American shipbuilding industry. This means that the Navy must either increase its orders of ships and/or improve its business practices, for example disciplining the changes it requires of shipbuilders once orders have been placed and vessels are under construction. Buying and stockpiling spare parts for ships that are already in service and whose need for regular maintenance and repair is well known would also help provide stability for the American shipbuilding industry. In a study conducted on the subject in 2006, the RAND Corporation concluded that the rising costs of building ships is the result of a combination of unsteady U.S. Government procurement rates and a “monopsony relationship” between the government and the shipbuilders. In a monopsony a single purchaser is faced with a host of sellers. Because there is so little American shipbuilding outside of what the Navy purchases, U.S. firms are at the commercial mercy of the 9 percent of the Navy budget devoted to buying ships. A 2005 Government Accountability Office report attributed cost increases in shipbuilding to instability in the entire industry, the difficulty in recruiting and training qualified personnel, high rates of skilled personnel turnover and the shipbuilders’ dependence on a rapidly shrinking supplier base. Finally there are the consequences **if U.S. seapower continues to decrease** and proves unable to meet even the reduced goals it has set for itself. History is a good guide. Nations in the middle like to side with the winner. During our Civil War British political leadership considered recognizing the Confederacy but was eventually dissuaded by Union military success. In World War II Sweden declared neutrality but grew increasingly amenable to Allied requests as Germany’s military position worsened. Romania initially sided with Germany in the same war but changed sides following U.S. attacks on their oil fields and a coup that deposed the pro-German dictator, Antonescu. Bulgarians followed a similar path from siding with the Nazis to switching their allegiance to the Allies in 1944. Saudi Prince Bandar, acknowledging China’s increasing international prominence and power visited Beijing last year and met with President Hu. American weakness at sea, especially in the Indo-Pacific will change the current military, diplomatic, and commercial character of the region. Whether the U.S. fleet shrinks because of too little funding or because unreformed procurement practices have raised the price of ships or because ships have been called home to save on operational expense, the result is the same. While we were once present in strength, we would be no more. A nation burdened with massive debt whose ability to shape world events has been limited in tandem with its capacity to invest in research and technology will have more and more trouble finding markets. China’s potential hegemony would not only force its neighbors’ to reconsider whether the U.S. is a reliable ally. It would also become an increasingly powerful magnet for trade in the region—at the expense of U.S. commerce. Unlike the U.S. whose seapower has protected global sea lanes that other states have used to their benefit **China has a different set of values**. It views with suspicion a liberal trading system notwithstanding the benefits received from it. **China’s friends include Iran and North Korea**. Beijing is a poor candidate to support the international order that has been the keel of U.S. foreign and security policy for a century. Waning U.S. seapower **is an invitation that China will regard as a complement to its rising military and navy** in particular. It foreshadows **a coercive resolution** of territorial disputes in the South China Sea, the likelihood of an increased regional arms race, and the troubling international perception that the U.S. is—or has—**abandoned its role as a great power**. American seapower is the strategic keel of our foreign and security policy. Reducing it would be an exercise of history-making shortsightedness. Restoring it would be an act of statesmanship from which Americans and all who cherish political liberty would benefit for the remainder of this century. Thank you.

### Elections (Obama Good)

#### Energy is not a key election issues --- other issues outweigh.

**The Washington Post**, 6/27/**2012** (Energy ads flood TV in swing states, p. http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/energy-ads/2012/06/27/gJQAD5MR7V\_story.html)

Energy issues don’t spark much excitement among voters, ranking below health care, education and the federal budget deficit — not to mention jobs and the economy. And yet those same voters are being flooded this year with campaign ads on energy policy. Particularly in presidential swing states, the airwaves are laden with messages boosting oil drilling and natural gas and hammering President Obama for his support of green energy. The Cleveland area alone has heard $2.7 million in energy-related ads. The disconnect between what voters say they care about and what they’re seeing on TV lies in the money behind the ads, much of it coming from oil and gas interests. Those funders get the double benefit of attacking Obama at the same time they are promoting their industry. Democrats also have spent millions on the subject, defending the president’s record and tying Republican candidate Mitt Romney to “Big Oil.” Overall, more than $41 million, about one in four of the dollars spent on broadcast advertising in the presidential campaign, has gone to ads mentioning energy, more than a host of other subjects and just as much as health care, according to ad-tracking firm Kantar Media/Cmag. In an election focused heavily on jobs and the economy, all of this attention to energy seems a bit off topic. But the stakes are high for energy producers and environmentalists, who are squared off over how much the government should regulate the industry. And attention has been heightened by a recent boom in production using new technologies such as fracking and horizontal drilling, as well as a spike in gas prices this spring just as the general election got underway. When asked whether energy is important, more than half of voters say yes, according to recent polls. But asked to rank their top issues, fewer than 1 percent mention energy.

#### -- Obama will lose –

#### Key polls and undecided voters

**Chambers**, **9/19**/2012 (Dean, Mitt Romney likely win in presidential election shown by three key polls, Examiner, p. http://www.examiner.com/article/mitt-romney-likely-win-presidential-election-shown-by-three-key-polls)

Rasmussen Reports has released today, three key polls that show Mitt Romney's likely win in this year's presidential election over President Obama. The Rasmussen Reports Presidential Daily Tracking Poll released today shows Romney leading 47 percent to 46 percent over Obama. Rasmussen's Daily Swing State Tracking Poll of 11 key swing states won by President Obama in 2008 shows Romney leading them by the exact same percentages. The latest Rasmussen poll of New Hampshire released today shows Romney leading there 48 percent to 45 percent. New Hampshire is a key swing state that could make a difference with its four electoral votes, and George W. Bush would have reached 270 electoral voters in 2000 without having won this state. New Hampshire had narrowly favored Obama in many polls over the last few months and while the analysis conduced here by this columnist has consistently predicted Mitt Romney will win the state (based in part on knowledge of local politics in the state having lived in New England for years), most projected have shaded New Hampshire blue and predicted it will go for Obama. This Rasmussen survey is key in that it likely shows movement in New Hampshire in the direction of Mitt Romney. In the instance of an incumbent president who enjoys just about 100 percent name recognition and is seeking reelection, most of the undecided voters are likely to swing to the challenger by election day. This is especially true when the challenger remains still less known to the public than the incumbent, as is true with former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney. By election day, those other nine percent not favoring Romney or Obama in the Rasmussen Daily Tracking poll are likely include less than one percent voting for third party candidates and five or six percent of those nine will likely vote for Mitt Romney. That would indicate a popular vote win by Romney of about 53 percent to 46 percent, or the reverse of Obama's win in 2008. This would lead to an electoral college total of more than 300 electoral votes for Romney. The 11 swing states tracked by Rasmussen in it's swing state tracking poll show Romney leading 47 percent to 46 percent, where some weeks ago the two candidates were tied at 45 percent in the Rasmussen tracking poll of these 11 key swing states. President Obama won these same states collectively by a 53 percent to 46 percent margin in 2008. Now he is seven percent behind that finish now in these states. Romney is likely to capture most of the undecided votes and could win these states collectively by at least a 52 percent to 47 percent margin. That would likely lead to Romney winning Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia and Wisconsin while having a competitive chance in Michigan and Pennsylvania. If President Obama can only win Michigan and Pennsylvania among those 11 swing states, he can not be reelected to the presidency. As these polls stand today, the election of Mitt Romney as our next president looks likely.

#### Plan cuts against Romney’s “dirty fuel” narrative – helps Obama win swing states

LeVine 12 (Steve, “How Dirty is Romney Prepared to Get to Win Election?” Foreign Policy, 6-13, 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. Romney grants that Obama is not precisely Mr. Clean -- while the president has championed clean energy technologies, he has also stewarded over the greatest buildup in U.S. fossil fuel production since the 1990s. But Romney insists he will be dirtier: He vows to **open more land to oil and gas drilling**, approve the import of more Canadian oil sands to Gulf Coast refineries, and allow more coal mining. As for Obama, Romney recently told a Colorado coal community, he isn't dirty enough to deserve a second presidential term. The president has "made it harder to get coal out of the ground; he's made it harder to get natural gas out of the ground; he's made it harder to get oil out of the ground," Romney said. The approach aligns with a campaign by the American Petroleum Institute, the U.S. oil industry's main lobbying arm, called "Vote4Energy." The API campaign, which consists of big political events and advertisements, targets 15 or so mostly swing states, those that both Obama and Romney will most need to muster the 270 electoral votes required to win. Marty Durbin, executive vice president at API, told me that the Vote4energy campaign is deliberately not backing any specific candidate or party, but attempting to centrally fix the subject of greater fossil-fuel drilling in voters' minds. "We're using this to highlight the importance of energy to the broader policy, that with the right energy policies we can have job creation, economic growth, energy security, government revenue. If voters have these realities in their mind when they go to the ballot box, that's what is going to move us forward in having a more rational national energy policy," he said. Already, he said, "the energy conversation is no longer just production and energy security. This is about job creation on a state-by-state level." Notwithstanding Durbin's disclaimer, the API campaign seems to weave seamlessly into the GOP strategy. And Maisano told me that he sees grist for GOP success in the targeted states. "Energy plays a huge role in those states, and I see it as a huge problem for Obama," he said. "It's going to be hard for him to win these states that he has to win, like North Carolina, like Florida and Michigan and Ohio and Missouri and Wisconsin. Energy undercuts him in those economies." Some analysts think the dirty campaign will ultimately fizzle. "The Romney campaign has positioned itself to beat the job-creation drum better than the Obama campaign has," said Kyle Saunders, a professor at Colorado State University, but an improvement in job numbers could undermine the GOP narrative. In addition, said John Sides, a professor at George Washington University, **Obama's incorporation of fossil fuels in his energy policy may muddle the picture for voters**. "I'm not sure that there is a lot of daylight between Obama and Romney," Sides told me. Yet my own impression is that the Republican strategy may be working, at least partly and at least for now. Given the stakes, Obama and the main environmental lobby seem more lethargic than they might be. When I sought comment for this story, API responded almost immediately with an offer to speak with Durbin. Not so much the Sierra Club, the principal bulwark of U.S. environmentalists. A spokeswoman missed a couple of emails sent over a couple of days, then by phone said she would try to scare up someone to speak. Finally, I finally received a message: "I haven't been able to track down our political team today." **In an election that may be decided on the margins,** advantage: fossil fuels.

#### Offshore drilling has massive support – outweighs all other energies

**Dixon**, 3/19/**2012** (Darius – energy reporter at Politico, Poll: Support rises for offshore drilling, Politico, p. http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0312/74185.html)

Interest in alternative energy sources like wind and solar over has waned among Americans the last year, while support for offshore oil and gas drilling has climbed back up to pre-BP oil spill levels, according to a poll released Monday. Fifty-two percent of those surveyed by the Pew Research Center support alternative energy, down 11 percent compared with March 2011. However, interest in developing oil, coal and natural gas resources rose by 10 percent, while the remainder to those who said they supported both or didn’t know. Support for offshore oil and gas drilling in U.S. waters has also recovered to its levels prior to the 2010 BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. Nearly two-thirds of those surveyed now favor allowing increased offshore drilling, up from 57 percent a year ago and 44 percent in June 2010, during the spill. The partisan divide on renewable energy versus oil, coal and natural gas development has also become more pronounced over the last year. Eighty-nine percent of Republicans favor allowing more offshore oil and gas drilling while only half of Democrats agree, according the survey. However, a 64 percent of independents support increased drilling off the U.S. coast.

#### No link – plan doesn’t happen till after the election

Lightman and Douglas 9/21 (David and William, “Unproductive Congress breaks until after November election”, 2012, <http://www.adn.com/2012/09/20/2633147/unproductive-congress-breaks-until.html>\_

Lawmakers spent Thursday pointing fingers and charging opponents with cynical political posturing. Among Congress' last decisions was a characteristic 2012 judgment: Punt action until later. It will let the farm bill, a broad measure that sets the nation's agriculture and food and nutrition assistance policies, expire Sept. 30. Congress also exits without any serious effort to edge away from the "fiscal cliff," the prospect of economy-damaging budget chaos if it doesn't act by year's end. Bush-era tax cuts are due to expire, and automatic spending cuts will take effect unless alternatives are passed. The public is noticing, as the legislative failures stir uncertainty and further roil an already-weak economy. This Congress' approval ratings were stuck at 13 percent in a Gallup survey Sept. 6-9, the lowest the pollster has ever logged this late in an election year since such measurements began in 1974. Yet **lawmakers are slinking out of town**, after a September session that was on and off for less than two weeks, following a summer recess that ran from Aug. 3 to Sept. 10. Congress is expected to return Nov. 13.

#### **Republicans and natural gas industry loves the plan**

Clark 12 (Aaron, “Obama Stance on Fossil Fuel Angers Industry,” Bloomberg, 1-24, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-01-24/obama-claiming-credit-for-fossil-fuel-gains-angers-industry.html)

President Barack Obama is taking credit for higher U.S. oil and gas production and lower imports, angering industry groups and Republicans who say he is working against domestic energy production. American energy will be a major theme of Obama’s State of the Union address to Congress tonight, Jay Carney, the White House spokesman, said in a briefing yesterday. In his first campaign ad this year, Obama boasts that U.S. dependence on foreign oil is below 50 percent for the first time in 13 years. Since Obama took office, U.S. natural gas production averaged 1.89 trillion cubic feet a month through October, 13 percent higher than the average during President George W. Bush’s two terms, according to Energy Department data. Crude oil production is 2 percent higher, the department said. “To be sure that is not because the White House meant for that to happen,” said Pavel Molchanov, an analyst at Raymond James & Associates Inc. Republicans say the numbers are misleading. Onshore oil and gas production on federal lands directly under Obama’s control is down 40 percent compared to 10 years ago, according to Spencer Pederson, a spokesman for Representative Doc Hastings, a Washington Republican and chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee. In 2010, the U.S. signed the fewest number of offshore drilling leases since 1984. ‘Drill Baby Drill’ “The president is responding to what America’s gut feeling is, that we should be less dependent on foreign oil, and he’s trying to take credit for it,” Hastings said in an interview. “His policies are exactly the opposite.” Four years ago, Obama campaigned against Republican vice presidential nominee Sarah Palin’s rally to “Drill Baby Drill.” Today he is highlighting fossil fuel gains to blunt charges that his policies are contributing to higher energy costs, according to Tyson Slocum, energy program director for Public Citizen, a Washington-based consumer advocacy group, said in an interview. “The Republican narrative is that Obama is shoveling huge amounts of money to his cronies in the renewable industry, and blocking the real energy that American needs,” Slocum said in an interview. “It’s a false narrative. The administration has been focused on green energy, but they haven’t been against fossil fuels.” Federal Leases In a January report, the American Petroleum Institute in Washington said that in two years the number of new leases to drill on federal lands declined 44 percent to 1,053 in 2010. The report blamed “new rules, policies and administrative actions that are not conducive to oil and natural gas production.” Lower imports are the result of lower demand, and increasing production has come despite Obama’s policies, according to Jack Gerard, American Petroleum Institute President. The U.S. needs a “course correction” on energy policy that includes faster permitting on federal lands in the West and in the Gulf of Mexico, he said. The group, whose members include Exxon Mobil Corp., the largest U.S. oil company, convened a conference call with reporters today to comment on what Obama is expected to say on domestic energy in tonight’s address. “We hope that the actions match the words,” Gerard said on the call. “The truth is that the administration has sometimes paid lip service to more domestic energy development, including more oil and natural gas development.” Offshore Drilling The American Enterprise Institute, a Washington group that supports free markets, called Obama’s Jan. 18 decision to deny a permit for TransCanada Corp. (TRP)’s $7 billion Keystone XL oil pipeline, part of his “crusade against fossil fuels.” “The losses due to the Obama administration’s death-grip on offshore drilling and its unwillingness to open federal lands or issue timely permits for exploration far outweigh any energy gains that the White House may tout this week,” Thomas Pyle, president of the Washington-based Institute for Energy Research, said in a statement. Obama last year called on Congress to eliminate “billions in taxpayer” subsidies for oil companies and to invest instead in renewable sources of power. In 2010, he proposed drilling for oil and natural gas off the U.S. East Coast, weeks before BP Plc (BP/)’s Macondo well in the Gulf of Mexico failed, spewing 4.9 million barrels of oil and triggering a temporary administration ban on offshore exploration.

#### Nat gas lobbyists swing the election and shield blame

Browning and Clifford 11 (James, Regional State Director – Common Cause, and Pat, Stone Senior Fellow – HUC-UC Ethics Center, “Fracking for Support: Natural Gas Industry Pumps Cash Into Congress,” Common Cause, 11-10, http://www.commoncause.org/site/pp.asp?c=dkLNK1MQIwG&b=7831813)

Natural gas interests have spent more than $747 million during a 10-year campaign – stunningly successful so far – to avoid government regulation of hydraulic “fracking,” a fast-growing and environmentally risky process used in Ohio and at least a dozen other states to tap underground gas reserves, according to a new study by Common Cause. A faction of the natural gas industry has directed more than $20 million to the campaigns of current members of Congress – including $600,000 to Ohioans -- and put $726 million into lobbying aimed at shielding itself from oversight, according to the report, the third in a series of “Deep Drilling, Deep Pockets” reports produced by the non-profit government watchdog group. Rep. John Boehner led Ohio’s Congressional delegation with $186,900 raised from fracking interests, followed Sen. Rob Portman with $91,000, Rep. Steve Chabot with $59,050, and Rep. Steve Stivers with $51,250. “Players in this industry have pumped cash into Congress in the same way they pump toxic chemicals into underground rock formations to free trapped gas,” said Common Cause President Bob Edgar. “And as fracking for gas releases toxic chemicals into groundwater and streams, the industry’s political fracking for support is toxic to efforts for a cleaner environment and relief from our dependence on fossil fuels.” The report also tracks $2.8 million in campaign contributions to Ohio’s state elected officials and notes that Ohio’s fracking regulations are among the weakest of any state. Gov. John Kasich was the leading individual recipient with $213,519, followed by former Gov. Ted Strickland with $87,450 and Secretary of State John Husted with $84,750. In Congress, the industry’s political giving heavily favors lawmakers who supported the 2005 Energy Policy Act, which exempted fracking from regulation under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Current members who voted for the bill received an average of $73,433, while those who voted against the bill received an average of $10,894. The report comes as the Environmental Protection Agency is scheduled to publish new, preliminary findings in 2012 about the potential dangers of fracking. That gives the industry a powerful incentive to increase political spending now in an attempt to shape public opinion and the debate over fracking in Congress, as well as affect the outcome of the 2012 congressional elections. “Thanks to the Supreme Court and its Citizens United decision, the natural gas industry will be free to spend whatever it likes next year to elect a Congress that will do its bidding,” Edgar said. “The industry’s political investments already have largely freed it from government oversight. Controlling the flow of that money and other corporate spending on our elections is critical to protecting our environment for this and future generations.”

#### Link is self-correcting --- Obama will October Surprise if he is behind.

**Whittington**, **6/14**/2012 (Mark, Obama’s October Surprise Could Be Legalizing Pot, Yahoo! News, p. http://news.yahoo.com/obamas-october-surprise-could-legalizing-pot-191100768.html

The Atlantic Wire believes that it has hit upon President Obama's surefire October Surprise to change his political fortunes and get him re-elected for a second term. That October surprise would be for him to support the legalization of pot. This last-minute gambit has an advantage to starting a war, being that no one would get killed. The theory is that young voters, disenchanted with Obama because of the fact they are still living in their parents' garage three years after graduation and can't get a job, will be motivated to turn out for him because he supports legalized dope smoking. The Washington Post related David Maraniss' claims of Barack Obama being a pothead during his high school days. The gambit would also answer Penn Jillette's recent rant on the hypocrisy of Obama, a self-admitted former doper, enforcing drug laws that put people like he used to be in jail. The idea that Obama can get potheads motivated enough to turn off "The Daily Show," get off the couch, and go to the polls is a very charming one. To be sure, people voting while stoned could explain a lot of election results -- the re-election of Jerry Brown as governor of California comes to mind. But the legalized pot gambit has some pitfalls. Millions of people, likely more than who toke while laughing hysterically at Bill Maher, are against legalized drug use. Rasmussen suggested that a plurality of 47 percent of Americans favor legalizing marijuana and taxing it, which makes the say yes to drugs gambit just a little tempting to a president facing defeat in November. But such a move could be turned back on Obama fairly quickly. Mitt Romney, whose skill at the political riposte has become well known, would have lots of fun with an Obama legalize dope initiative. What next, he will ask. Selling crystal meth to school kids from vending machines? And if Obama proposed taxing pot at the same time, Romney would think that the good lord really does want him to be president. The conservative base likes few things less, besides gays getting married, than legalized dope and raising taxes, even on legalized dope. What, Obama would ask, does this have to do with a bad economy? One hope would be left for Obama: a stimulus package for pot growers. It may be his only hope.

#### Voters will forget events in a month.

**Carlson**, 9/18/**2012** (Margaret, Why Romney can still win, Star Tribune, p. http://www.startribune.com/opinion/commentaries/170184556.html?refer=y)

Besides, we live in the United States of Amnesia, where no one (except maybe the press) remembers Romney's mistakes if they happened more than a month ago. Who can forget when he criticized the British, our closest ally, for not being as good at running the Olympics as he was (turned out it was)? Or his $10,000 bet with Texas Gov. Rick Perry over his health-care plan? Or his comment that "corporations are people, my friend"? Or his failure to release years of tax returns? Soon everyone may even forget the video in which he says of the poor, "My job is not to worry about those people."

#### The plan will not affect the election --- the Minimal Effect Model proves.

**Farhi**, 7/6/**2012** (Paul – reporter for the Washington Post, Do campaigns really change voters’ minds?, The Washington Post, p. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/do-campaigns-really-change-voters-minds/2012/07/06/gJQAEljyRW_story.html>)

How can anyone accurately estimate the outcome of an election more than three months ahead of time — before the conventions, the debates, and the twists and turns of the fall campaign? Primarily because Abramowitz’s forecasting model disregards the fall campaign altogether. His method acknowledges something that political operatives, journalists and candidates rarely do: Presidential campaigns don’t matter much in determining winners and losers. Despite all the noise from the campaign trail — from the onslaught of TV ads to the daily rallies to the frenzied news coverage — factors beyond either candidate’s control largely determine the result, according to this school of thought. So much is already baked into a presidential contest that even the best managed and most effective campaign (or the most incompetent one) can’t move the needle too far. This idea has been around since at least the 1940s and has been so thoroughly studied that it has its own wonky name, the Minimal Effects Model. Simply stated, the model says that presidential campaigns have a highly limited effect on how people vote. Because of partisan loyalties and other structural factors, millions of voters have made up their minds long before the most intense electioneering begins, leaving only a disengaged few for the candidates to persuade. “When you’re in the middle of a campaign, there’s a tendency for people, especially the media, to overestimate the importance of certain events,” Abramowitz says. These include high-profile gaffes, vice presidential selections, controversial ads and other moments that capture so much attention. Except, he adds, “those things have no measurable impact [on voters’ decisions]. The media are interested in getting people’s attention, but a lot of the stories you read or see are focusing on things that are trivial. The way campaigns play out is largely determined by fundamentals.”

#### GOP will steal the election --- six warrants

**Fitrakis and Wasserman**, 9/5/**2012** (Bob – Professor of Political Science in the Social and Behavioral Sciences Department at Columbus State Community College and Harvey – senior advisor to Greenpeace USA and the Nuclear Information and Resource Service, Will the GOP Steal America’s 2012 Election, Daily Kos, p. <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/09/05/1128300/-Will-the-GOP-Steal-America-s-2012-Election>)

The Republican Party could steal the 2012 US Presidential election with relative ease. Six basic factors make this year’s theft a possibility: The power of corporate money, now vastly enhanced by the US Supreme Court’s Citizens’ United decisions; The Electoral College, which narrows the number of votes needed to be moved to swing a presidential election; The systematic disenfranchisement of---according to the Brennan Center---ten million or more citizens, most of whom would otherwise be likely to vote Democratic. More than a million voters have also been purged from the rolls in Ohio, almost 20% of the total vote count in 2008; The accelerating use of electronic voting machines, which make election theft a relatively simple task for those who control them, including their owners and operators, who are predominantly Republican; The GOP control of nine of the governorships in the dozen swing states that will decide the outcome of the 2012 campaign; and, The likelihood that the core of the activist “election protection” community that turned out in droves to monitor the vote for Barack Obama in 2008 has not been energized by his presidency and is thus unlikely to work for him again in 2012.

#### Romney will maintain a working relationship with 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>)

At the same time, the potential impact of a Romney presidency should not be exaggerated. Mr Romney is not an ideological politician, and he will have solid reasons to maintain a working relationship with Russia. These include reliance on Russian transit corridors to support US forces in Afghanistan to 2015 and beyond, Russia's veto in the UN Security Council, and its potential to act as interlocutor between the US and rogue states. Finally, there is a significant element of uncertainty that stems from the lack of clarity about what Mr Romney, who has often changed his position, actually stands for. In particular, the extent of the influence on him of several competing Republican foreign policy schools (neo-conservativism, populist isolationism, realism, liberal internationalism) is unclear.

#### Give Russia war zero probability – politics, military superiority, and nuclear security

Graham 7 (Thomas, Russia in Global Affairs, "The dialectics of strength and weakness", http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/20/1129.html)

An astute historian of Russia, Martin Malia, wrote several years ago that “Russia has at different times been demonized or divinized by Western opinion less because of her real role in Europe than because of the fears and frustrations, or hopes and aspirations, generated within European society by its own domestic problems.” Such is the case today. To be sure, mounting Western concerns about Russia are a consequence of Russian policies that appear to undermine Western interests, but they are also a reflection of declining confidence in our own abilities and the efficacy of our own policies. Ironically, this growing fear and distrust of Russia come at a time when Russia is arguably less threatening to the West, and the United States in particular, than it has been at any time since the end of the Second World War. Russia does not champion a totalitarian ideology intent on our destruction, its **military poses no threat** to sweep across Europe, its economic growth depends on constructive commercial relations with Europe, and its strategic arsenal – while still capable of annihilating the United States – is under more reliable control than it has been in the past fifteen years and the threat of a strategic strike **approaches zero probability.** Political gridlock in key Western countries, however, precludes the creativity, risk-taking, and subtlety needed to advance our interests on issues over which we are at odds with Russia while laying the basis for more constructive long-term relations with Russia.

**Relations are screwed now**

Kupchan 8/21

[Charles, Whitney Shepardson Senior Fellow, 8/21/12, <http://www.cfr.org/russian-fed/russia-joins-wto-amid-continuing-tensions-us/p28858>

Russia’s accession to the WTO this Wednesday marks the successful end of a long and tortuous road of negotiations. Washington played an important role in paving the way, in the end game helping to remove the final hurdle by pressing Georgia to acquiesce to Russian membership despite the continuing acrimony between Tblisi and Moscow. Russia’s admission to the WTO should thus mark a significant advance in U.S.-Russian relations – a major step forward in the so-called “reset.” But the opposite is true. Relations between Washington and Moscow have been particularly strained of late, with the Obama administration justifiably angry over the Kremlin’s intransigent alignment with a Syrian regime using brute force against its own people. Meanwhile, the U.S. Congress has yet to graduate Russia from Jackson-Vanik restrictions – economic sanctions put in place in the 1970s intended to pressure the Soviet Union to allow emigration of its Jews. Congress is also considering legislation which would link normal trade relations with Russia to the country’s readiness to improve its record on human rights. The so-called Magnitsky Bill and related proposals envisage the public disclosure of a blacklist of human rights violators and the imposition of a visa ban on such individuals. Sergei Magnitsky was a Russian whistleblower who was imprisoned and then died while under policy custody in 2009. Without Russia’s graduation from Jackson-Vanik, commerce between the U.S. and Russia will not fully benefit from Russia’s accession to the WTO. And the Kremlin has expressed outrage that Congress is linking trade and human rights, claiming that Washington has no right to interfere in Russia’s domestic affairs. Senior Russian officials have threatened to retaliate with their own restrictions on visas for Americans, a move that could impair economic cooperation. Congress’ reluctance to repeal Jackson-Vanik stems in part from partisan wrangling amid the home stretch of the presidential race. Mitt Romney is positioning himself as the foreign policy hardliner in the contest, seeking to portray Obama as insufficiently tough in his conduct of statecraft. Romney is reserving his best rhetoric for the Kremlin, going so far as to declare that Russia is America’s chief foe. Although such claims bear little semblance to reality, the Republicans are ready to pounce if Democrats appear to be too accommodating of the Kremlin. As a result, the effort to move Russia past the Jackson-Vanick era has bogged down on Capitol Hill. Moreover, although Congress is more than justified in criticizing Russia on matters of human rights, there is also a counterproductive Russophobia on Capitol Hill that is best explained as a hangover from the Cold War. It is appears probable that Congress will be finally be ready to graduate Russia from Jackson-Vanik during the lame duck session that follows the November election. But even so, this episode is revealing America’s schizophrenic view of Russia and casting an unfortunate shadow over what should be an auspicious moment in commercial ties between the two countries. For its part, Russia has played right into the hands of American voices arguing that the Kremlin should be kept at arm’s length. The Russian government continues to trample on political freedoms; last week’s conviction of the punk band Pussy Riot is a case in point. The Kremlin’s **repression of political opponents** is not only distasteful, but also unnecessary; Putin’s political machine and personal popularity are more than sufficient to give him a strong hand. Putin’s more **confrontational foreign policy** is also costing him dearly in Washington. Initially, many American observers presumed that his more blustery tone was aimed at shoring up support in preparation for the presidential election. But Putin’s provocations have not abated, especially when it comes to NATO’s plans for **missile defense and**, most importantly, the crisis in **Syria**. Putin was arguably justified in reacting with pique to the NATO operation in Libya on the grounds that it brought about regime change under the cover of a UN mandate intended to protect civilians. But smarting over the Libya mission provides Putin no reason whatsoever to embrace a government in Syria that is mercilessly killing its own citizens. Indeed, the Kremlin seems to have backed itself into a corner, stuck supporting a regime that has lost its legitimacy and decency in the court of world opinion. Russia gains nothing from standing with Assad – and the chilling effect on U.S.-Russian relations will last a long time. Indeed, the Kremlin’s policy toward Syria is raising troubling questions in Washington about Russian intentions and its suitability as a strategic partner. Even in the absence of these tensions in U.S.-Russian relations, the implications of Russia’s accession to the WTO should not be overstated. To be sure, there will be significant economic benefits to Russia and its trading partners. But WTO membership has only modest potential to foster ambitious economic and political reforms or to encourage Russia to more fully embrace Western norms. After all, China has been a WTO member since 2001, but its inclusion has done little to dismantle state capitalism or encourage political reform. Russia takes an important step in the right direction on Wednesday. But when it comes to consolidating rapprochement between Washington and Moscow and more fully anchoring Russia in Western markets and institutions, there is still much hard work to be done.

## 1AR vs Dartmouth DY

### Sustainability

#### 2. Heg is completely sustainable- their authors are incorrect

**Beckley 12**

[Michael Beckley, research fellow in the International Security Program at Harvard Kennedy School’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, “China’s Century?”, Winter 2012]

Hegemony is indeed expensive and provocative, but these declinist arguments tell only part of the story. The United States is both “system-maker and privilege-taker”—it pays a large share of system-maintenance costs but takes a disproportionate share of the benefiªts.36 The basic claim of the alternative perspective is that these benefiªts outweigh the costs. Most obvious, the United States, as hegemon, possesses an array of tools with which to reward and punish. It can provide, restrict, or deny access to the U.S. market, technology, foreign aid, support for membership in international organizations, bribes, and White House visits. These tit-for-tat bargains with individual states, however, are not as consequential as the United States’ power over aspects of the international system itself. In the alternative perspective, hegemony is not just preponderant power, it is “structural power.”37 It is the power to set agendas, to shape the normative frameworks within which states relate to one another, and to change the range of choices open to others without putting pressure directly on them. It is, at once, less visible and more profound than brute force. Seen in this light, the United States is neither benevolent nor feeble, but coercive and capable, and the goods it produces “are less collective goods than private ones, accruing primarily to the hegemon and thus helping maintain its hegemony.”38 Military superiority, for example, allows the United States to employ “force without war,” pressuring other countries into making concessions by shifting military units around or putting them on alert.39 It also allows the United States to run a protection racket, garnering inºfluence through the provision of security. As Joseph Nye explains, “Even if the direct use of force were banned among a group of countries, military force would still play an important political role. For example, the American military role in deterring threats to allies, or of assuring access to a crucial resource such as oil in the Persian Gulf, means that the provision of protective force can be used in bargaining situations. Sometimes the linkage may be direct; more often it is a factor not mentioned openly but present in the back of statesmen’s minds.”40 To be sure, the costs of maintaining U.S. military superiority are substantial. By historical standards, however, they are exceptionally small.41 Past hegemons succumbed to imperial overstretch after ªfighting multifront wars against major powers and spending more than 10 percent (and often 100 or 200 percent) of their GDPs on defense.42 The United States, by contrast, spends 4 percent of its GDP on defense § Marked 16:20 § and concentrates its enmity on rogue nations and failed states. Past bids for global mastery were strangled before hegemony could be fully consolidated. The United States, on the other hand, has the advantage of being an extant hegemon—it did not overturn an existing international order; rather, the existing order collapsed around it. As a result, its dominant position is entrenched to the point that “any effort to compete directly with the United States is futile, so no one tries.”43 The dollar’s global role may handicap American exports, but it also comes with perks including seigniorage,44 reduced exchange rate risks for U.S. ªfirms involved in international commerce, competitive advantages for American banks in dollarized ªfinancial markets, and the ability to delay and deºflect current account adjustments onto other countries.45 More important, foreign governments that hold dollar reserves depend on U.S. prosperity for their continued economic growth and are thus “entrapped,” unable to disentangle their interests from those of the United States.46 Rather than seeking to undermine the American economy, they invest in its continued expansion.47 Finally, given its position at the top of the world trade regime, the United States can distort international markets in its favor.48 Declinists expect the hegemon to use its power magnanimously. According to the alternative perspective, however, American foreign economic policy involves the routine use of diplomatic leverage at the highest levels to create opportunities for U.S. ªfirms.49 U.S. trade offiªcials, “acting as self-appointed enforcers of the free trade regime, asserted the right with their own national law to single out and punish countries they judged to be unfair traders.”50 Globalization, therefore, may not be a neutral process that diffuses wealth evenly throughout the international system, but a political process shaped by the United States in ways that serve its interests.

### China/Russia

#### Heg key to solve China-Taiwan war

#### Blumenthal 12

[Dan Blumenthal is a resident fellow in Asian studies at the American Enterprise Institute and a member of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, “A strong military keeps the threat of war small”, 5/2/12, <http://www.aei.org/article/foreign-and-defense-policy/regional/asia/a-strong-military-keeps-the-threat-of-war-small/>]

There are good reasons for mutual apprehension; they cannot be papered over with better communications or "confidence building measures." China's dictators are neither wrong in their belief that the ultimate U.S. aim is democracy in China, nor misguided in their belief that Washington will do whatever it takes to make sure China does not dominate Asia. Washington is right to believe that China has greater ambitions now that it is more powerful. China wants more control, if not hegemony, over the Asia Pacific. There should be no surprise that China is a strategic rival: great power competition is the natural state of international politics. Why anyone thought China would be different is a mystery. Though the two sides have clashing interests, neither side wants strategic competition to descend into conflict. Managing the competition calls for sophisticated statecraft. The two sides should acknowledge their divergent objectives, while continuing to focus on their mutual interests — deep economic reform in both countries But, in the end, it will be old-fashioned deterrence by the U.S. that will keep the peace between these great powers. This is easier said than done. A war-weary United States is reluctant to provide resources for its stated strategy of checking Chinese power. Historically, Washington's habit is to cut its military after long wars. It is incumbent upon America to go against this penny-wise, pound-foolish practice. America's leaders must make the case that paying now for a greater military presence in Asia will deter a far more costly possible conflict with China. By paying for the ships and aircraft our military needs, Americans may buy themselves peace.

#### Multipolarity exacerbates current tensions with Russia – causing nuke war

**Arbatov 07** corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, member of the Editorial Board of Russia in Global Affairs.

(*Alexei,* [© "Russia in Global Affairs". № 2, July - September 2007](http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/20/), Is a New Cold War Imminent? 08-08)

However, the low probability of a new Cold War and the collapse of American unipolarity (as a political doctrine, if not in reality) cannot be a cause for complacency. Multipolarity, existing objectively at various levels and interdependently, holds many difficulties and threats. For example, if the Russia-NATO confrontation persists, it can do much damage to both parties and international security. Or, alternatively, if Kosovo secedes from Serbia, this may provoke similar processes in Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Transdniestria, and involve Russia in armed conflicts with Georgia and Moldova, two countries that are supported by NATO. Another flash point involves Ukraine. In the event of Kiev’s sudden admission into the North Atlantic Alliance (recently sanctioned by the U.S. Congress), such a move may divide Ukraine and provoke mass disorders there, thus making it difficult for Russia and the West to refrain from interfering. Meanwhile, U.S. plans to build a missile defense system in Central and Eastern Europe may cause Russia to withdraw from the INF Treaty and resume programs for producing intermediate-range missiles. Washington may respond by deploying similar missiles in Europe, which would dramatically increase the vulnerability of Russia’s strategic forces and their control and warning systems. This could make the stage for nuclear confrontation even tenser.

## 2AC vs Wayne State LM

### Death Bad – 2AC

#### Thinking about death is necessary to enjoy life

Christine **Overall**, Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences at Queen’s University, Kingston, PhD in Philosophy from the University of Toronto, **2003**, Aging, Death and Human Longevity: A Philosophical Inquiry, p. 2-3

I believe it is neither immature nor irresponsible to dwell on human mortality. Indeed, it is contrary to the history and spirit of the philosophical enterprise to declare a topic off limits for philosophical thought—even, or maybe especially, if thinking about it causes negative emotions. In Muriel Spark’s novel *Memento Mori*, the characters repeatedly receive anonymous phone messages, conveyed in different voices, saying “Remember you must die.” One character, Henry Mortimer, believes much can be learned from these unidentified callers. He remarks to the other characters: If I had my life over again I should form the habit of nightly composing myself to thoughts of death. I would practise, as it were, the remembrance of death. There is no other practise which so intensifies life. Death, when it approaches, ought not to take one by surprise. It should be part of the full expectancy of life. Without an ever-present sense of death life is insipid. You might as well live on the whites of eggs…. Now, one factor is constant in all your reports. The words, “Remember you must die.” It is, you know, an excellent thing to remember this, for it is nothing more than the truth. To remember one’s death is, in short, a way of life. (Spark 1959, 150-151) To keep directly before one’s mind the observation that human beings are mortal, that most obvious and banal fact of human existence, and to further remind oneself that one is included within that most dreadful generalization, is a stimulus to ongoing reflection about the nature and purpose of one’s life. It is a reminder that, whatever apparent security medical science and technology may offer, our lives are fragile and our connection to a personal future only tenuous. Although thoughts of death can at times produce depression and lassitude, such feelings are a signal of the significance of the topic and do not therefore show that it ought not to be contemplated. Moreover, if they are handled carefully, these feelings are not necessarily an impediment to creative inquiry. It seems unlikely that philosophical thinking about mortality is a waste of time, unless it should turn out that it is impossible to say anything of value on the subject—an outcome that I hope the succeeding chapters will obviate. Indeed, one theme of this book is that thinking about mortality and longevity may give new life to perennial philosophical questions about human purposes and values.

#### Only focusing on death allows us to truly follow our dreams and live life to our full potential

Steve **Jobs**, CEO of Apple Computers, June 12, **2005** http://news-service.stanford.edu/news/2005/june15/jobs-061505

My third story is about death. When I was 17, I read a quote that went something like: "If you live each day as if it was your last, someday you'll most certainly be right." It made an impression on me, and since then, for the past 33 years, I have looked in the mirror every morning and asked myself: "If today were the last day of my life, would I want to do what I am about to do today?" And whenever the answer has been "No" for too many days in a row, I know I need to change something. Remembering that I'll be dead soon is the most important tool I've ever encountered to help me make the big choices in life. Because almost everything – all external expectations, all pride, all fear of embarrassment or failure - these things just fall away in the face of death, leaving only what is truly important. Remembering that you are going to die is the best way I know to avoid the trap of thinking you have something to lose. You are already naked. There is no reason not to follow your heart. About a year ago I was diagnosed with cancer. I had a scan at 7:30 in the morning, and it clearly showed a tumor on my pancreas. I didn't even know what a pancreas was. The doctors told me this was almost certainly a type of cancer that is incurable, and that I should expect to live no longer than three to six months. My doctor advised me to go home and get my affairs in order, which is doctor's code for prepare to die. It means to try to tell your kids everything you thought you'd have the next 10 years to tell them in just a few months. It means to make sure everything is buttoned up so that it will be as easy as possible for your family. It means to say your goodbyes. I lived with that diagnosis all day. Later that evening I had a biopsy, where they stuck an endoscope down my throat, through my stomach and into my intestines, put a needle into my pancreas and got a few cells from the tumor. I was sedated, but my wife, who was there, told me that when they viewed the cells under a microscope the doctors started crying because it turned out to be a very rare form of pancreatic cancer that is curable with surgery. I had the surgery and I'm fine now. This was the closest I've been to facing death, and I hope its the closest I get for a few more decades. Having lived through it, I can now say this to you with a bit more certainty than when death was a useful but purely intellectual concept: No one wants to die. Even people who want to go to heaven don't want to die to get there. And yet death is the destination we all share. No one has ever escaped it. And that is as it should be, because Death is very likely the single best invention of Life. It is Life's change agent. It clears out the old to make way for the new. Right now the new is you, but someday not too long from now, you will gradually become the old and be cleared away. Sorry to be so dramatic, but it is quite true. Your time is limited, so don't waste it living someone else's life. Don't be trapped by dogma - which is living with the results of other people's thinking. Don't let the noise of other's opinions drown out your own inner voice. And most important, have the courage to follow your heart and intuition. They somehow already know what you truly want to become. Everything else is secondary.

#### Reducing suffering doesn’t consume all existence – it can be balanced and is an extension of life – only they enable complete self-denial

Conway 99 (David, Middlesex University, “Nietzsche's Revaluation of Schopenhauer as Educator”, http://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/MPsy/MPsyConw.htm)

Nonetheless, Nietzsche was mistaken in supposing that it was contrary to the interests of an individual who is otherwise free from suffering to feel sympathy and pity for those who do suffer (through no fault of their own). Pity is not the baneful emotion which Nietzsche claims it to be. This verdict leaves unresolved the ultimate issue. In a world which does as a matter of fact contain the enormous amount of suffering that ours contains, is not an individual who is open through sympathetic identification to this suffering bound like Schopenhauer says to be revolted by the world to the point of revulsion with it? Nietzsche, of course, thought the strong can and should disengage their sympathies from the suffering of the weak. I think this is a mistake. One's world is impoverished by such disengagement of sympathies. Yet how can one continue to affirm the will when one feels with all the suffering there is? Nietzsche is correct that existence could only be tolerable if we were able to live without being constantly affected by the suffering of others. However, it was wrong to think that in order to achieve this enviable state, pity should be condemned and avoided. No, on this matter I think we are entitled to place more trust in life itself than did Nietzsche. The fact is that there are strict psychological limits on our susceptibility to feel pity. Pity is in part a function of our attention. To what we attend is a function of our will. Our sentiments very largely determine to what we attend. Consequently, it is only where people have disengaged themselves from pursuit of personal projects, like appreciating and producing art or caring for loved ones, and so on , that there can be scope for a degree of pity of the sort that alone can give rise to denial of will. Where denial of will becomes psychologically possible, therefore, it can hardly be thought of as unwarranted. Nietzsche himself spoke approvingly of taking leave of life at the time before one became a burden and life lost its point. Surely, he would not have wished to frown on Sannyasis who give up all attachments at that stage in life after they have made their way through it. In conclusion, therefore, I wish to say that their are elements of truth and error in both Schopenhauer and Nietzsche on the matter of greatest divide between them. Schopenhauer is right to see denial of will where it occurs in such figures as religious recluses as a legitimate response to the suffering of the world. Nietzsche is right to see denial of the will as not always a legitimate response to the world's suffering. Nietzsche is right that life need not contain suffering of the magnitude Schopenhauer claims is integral to it. Schopenhauer is right that an attitude of sympathy for all suffering creatures is a benefit and not a bane to the person who has the attitude.

#### Denying the will to live leads to internal conflict and strife

**Schroeder 6 (William R.,** Associate Professor of Philosophy – University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Review of Julian Young’s Schopenhauer, Notre Dame Philosophical Reviews, 9-7, http://ndpr.nd.edu/review.cfm?id=7583)

Finally, Young argues that Schopenhauer’s ethics **fails to transcend egoism** because one’s care for others is only an extension of one’s care for oneself. At the deepest level, self and others are not distinct; thus, Schopenhauer’s view provides no respect for others as such (182-4). Schopenhauer might reply that standard conceptions of ethics presuppose the principle of individuation that he rejects. Schopenhauer is trying to show how ethical responsiveness is possible given his metaphysics, even if he rejects the classical presuppositions of ethics. To Young’s core objection that Schopenhauer never succeeds in showing how the atemporal thing-in-itself becomes temporal, some interpreters might reply by emphasizing his “double-aspect” theory of the Will. (The universal atemporal Will is one aspect while the individual temporal instantiations of the Will is its other aspect.) Though Young acknowledges the double-aspect theory (60-1; 78-9), he notes that this does not render any more intelligible how an atemporal entity and temporal ones can be mirror-aspects of each other. Elaborating several of Young’s criticisms, I would argue that Schopenhauer never did render his empiricist aspirations coherent with his metaphysical goals. Also, I would suggest that a single fundamental choice that would bind persons to their characters is insufficient to explain the continued experience of responsibility most people feel for their specific faults or failures. Would they even have any consciousness of such a basic choice? I agree with Young that Schopenhauer simply failed to see the potentially stimulating effects of suffering; it can certainly be taken as a challenge to greater efforts and more intense self-development. This is one of Nietzsche’s many departures from Schopenhauer, and it allows Nietzsche to adopt a life-affirming orientation toward life that sharply contrasts with Schopenhauer’s life-negation. Nietzsche retained Schopenhauer’s goal of a kind of Dionysian, mystical merging with ultimate reality, but he believed that the this-worldly life-process constituted that ultimate reality. Schopenhauer’s salvation allegedly helps individuals transcend death, but all that “survives” is the atemporal Will (or the more basic thing-in-itself); nothing of individuality survives. Nietzsche took similar solace in the eternity of the this-worldly life-process, but at least individuals might contribute to--and even reshape--that process, and its existence is far more certain. Schopenhauer is an extreme example of one path within philosophy--accepting a transcendent reality and construing freedom or salvation as dissociation from the perceived world and any interest in it. A quite different path takes the perceived world to be primary, rejecting any escape to some alternate, hidden reality; it also insists that freedom requires a sense of being expressed by this-worldly actions. Withdrawal from and indifference to the world of human affairs, from this perspective, seems like a desperate form of egoism. Moreover, it fails to achieve the peace Schopenhauer valued because **denying the will to live can only lead to endless internal conflict and strife**. Suffering and strife thus penetrate the most refined efforts to achieve salvation[3]. Schopenhauer’s metaphysics seems to undermine, rather than reinforce, his aim of achieving peace. Young’s book acknowledges the grandeur of Schopenhauer’s effort, but it also demonstrates the many ways it remains inadequate.

(NOTE – Young is Julian Young, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Auckland)

#### Dying makes celebration of life impossible – suffering will consume existence and obliterate reflection

Nussbaum 94 (Martha, David Benedict Professor, Professor of Philosophy and Classics, and Adjunct Professor of Comparative Literature at Brown University, Nietzsche, Genealogy, Morality: Essays on Nietzsche’s On the Genealogy of Morals, ed. Richard Schacht, p. 158-59)

We now turn to the heart of the matter, the role of “external goods” in the good human life. And here we encounter a rather large surprise. There is no philosopher in the modern Western tradition who is more emphatic than Nietzsche is about the central importance of the body, and about the fact that we are bodily creatures. Again and again he charges Christian and Platonist moralities with making a false separation between our spiritual and our physical nature; against them, he insists that we are physical through and through. The surprise is that, having said so much and with such urgency, he really is very loathe to draw the conclusion that is naturally suggested by his position: that human beings need worldly goods in order to function. In all of Nietzsche’s rather abstract and romantic praise of solitude and asceticism, we find no grasp of the simple truth that a hungry person cannot think well; that a person who lacks shelter, basic health care, and the basic necessities of life, is not likely to become a great philosopher or artist, no matter what her innate equipment. The solitude Nietzsche describes is **comfortable bourgeois solitude**, whatever its pains and loneli­ness. Who are his ascetic philosophers? “Heraclitus, Plato, Descartes, Spi­noza, Leibniz, Kant, Schopenhauer”—none a poor person, none a person who had to perform menial labor in order to survive. And because Nietzsche does not grasp the simple fact that if our abilities are physical abilities they have physical necessary conditions, he does not understand what the democratic and socialist movements of his day were all about. The pro-pity tradition, from Homer on, understood that one functions badly if one is hungry, that one thinks badly if one has to labor all day in work that does not involve the fully human use of one’s faculties. I have suggested that such thoughts were made by Rousseau the basis for the modern development of democratic-socialist thinking. Since Nietzsche does not get the basic idea, he does not see what socialism is trying to do. Since he probably never saw or knew an acutely hungry person, or a person performing hard physical labor, he never asked how human self-command is affected by such forms of life. And thus he can proceed as if it does not matter how people live from day to day, how they get their food. Who provides basic welfare support for Zarathustra? What are the “higher men” doing all the day long? The reader does not know and the author does not seem to care. Now Nietzsche himself obviously was not a happy man. He was lonely, in bad health, scorned by many of his contemporaries. And yet, there still is a distinction to be drawn between the sort of vulnerability that Nietzsche’s life contained and the sort we find if we examine the lives of truly impov­erished and hungry people. We might say, simplifying things a bit, that there are two sorts of vulnerability: what we might call bourgeois vulnerabil­ity—for example, the pains of solitude, loneliness, bad reputation, some ill health, pains that are painful enough but still compatible with thinking and doing philosophy—and what we might call **basic vulnerability**, which is a deprivation of resources so central to human functioning that thought and character are themselves impaired or not developed. Nietzsche, focus­ing on the first sort of vulnerability, holds that it is not so bad; it may even be good for the philosopher.49 **The second sort**, I claim, **he simply ne­glects**—believing, apparently, that even a beggar can be a Stoic hero, if only socialism does not inspire him with weakness.

#### Preventing premature death is vital to maximize temporal and spiritual existence – they preclude the possibility for people to confront the meaning of life on their own terms

Tallis 97 (Raymond, Professor of Medicine – University of Manchester, Enemies of Hope: A Critique of Contemporary Pessimism, p. 400-402)

At any rate, we may anticipate that the future progress in medical science will make possible only finite additions to lifespan, palliating rahter than curing our transcience. This raises the question of what (finite) additions to a finite lifespan are worthwhile? The answer will change our perceptions of the curve of life are altered by medical and social advances; in particular the definition of premature, 'tragically early', death will be revised upwards. Nietzsche’s Zarathustra recommended that, since we cannot live for ever, we should at least die at the right time. When is the right time to die? According to Paul Valery's M. Teste. It is said that there are two kinds of death, the natural (complete) and the ordinary - giving back to the world nothing but a corpse empty of its possible consciousness. The ordinary is the ordinary dead man (and on his features, the expression of a man surprised and slightly shocked, impolitely interrupted by some trifle in an interesting conversation). The natural of true death would be the total exhaustion of the possibilities of the system of an individual [person]man. All the inner combinations of his capacities, incomplete in themselves, would be exhausted. He has told himself everything he knew. This seems an unlikely prospect and we may assume that all human beings will leave much unfinished business behind when they die and death will remain as poignant. Does not the Utopian dream of progress, therefore distract from this fundamental certainty and so render us spiritually more shallow? I don't think so; indeed, I would argue the reverse: life and death in Utopia will be more, not less, metaphysical. With more effective ways of retarding the onset of diseases and limiting their adverse effects, it seems likely that 'old age' will come to play a bigger role in limiting the quality and duration of life. The distinction between disease and ageing is not as clear-cut as has been suggested by those who have been appropriately anxious that woes in older people should not be dismissed as (untreatable) 'ageing' and oppurtunities for improving (treatable) illness lost. Even, however, supposing ageing and disease were clearly separable, they would still interact and converge, having a common ultimate outcomes - death - and a common pathway to that outcome - homoestatic failure. The question that then concerns us is whether death purely or predominantly by ageing would be an advance over death by clearly defined disease. Death in old age will, of course, seem more appropriate (or less inappropiate) that ht edeath in youth; but, beyond this, death from old age may be less unpleasant, not being associated with intrusive symptoms such as pain, nauses, shortness of breath and gross disability. Instead, we may envisage a subtle and progressive reduction in life-space associated withan increased probability of a demise that is more easily achieved - as if the distance to be traversed between life and death has been abbreviated. The image of death by ageing as the end-result of gradual but harmonious failure of all organs is attractive. It is compatible with the current conceptions of ageing in the absence of clearly defined disease, which suggest a picture of progressive, roughly synchronous decline in function of many different organs. Such a death would seem to be likely to be more conscious more metaphysical, than death typically is at present. Do not go gentle into that good night. No; but do not go kicking and screaming, either instead proceed by a series of grey-scale gradations of evening to oblivion. The tragedy is not blunted, but purified of the kind of distraction that dominate decline and death at present. Physical suffering is not necessarily a more translucent metaphysical window than painless decline quite the reverse; to suffer is to be nailed to the particular to endure an involuntary narrowing of an attention made almost absolute. Utopia and Utopian medicine will not therefore cure transcience but may permit a death that is more in keeping with the possibilities of man the metaphysical anumal. It is absurd, therefore to see progress towards Utopia as being a means by which humankind is made shallower; on the contrary it may be the means by which human beings come nearer to fulfilling the mysterious potential within them to become ever more richly and complex aware of themselves and of the world around them.

#### Death is inevitable – they can’t get any offense. Everyone dies at some point, it’s just a question of whether people can maximize their life.

#### We don’t link to Baudrillard. We don’t deprive people of death. If people want to die, they can go ahead and kill themselves. If anyone person doesn’t want to die, then you should vote aff because it proves all our args that that people enjoy life and want to maximize it. Squo proves some people like life like you.

#### Life always has value – even if its reduced, people have some worth – they have families and relationships and hobbies and fun – which should be preserved

Coontz 1 (Phyllis D., School of Public and International Affairs – University of Pittburgh, “Transcending the Suffering of AIDS”, Journal of Community Health Nursing, 18(4), December)

In the 1950s, psychiatrist and theorist Viktor Frankl (1963) described an existentia l theory of purpose and meaning in life. Frankl, a long-time prisoner in a concentration camp, related several instances of transcendent states that he experienced in the midst of that terrible suffering using his own experiences and observations. He believed that these experiences allowed him and others to maintain their sense of dignity and self-worth. Frankl (1969) claimed that transcendence occurs by giving to others, being open to others and the environment, and coming to accept the reality that some situations are unchangeable. He hypothesized that life always has meaning for the individual; a person can always decide how to face adversity. Therefore, self-transcendence provides meaning and enables the discovery of meaning for a person (Frankl, 1963). Expanding Frankl’s work, Reed (1991b) linked self-transcendence with mental health. Through a developmental process individuals gain an increasing understanding of who they are and are able to move out beyond themselves despite the fact that they are experiencing physical and mental pain. This expansion beyond the self occurs through introspection, concern about others and their well-being, and integration of the past and future to strengthen one’s present life (Reed, 1991b).

#### -- Alt devalues life and crushes liberal politics

Kellner 89 (Douglas, Chair of Philosophy – University of California, Los Angeles, Jean Baudrillard, p. 107-108)

Yet does the sort of symbolic exchange which Baudrillard advocates really provide a solution to the question of death? Baudrillard’s notion of symbolic exchange between life and death and his ultimate embrace of nihilism (see 4.4) is probably his most un-Nietzschean moment, the instant in which his thought radically devalues life and focuses with a fascinated gaze on that which is most terrible — death. In a popular French reading of Nietzsche, his ‘transvaluation of values’ demanded negation of all repressive and life- negating values in favor of affirmation of life, joy and happiness. This ‘philosophy of value’ valorized life over death and derived its values from phenomena which enhanced, refined and nurtured human life. In Baudrillard, by contrast, life does not exist as an autonomous source of value, and the body exists only as ‘the caarnality of signs,’ as a mode of display of signification. His sign fetishism erases all materialjty from the body and social life, and makes possible a fascinated aestheticized fetishism of signs as the primary ontological reality. This way of seeing **erases** **suffering**, disease, pain **and** the horror of **death** from the body and social life and replaces it with the play of signs — Baudrillard’s alternative. Politics too is reduced to a play of signs, and the ways in which different politics alleviate or intensify human suffering disappears from the Baudrillardian universe. Consequently Baudrillard’s theory spirals into a fascination with signs which leads him to embrace certain privileged forms of sign culture and to reject others (that is, the theoretical signs of modernity such as meaning, truth, the social, power and so on) and to pay less and less attention to materiality (that is, to needs, desire, suffering and so on) a trajectory will **ultimately lead** him **to embrace nihilism** (see 4.4). Thus Baudrillard’s interpretation of the body, his refusal of theories of sexuality which link it with desire and pleasure, and his valorization of death as a mode of symbolic exchange — which valorizes sacrifice, suicide and other symbolic modes of death — are all part and parcel of a fetishizing of signs, of a valorization of sign culture over all other modes of social life. Such fetishizing of sign culture finds its natural (and more harmless) home in the fascination with the realm of sign culture which we call art. I shall argue that Baudrillard’s trajectory exhibits an ever more intense aestheticizing of social theory and philosophy, in which the values of the representation of social reality, political struggle and change and so on are displaced in favor of a (typically French) sign fetishism. On this view, Baudrillard’s trajectory is best interpreted as an increasingly aggressive and extreme fetishizing of signs, which began in his early works in the late 1 960s and which he was only gradually to exhibit in its full and perverse splendor as aristocratic aestheticism from the mid-1970s to the present. Let us now trace the evolution of his fascination with art, a form of sign culture which Baudrillard increasingly privileges and one which provides an important feature attraction of the postmodern carnival.

### Baudrillard

#### Baudrillard is wrong – reality exists – symbols aren’t everything

Marsh 95 (James, Professor of Philosophy – Fordham University, Critique, Action, and Liberation, p. 292-293)

Such an account, however, is as one-sided or perhaps even more one-sided than that of naive modernism. We note a residual idealism that does not take into account socioeconomic realities already pointed out such as the corporate nature of media, their role in achieving and legitimating profit, and their function of manufacturing consent. In such a postmodernist account is a reduction of everything to image or symbol that misses the relationship of these to **realities** such as corporations seeking profit, impoverished workers in these corporations, or peasants in Third-World countries trying to conduct elections. Postmodernism does not adequately distinguish here between a reduction of reality to image and a mediation of reality by image. A media idealism exists rooted in the influence of structuralism and poststructuralism and doing insufficient justice to **concrete human experience**, judgment, and free interaction in the world.4 It is also paradoxical or contradictory to say it really is true that nothing is really true, that everything is illusory or imaginary. Postmodemism makes judgments that implicitly deny the reduction of reality to image. For example, Poster and Baudrillard do want to say that we really are in a new age that is informational and postindustrial. Again, to say that everything is imploded into media images is akin logically to the Cartesian claim that everything is or might be a dream. What happens is that dream or image is absolutized or generalized to the point that its original meaning lying in its contrast to natural, human, and social reality is lost. We can discuss Disneyland as reprehensible because we know the difference between Disneyland and the larger, enveloping reality of Southern California and the United States.5 We can note also that postmodernism misses the reality of the accumulation-legitimation tension in late capitalism in general and in communicative media in particular. This tension takes different forms in different times. In the United States in the 1960s and 1970s, for example, social, economic, and political reality occasionally manifested itself in the media in such a way that the electorate responded critically to corporate and political policies. Coverage of the Vietnam war, for example, did help turn people against the war. In the 1980s, by contrast, the emphasis shifted more toward accumulation in the decade dominated by the “great communicator.” Even here, however, the majority remained opposed to Reagan’s policies while voting for Reagan. Human and social reality, while being influenced by and represented by the media, transcended them and remained resistant to them.6 To the extent that postmodernists are critical of the role media play, we can ask the question about the normative adequacy of such a critique. Why, in the absence of normative conceptions of rationality and freedom, should media dominance be taken as bad rather than good? Also, the most relevant contrasting, normatively structured alternative to the media is that of the “public sphere,” in which the imperatives of free, democratic, nonmanipulable communicative action are institutionalized. Such a public sphere has been present in western democracies since the nineteenth century but has suffered erosion in the twentieth century as capitalism has more and more taken over the media and commercialized them. Even now the public sphere remains normatively binding and really operative through institutionalizing the ideals of free, full, public expression and discussion; ideal, legal requirements taking such forms as public service programs, public broadcasting, and provision for alternative media; and social movements acting and discoursing in and outside of universities in print, in demonstrations and forms of resistance, and on media such as movies, television, and radio.7

### Fear

#### Fear of death enhances the value to life – recognizing death allows us to create a world of meaning and love

Kelsang 99 (Geshe, Internationally Renowned Teacher of Buddhism, “Dealing With Fear”, http://www.dealingwithfear.org/fear-of-death.htm/)

A healthy fear of death would be the fear of dying unprepared, as this is a fear we can do something about, a danger we can avert. If we have this realistic fear, this sense of danger, we are encouraged to prepare for a peaceful and successful death and are also **inspired to make the most of our very precious human life instead of wasting it**. This "sense of danger" inspires us to make preparations so that we are no longer in the danger we are in now, for example by practicing moral discipline, purifying our negative karma, and accumulating as much merit, or good karma, as possible. We put on a seat belt out of a sense of danger of the unseen dangers of traffic on the road, and that seat belt protects us from going through the windshield. We can do nothing about other traffic, but we can do something about whether or not we go through the windscreen if someone crashes into us. Similarly, we can do nothing about the fact of death, but we can seize control over how we prepare for death and how we die. Eventually, through [Tantric](http://www.tharpa.com/background/about-tantra.htm) spiritual practice, we can even attain a deathless body. In [Living Meaningfully, Dying Joyfully](http://www.tharpa.com/lmdj.htm), Geshe Kelsang says: Dying with regrets is not at all unusual. **To avoid a sad and meaningless end to our life we need to remember continually that we too must die**. Contemplating our own death will inspire us to use our life wisely by developing the inner refuge of spiritual realizations; otherwise we shall have no ability to protect ourself from the sufferings of death and what lies beyond. Moreover, when someone close to us is dying, such as a parent or friend, we shall be powerless to help them because we shall not know how; and we shall experience sadness and frustration at our inability to be of genuine help. Preparing for death is one of the kindest and wisest things we can do both for ourself and others. The fact of the matter is that this world is not our home. We are travelers, passing through. We came from our previous life, and in a few years, or a few days, we shall move on to our next life. We entered this world empty-handed and alone, and we shall leave empty-handed and alone. Everything we have accumulated in this life, including our very body, will be left behind. All that we can take with us from one life to the next are the imprints of the positive and negative actions we have created. **If we ignore death we shall waste our life** working for things that we shall only have to leave behind, creating many negative actions in the process, and having to travel on to our next life with nothing but a heavy burden of negative karma. On the other hand, if we base our life on a realistic awareness of our mortality, we shall regard our spiritual development as far more important than the attainments of this world, and we shall view our time in this world principally as an opportunity to cultivate positive minds such as patience, love, compassion, and wisdom. Motivated by these virtuous minds we shall perform many positive actions, thereby creating the cause for future happiness.

#### -- Perm – Do the Aff and [Insert part of Alt text]

#### -- No Impact – their authors aren’t qualified and don’t cite empirical data – they’re just making wild assertions. Prefer our specific scenarios and solvency claims. Doing the Aff is necessary to solve extinction, and survival is a prerequisite to forming alternative social relationships.

### Bataille

#### The Aff’s a prerequisite to the Alt – only innovative responses to tech-induced environmental destruction enable reconceptualization of technology as more than an instrument. The Alt’s passive refusal leaves prevailing worldviews intact.

Feenberg 7 (Andrew, Canada Research Chair in the Philosophy of Technology in the School of Communication at Simon Fraser University, Danish Yearbook of Philosophy, Volume 42, “Between Reason and Experience,” p. 24-27, http://www.sfu.ca/~andrewf/books/Between\_Reason\_and\_Experience\_DYP42.pdf)

As I reformulate this social version of the technical revealing, it has political consequences. Political protests arise as feedback from disastrous technical projects and designs reaches those excluded from the original networks of control. These protests are often based on scientific knowledge of the devastation caused by technology designed in indifference to human needs. This is the point at which objective facts enter experience as motives for distrust and fear of technology and technical authority. The subjects become aware of the contingency of the technically structured world on choices and decisions that do not proceed from a supposedly pure rationality. The lifeworld reacts back on technology through the objective contents of knowledge of its side effects. There have been many attempts to articulate the implications of this new situation. My approach is closest to that of Ulrich Beck. Like him I argue that we are entering a new phase of technological development in which the externalities associated with the prevailing technologies threaten the survival of the industrial system (Beck, 1992). This threat has begun to force redesign of many technologies and changes in the disciplines and training underlying the technical professions. Beck explains the transition from a capitalism based on distinct spheres with little interaction, to a “reflexive modernity” in which interaction between spheres becomes the norm. Multiple approaches and cross disciplinary conceptions increasingly shape the design process in response. He develops the social consequences of the resultant changes while I have focused primarily on the technological dimension of the new phase. In this phase, what Gilbert Simondon calls “concretizing” innovations emerge designed to accommodate a wider range of social influences and contextual factors.12 As design is pulled in different directions by actors attempting to impose their differing functional requirements on devices, the winning design strategies are often those that reconcile multiple functions in simple and elegant structures capable of serving them all. Examples abound: hybrid engines in automobiles, refrigerants and propellants that do not damage the ozone layer, substitutes for lead in consumer products, and so on. In the process of developing these technologies environmental, medical and other concerns are brought to bear on design by new actors excluded from the original technological regime. Of course, no small refinements such as these can resolve the environmental crisis, but the fact that they are possible at all removes the threat of technological regression as a major alibi for doing nothing. The emergence of a radically new technical politics requires us to rethink the basic concept of rationality that has supplied the existing industrial society with its highest philosophical sanction. Heidegger and Marcuse help us to understand the limitations of the prevailing concept. They remind us that the hypostatization of a reason fragmented into specializations and differentiated from a broader cultural and normative context is not inevitable but belongs to a specific historical era, an era that may well be approaching its end. A new understanding of rationality is possible based not on a return to a teleological worldview in which we can no longer believe but on recognition of the complexity of experiences that have been cast in artificially narrow instrumental schemas. Concrete experience is thus the touchstone of this ontology because it is only there that the world reveals itself in its multifarious and unpredictable connections and potentialities. From this new standpoint specialization and differentiation will not disappear, but they will be treated as methodologically useful rather than as ontologically fundamental. The resultant breaching of the boundaries between disciplines and between the technical realm and the lifeworld responds to the crisis of industrial society. We may learn to bound the cosmos in modern forms by attending to the limits that emerge from the unintended interactions of domains touched by powerful modern technologies. This is the form in which the lived world we have discovered in the thought of Heidegger and Marcuse becomes active in the structure of a rationality that still has for its mission the explanation of objective nature. The discovery of a limit reveals the significance of that which is threatened beyond it. This dialectic of limitation is most obvious in the case of threats to human health or species survival. On the one side, the experienced world gains a ground in respect for an object, in this case the human body or a threatened species. On the other side, a concrete technical response is solicited employing the means at hand in new combinations or inventing new ones. From this standpoint no return to a qualitative science is possible or necessary. Modern science objectifies and reifies by its very nature but it could operate within limits standing in for the lost essences of antiquity and like them referring us to an irreducible truth of experience. As we encounter this truth we are reminded of the necessity of restraint. This must be a productive restraint leading to a process of transformation, not a passive refusal of a reified system. The forward looking Janus face is fundamental and grants hope not by rejecting scientific-technical achievements but by revealing their essential nature as processes in which human action can intervene.13 Innovative responses to the new limits can serve in the reconstruction of both technical disciplines and technology. To be sure, the process character and full complexity of reality cannot be reflected immediately in the scientific-technical disciplines, but the disciplines can be deployed in fluid combinations that reflect the complexity of reality as it enters experience through humanly provoked disasters of all sorts and through the consciousness of new threats of which we ourselves are the ultimate source. The goal is not merely to survive but to reconstruct modern technology around a new model of wealth that is environmentally compatible and that draws on human capacities suppressed or ignored in the present dispensation. Marcuse interpreted this in terms of the surrealist “hazard objectif,” the rather fantastic notion of an aesthetically formed world in which “human faculties and desires ... appear as part of the objective determinism of nature – coincidence of causality through nature and causality through freedom” (Marcuse, 1969: 31).

#### -- The Alt doesn’t solve – Bataille’s affirmation of transgression without return means nothing changes.

Wolin 96 (Richard, Professor of Modern European Intellectual History and Humanities at Rice University, Constellations, Volume 2, No 3, “Left Fascism: Georges Bataille and the German Ideology,” p. 406-407)

However, as a result of the ethos of transgression that is propagated in Bataille’s work - a quasi-aestheticist valorization of transgression for transgression’s sake - one encounters serious normative lacunae. One might even go so far as to say, echoing Tony Judt, that aspects of Bataille’s thought are redolent of a more general and long-standing “vacuum at the heart of public ethics in France,” “the marked absence of a concern with public ethics or political morality.”38 I have already spoken of his work as an unsurpassable normative point of reference for much of post-structuralism. Here, “anti-normativism” itself becomes “normative,” insofar as rejection of the “norm” becomes itself a source of normativity. In recent years, as poststructuralists have begun meditating on the problem of how one would go about constituting a non-totalitarian political community - a communautk inavouable (Blanchot) or dksoeuvrke (J-L. Nancy), as it has been called - it is, unsurprisingly, to Bataille’s work that they have immediately turned.39 Yet, as Bernard-Henri LCvy has cautioned in relation to this avowedly illiberal, new “organicism” or “communitarianism”: Organicism. Naturalism. Refusal of universal values. Denial of values purely and simply. ...It is on these bases, on this mute foundation, that one deploys a cover of horror that is more somber and infinitely more clamorous. . . . I will have attained my objective when I have succeeded in convincing that fascism is not in the first instance barbarism; that is it not essentially and to begin with the apocalypse; that it does not always and of necessity mean storms of iron and blood. Instead, it is in the first instance a type of society, a model of community, a manner of thinking and of organizing the social bond.40 It is precisely Bataille’s ecstatic model of community, his manner of “thinking and of organizing the social bond,” that I wish to call into question. It is a model that, fundamentally and undeniably, seeks to establish the normative basis of social action on an aesthetic foundation. As such its guiding ethos would be an aesthetics of transgression. Bataille’s ecstatic community would also be an aesthetic community: it would be a community in which the type of social action that would be valued above all would be action that yielded “no return,” action that - in the manner of art for art’s sake - had no end beyond itself. In the last analysis, the celebration of transgression for transgression’s sake remains **unnuanced, unqualified, and uncritical**. In lieu of a conceptual articulation of how one would begin to differentiate between, shall we say, salutary and retrograde instances of transgression, we are left with an ethos of shock, rupture, and disruption, purely and simply. In essence, Bataille - and those who have followed in his footsteps - seeks to ground an ethics of postmodernity in an avant-garde cultural practice that draws heavily on precapitalist forms of social life, precisely those forms that have been scorned and tabooed by the process of modernization. Indeed, the very desideratum of an adequate “conceptual articulation” of Bataillesque concepts such as “sovereignty,” “heterogeneity,” “expenditure,” and so forth would amount to a contrudictio inadjecto. In Bataille’s sense, the very call for principled legitimation would stand convicted a priori of indebtedness to the logic of “productive consumption,” to the values of a society predicated on instrumental reason and equivalent exchange.

#### -- The Alt legitimizes violence – war is the primary tool for Bataille’s attack on the status quo.

Wolin 96 (Richard, Professor of Modern European Intellectual History and Humanities at Rice University, Constellations, Volume 2, No 3, “Left Fascism: Georges Bataille and the German Ideology,” p. 404-405)

Moreover, the cultural attitudes of both Spengler and Bataille are linked by an aesthetics of violence that is highly characteristic of the “front generation.” In a key passage in The Decline of the West, Spengler, depicting the “life-world” of blood and instinct that had been repressed by the Faustian spirit of modernity, observes: “War is the primary politics of everything that lives and so much so that in the depths battle and life are one, and being and will-to-battle expire together.”2’ Similarly, for Junger, “War is an intoxication beyond all bonds. It is a frenzy without cautions and limits, comparable only to the forces of nature.”29 Bataille (the meaning of his name in French should be recalled), too, is convinced, that “conflict is life. Man’s value depends upon his aggressive strength. A living man regards death as the fulfillment of life; he does not see it as a misfortune. . , , I MYSELF AM WAR.”30 As Jay observes in this connection: “on a deeper level, the war [World War I] seems to have exercised a certain positive fascination [on Bataille]. For it is striking that many of Bataille’s obsessive themes would betray an affinity for the experiences of degradation, pollution, violence and communal bonding that were characteristic of life in the trenches.” In the worldview of both Bataille and that of German young conservatives, war plays an essential, positive role. It serves as a means of dissolving the principium individuationis: the principle of bourgeois subjectivity, on which the homogeneous order of society - a world of loneliness and fragmentation - depends. For, according to Bataille, “the general movement of life is . . . accomplished beyond the demands of individuals." It is in **precisely this spirit** that he celebrates the non-utilitarian nature of “combat” or “war” as a type of aestheticist end in itself: “Glory . . . expresses a movement of senseless frenzy, of measureless expenditure of energy, which the fervor of combat presupposes. Combat is glorious in that it is always beyond calculation at some moment.”33 For the same reasons, Bataille eulogizes those premodern “wamer societies in which pure, uncalculated violence and ostentatious forms of combat held sway. For under such conditions, war was not made subservient to the vulgar ends of enterprise and accumulation, as is the case for modern-day imperialism, but served as a glorious end in itself. Yet, in the early 1930s, it was precisely this aestheticist celebration of “violence for violence’s sake,” or “war for war’s sake,” that Benjamin viewed as the essence of modem fascism. As he remarks in a well known passage: “Fiat ars - pereat mundus,” says fascism, and, as Marinetti admits, expects war to supply the artistic gratification of a sense perception that has been changed by technology. . . . Mankind, which in Homer’s time was an object of contemplation for the Olympian gods, now is one for itself. Its self-alienation has reached such a degree that it can experience its own destruction as an aesthetic pleasure of the first order. This is the situation of politics which fascism is rendering aesthetic.’ In Bataille’s thought war serves as the harbinger of a cultural transfiguration in which the primacy of self-subsistent subjectivity would be replaced by the values of an “unavowable” or “ecstatic community”: that is, a community that would no longer be governed by the goals of a “visual culture” - transparency, self-identity, etc. - but instead, those of self-laceration, difference, and finitude. In fact, this Bataille-inspired program of an ecstatic community has been quite explicitly carried forth and explored in the political writings of Maurice Blanchot (La Communautk inavouable; 1983) and Jean-Luc Nancy (La Communautk dboeuvrke; 1985).

#### -- Their link arguments are ontologically flawed – they homogenize and over-simplify technology.

Tomasi 7 (Alessandro, Instructor in Philosophy at the University of Rhode Island, Human Studies, 30, “Technology and Intimacy in the Philosophy of Georges Bataille,” p. 414-415)

The theory that technology is essentially instrumental is a typical example of a fix whose secondary effects are more harmful than the primary ones it manages to cure. It has illumined one side of technology by pushing the other into darkness. Jacques Ellul’s reduction of machinery and tools to a sub-system, and in fact the least important aspect, of technology represents an extreme example of this approach. The machine is only the most superficial of all technical manifestations, a mere ‘‘massive presence,’’ as Ellul argues. In fact, ‘‘it is the machine which is now entirely dependent upon technique’’ (Ellul 1964, p. 4), and technique is a mindset merely concerned with the best means to achieve a given end. The dominance of this mindset is such that it constitutes itself as a value system, in which everything is organized according to the duality useful/useless. Of course, if we define technology as technical thinking of means and ends, then there is no escape for tools and machinery from being reduced to means in the instrumental process which sees a gargantuan technique as an end in itself. In this way, though, we commit ourselves to an **ontological and definitional blunder**. It is like defining the moon only by referring to its illuminated side. Bataille and Ellul would agree on the instrumental nature of the technical consciousness, but this does not eliminate the possibility that a non-utilitarian, intimate relation with the ‘‘massive presence’’ of tools and machines is still possible (Ellul 1964, p. 6). Arguably, the use of the adjective ‘‘massive’’ was conceivable only because of the objectifying consciousness with which Ellul approaches the reality of technological devices. As a matter of fact, the machinery that surrounds me, in my own home, eludes my consciousness most of the time (until something happens, that is, that forces it to go into the open, such as when it stops functioning).

### Security

#### The alt creates a political void filled by elites – locking in oppression

Cook 92 (Anthony, Associate Professor – Georgetown Law, New England Law Review, Spring, 26 New Eng.L. Rev. 751, Lexis)

The effect of deconstructing the power of the author to impose a fixed meaning on the text or offer a continuous narrative is both debilitating and liberating. It is debilitating in that any attempt to say what should be done within even our insular Foucaultian preoccupations may be oppositionalized and deconstructed as an illegitimate privileging of one term, value, perspective or narrative over another. The struggle over meaning might continue ad infinitum. That is, if a deconstructionist is theoretically consistent and sees deconstruction not as a political tool but as a philosophical orientation, political action is impossible, because such action requires a degree of closure that deconstruction, as a theoretical matter, does not permit. Moreover, the approach is debilitating because deconstruction without material rootedness, without goals and vision, **creates a political** and spiritual **void** into which the socially real power we theoretically deconstruct steps and **steps on** the disempowered and dispossessed.  [\*762]  To those dying from AIDS, stifled by poverty, dehumanized by sexism and racism, crippled by drugs and brutalized by the many forms of physical, political and economic violence that characterizes our narcissistic culture, power hardly seems a matter of illegitimate theoretical privileging. When vision, social theory and political struggle do not accompany critique, the **void will be filled** by the rich, the powerful and the charismatic, those who influence us through their eloquence, prestige, wealth and power.

#### Alternative fails – critical theory has no mechanism to translate theory into practice

**Jones 99** (Richard Wyn, Lecturer in the Department of International Politics – University of Wales, Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory, CIAO, http://www.ciaonet.org/book/wynjones/wynjones06.html)

Because emancipatory political practice is central to the claims of critical theory, one might expect that proponents of a critical approach to the study of international relations would be reflexive about the relationship between theory and practice. Yet their thinking on this issue thus far does not seem to have progressed much beyond **grandiose statements of intent**. There have been no systematic considerations of how critical international theory can help generate, support, or sustain emancipatory politics beyond the seminar room or conference hotel. Robert Cox, for example, has described the task of critical theorists as providing “a guide to strategic action for bringing about an alternative order” (R. Cox 1981: 130). Although he has also gone on to identify possible agents for change and has outlined the nature and structure of some feasible alternative orders, he has not explicitly indicated whom he regards as the addressee of critical theory (i.e., who is being guided) and thus how the theory can hope to become a part of the political process (see R. Cox 1981, 1983, 1996). Similarly, Andrew Linklater has argued that “a critical theory of international relations must regard the practical project of extending community beyond the nation–state as its most important problem” (Linklater 1990b: 171). However, he has little to say about the role of theory in the realization of this “practical project.” Indeed, his main point is to suggest that the role of critical theory “is not to offer instructions on how to act but to reveal the existence of unrealised possibilities” (Linklater 1990b: 172). But the question still remains, reveal to whom? Is the audience enlightened politicians? Particular social classes? Particular social movements? Or particular (and presumably particularized) communities? In light of Linklater’s primary concern with emancipation, one might expect more guidance as to whom he believes might do the emancipating and how critical theory can impinge upon the emancipatory process. There is, likewise, little enlightenment to be gleaned from Mark Hoffman’s otherwise important contribution. He argues that critical international theory seeks not simply to reproduce society via description, but to understand society and change it. It is both descriptive and constructive in its theoretical intent: it is both an intellectual and a social act. It is not merely an expression of the concrete realities of the historical situation, but also a force for change within those conditions. (M. Hoffman 1987: 233) Despite this very ambitious declaration, once again, Hoffman gives no suggestion as to how this “force for change” should be operationalized and what concrete role critical theorizing might play in changing society. Thus, although the critical international theorists’ critique of the role that more conventional approaches to the study of world politics play in reproducing the contemporary world order may be persuasive, their account of the relationship between their own work and emancipatory political practice is unconvincing. Given the centrality of practice to the claims of critical theory, this is a very significant weakness. Without some plausible account of the **mechanisms** by which they hope to aid in the achievement of their emancipatory goals, proponents of critical international theory are hardly in a position to justify the assertion that “it represents the next stage in the development of International Relations theory” (M. Hoffman 1987: 244). Indeed, without a more convincing conceptualization of the theory–practice nexus, one can argue that critical international theory, by its own terms, has no way of redeeming some of its central epistemological and methodological claims and thus that it is a **fatally flawed** enterprise.

#### Death isn’t the *sole* consideration of the Aff. The advantage is also about *making life better*. If they advocate a different relationship with death, we can permute. If their argument is that we should *never* talk about death, that’s worse because it creates amnesia that destroys ethical relationships with the dead

1. Sontag 3 (Susan, Peace Prize Recipient, Human Rights Activist And Internationally Renowned Author, Regarding the Pain of Others, p. 114-116)

To designate a hell is not, of course, to tell us anything about how to extract people from that hell, how to moderate hell's flames. Still, it seems a good in it­self to acknowledge, to have enlarged, one's sense of how much suffering caused by human wickedness there is in the world we share with others. Someone who is perennially surprised that depravity exists, who continues to feel disillusioned (even incredulous) when confronted with ev­idence of what humans are capable of inflicting in the way of gruesome, hands-on cruelties upon other humans, has not reached moral or psychological adulthood. No one after a certain age has the right to this kind of innocence, of superficiality, to this degree of ignorance, or amnesia. There now exists a vast repository of images that make it harder to maintain this kind of moral defectiveness. Let the atrocious images haunt us. Even if they are only to­kens, and cannot possibly encompass most of the reality to which they refer, they still perform a vital function. The images say: This is what human beings are capable of doing-may volunteer to do, enthusiastically, self-righteously. Don't forget. This is not quite the same as asking people to remember a particularly monstrous bout of evil. ("Never forget.") Perhaps too much value is assigned to memory, not enough to thinking. Remembering is an ethical act, has ethical value in and of itself. Memory is, achingly, the only relation we can have with the dead. So the belief that remembering is an ethical act is deep in our natures as humans, who know we are going to die, and who mourn those who in the normal course of things die before us-grandparents, parents, teachers, and older friends. Heartlessness and amnesia seem to go together. But history gives contradictory signals about the value of remembering in the much longer span of a collective his­tory. There is simply too much injustice in the world. And too much remembering (of ancient grievances: Serbs, Irish) embitters. To make peace is to forget. To reconcile, it is necessary that memory be faulty and limited. If the goal is having some space in which to live one's own life, then it is desirable that the account of specific injustices dissolve into a more general understanding that human beings everywhere do terrible things to one another.

#### Their impact is a theoretical fabrication

Jarvis 00 (Darryl, Senior Lecturer in International Relations – University of Sydney, International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism, p. 128)

Perhaps more alarming though is the outright violence Ashley recommends in response to what at best seem trite, if not imagined, injustices. Inculpating modernity, positivism, technical rationality, or realism with violence, racism, war, and countless other crimes not only smacks of anthropomorphism but, as demonstrated by Ashley’s torturous prose and reasoning, requires a dubious logic to make such connections in the first place. Are we really to believe that ethereal entities like positivism, modernism, or realism emanate a “violence” that marginalizes dissidents? Indeed, where is this violence, repression, and marginalization? As self-professed dissidents supposedly exiled from the discipline, Ashley and Walker appear remarkably well integrated into the academy—vocal, published, and at the center of the Third Debate and the forefront of theoretical research. Likewise, is Ashley seriously suggesting that, on the basis of this largely imaged violence, global transformation (perhaps even revolutionary violence) is a necessary, let alone desirable, response? Has the rationale for emancipation or the fight for justice been reduced to such vacuous revolutionary slogans as “Down with positivism and rationality”? The point is surely trite. Apart from members of the academy, who has heard of positivism and who for a moment imagines that they need to be emancipated from it, or from modernity, rationality, or realism for that matter? In an era of unprecedented change and turmoil, of new political and military configurations, of war in the Balkans and ethnic cleansing, is Ashley really suggesting that some of the greatest threats facing humankind or some of the great moments of history rest on such **innocuous** and largely unknown **nonrealities** like positivism and realism? These are **imagined and fictitious enemies**, **theoretical fabrications** that represent arcane, self-serving debates superfluous to the lives of most people and, arguably, to most issues of importance in international relations.

#### Democratic structures check the impact

Dickinson 4 (Edward Ross, University of Cincinnati, “Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy: Some Reflections on Our Discourse About ‘Modernity’”, Central European History, 37(1), p. 18-19)

In an important programmatic statement of 1996 Geoff Eley celebrated the fact that Foucault’s ideas have “fundamentally directed attention away from institutionally centered conceptions of government and the state . . . and toward a dispersed and decentered notion of power and its ‘microphysics.’”48 The “broader, deeper, and less visible ideological consensus” on “technocratic reason and the ethical unboundedness of science” was the focus of his interest.49 But the “power-producing effects in Foucault’s ‘microphysical’ sense” (Eley) of the construction of social bureaucracies and social knowledge, of “an entire institutional apparatus and system of practice” ( Jean Quataert), simply do not explain Nazi policy.50 The destructive dynamic of Nazism was a product not so much of a particular modern set of ideas as of a particular modern political structure, one that could realize the disastrous potential of those ideas. What was critical was not the expansion of the instruments and disciplines of biopolitics, which occurred everywhere in Europe. Instead, it was the principles that guided how those instruments and disciplines were organized and used, and the external constraints on them. In National Socialism, biopolitics was shaped by a totalitarian conception of social management focused on the power and ubiquity of the völkisch state. In democratic societies, biopolitics has historically been constrained by a rights-based strategy of social management. This is a point to which I will return shortly. For now, the point is that what was decisive was actually politics at the level of the state. A comparative framework can help us to clarify this point. Other states passed compulsory sterilization laws in the 1930s — indeed, individual states in the United States had already begun doing so in 1907. Yet they **did not proceed** **to** the next steps adopted by National Socialism — mass sterilization, mass “eugenic” abortion and **murder** of the “defective.” Individual figures in, for example, the U.S. did make such suggestions. But neither the political structures of democratic states nor their legal and political principles permitted such policies actually being enacted. Nor did the scale of forcible sterilization in other countries match that of the Nazi program. I do not mean to suggest that such programs were not horrible; but in a democratic political context they did not develop the dynamic of constant radicalization and escalation that characterized Nazi policies.

#### -- Some threats are real – “security politics” does not motivate all violence

**Kydd 97** (Professor of Political Science – California, Riverside, Security Studies, Autumn, p. 154)

As for the Second World War, few structural realists will make a sustained case the Hitler was genuinely motivated by a rational pursuit of security for Germany and the other German statesmen would have responded in the same way to Germany’s international situation. Even Germen generals opposed Hitler’s military adventurism until 1939; it is difficult to imagine a less forceful civilian leader overruling them and leading Germany in an oath of conquest. In the case of the cold war, it is again difficult to escape the conclusion that the Soviet Union was indeed expansionist before Gorbachev and not solely motivated by security concerns. The increased emphasis within international relations scholarship on explaining the nature and origins of aggressive expansionists states reflects a growing consensus that aggressive states are at the root of conflict, not security concerns.

## 2AC vs Iowa AK

### ASPEC

#### Cross-x checks – they could have asked

#### Infinitely regressive – there is no resolutional basis – it only says US Federal Government – that’s unpredictable

#### Kills topic education – only focus on agencies not the substance

#### Not a voting issue – if they win this it just means we should be forced to specify.

#### **A2: Conditional**

#### Plan isn’t conditional – we’ll always defend it gets implemented

### T – Restrictions – 2AC

#### We meet – we reduce access restrictions on OCS lands – the plan text specifies this

#### That’s what the restrictions are

Hartley and Medlock 7 (Dr. Peter, Professor of Economics – Rice University, Rice Scholar – Baker Institute for Public Policy, and Dr. Kenneth B., Fellow in Energy Policy – Baker Institute for Public Policy, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Economics – Rice University, “North American Security of Natural Gas Supply in a Global Market,” James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy, November, <http://www.bakerinstitute.org/programs/energy-forum/publications/energy-studies/docs/natgas/ng_security-nov07.pdf>)

**Access restrictions** in the United States are in place due to explicit federal prohibition of drilling in environmentally sensitive areas or burdensome conditions required to secure drilling permits in other areas. In this section, we discuss the nature of such restrictions in the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) and the Rocky Mountain region (RMR), and the quantity of resources that are effectively off-limits. Figure 1 and Table 1 illustrate the geographic extent, with the exception of Alaska, and the quantity of resources that are effectively stranded. It is these quantities that we either include or remove from consideration in the scenario analyses outlined below.

#### We meet – removing the restrictions is a financial incentive for companies to drill for natural gas

#### **CI – “Restrictions” means “regulations” – this evidence is energy specific**

Davies 30 (Major George, “CLAUSE 1.—(Scheme regulating production, supply and sale of coal.),” February, vol 235 cc2453-558, http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1930/feb/27/clause-1-scheme-regulating-production)

Major GEORGE DAVIES The hon. Member says he has heard no reason advanced for this Amendment. I am willing to give him one, and I will tell him that the reason why the benches are not full, as they were a short time ago, is that man cannot live by bread alone and, as there is a rule against the introduction of newspapers and foodstuffs, it is necessary for some of us to refresh ourselves after a late Division. I am not going to transgress the ruling of the Chair, as we have been given very great latitude, but I want to confine myself to the point at issue, which is the regulation of sale. I have had experience in the past of efforts to regulate the sale of sugar. Like the coal industry to-day, there has been in the past an over-production of many of the fundamental articles of the life of a nation. I will not dwell on the case of rubber, but the sugar situation was entirely on all fours with this situation, as it was a question of the regulation of sale. Facing a situation very similar in kind and not dissimilar in degree to the problem now before us, those connected with that particular industry in certain countries thought it an advantage to control and regulate the sale. As soon as you use the word "regulation" in this connection it is idle to suggest that it does not mean restriction. Obviously, that is the point—to restrict—and, while 2541 it is true the word "restrict" is not in this particular Clause, and cannot be argued in connection with this Amendment, yet behind the word "regulate" is the word "restrict," in other words, controlling what has been uncontrolled, production thrown on markets not able to receive it.

#### Natural gas drilling is energy production

CMP No Date (Conservation Measures Partnership, “3 Energy Production & Mining,” *Threats & Actions Taxonomies*, http://www.conservationmeasures.org/initiatives/threats-actions-taxonomies/threats-taxonomy/3-energy-production-mining)

3 Energy Production & Mining

Definition: Threats from production of non-biological resources

Exposition: Various forms of water use (for example, dams for hydro power) could also be put in this class, but these threats seemed more related to other threats that involve alterations to hydrologic regimes. As a result, they should go in 7.2 Dams & Water Management/Use.

3.1 Oil & Gas Drilling

Definition: Exploring for, developing, and producing petroleum and other liquid hydrocarbons

Exposition: Oil and gas pipelines go into 4.2 Utility & Service Lines. Oil spills that occur at the drill site should be placed here; those that come from oil tankers or pipelines should go in 4. Transportation & Service Corridors or in 9.2 Industrial & Military Effluents, depending on your perspective.

Examples:

oil wells

deep sea natural gas drilling

3.2 Mining & Quarrying

Definition: Exploring for, developing, and producing minerals and rocks

Exposition: It is a judgment call whether deforestation caused by strip mining should be in this category or in 5.3 Logging & Wood Harvesting – it depends on whether the primary motivation for the deforestation is access to the trees or to the minerals. Sediment or toxic chemical runoff from mining should be placed in 9.2 Industrial & Military Effluents if it is the major threat from a mining operation.

Examples:

coal strip mines

alluvial gold panning

gold mines

rock quarries

sand/salt mines

coral mining

deep sea nodules

guano harvesting

dredging outside of shipping lanes

3.3 Renewable Energy

Definition: Exploring, developing, and producing renewable energy

Exposition: Hydropower should be put in 7.2 Dams & Water Management/Use.

Examples:

geothermal power production

solar farms

wind farms (including birds flying into windmills)

tidal farms

#### Prefer it –

#### They over-limit - the most common forms of restrictions are legislation and agency based – our aff involves both and is at the core of the topic – they make it impossible to be aff – most affs deal with legislative and congressional restrictions. Only 6 Affs – no nat gas affs – they don’t exist

#### No ground loss – the aff links to all their topic generics and we still claim to increase energy production

#### Competing interpretations are bad – causes a race to the bottom – they will always find a way to exclude the aff. Default to reasonability – we don’t make the topic unmanageable

#### Competing interpretations are bad – causes a race to the bottom – they will always find a way to exclude the aff. Default to reasonability – we don’t make the topic unmanageable

### Shale Gas Doesn’t Solve

**Shale gas not infinite – 8-10 years at best, after that the wells fizzle out**

**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 earliest horizontal resource drilling was done by Mitchell Energy (now part of DVN) in 2005 in the Barnett Shale which is in and around Fort Worth, Texas. Horizontal fracturing into shale has become much more sophisticated since those early days, with enhanced recovery of gas in place, although at much greater cost per well. An average 20 stage horizontal dry gas well in the South Texas Eagle Ford Shale or the East Texas/North Louisiana Haynesville play may cost $8.5 to $12 million. It will be drilled to vertical depths of 8,000 to 12,000 feet below surface. I have examined production data for over 50 wells that have been operating for 9 months to over a year and a half. Now let’s do some arithmetic. Let’s assume an average well cost of $10 million with an estimated ultimate recovery (EUR) of 6 bcf. At $2.00 per mcf gross expected revenues are $12 million and at $3.00 mcf revenues are $18 million and so on. Don’t forget about the expense side of the ledger. There is the mineral owner royalty payment which is often ¼ or 25% which comes right off the top. There are state severance taxes which vary from state to state but in Texas are 7.5%. There are ad valorem taxes of about 2% as well. Operating expenses will average $120,000 to $160,000 per well per year. Then the gas must be “cleaned” to make it conform to pipeline specifications. The highly toxic H2S (hydrogen sulfide) and CO2 (carbon dioxide) are removed along with excess water to get the gas below 7 ppm (parts per million). Only then is it ready to go into a KMP or EPD main high pressure sales pipeline. Estimated price tag for this gas prep is at least $.25 per mcf. Then after some number of years the well pressure will fall below certain levels and a compressor will need to be installed. If gas prices are low (like now) and the well’s gas production has declined to a small fraction of its original flow rates, the calculation is made as to which is more economic; install the compressor or shut in the production all together. The latter is the decision reached by hundreds of producers across the country. You are welcome to check my calculations but you lose a whole lot of money at $2.00 gas, lose some money at $3.00 gas, and make less than a 5% return at $4.00 gas. And all this assumes you can make an average of 6 bcf per well. The debate on this issue is becoming quite spirited. Recent data now suggest that many of these deep multistage horizontal wells are declining at greater thananticipated rates of 80% to as much as 90% in the first year. This was the case for almost all the well data that I inspected. So this means if production began at 5mmcf (million cubic feet) per day that by the end of year one that number may be reduced to 500 mcf to 750 mcf per day. The equally consequential part of this dispute is how long does this production last. The certain answer is that nobody knows for sure. The technology is so new that there aren’t any deep (below 10,000 feet) multistage horizontals that have been on production for 10 years or even 5 years. But if, and it is if, the “tail” in these shale wells fizzles out and the well becomes uneconomic after 8 or even 12 years instead of the projected 25 year life then the entire economics of the shale boom must be revisited.

### Heidegger K – 2AC

#### Case turns the K – global natural gas extraction is inevitable – other countries view nature as a standing reserve – the sends a global signal to other countries to use environment-friendly tech – that’s Schneider.

#### The Aff’s a prerequisite to the Alt – only innovative responses to tech-induced environmental destruction enable reconceptualization of technology as more than an instrument and of nature as more than standing reserve. The Alt’s passive refusal leaves prevailing worldviews intact.

Feenberg 7 (Andrew, Canada Research Chair in the Philosophy of Technology in the School of Communication at Simon Fraser University, Danish Yearbook of Philosophy, Volume 42, “Between Reason and Experience,” p. 24-27, http://www.sfu.ca/~andrewf/books/Between\_Reason\_and\_Experience\_DYP42.pdf)

As I reformulate this social version of the technical revealing, it has political consequences. Political protests arise as feedback from disastrous technical projects and designs reaches those excluded from the original networks of control. These protests are often based on scientific knowledge of the devastation caused by technology designed in indifference to human needs. This is the point at which objective facts enter experience as motives for distrust and fear of technology and technical authority. The subjects become aware of the contingency of the technically structured world on choices and decisions that do not proceed from a supposedly pure rationality. The lifeworld reacts back on technology through the objective contents of knowledge of its side effects. There have been many attempts to articulate the implications of this new situation. My approach is closest to that of Ulrich Beck. Like him I argue that we are entering a new phase of technological development in which the externalities associated with the prevailing technologies threaten the survival of the industrial system (Beck, 1992). This threat has begun to force redesign of many technologies and changes in the disciplines and training underlying the technical professions. Beck explains the transition from a capitalism based on distinct spheres with little interaction, to a “reflexive modernity” in which interaction between spheres becomes the norm. Multiple approaches and cross disciplinary conceptions increasingly shape the design process in response. He develops the social consequences of the resultant changes while I have focused primarily on the technological dimension of the new phase. In this phase, what Gilbert Simondon calls “concretizing” innovations emerge designed to accommodate a wider range of social influences and contextual factors.12 As design is pulled in different directions by actors attempting to impose their differing functional requirements on devices, the winning design strategies are often those that reconcile multiple functions in simple and elegant structures capable of serving them all. Examples abound: hybrid engines in automobiles, refrigerants and propellants that do not damage the ozone layer, substitutes for lead in consumer products, and so on. In the process of developing these technologies environmental, medical and other concerns are brought to bear on design by new actors excluded from the original technological regime. Of course, no small refinements such as these can resolve the environmental crisis, but the fact that they are possible at all removes the threat of technological regression as a major alibi for doing nothing. The emergence of a radically new technical politics requires us to rethink the basic concept of rationality that has supplied the existing industrial society with its highest philosophical sanction. Heidegger and Marcuse help us to understand the limitations of the prevailing concept. They remind us that the hypostatization of a reason fragmented into specializations and differentiated from a broader cultural and normative context is not inevitable but belongs to a specific historical era, an era that may well be approaching its end. A new understanding of rationality is possible based not on a return to a teleological worldview in which we can no longer believe but on recognition of the complexity of experiences that have been cast in artificially narrow instrumental schemas. Concrete experience is thus the touchstone of this ontology because it is only there that the world reveals itself in its multifarious and unpredictable connections and potentialities. From this new standpoint specialization and differentiation will not disappear, but they will be treated as methodologically useful rather than as ontologically fundamental. The resultant breaching of the boundaries between disciplines and between the technical realm and the lifeworld responds to the crisis of industrial society. We may learn to bound the cosmos in modern forms by attending to the limits that emerge from the unintended interactions of domains touched by powerful modern technologies. This is the form in which the lived world we have discovered in the thought of Heidegger and Marcuse becomes active in the structure of a rationality that still has for its mission the explanation of objective nature. The discovery of a limit reveals the significance of that which is threatened beyond it. This dialectic of limitation is most obvious in the case of threats to human health or species survival. On the one side, the experienced world gains a ground in respect for an object, in this case the human body or a threatened species. On the other side, a concrete technical response is solicited employing the means at hand in new combinations or inventing new ones. From this standpoint no return to a qualitative science is possible or necessary. Modern science objectifies and reifies by its very nature but it could operate within limits standing in for the lost essences of antiquity and like them referring us to an irreducible truth of experience. As we encounter this truth we are reminded of the necessity of restraint. This must be a productive restraint leading to a process of transformation, not a passive refusal of a reified system. The forward looking Janus face is fundamental and grants hope not by rejecting scientific-technical achievements but by revealing their essential nature as processes in which human action can intervene.13 Innovative responses to the new limits can serve in the reconstruction of both technical disciplines and technology. To be sure, the process character and full complexity of reality cannot be reflected immediately in the scientific-technical disciplines, but the disciplines can be deployed in fluid combinations that reflect the complexity of reality as it enters experience through humanly provoked disasters of all sorts and through the consciousness of new threats of which we ourselves are the ultimate source. The goal is not merely to survive but to reconstruct modern technology around a new model of wealth that is environmentally compatible and that draws on human capacities suppressed or ignored in the present dispensation. Marcuse interpreted this in terms of the surrealist “hazard objectif,” the rather fantastic notion of an aesthetically formed world in which “human faculties and desires ... appear as part of the objective determinism of nature – coincidence of causality through nature and causality through freedom” (Marcuse, 1969: 31).

#### Perm – do the plan and non-competitive parts of the alternative. It solves best.

**McWhorter 92** (Ladelle, Assistant Professor of Philosophy – Northeast Missouri State University, Heidegger and the Earth, p. 3)

Heidegger's work is a call to reflect, to think in some way other than calculatively, technologically, pragmatically. Once we begin to move with and into Heidegger's call and begin to see our trying to seize control and solve problems as itself a problematic approach, if we still believe that thinking's only real purpose is to function as a prelude to action, we who attempt to think will twist within the agonizing grip of paradox, feeling nothing but frustration, unable to conceive of ourselves as anything but paralyzed. However, as so many peoples before us have known, paradox is not only a trap; it is also a scattering point and passageway. Paradox invites examination of its own constitution (hence of the patterns of thinking within which it occurs) and thereby breaks a way of thinking open, revealing the configurations of power that propel it and hold it on track. And thus it makes possible the dissipation of that power and the deflection of thinking into new paths and new possibilities.

#### -- No extinction – tech and calculation have existed forever – and the world is getting better

#### -- Extinction outweighs – pre-requisite to Being

**Zimmerman 93** (Michael E., Professor of Philosophy – University of Tulane, Contesting Earth’s Future: Radical Ecology and Postmodernity, p. 119-120)

Heidegger asserted that human self assertion, combined with the eclipse of being, threatens the relation between being and human Dasein. Loss of this relation would be even more dangerous than a nuclear war that might “bring about the complete annihilation of humanity and the destruction of the earth.” This controversial claim is comparable to the Christian teaching that it is better to forfeit the world than to lose one’s soul by losing ones relation to God. Heidegger apparently thought along these lines: it is possible that after a nuclear war, life might once again emerge, but it is far less likely that there will ever again occur in an ontological clearing through which life could manifest itself. Further, since modernity’s one dimensional disclosure to entities virtually denies that any “being” at all, the loss of humanity’s openness for being is already occurring. Modernity’s background mood is horror in the face of nihilism, which is consistent with the aim of providing material happiness for everyone by reducing nature into pure energy. The unleashing of vast quantities of energy in a nuclear war would be equivalent to modernity’s slow destruction of nature: unbounded destruction would equal limitless consumption. If humanity avoided a nuclear war only to survive as contended clever animals, Heidegger believed we would exist in a state of ontological damnation: hell on earth, masquerading as material paradise. Deep ecologists might agree that a world of material human comfort purchased at the price of everything wild would not be a world worth living in, for in killing wild nature, people would be as good as dead. **But most** of them **could not agree that the loss of humanity’s relation to being would be worse than nuclear omnicide**, for it is wrong to suppose that the lives of millions of extinct and unknown species are somehow lessened because they were never “disclosed” by humanity.

**Perm do plan and exchange the ontology of being for one of becoming**

#### Framework – evaluate the aff vs. status quo or a competitive policy option. That’s best for fairness and predictability – there are too many frameworks to predict and they moot all of the 1ac – makes it impossible to be aff. Only our framework solves activism.

#### -- Alt fails – ‘letting be’ and waiting for metaphysical transformation dooms us to extinction

**Santoni 85** (Ronald E., Professor of Philosophy – Denison, Nuclear War, Ed. Fox and Groarke, p. 156-157)

To be sure, Fox sees the need for our undergoing “certain fundamental changes” in our “thinking, beliefs, attitudes, values” and Zimmerman calls for a “paradigm shift” in our thinking about ourselves, other, and the Earth. But it is not clear that what either offers as suggestions for what we can, must, or should do in the face of a runaway arms race are sufficient to “wind down” the arms race before it leads to **omnicide**. In spite of the importance of Fox’s analysis and reminders it is not clear that “admitting our (nuclear) fear and anxiety” to ourselves and “identifying the mechanisms that dull or mask our emotional and other responses” represent much more than examples of basic, often. stated principles of psychotherapy. Being aware of the psychological maneuvers that keep us numb to nuclear reality may well be the road to transcending them but it must only be a “first step” (as Fox acknowledges), during which we **simultaneously act** to eliminate nuclear threats, break our complicity with the arms race, get rid of arsenals of genocidal weaponry, and create conditions for international goodwill, mutual trust, and creative interdependence. Similarly, in respect to Zimmerman: in spite of the challenging Heideggerian insights he brings out regarding what motivates the arms race, many questions may be raised about his prescribed “solutions.” Given our need for a paradigm shift in our (distorted) understanding of ourselves and the rest of being, are we merely left “to prepare for a possible shift in our self-understanding? (italics mine)? Is this all we can do? Is it necessarily the case that such a shift “cannot come as a result of our own will?” – and work – but only from “a destiny outside our control?” Does this mean we leave to God the matter of bringing about a paradigm shift? Granted our fears and the importance of not being controlled by fears, as well as our “anthropocentric leanings,” should we be as cautious as Zimmerman suggests about our disposition “to want to do something” or “to act decisively in the face of the current threat?” In spite of the importance of our taking on the anxiety of our finitude and our present limitation, does it follow that “we should be willing for the worst (i.e. an all-out nuclear war) to occur”? Zimmerman wrongly, I contend, equates “resistance” with “denial” when he says that “as long as we resist and deny the possibility of nuclear war, that possibility will persist and grow stronger.” He also wrongly perceives “resistance” as presupposing a clinging to the “order of things that now prevails.” Resistance connotes opposing, and striving to defeat a prevailing state of affairs that would allow or encourage the “worst to occur.” I submit, against Zimmerman, that we should not, in any sense, be willing for nuclear war or omnicide to occur. (This is not to suggest that we should be numb to the possibility of its occurrence.) Despite Zimmerman’s elaborations and refinements his Heideggerian notion of “letting beings be” continues to be **too permissive** in this regard. In my judgment, an individual’s decision not to act against and resist his or her government’s preparations for nuclear holocaust is, as I have argued elsewhere, to be **an early accomplice to** the most horrendous crime against life imaginable – its **annihilation**.

#### That’s especially true for the environment

**Levy 99** (Neil, Ph.D. in Comparative Literature and Critical Theory – Monash University, and Currently Tutor, Centre for Critical Theory, Monash University, (Discourses of the Environment edited by Eric Darier) p. 214-215)

If our current situation can really be accurately characterized as the extension of bio-power from the realm of population to that of all life, does that entail that the strategies we should be adopting are those of management of the non-human world, as well as that of the human? I believe that **it does**. But I do not believe that this necessitates, or even makes possible, the genetically engineered, artificial world which McKibben and many others who have advocated non-anthropocentric ethics have feared, the replacement of the natural world with `a space station' (McKibben 1989: 170). And not just for the reason that, after the end of nature, the artificial/natural distinction is impossible to maintain. The world McKibben fears, in which forests are replaced by trees designed by us for maximum efficiency at absorbing carbon, and new strains of genetically engineered corn flourish in the new conditions brought about by global warming, seems to me unlikely in the extreme. The systems with which we are dealing, the imbrication of a huge variety of forms of life with chemical processes, with meteorological and geographic processes, are so complex, and occur on such scale, that I can see no way in which they could be replaced by artificial systems which would fulfil the same functions. Every intervention we make in' that direction has consequences which are so far-reaching, and involve so many variables and as yet undetected connections between relatively independent systems, that they are practically unforeseeable. To replace non-human systems with mechanisms of our own devising would involve thousands of such interventions, each of which would then require follow-up interventions in order to reverse or control their unintended consequences. Even when, and if, our knowledge of the environment were to reach a stage at which we were able to predict the consequences of our interventions, it would be likely to be far easier, and, in the long run, cheaper, simply to turn the already functioning, `natural' systems to our advantage. No method of reducing the amount of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere is likely to be more effective than preserving the Amazonian rain forest. For this reason, I believe, environmentalists **have nothing to fear from** such **an apparently instrumental approach.** If the `technological fix' is unlikely to be more successful than strategies of limitation of our use of resources, we are nevertheless **unable simply to leave the environment as it is.** There is a real and pressing need for more, and more accurate, technical and scientific information about the non-human world. For we are faced with a situation in which the processes we have **already set in train** will continue to impact upon that world, and therefore us, for centuries. It is therefore necessary, not only to stop cutting down the rain forests, but to **develop** real, **concrete proposals for action**, to reverse, or at least limit, the effects of our previous interventions. Moreover, there is another reason why our behaviour towards the non-human cannot simply be a matter of leaving it as it is, at least in so far as our goals are not only environmental but also involve social justice. For if we simply preserve what remains to us of wilderness, of the countryside and of park land, we also **preserve patterns of very unequal access to their resources** and their consolations (Soper 1995: 207). In fact, **we risk exacerbating these inequalities**. It is not us, but the poor of Brazil, who will bear the brunt of the misery which would result from a strictly enforced policy of leaving the Amazonian rain forest untouched, in the absence of alternative means of providing for their livelihood. It is the development of policies to provide such ecologically sustainable alternatives which we require, as well as the development of technical means for replacing our current green-house gas-emitting sources of energy. Such policies and proposals **for concrete action** must be formulated by ecologists, environmentalists, people with expertise concerning the functioning of ecosystems and the impacts which our actions have upon them. Such proposals are, therefore, **very much the province of Foucault's specific intellectual,** the one who works `within specific sectors, at the precise points where their own conditions of life or work situate them' (Foucault 1980g: 126). For who could be more fittingly described as `the strategists of life and death' than these environmentalists? After the end of the Cold War, it is in this sphere, more than any other, that man's `politics places his existence as a living being in question' (Foucault 1976: 143). For it is in facing the consequences of our intervention in the non-human world that the **fate of our species**, and of those with whom we share this planet, **will be decided**.

#### -- Fracking and technology makes all your impacts inevitable – it will exist in some form of another – makes technological forms inevitable

#### -- The alt rejects humanism – dooming the planet to extinction

**Davies 97** (Tony, Professor of English – Birmingham University, Humanism, p. 130-132)

So there will not after all be, nor indeed could there be, any tidy definitions. The several humanisms – the civic humanism of the quattrocento Italian city-states, the Protestant humanism of sixteenth century northern Europe, the rationalistic humanism that attended at the revolutions of enlightened modernity, and the romantic and positivistic humanisms through which the European bourgeoisies established their hegemony over it, the revolutionary humanism that shook the world and the liberal humanism that sought to tame it, the humanism of the Nazis and the humanism of their victims and opponents, the antihumanist humanism of Heidegger and the humanist antihumanism of Foucault and Althusser – are not reducible to one, or even to a single line or pattern. Each has its distinctive historical curve, its particular discursive poetics, its own problematic scansion of the human. Each seeks, as all discourses must, to impose its own answer to the question of ‘which is to be master’. Meanwhile, the problem of humanism remains, for the present, an inescapable horizon within which all attempts to think about the ways in which human being have, do, might live together in and on the world are contained. Not that the actual humanisms described here necessarily provide a model, or even a useful history, least of all for those very numerous people, and peoples, for whom they have been alien and oppressive. Some, at least, offer a grim warning. Certainly it should no longer be possible to formulate phrases like ‘the destiny of man’ or ‘the triumph of human reason’ without an instant consciousness of the folly and brutality they drag behind them. All humanisms, until now, have been imperial. They speak of the human in the accents and the interests of a class, a sex, a ‘race’. Their embrace suffocates those whom it does not ignore. The first humanists scripted the tyranny of Borgias, Medicis and Tudors. Later humanisms dreamed of freedom and celebrated Frederick II, Bonaparte, Bismarck, Stalin. The liberators of colonial America, like the Greek and Roman thinkers they emulated, owned slaves. At various times, not excluding the present, the circuit of the human has excluded women, those who do not speak Greek or Latin or English, those whose complexions are not pink, children, Jews. It is almost impossible to think of a crime that has not been committed in the name of humanity. At the same time, though it is clear that the master narrative of transcendental Man has outlasted its usefulness, **it would be unwise** simply **to abandon the ground occupied by** the historical **humanisms**. For one thing, some variety of humanism remains, on many occasions, the only available alternative to bigotry and persecution. The freedom to speak and write, to organize and campaign in defence of individual or collective interests, to protest and disobey: all these, and the prospect of a world in which they will be secured, can only be articulated in humanist terms. It is true that the Baconian ‘Knowledge of Causes, and Secrett Motions of Things’, harnessed to an overweening rationality and an unbridled technological will to power, has enlarged the bounds of human empire to the point of **endangering the survival of the** violated **planet** on which we live. But how, if not by mobilizing collective resources of human understanding and responsibility of ‘enlightened self-interest’ even, can that danger be turned aside?

#### Valuing nature as standing reserve is essential to the survival of all species—only humans have to cognitive ability to make moral decisions to preserve their environment

Younkins 4 (Professor of Business Administration, Wheeling Jesuit (Edward, The Flawed Doctrine of Nature's Intrinsic Value, Quebecois Libre 147, http://www.quebecoislibre.org/04/041015-17.htm, gender modified)

Environmentalists erroneously assign human values and concern to an amoral material sphere. When environmentalists talk about the nonhuman natural world, they commonly attribute human values to it, which, of course, are completely irrelevant to the nonhuman realm. For example, “nature” is incapable of being concerned with the possible extinction of any particular ephemeral species. Over 99 percent of all species of life that have ever existed on earth have been estimated to be extinct with the great majority of these perishing because of nonhuman factors. Nature cannot care about “biodiversity.” Humans happen to value biodiversity because it reflects the state of the natural world in which they currently live. Without humans, the beauty and spectacle of nature would not exist – such ideas can only exist in the mind of a rational valuer. These environmentalists fail to realize that value means having value to some valuer. To be a value some aspect of nature must be a value to some human being. People have the capacity to assign and to create value with respect to nonhuman existents. Nature, in the form of natural resources, does not exist independently of man. Men, choosing to act on their ideas, transform nature for human purposes. All resources are [hu]man-made. It is the application of human valuation to natural substances that makes them resources. Resources thus can be viewed as a function of human knowledge and action. By using their rationality and ingenuity, [humans] men affect nature, thereby enabling them to achieve progress. Mankind’s survival and flourishing depend upon the study of nature that includes all things, even man himself. Human beings are the highest level of nature in the known universe. Men are a distinct natural phenomenon as are fish, birds, rocks, etc. Their proper place in the hierarchical order of nature needs to be recognized. Unlike plants and animals, human beings have a conceptual faculty, free will, and a moral nature. Because morality involves the ability to choose, it follows that moral worth is related to human choice and action and that the agents of moral worth can also be said to have moral value. By rationally using his conceptual faculty, man can create values as judged by the standard of enhancing human life. The highest priority must be assigned to actions that enhance the lives of individual human beings. It is therefore morally fitting to make use of nature. Man’s environment includes all of his surroundings. When he creatively arranges his external material conditions, he is improving his environment to make it more useful to himself. Neither fixed nor finite, resources are, in essence, a product of the human mind through the application of science and technology. Our resources have been expanding over time as a result of our ever-increasing knowledge. Unlike plants and animals, human beings do much more than simply respond to environmental stimuli. Humans are free from nature’s determinism and thus are capable of choosing. Whereas plants and animals survive by adapting to nature, [humans] men sustain their lives by employing reason to adapt nature to them. People make valuations and judgments. Of all the created order, only the human person is capable of developing other resources, thereby enriching creation. The earth is a dynamic and developing system that we are not obliged to preserve forever as we have found it. Human inventiveness, a natural dimension of the world, has enabled us to do more with less. Those who proclaim the intrinsic value of nature view man as a destroyer of the intrinsically good. Because it is man’s rationality in the form of science and technology that permits him to transform nature, he is despised for his ability to reason that is portrayed as a corrupting influence. The power of reason offends radical environmentalists because it leads to abstract knowledge, science, technology, wealth, and capitalism. This antipathy for human achievements and aspirations involves the negation of human values and betrays an underlying nihilism of the environmental movement.

### Environment DA

#### No link – plan excludes shale and methane hydrates

Energy Insider 7 (Energy Insider, “The Rise of Unconventional Gas”, 2007, http://www.enerdynamics.com/documents/Insider91807\_000.pdf)

What is Unconventional Gas? Natural gas is formed over thousands of years by the combination of pressure and heat on organic material trapped in rock. After natural gas is formed, the earth’s pressure often pushes the gas upward through small holes and cracks in rock until it reaches a layer of impermeable rock where the gas becomes trapped. It sits there in a “pool” until it is released from the ground by a drill bit providing a path to the surface. This is what we call conventional gas, the resource upon which our gas industry was built. But not all gas is found in these formations. In fact, there are a number of forms of unconventional gas that were created in formations without the permeability necessary to allow migration. These include: • Tight Sands Gas – formed in sandstone or carbonate (called tight gas sands) with low permeability which prevents the gas from flowing naturally. • Coalbed Methane (CBM) – formed in coal deposits and adsorbed4 by coal particles. • Shale Gas – formed in fine-grained shale rock (called gas shales) with low permeability in which gas has been adsorbed by clay particles or is held within minute pores and microfractures. • Methane Hydrates – a crystalline combination of natural gas and water, formed at low temperature and high pressure in places such as under the oceans and permafrost.

#### Drilling doesn’t hurt the environment – new technology means drilling’s effect upon the environment is minimal if any – that’s Griles

#### Fracking now should trigger their impacts – if not, it’s empirically denied because conventional drilling is safer

#### No environmental harm – offshore drilling has a 100% safety record and reduces leakages

Thornley 9 (Drew – Independent policy analyst focused primarily on energy, teaches business law at Concordia University in Austin, Texas. graduated summa cum laude with a B.A. in economics from The University of Alabama in 2002 and received a J.D. from Harvard Law School in 2005, “ENERGY & ENVIRONMENTAL MYTHS”, April 2009, http://www.manhattan-institute.org/energymyths/myth8.htm)

Since 1975, offshore drilling in the Exclusive Economic Zone (within 200 miles of U.S. coasts) has a safety record of 99.999 percent, meaning that only 0.0001 percent of the oil produced has been spilled.[103] With regard to the Outer Continental Shelf (U.S. waters under federal, rather than state, jurisdiction),[104] between 1993 and 2007 there were 651 oil spills, releasing 47,800 barrels of oil. Given 7.5 billion barrels of oil produced during that period, one barrel of oil has been spilled in the OCS per 156,900 barrels produced.[105] Research published in 2000 by the U.S. Minerals Management Service (MMS)[106] documents the decreasing occurrence of crude-oil spills in the OCS. Revising previous estimates first published in 1994, the authors analyzed data through 1999 and concluded that oil-spill rates for OCS platforms, tankers, and barges continued to decline.[107] Additionally, the number of oil spills from platforms, tankers, and pipelines is small, relative to the amount of oil extracted and transported. Even so, oil spills remain an unpleasant reality of offshore oil drilling. Certainly, any amount of oil spilled into the ocean is undesirable, but offshore oil operations contribute relatively little of the oil that enters ocean waters each year. For example, **ocean floors naturally seep** more oil into the ocean than do oil-drilling accidents and oil-tanker spills combined. (However, such seepage generally does not rise to the surface or reach the coastlines and, thus, is not as apparent as oil-drilling spills.) According to the National Academies’ National Research Council, natural processes are responsible for over 60 percent of the petroleum that enters North American ocean waters and over 45 percent of the petroleum that enters ocean waters worldwide.[108] Thus, in percentage terms, North America’s oil-drilling activities spill less oil into the ocean than the global average, suggesting that our drilling is comparatively safe for the environment. Ironically, research shows that drilling can actually reduce natural seepage, as it relieves the pressure that drives oil and gas up from ocean floors and into ocean waters. In 1999, two peer-reviewed studies found that natural seepage in the northern Santa Barbara Channel was significantly reduced by oil production. The researchers documented that natural seepage declined 50 percent around Platform Holly over a twenty-two-year period, concluding that, as oil was pumped from the reservoir, the pressure that drives natural seepage dropped.[109] Offshore oil drilling is carefully monitored for environmental safety. Using **state-of-the-art technology and employing a range of procedural safeguards**, U.S. offshore drilling has a track record of minimal environmental impact. Modern oil drilling is even designed to withstand hurricanes and tropical storms. According to the MMS, 3,050 of the Gulf of Mexico’s 4,000 platforms and 22,000 of the 33,000 miles of the Gulf’s pipelines were in the direct path of either Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita. The hurricanes destroyed 115 drilling platforms, damaged 52 others, and damaged 535 pipeline segments, yet “there was no loss of life and no major oil spills attributed to either storm.”[110] All forms of energy production come with risks, both to humans and to the environment. Offshore oil drilling is no exception. Spills from offshore drilling and tankers undoubtedly will continue to occur, but they **are rare and are decreasing in frequency**; and the amount of oil spilled from rigs and tankers is small, compared with the amount of oil extracted and with the amount of oil that enters ocean waters naturally from ocean floors. As technology continues to advance, and as companies find themselves accountable to a public increasingly concerned about environmental stewardship, drilling for oil in our coastal waters **will continue to be conducted in a safe and environmentally conscious manner**.

#### Stupid – global natural gas extraction is inevitable – other countries will drill inevitable – it’s just a question of the US taking the lead – their impact is inevitable or empirically denied

#### New tech and safeguards solve your offense

NPC 3 (National Petroleum Council, “Balancing Natural Gas Policy – Fueling the Demands of a Growing Economy,” 9-25, http://ferc.gov/industries/gas/indus-act/lng/safety/09-23-03-npc.pdf)

Increase Access and Reduce Permitting Impediments to Development of

Lower-48 Natural Gas Resources Land-use policies of federal, state, and local governments have not kept pace with technological advances that allow for exploration and production while protecting environmentally sensitive areas by reducing the number and size of onshore drilling sites and offshore production facilities. In addition, the federal government has continued to set federal lands off-limits to development through legislation, executive orders, and regulatory and administrative decisions. Moreover, an increasingly complex and costly maze of statutory and regulatory requirements effectively places a significant portion of additional lands off-limits to development, even though they are technically available for leasing. The trend toward increased land restrictions and set-asides has been especially troublesome in the Rocky Mountain area. The NPC estimates that 25% of the remaining technical resource in the lower-48 underlies the Rocky Mountain area, and that 29% (70 TCF) is currently off-limits to exploration and development, either due to statutory leasing withdrawals or to the cumulative effect of conditions of approval associated with exploration and development activities. Set asides are common in the OCS, where virtually the entirety of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts are off limits due to executive order and most of the Eastern Gulf of Mexico is off limits due to administrative decisions. Most recently, further restrictions were set in place when the original boundaries of the 2001 OCS Lease Sale 181 were reduced to include only 25% of the originally proposed acreage. Experience shows that natural gas development in areas similar to those restricted in the United States can be undertaken with appropriate environmental safeguards. The use of state-of-the-art drilling and production technologies plays a key role in those developments. Mountainous areas of western Canada, which face fewer federal and provincial barriers to access, have been successfully developed without compromising the environment. The OCS of Eastern Canada is being successfully and safely developed, and the governments of British Columbia and Canada are reviewing the potential to open offshore Western Canada for exploration and development. The NPC recognizes and supports the obligations of state and federal governments to protect endangered species, historical resources, and the environment. At the same time, the NPC sees the need for government to balance those considerations with the need to increase supplies of natural gas. The following public-policy recommendations are designed to foster balance by streamlining processes, improving communications, enhancing cooperation, acknowledging proven technological advances, and reducing unnecessary costs and delays for the industry and the various government agencies and non-governmental organizations involved with addressing these issues. The recommendations are segregated into onshore and offshore.

### Shipbuilding – 2AC

#### Increasing offshore natural gas production is key to the shipbuilding industry

Mason 9 (Joseph R. – Louisiana State University Endowed Chair of Banking and nationally-renowned economist , “The Economic Contribution of Increased Offshore Oil Exploration and Production to Regional and National Economies”, February, <http://www.americanenergyalliance.org/images/aea_offshore_updated_final.pdf>)

Offshore oil and gas production **has a significant effect** on local onshore economies as well as the national economy. There are broadly three “phases” of development that contribute to state economic growth: (1) the initial exploration and development of offshore facilities; (2) the extraction of oil and gas resources; and (3) refining crude oil into finished petroleum products. Industries supporting those phases are most evident in the sections of the Gulf of Mexico that are currently open to offshore drilling. For example, the U.S. shipbuilding industry — based largely in the Gulf region – **benefits significantly** from initial offshore oil exploration efforts.9 Exploration and development also **requires specialized exploration and drilling vessels**, **floating drilling rigs**, and miles and miles of **steel pipe**, as well as **highly educated and specialized labor** to staff the efforts. The onshore support does not end with production. A recent report prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy indicates that the Louisiana economy is “highly dependent on a wide variety of industries that depend on offshore oil and gas production”10 and that offshore production supports onshore production in the chemicals, platform fabrication, drilling services, transportation, and gas processing.11 Fleets of helicopters and U.S.- built vessels also supply offshore facilities with a wide range of industrial and consumer goods, from industrial spare parts to groceries. As explained in Section IV.G, however, the distance between offshore facilities and onshore communities can affect the relative intensity of the local economic effects. The economic effects in the refining phase are even more diffuse than the effects for the two preceding phases. Although significant capacity is located in California, Illinois, New Jersey, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington, additional U.S. refining capacity is spread widely around the country.12 As a result, refinery jobs, wages, and tax revenues are even more likely to extend into other areas of the country, including non-coastal states like Illinois.

#### Prevents multiple great power conflicts --- risk of escalation high

Crospey 12 (Dr. Seth – Senior Fellow at Hudson Institute, Former Assistant to the Secretary of Defense and Deputy Undersecretary of the Navy, ““The U.S. Navy Shipbuilding Plan: Assumptions and Associated Risks to National Security”, Statement before the Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Oversight & Investigations U.S. House of Representatives, 4/18, http://www.hudson.org/files/publications/SethCropsey--USNavyShipbuildingPlan--Testimony041812.pdf)

If the Navy’s assumption is mistaken that current political leadership will agree to large future increases in shipbuilding we will be headed toward a kind of naval holiday. The equally optimistic expectation that average ship costs can be maintained at $2 billion dollars per vessel prolongs the holiday. This will not be a pleasant holiday. China’s economy has its problems but it continues to perform. Janes Defence Forecasts says that China will double its defense budget between now and 2015.iii Russia plans a $160 billion dollar naval expansion in the Pacific which is to include 36 new submarines and 40 surface ships.iv If a couple postpones needed repairs on their home for a decade and then decides to fix all that has broken they will be very lucky to finish the job in a year. They will also be fortunate because other more prudent owners will have sustained the home repair industry. Our shipbuilding industry **does not have the benefit of other purchasers** who can sustain it if Navy budgets prove unequal to the task. For the industrial base that supports U.S. shipbuilding a budget-induced naval holiday would be a disaster that could take decades—**if ever**—from which to recover. Knowledge of shipbuilding remains part of American manufacturing. But accelerating cost, an ageing workforce, reduced orders for warships, and an uncertain future risk the nation’s ability to turn out sufficient numbers of vessels at affordable prices and profitably enough to keep shipbuilding companies alive. The destabilization of the American shipbuilding industrial base is one reason that the cost of warships is outpacing the rate of inflation. The Navy’s reduced procurement of ships over the past twenty years has caused the industry to contract, lay off workers, and in general to become less reliable. This has driven up the cost of labor and the cost of construction materials. The fewer ships the Navy buys, the less lucrative the industry is for skilled workers. As the cost of labor rises shipbuilders are increasingly pressed to attract and train qualified personnel. The negative trends reinforce each other. As younger workers are dissuaded from seeking employment or remaining in the industry by the prospects of sporadic employment those who remain—the existing workers—age. The cycle is self-defeating. Paying older workers increases overhead costs and makes it increasingly expensive to invest in the training and education of a younger workforce. The destabilization of the industrial base also causes costs to rise since many of the materials and products that go into building Navy ships are not useful for other purposes. Since the Navy is buying far fewer ships now than it did in the 1980s, many shipyards rely on a single source for necessary materials. With a virtual monopoly on these products, the suppliers have in large part the ability to name their price. The inefficient manner in which the shipyards acquire these materials drives up labor and overhead costs. The solution lies in stabilizing the American shipbuilding industry. This means that the Navy must either increase its orders of ships and/or improve its business practices, for example disciplining the changes it requires of shipbuilders once orders have been placed and vessels are under construction. Buying and stockpiling spare parts for ships that are already in service and whose need for regular maintenance and repair is well known would also help provide stability for the American shipbuilding industry. In a study conducted on the subject in 2006, the RAND Corporation concluded that the rising costs of building ships is the result of a combination of unsteady U.S. Government procurement rates and a “monopsony relationship” between the government and the shipbuilders. In a monopsony a single purchaser is faced with a host of sellers. Because there is so little American shipbuilding outside of what the Navy purchases, U.S. firms are at the commercial mercy of the 9 percent of the Navy budget devoted to buying ships. A 2005 Government Accountability Office report attributed cost increases in shipbuilding to instability in the entire industry, the difficulty in recruiting and training qualified personnel, high rates of skilled personnel turnover and the shipbuilders’ dependence on a rapidly shrinking supplier base. Finally there are the consequences **if U.S. seapower continues to decrease** and proves unable to meet even the reduced goals it has set for itself. History is a good guide. Nations in the middle like to side with the winner. During our Civil War British political leadership considered recognizing the Confederacy but was eventually dissuaded by Union military success. In World War II Sweden declared neutrality but grew increasingly amenable to Allied requests as Germany’s military position worsened. Romania initially sided with Germany in the same war but changed sides following U.S. attacks on their oil fields and a coup that deposed the pro-German dictator, Antonescu. Bulgarians followed a similar path from siding with the Nazis to switching their allegiance to the Allies in 1944. Saudi Prince Bandar, acknowledging China’s increasing international prominence and power visited Beijing last year and met with President Hu. American weakness at sea, especially in the Indo-Pacific will change the current military, diplomatic, and commercial character of the region. Whether the U.S. fleet shrinks because of too little funding or because unreformed procurement practices have raised the price of ships or because ships have been called home to save on operational expense, the result is the same. While we were once present in strength, we would be no more. A nation burdened with massive debt whose ability to shape world events has been limited in tandem with its capacity to invest in research and technology will have more and more trouble finding markets. China’s potential hegemony would not only force its neighbors’ to reconsider whether the U.S. is a reliable ally. It would also become an increasingly powerful magnet for trade in the region—at the expense of U.S. commerce. Unlike the U.S. whose seapower has protected global sea lanes that other states have used to their benefit **China has a different set of values**. It views with suspicion a liberal trading system notwithstanding the benefits received from it. **China’s friends include Iran and North Korea**. Beijing is a poor candidate to support the international order that has been the keel of U.S. foreign and security policy for a century. Waning U.S. seapower **is an invitation that China will regard as a complement to its rising military and navy** in particular. It foreshadows **a coercive resolution** of territorial disputes in the South China Sea, the likelihood of an increased regional arms race, and the troubling international perception that the U.S. is—or has—**abandoned its role as a great power**. American seapower is the strategic keel of our foreign and security policy. Reducing it would be an exercise of history-making shortsightedness. Restoring it would be an act of statesmanship from which Americans and all who cherish political liberty would benefit for the remainder of this century. Thank you.

### LNG Exports Good – Impact – Russia-Ukraine War

#### US LNG exports solve Russia-Ukraine war

Ebinger et al 12 (Charles, Senior Fellow and Director of the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, Kevin Massy, Assistant Director of the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, and Govinda Avasarala, Senior Research Assistant in the Energy Security Initiative – Brookings, “Liquid Markets: Assessing the Case for U.S. Exports of Liquefied Natural Gas,” Brookings Institution, Policy Brief 12-01, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2012/5/02%20lng%20exports%20ebinger/0502\_lng\_exports\_ebinger.pdf).

A large increase in U.S. LNG exports would have the potential to increase U.S. foreign policy interests in both the Atlantic and Pacific basins. Unlike oil, natural gas has traditionally been an infrastructure-constrained business, giving geographical proximity and political relations between producers and consumers a high level of importance. Issues of “pipeline politics” have been most directly visible in Europe, which relies on Russia for around a third of its gas. Previous disputes between Moscow and Ukraine over pricing have led to major gas shortages in several E.U. countries in the winters (when demand is highest) of both 2006 and 2009. Further disagreements between Moscow and Kiev over the terms of the existing bilateral gas deal have the potential to escalate again, with negative consequences for E.U. consumers. The risk of high reliance on Russian gas has been a principal driver of European energy policy in recent decades. Among central and eastern European states, particularly those formerly aligned with the Soviet Union such as Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, the issue of reliance on imports of Russian gas is a primary energy security concern and has inspired energy policies aimed at diversification of fuel sources for power generation. From the U.S. perspective such Russian influence in the affairs of these democratic nations is an impediment to efforts at political and economic reform. The market power of Gazprom, Russia’s state-owned gas monopoly, is evident in these countries. Although they are closer to Russia than other consumers of Russian gas in Western Europe, many countries in Eastern and Central Europe pay higher contract prices for their imports, as they are more reliant on Russian gas as a proportion of their energy mixes. In the larger economies of Western Europe, which consume most of Russia’s exports, there are efforts to diversify their supply of natural gas. The E.U. has formally acknowledged the need to put in place mechanisms to increase supply diversity. These include market liberalization approaches such as rules mandating third-party access to pipeline infrastructure (from which Gazprom is demanding exemption), and commitments to complete a single market for electricity and gas by 2014, and to ensure that no member country is isolated from electricity and gas grids by 2015.112 Despite these formal efforts, there are several factors retarding the E.U.’s push for a unified effort to reduce dependence on Russian gas. National interest has been given a higher priority than collective, coordinated E.U. energy policy: the gas cutoffs in 2006 and 2009 probably contributed to the acceptance of the Nord Stream project, which carries gas from Russia into Germany. Germany’s decision to phase out its fleet of nuclear reactors by 2022 will result in far higher reliance on natural gas for the E.U.’s biggest economy. The environmental imperative to reduce carbon emissions— codified in the E.U.’s goal of essentially decarbonizing its power sector by the middle of century—mean that natural gas is being viewed by many as the short-to medium fuel of choice in power generation. Finally, the prospects for European countries to replicate the unconventional gas “revolution” that has resulted in a glut of natural gas in the United States look uncertain. Several countries, including France and the U.K., have encountered stiff public opposition to the techniques used in unconventional gas production, while those countries, such as Poland and Hungary, that have moved ahead with unconventional- gas exploration have generally seen disappointing early results. Collectively, these factors suggest that the prospects for reduced European reliance on Russian gas appear dim. The one factor that has been working to the advantage of advocates of greater European gas diversity has been the increased liquidity of the global LNG market, discussed above. Russia’s dominant position in the European gas market is being eroded by the increased availability of LNG. Qatar’s massive expansion in LNG production in 2008, coupled with the rise in unconventional gas production in the United States as well as a drop in global energy demand due to the global recession, produced a global LNG glut that saw many cargoes intended for the U.S. market diverted into Europe. As mentioned previously, with an abundant source of alternative supply, some European consumers, mainly Gazprom’s closest partners, were able to renegotiate their oil-linked, takeor- pay contracts with Gazprom. As Figure 10 illustrates, however, in the wake of the Fukushima natural disaster and nuclear accident in Japan and a return to growth in most industrialized economies, the LNG market is projected to tighten considerably in the short-term, potentially returning market power to Russia. However, there is a second, structural change to the global gas market that may have more lasting effects to Russia’s market power in the European gas market. LNG is one of the fastest growing segments of the energy sector. The growth of the LNG market, both through long-term contract and spot-market sales, is likely to put increasing pressure on incumbent pipeline gas suppliers. A significant addition of U.S. LNG exports will **accelerate this trend**. In addition to adding to the size of the market, U.S. LNG contracts are likely to be determined on a “floating” basis, with sales terms tied to the price of a U.S. benchmark such as Henry Hub, **eroding the power of providers of long-term oil linked contract suppliers such as Russia**. While U.S. LNG will not be a direct tool of U.S. foreign policy—the destination of U.S. LNG will be determined according to the terms of individual contracts, the spot-price-determined demand, and the LNG traders that purchase such contracts—the addition of a large, market-based producer will **indirectly** serve to increase gas supply diversity in Europe, thereby providing European consumers with increased flexibility and market power.

#### Russia-Ukraine war goes nuclear – draws in the US

**Kingston 9** (Brian, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs – CIFP, “Ukraine: A Risk Assessment Report”, February, http://www.carleton.ca/cifp/app/serve.php/1214.pdf)

Russia: Russia seeks to influence the weakened Ukraine, inflaming ethnic-Russian separatism; Crimea declares independence; Ukraine resists, perhaps seeing an external war as a distraction from internal strife; Russia comes to the aid of Crimea/ethnic-Russians resulting in open warfare between Russia and Ukraine. The West: The West also suffers from the global recession, but (perhaps following a period of inward looking protectionism) realizes that it cannot allow Russian success in Ukraine; open hostilities erupt between Russian and NATO forces triggering World War III and the strong possibility of nuclear war, or at least the drawing in of many other countries.

### Elections DA – Obama Good – 2AC

#### Case outweighs –

#### -- Their link is non-unique – Obama is supporting fracking now – that’s sufficient to trigger the disad

#### Energy is not a key election issues --- other issues outweigh.

**The Washington Post**, 6/27/**2012** (Energy ads flood TV in swing states, p. http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/energy-ads/2012/06/27/gJQAD5MR7V\_story.html)

Energy issues don’t spark much excitement among voters, ranking below health care, education and the federal budget deficit — not to mention jobs and the economy. And yet those same voters are being flooded this year with campaign ads on energy policy. Particularly in presidential swing states, the airwaves are laden with messages boosting oil drilling and natural gas and hammering President Obama for his support of green energy. The Cleveland area alone has heard $2.7 million in energy-related ads. The disconnect between what voters say they care about and what they’re seeing on TV lies in the money behind the ads, much of it coming from oil and gas interests. Those funders get the double benefit of attacking Obama at the same time they are promoting their industry. Democrats also have spent millions on the subject, defending the president’s record and tying Republican candidate Mitt Romney to “Big Oil.” Overall, more than $41 million, about one in four of the dollars spent on broadcast advertising in the presidential campaign, has gone to ads mentioning energy, more than a host of other subjects and just as much as health care, according to ad-tracking firm Kantar Media/Cmag. In an election focused heavily on jobs and the economy, all of this attention to energy seems a bit off topic. But the stakes are high for energy producers and environmentalists, who are squared off over how much the government should regulate the industry. And attention has been heightened by a recent boom in production using new technologies such as fracking and horizontal drilling, as well as a spike in gas prices this spring just as the general election got underway. When asked whether energy is important, more than half of voters say yes, according to recent polls. But asked to rank their top issues, fewer than 1 percent mention energy.

#### -- Obama will lose –

#### Key polls and undecided voters

**Chambers**, **9/19**/2012 (Dean, Mitt Romney likely win in presidential election shown by three key polls, Examiner, p. http://www.examiner.com/article/mitt-romney-likely-win-presidential-election-shown-by-three-key-polls)

Rasmussen Reports has released today, three key polls that show Mitt Romney's likely win in this year's presidential election over President Obama. The Rasmussen Reports Presidential Daily Tracking Poll released today shows Romney leading 47 percent to 46 percent over Obama. Rasmussen's Daily Swing State Tracking Poll of 11 key swing states won by President Obama in 2008 shows Romney leading them by the exact same percentages. The latest Rasmussen poll of New Hampshire released today shows Romney leading there 48 percent to 45 percent. New Hampshire is a key swing state that could make a difference with its four electoral votes, and George W. Bush would have reached 270 electoral voters in 2000 without having won this state. New Hampshire had narrowly favored Obama in many polls over the last few months and while the analysis conduced here by this columnist has consistently predicted Mitt Romney will win the state (based in part on knowledge of local politics in the state having lived in New England for years), most projected have shaded New Hampshire blue and predicted it will go for Obama. This Rasmussen survey is key in that it likely shows movement in New Hampshire in the direction of Mitt Romney. In the instance of an incumbent president who enjoys just about 100 percent name recognition and is seeking reelection, most of the undecided voters are likely to swing to the challenger by election day. This is especially true when the challenger remains still less known to the public than the incumbent, as is true with former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney. By election day, those other nine percent not favoring Romney or Obama in the Rasmussen Daily Tracking poll are likely include less than one percent voting for third party candidates and five or six percent of those nine will likely vote for Mitt Romney. That would indicate a popular vote win by Romney of about 53 percent to 46 percent, or the reverse of Obama's win in 2008. This would lead to an electoral college total of more than 300 electoral votes for Romney. The 11 swing states tracked by Rasmussen in it's swing state tracking poll show Romney leading 47 percent to 46 percent, where some weeks ago the two candidates were tied at 45 percent in the Rasmussen tracking poll of these 11 key swing states. President Obama won these same states collectively by a 53 percent to 46 percent margin in 2008. Now he is seven percent behind that finish now in these states. Romney is likely to capture most of the undecided votes and could win these states collectively by at least a 52 percent to 47 percent margin. That would likely lead to Romney winning Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia and Wisconsin while having a competitive chance in Michigan and Pennsylvania. If President Obama can only win Michigan and Pennsylvania among those 11 swing states, he can not be reelected to the presidency. As these polls stand today, the election of Mitt Romney as our next president looks likely.

#### Eurozone collapse now

**Marketwatch**, **7/24**/2012 (Euro crisis brings world to brink of depression, p. http://articles.marketwatch.com/2012-07-24/commentary/32817852\_1\_euro-crisis-german-banks-credit-crisis)

Europe is a tinderbox waiting for a spark. The financial volatility in Europe may have created a situation that is now beyond the capacity of policy makers to control or curb. When an accomplished fixer like Pascal Lamy, the head of the World Trade Organization and the longtime chief of staff for former European Commission President Jacques Delors, describes the situation in Europe as “difficult, very difficult, very difficult, very difficult,” you know it is time to run for cover. The crisis has now gone well beyond the prospect of breaking up the euro (US:EURUSD) to the threat of a full-fledged financial and economic collapse in Europe that could plunge the world into a second Great Depression.

#### That loses Obama the election --- biggest factor.

New York Times, 3/13/**2012** (Muddled Economic Picture Muddles the Political One, Too, p. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/14/us/politics/economy-plays-biggest-role-in-obama-re-election-chances.html?_r=1>)

The final major economic turning point of President Obama’s first term seems to have arrived. The question is which way the economy will turn. Job growth has picked up nicely in the last few months, raising the prospect that the American economy is finally in the early stages of a recovery that will gather strength over time. But with gas prices rising, the government cutting workers and consumers still deep in debt, some forecasters predict that economic growth — and with it, job growth — will slow in coming months. Politically, the difference between the two situations is vast. In one, Mr. Obama will be able to campaign on a claim, as he has recently begun to do, that the country is back on track. In another, he will be left to explain that recoveries from financial crises take years, and to argue that Republicans want to return to the Bush-era policies that created the crisis — as he tried to argue, unsuccessfully, in the 2010 midterm election. His approval rating has slipped again in some polls recently, with higher gas prices possibly playing a role. As a result, the economic numbers over the next couple of months, including an unemployment report on April 6, will have bigger political implications than the typical batch of data. The Federal Reserve acknowledged the uncertainty in its scheduled statement on Tuesday, suggesting the economy had improved somewhat but still predicting only “moderate economic growth.” Economists say the economy’s near-term direction depends relatively little on Mr. Obama’s economic policies. The standoff over Iran’s nuclear program, the European debt crisis and other events will most likely affect the economy more. But many American voters are still likely to make their decision based on the economy. Historically, nothing — not campaign advertisements, social issues or even wars — has influenced voters more heavily than the direction of the economy in an election year. “If you could know one thing and you had to predict which party was going to win the next presidential election,” Lynn Vavreck, a political scientist at the University of California, Los Angeles, said, “you couldn’t do better than knowing the change in economic growth.”

#### -- Not intrinsic – logical policymaker could do the plan and \_\_\_\_

#### Plan cuts against Romney’s “dirty fuel” narrative – helps Obama win swing states

LeVine 12 (Steve, “How Dirty is Romney Prepared to Get to Win Election?” Foreign Policy, 6-13, 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. Romney grants that Obama is not precisely Mr. Clean -- while the president has championed clean energy technologies, he has also stewarded over the greatest buildup in U.S. fossil fuel production since the 1990s. But Romney insists he will be dirtier: He vows to **open more land to oil and gas drilling**, approve the import of more Canadian oil sands to Gulf Coast refineries, and allow more coal mining. As for Obama, Romney recently told a Colorado coal community, he isn't dirty enough to deserve a second presidential term. The president has "made it harder to get coal out of the ground; he's made it harder to get natural gas out of the ground; he's made it harder to get oil out of the ground," Romney said. The approach aligns with a campaign by the American Petroleum Institute, the U.S. oil industry's main lobbying arm, called "Vote4Energy." The API campaign, which consists of big political events and advertisements, targets 15 or so mostly swing states, those that both Obama and Romney will most need to muster the 270 electoral votes required to win. Marty Durbin, executive vice president at API, told me that the Vote4energy campaign is deliberately not backing any specific candidate or party, but attempting to centrally fix the subject of greater fossil-fuel drilling in voters' minds. "We're using this to highlight the importance of energy to the broader policy, that with the right energy policies we can have job creation, economic growth, energy security, government revenue. If voters have these realities in their mind when they go to the ballot box, that's what is going to move us forward in having a more rational national energy policy," he said. Already, he said, "the energy conversation is no longer just production and energy security. This is about job creation on a state-by-state level." Notwithstanding Durbin's disclaimer, the API campaign seems to weave seamlessly into the GOP strategy. And Maisano told me that he sees grist for GOP success in the targeted states. "Energy plays a huge role in those states, and I see it as a huge problem for Obama," he said. "It's going to be hard for him to win these states that he has to win, like North Carolina, like Florida and Michigan and Ohio and Missouri and Wisconsin. Energy undercuts him in those economies." Some analysts think the dirty campaign will ultimately fizzle. "The Romney campaign has positioned itself to beat the job-creation drum better than the Obama campaign has," said Kyle Saunders, a professor at Colorado State University, but an improvement in job numbers could undermine the GOP narrative. In addition, said John Sides, a professor at George Washington University, **Obama's incorporation of fossil fuels in his energy policy may muddle the picture for voters**. "I'm not sure that there is a lot of daylight between Obama and Romney," Sides told me. Yet my own impression is that the Republican strategy may be working, at least partly and at least for now. Given the stakes, Obama and the main environmental lobby seem more lethargic than they might be. When I sought comment for this story, API responded almost immediately with an offer to speak with Durbin. Not so much the Sierra Club, the principal bulwark of U.S. environmentalists. A spokeswoman missed a couple of emails sent over a couple of days, then by phone said she would try to scare up someone to speak. Finally, I finally received a message: "I haven't been able to track down our political team today." **In an election that may be decided on the margins,** advantage: fossil fuels.

#### Offshore drilling has massive support – outweighs all other energies

**Dixon**, 3/19/**2012** (Darius – energy reporter at Politico, Poll: Support rises for offshore drilling, Politico, p. http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0312/74185.html)

Interest in alternative energy sources like wind and solar over has waned among Americans the last year, while support for offshore oil and gas drilling has climbed back up to pre-BP oil spill levels, according to a poll released Monday. Fifty-two percent of those surveyed by the Pew Research Center support alternative energy, down 11 percent compared with March 2011. However, interest in developing oil, coal and natural gas resources rose by 10 percent, while the remainder to those who said they supported both or didn’t know. Support for offshore oil and gas drilling in U.S. waters has also recovered to its levels prior to the 2010 BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. Nearly two-thirds of those surveyed now favor allowing increased offshore drilling, up from 57 percent a year ago and 44 percent in June 2010, during the spill. The partisan divide on renewable energy versus oil, coal and natural gas development has also become more pronounced over the last year. Eighty-nine percent of Republicans favor allowing more offshore oil and gas drilling while only half of Democrats agree, according the survey. However, a 64 percent of independents support increased drilling off the U.S. coast.

#### No link – plan doesn’t happen till after the election

Lightman and Douglas 9/21 (David and William, “Unproductive Congress breaks until after November election”, 2012, <http://www.adn.com/2012/09/20/2633147/unproductive-congress-breaks-until.html>\_

Lawmakers spent Thursday pointing fingers and charging opponents with cynical political posturing. Among Congress' last decisions was a characteristic 2012 judgment: Punt action until later. It will let the farm bill, a broad measure that sets the nation's agriculture and food and nutrition assistance policies, expire Sept. 30. Congress also exits without any serious effort to edge away from the "fiscal cliff," the prospect of economy-damaging budget chaos if it doesn't act by year's end. Bush-era tax cuts are due to expire, and automatic spending cuts will take effect unless alternatives are passed. The public is noticing, as the legislative failures stir uncertainty and further roil an already-weak economy. This Congress' approval ratings were stuck at 13 percent in a Gallup survey Sept. 6-9, the lowest the pollster has ever logged this late in an election year since such measurements began in 1974. Yet **lawmakers are slinking out of town**, after a September session that was on and off for less than two weeks, following a summer recess that ran from Aug. 3 to Sept. 10. Congress is expected to return Nov. 13.

#### **Republicans and natural gas industry loves the plan**

Clark 12 (Aaron, “Obama Stance on Fossil Fuel Angers Industry,” Bloomberg, 1-24, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-01-24/obama-claiming-credit-for-fossil-fuel-gains-angers-industry.html)

President Barack Obama is taking credit for higher U.S. oil and gas production and lower imports, angering industry groups and Republicans who say he is working against domestic energy production. American energy will be a major theme of Obama’s State of the Union address to Congress tonight, Jay Carney, the White House spokesman, said in a briefing yesterday. In his first campaign ad this year, Obama boasts that U.S. dependence on foreign oil is below 50 percent for the first time in 13 years. Since Obama took office, U.S. natural gas production averaged 1.89 trillion cubic feet a month through October, 13 percent higher than the average during President George W. Bush’s two terms, according to Energy Department data. Crude oil production is 2 percent higher, the department said. “To be sure that is not because the White House meant for that to happen,” said Pavel Molchanov, an analyst at Raymond James & Associates Inc. Republicans say the numbers are misleading. Onshore oil and gas production on federal lands directly under Obama’s control is down 40 percent compared to 10 years ago, according to Spencer Pederson, a spokesman for Representative Doc Hastings, a Washington Republican and chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee. In 2010, the U.S. signed the fewest number of offshore drilling leases since 1984. ‘Drill Baby Drill’ “The president is responding to what America’s gut feeling is, that we should be less dependent on foreign oil, and he’s trying to take credit for it,” Hastings said in an interview. “His policies are exactly the opposite.” Four years ago, Obama campaigned against Republican vice presidential nominee Sarah Palin’s rally to “Drill Baby Drill.” Today he is highlighting fossil fuel gains to blunt charges that his policies are contributing to higher energy costs, according to Tyson Slocum, energy program director for Public Citizen, a Washington-based consumer advocacy group, said in an interview. “The Republican narrative is that Obama is shoveling huge amounts of money to his cronies in the renewable industry, and blocking the real energy that American needs,” Slocum said in an interview. “It’s a false narrative. The administration has been focused on green energy, but they haven’t been against fossil fuels.” Federal Leases In a January report, the American Petroleum Institute in Washington said that in two years the number of new leases to drill on federal lands declined 44 percent to 1,053 in 2010. The report blamed “new rules, policies and administrative actions that are not conducive to oil and natural gas production.” Lower imports are the result of lower demand, and increasing production has come despite Obama’s policies, according to Jack Gerard, American Petroleum Institute President. The U.S. needs a “course correction” on energy policy that includes faster permitting on federal lands in the West and in the Gulf of Mexico, he said. The group, whose members include Exxon Mobil Corp., the largest U.S. oil company, convened a conference call with reporters today to comment on what Obama is expected to say on domestic energy in tonight’s address. “We hope that the actions match the words,” Gerard said on the call. “The truth is that the administration has sometimes paid lip service to more domestic energy development, including more oil and natural gas development.” Offshore Drilling The American Enterprise Institute, a Washington group that supports free markets, called Obama’s Jan. 18 decision to deny a permit for TransCanada Corp. (TRP)’s $7 billion Keystone XL oil pipeline, part of his “crusade against fossil fuels.” “The losses due to the Obama administration’s death-grip on offshore drilling and its unwillingness to open federal lands or issue timely permits for exploration far outweigh any energy gains that the White House may tout this week,” Thomas Pyle, president of the Washington-based Institute for Energy Research, said in a statement. Obama last year called on Congress to eliminate “billions in taxpayer” subsidies for oil companies and to invest instead in renewable sources of power. In 2010, he proposed drilling for oil and natural gas off the U.S. East Coast, weeks before BP Plc (BP/)’s Macondo well in the Gulf of Mexico failed, spewing 4.9 million barrels of oil and triggering a temporary administration ban on offshore exploration.

#### Nat gas lobbyists swing the election and shield blame

Browning and Clifford 11 (James, Regional State Director – Common Cause, and Pat, Stone Senior Fellow – HUC-UC Ethics Center, “Fracking for Support: Natural Gas Industry Pumps Cash Into Congress,” Common Cause, 11-10, http://www.commoncause.org/site/pp.asp?c=dkLNK1MQIwG&b=7831813)

Natural gas interests have spent more than $747 million during a 10-year campaign – stunningly successful so far – to avoid government regulation of hydraulic “fracking,” a fast-growing and environmentally risky process used in Ohio and at least a dozen other states to tap underground gas reserves, according to a new study by Common Cause. A faction of the natural gas industry has directed more than $20 million to the campaigns of current members of Congress – including $600,000 to Ohioans -- and put $726 million into lobbying aimed at shielding itself from oversight, according to the report, the third in a series of “Deep Drilling, Deep Pockets” reports produced by the non-profit government watchdog group. Rep. John Boehner led Ohio’s Congressional delegation with $186,900 raised from fracking interests, followed Sen. Rob Portman with $91,000, Rep. Steve Chabot with $59,050, and Rep. Steve Stivers with $51,250. “Players in this industry have pumped cash into Congress in the same way they pump toxic chemicals into underground rock formations to free trapped gas,” said Common Cause President Bob Edgar. “And as fracking for gas releases toxic chemicals into groundwater and streams, the industry’s political fracking for support is toxic to efforts for a cleaner environment and relief from our dependence on fossil fuels.” The report also tracks $2.8 million in campaign contributions to Ohio’s state elected officials and notes that Ohio’s fracking regulations are among the weakest of any state. Gov. John Kasich was the leading individual recipient with $213,519, followed by former Gov. Ted Strickland with $87,450 and Secretary of State John Husted with $84,750. In Congress, the industry’s political giving heavily favors lawmakers who supported the 2005 Energy Policy Act, which exempted fracking from regulation under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Current members who voted for the bill received an average of $73,433, while those who voted against the bill received an average of $10,894. The report comes as the Environmental Protection Agency is scheduled to publish new, preliminary findings in 2012 about the potential dangers of fracking. That gives the industry a powerful incentive to increase political spending now in an attempt to shape public opinion and the debate over fracking in Congress, as well as affect the outcome of the 2012 congressional elections. “Thanks to the Supreme Court and its Citizens United decision, the natural gas industry will be free to spend whatever it likes next year to elect a Congress that will do its bidding,” Edgar said. “The industry’s political investments already have largely freed it from government oversight. Controlling the flow of that money and other corporate spending on our elections is critical to protecting our environment for this and future generations.”

#### Voters will forget events in a month.

**Carlson**, 9/18/**2012** (Margaret, Why Romney can still win, Star Tribune, p. http://www.startribune.com/opinion/commentaries/170184556.html?refer=y)

Besides, we live in the United States of Amnesia, where no one (except maybe the press) remembers Romney's mistakes if they happened more than a month ago. Who can forget when he criticized the British, our closest ally, for not being as good at running the Olympics as he was (turned out it was)? Or his $10,000 bet with Texas Gov. Rick Perry over his health-care plan? Or his comment that "corporations are people, my friend"? Or his failure to release years of tax returns? Soon everyone may even forget the video in which he says of the poor, "My job is not to worry about those people."

#### The plan will not affect the election --- the Minimal Effect Model proves.

**Farhi**, 7/6/**2012** (Paul – reporter for the Washington Post, Do campaigns really change voters’ minds?, The Washington Post, p. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/do-campaigns-really-change-voters-minds/2012/07/06/gJQAEljyRW_story.html>)

How can anyone accurately estimate the outcome of an election more than three months ahead of time — before the conventions, the debates, and the twists and turns of the fall campaign? Primarily because Abramowitz’s forecasting model disregards the fall campaign altogether. His method acknowledges something that political operatives, journalists and candidates rarely do: Presidential campaigns don’t matter much in determining winners and losers. Despite all the noise from the campaign trail — from the onslaught of TV ads to the daily rallies to the frenzied news coverage — factors beyond either candidate’s control largely determine the result, according to this school of thought. So much is already baked into a presidential contest that even the best managed and most effective campaign (or the most incompetent one) can’t move the needle too far. This idea has been around since at least the 1940s and has been so thoroughly studied that it has its own wonky name, the Minimal Effects Model. Simply stated, the model says that presidential campaigns have a highly limited effect on how people vote. Because of partisan loyalties and other structural factors, millions of voters have made up their minds long before the most intense electioneering begins, leaving only a disengaged few for the candidates to persuade. “When you’re in the middle of a campaign, there’s a tendency for people, especially the media, to overestimate the importance of certain events,” Abramowitz says. These include high-profile gaffes, vice presidential selections, controversial ads and other moments that capture so much attention. Except, he adds, “those things have no measurable impact [on voters’ decisions]. The media are interested in getting people’s attention, but a lot of the stories you read or see are focusing on things that are trivial. The way campaigns play out is largely determined by fundamentals.”

#### GOP will steal the election --- six warrants

**Fitrakis and Wasserman**, 9/5/**2012** (Bob – Professor of Political Science in the Social and Behavioral Sciences Department at Columbus State Community College and Harvey – senior advisor to Greenpeace USA and the Nuclear Information and Resource Service, Will the GOP Steal America’s 2012 Election, Daily Kos, p. <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/09/05/1128300/-Will-the-GOP-Steal-America-s-2012-Election>)

The Republican Party could steal the 2012 US Presidential election with relative ease. Six basic factors make this year’s theft a possibility: The power of corporate money, now vastly enhanced by the US Supreme Court’s Citizens’ United decisions; The Electoral College, which narrows the number of votes needed to be moved to swing a presidential election; The systematic disenfranchisement of---according to the Brennan Center---ten million or more citizens, most of whom would otherwise be likely to vote Democratic. More than a million voters have also been purged from the rolls in Ohio, almost 20% of the total vote count in 2008; The accelerating use of electronic voting machines, which make election theft a relatively simple task for those who control them, including their owners and operators, who are predominantly Republican; The GOP control of nine of the governorships in the dozen swing states that will decide the outcome of the 2012 campaign; and, The likelihood that the core of the activist “election protection” community that turned out in droves to monitor the vote for Barack Obama in 2008 has not been energized by his presidency and is thus unlikely to work for him again in 2012.

#### Romney will maintain a working relationship with 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>)

At the same time, the potential impact of a Romney presidency should not be exaggerated. Mr Romney is not an ideological politician, and he will have solid reasons to maintain a working relationship with Russia. These include reliance on Russian transit corridors to support US forces in Afghanistan to 2015 and beyond, Russia's veto in the UN Security Council, and its potential to act as interlocutor between the US and rogue states. Finally, there is a significant element of uncertainty that stems from the lack of clarity about what Mr Romney, who has often changed his position, actually stands for. In particular, the extent of the influence on him of several competing Republican foreign policy schools (neo-conservativism, populist isolationism, realism, liberal internationalism) is unclear.

#### Give Russia war zero probability – politics, military superiority, and nuclear security

Graham 7 (Thomas, Russia in Global Affairs, "The dialectics of strength and weakness", http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/20/1129.html)

An astute historian of Russia, Martin Malia, wrote several years ago that “Russia has at different times been demonized or divinized by Western opinion less because of her real role in Europe than because of the fears and frustrations, or hopes and aspirations, generated within European society by its own domestic problems.” Such is the case today. To be sure, mounting Western concerns about Russia are a consequence of Russian policies that appear to undermine Western interests, but they are also a reflection of declining confidence in our own abilities and the efficacy of our own policies. Ironically, this growing fear and distrust of Russia come at a time when Russia is arguably less threatening to the West, and the United States in particular, than it has been at any time since the end of the Second World War. Russia does not champion a totalitarian ideology intent on our destruction, its **military poses no threat** to sweep across Europe, its economic growth depends on constructive commercial relations with Europe, and its strategic arsenal – while still capable of annihilating the United States – is under more reliable control than it has been in the past fifteen years and the threat of a strategic strike **approaches zero probability.** Political gridlock in key Western countries, however, precludes the creativity, risk-taking, and subtlety needed to advance our interests on issues over which we are at odds with Russia while laying the basis for more constructive long-term relations with Russia.

**Relations are screwed now**

Kupchan 8/21

[Charles, Whitney Shepardson Senior Fellow, 8/21/12, <http://www.cfr.org/russian-fed/russia-joins-wto-amid-continuing-tensions-us/p28858>

Russia’s accession to the WTO this Wednesday marks the successful end of a long and tortuous road of negotiations. Washington played an important role in paving the way, in the end game helping to remove the final hurdle by pressing Georgia to acquiesce to Russian membership despite the continuing acrimony between Tblisi and Moscow. Russia’s admission to the WTO should thus mark a significant advance in U.S.-Russian relations – a major step forward in the so-called “reset.” But the opposite is true. Relations between Washington and Moscow have been particularly strained of late, with the Obama administration justifiably angry over the Kremlin’s intransigent alignment with a Syrian regime using brute force against its own people. Meanwhile, the U.S. Congress has yet to graduate Russia from Jackson-Vanik restrictions – economic sanctions put in place in the 1970s intended to pressure the Soviet Union to allow emigration of its Jews. Congress is also considering legislation which would link normal trade relations with Russia to the country’s readiness to improve its record on human rights. The so-called Magnitsky Bill and related proposals envisage the public disclosure of a blacklist of human rights violators and the imposition of a visa ban on such individuals. Sergei Magnitsky was a Russian whistleblower who was imprisoned and then died while under policy custody in 2009. Without Russia’s graduation from Jackson-Vanik, commerce between the U.S. and Russia will not fully benefit from Russia’s accession to the WTO. And the Kremlin has expressed outrage that Congress is linking trade and human rights, claiming that Washington has no right to interfere in Russia’s domestic affairs. Senior Russian officials have threatened to retaliate with their own restrictions on visas for Americans, a move that could impair economic cooperation. Congress’ reluctance to repeal Jackson-Vanik stems in part from partisan wrangling amid the home stretch of the presidential race. Mitt Romney is positioning himself as the foreign policy hardliner in the contest, seeking to portray Obama as insufficiently tough in his conduct of statecraft. Romney is reserving his best rhetoric for the Kremlin, going so far as to declare that Russia is America’s chief foe. Although such claims bear little semblance to reality, the Republicans are ready to pounce if Democrats appear to be too accommodating of the Kremlin. As a result, the effort to move Russia past the Jackson-Vanick era has bogged down on Capitol Hill. Moreover, although Congress is more than justified in criticizing Russia on matters of human rights, there is also a counterproductive Russophobia on Capitol Hill that is best explained as a hangover from the Cold War. It is appears probable that Congress will be finally be ready to graduate Russia from Jackson-Vanik during the lame duck session that follows the November election. But even so, this episode is revealing America’s schizophrenic view of Russia and casting an unfortunate shadow over what should be an auspicious moment in commercial ties between the two countries. For its part, Russia has played right into the hands of American voices arguing that the Kremlin should be kept at arm’s length. The Russian government continues to trample on political freedoms; last week’s conviction of the punk band Pussy Riot is a case in point. The Kremlin’s **repression of political opponents** is not only distasteful, but also unnecessary; Putin’s political machine and personal popularity are more than sufficient to give him a strong hand. Putin’s more **confrontational foreign policy** is also costing him dearly in Washington. Initially, many American observers presumed that his more blustery tone was aimed at shoring up support in preparation for the presidential election. But Putin’s provocations have not abated, especially when it comes to NATO’s plans for **missile defense and**, most importantly, the crisis in **Syria**. Putin was arguably justified in reacting with pique to the NATO operation in Libya on the grounds that it brought about regime change under the cover of a UN mandate intended to protect civilians. But smarting over the Libya mission provides Putin no reason whatsoever to embrace a government in Syria that is mercilessly killing its own citizens. Indeed, the Kremlin seems to have backed itself into a corner, stuck supporting a regime that has lost its legitimacy and decency in the court of world opinion. Russia gains nothing from standing with Assad – and the chilling effect on U.S.-Russian relations will last a long time. Indeed, the Kremlin’s policy toward Syria is raising troubling questions in Washington about Russian intentions and its suitability as a strategic partner. Even in the absence of these tensions in U.S.-Russian relations, the implications of Russia’s accession to the WTO should not be overstated. To be sure, there will be significant economic benefits to Russia and its trading partners. But WTO membership has only modest potential to foster ambitious economic and political reforms or to encourage Russia to more fully embrace Western norms. After all, China has been a WTO member since 2001, but its inclusion has done little to dismantle state capitalism or encourage political reform. Russia takes an important step in the right direction on Wednesday. But when it comes to consolidating rapprochement between Washington and Moscow and more fully anchoring Russia in Western markets and institutions, there is still much hard work to be done.

#### -- No motive for cyber-terror

Green 2 (Joshua, Editor – Washington Monthly, “The Myth of Cyberterrorism”, Washington Monthly, November,

http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2001/0211.green.html#byline)

Despite all the media alarm about terrorists poised on the verge of cyberattack, intelligence suggests that they're doing no more than emailing and surfing for potential targets. When U.S. troops recovered al Qaeda laptops in Afghanistan, officials were surprised to find its members more technologically adept than previously believed. They discovered structural and engineering software, electronic models of a dam, and information on computerized water systems, nuclear power plants, and U.S. and European stadiums. But nothing suggested they were planning cyberattacks, only that they were using the Internet to communicate and coordinate physical attacks. "There doesn't seem to be any evidence that the people we know as terrorists like to do cyberterrorism," says Libicki. Indeed, in a July report to the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee detailing the threats detected to critical infrastructure, the General Accounting Office noted "to date none of the traditional terrorist groups such as al Qaeda have used the Internet to launch a known assault on the U.S.'s infrastructure." It is much easier, and almost certainly much deadlier, to strike the old-fashioned way.

**-- Err Neg – their evidence is biased**

Green 2 (Joshua, Editor – Washington Monthly, “The Myth of Cyberterrorism”, Washington Monthly, November,

http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2001/0211.green.html#byline)

Why all this brooding over so relatively **minor** a threat? Ignorance is one reason. Cyberterrorism merges two spheres--terrorism and technology--that most lawmakers and senior administration officials don't fully understand and therefore tend to fear, making them likelier to accede to any measure, if only out of self-preservation. Just as tellingly, many are eager to exploit this ignorance. Numerous technology companies, still reeling from the collapse of the tech bubble, have recast themselves as innovators crucial to national security and boosted their Washington presence in an effort to attract federal dollars. As Ohio State University law professor Peter Swire explained to Mother Jones, "Many companies that rode the dot-com boom need to find big new sources of income. One is direct sales to the federal government; another is federal mandates. If we have a big federal push for new security spending, that could prop up the sagging market." But lately, a third motive has emerged: Stoking fears of cyberterrorism helps maintain the level of public anxiety about terrorism generally, which in turn makes it easier for the administration to pass its agenda.

#### -- Government defenses solve

Schwartz 3 (John, “Blocking a Cyberterror Attack”, Computer Crime Research Center, May, http://www.crime-research.org/news/2003/05/Mess0604.html)

The government is working to close that gap. In the executive branch, cyberdefense is one of the concerns of the new Department of Homeland Security. Within the military, a task force with a $26 million annual budget is studying cyberwarfare for both its defensive and offensive potential, and President Bush has signed a directive, disclosed in February, calling for the military to develop policies to govern the waging of digital war. Regular exercises at the military service academies prepare students to defend military networks against hackers. For now, though, the quarry in such exercises remains elusive. The most damaging attacks and intrusions, experts say, are typically carried out by disgruntled corporate insiders intent on embezzlement or sabotage, or by individuals - typically young and male - seeking thrills and notoriety. There was, to be sure, the explicitly political Code Red, a self-reproducing program known as a worm that was unleashed in 2001 to take control of thousands of computers and force them to block access to the White House Web site by flooding government servers with data. Many security experts believe that the program was developed in China in retaliation for the loss of a Chinese jet and its pilot after a collision with an American spy plane. Once the worm was detected, a tweak to the numeric online address for the White House Web site prevented disruption. Code Red drew attention to cyberattacks as a vehicle for political activism, said Roger Thompson, the director of malicious code research at TruSecure, a computer security company. "Instead of doing it to be jerks and show off to their buddies, they're doing it to make a statement," he said.
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### 1

#### Text: The fifty state governments of the United States should substantially increase financial incentives for subdermal solar panels

#### 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.

#### States can provide financial incentives for energy policy – already being done

Piscitello and Bogach 97 (E. Scott and V. Susan, “Financial Incentives for Renewable Energy Development”, 1997, pg. 33)

Financial incentives for renewable energy development in the United States are set at both the federal and **state levels**. In many cases, policy frameworks are set by the federal government with states required to design and implement policy details. As a result, financial incentive policies for renewable energy development in the United Slates vary greatly among individual states. States often formulate financial incentive policies to promote development of a resource within their particular borders, but which is not as prominent in other states (such as financial incentives for energy from biomass in Georgia, Alabama, and other states located in the southeastern United States). The State of California, however, developed strong financial incentive policies that have succeeded in promoting a broad range of renewable energy resources, including wind and solar resources. California was therefore chosen as a focus for the financial incentives offered for renewable energy development in the United States. Examples of incentives used in other states arc documented at the end of this section-In reaction to the oil crisis of the 1970s, the State of California adopted energy policies for (a) promoting energy diversity; (b) reducing dependence on fossil fuels; (c) using indigenous energy resources; and (d) promoting environmentally benign energy sources. These principles led to a series of financial incentive policies for renewable energy development that has resulted in significant installed capacity. By the early 1990s, renewable energy facilities comprised approximately 10 percent of the installed generating capacity in California Due to an oversubscription by renewable energy facilities in the late 1980s and 1990s, financial incentives for renewable energy development were removed. At the same time, California was and is continuing to move toward deregulating its electric utility industry. Despite uncertainties regarding future evolution of the deregulated industry, energy prices are expected to remain below those at which renewable energy facilities are financially viable- As a result, California is presently developing new financial incentives aimed at maintaining its existing renewable energy facilities as well as promoting further development of the most promising technologies in the deregulated power market.

#### Centralization subordinates ethical decision-making to the pursuit of power as an end in-and-of itself. This makes hierarchy and abuse of power inevitable.

Papworth 1 (John, Senior Editor @ Ecologist + Founder of Fourth World Review, Peace Through Social Empowerment, "Primary Causes," http://www.cesc.net/radicalweb/radicalconsultation/papworth/jp14.html)

We need to see that the massive abuses of power now dominating human affairs have their origins in the destruction of genuine peoples' power, power at the smallest level of society, in the village, the neighbourhood, the community or whatever name we choose to give it; power which was frequently expressed in work, in localised trading, in relationships and in a wide range of social usages, common understandings and adherence to a common code of moral principle. Our prospects of countering the evil forces promoting the global crisis and of making any significant progress are bleak indeed if we do not grasp that if people have no real power to enable their moral judgements to be reflected in the general life processes of their own communities, if they do not themselves control their social structures, their schools, post office, bank, police, hospital, transport and their welfare services; if they have no local power to determine these matters, if they do not have their own locally elected representatives to sit, with others similarly elected, on boards which govern matters of wider import, including public utilities such as water, gas, electricity and not least, governing the content of radio and television, they have no effective power at all. The very structures disempower them and it is a mere abuse of language to describe any such process as democratic. Democracy, we should never cease to hold, does not mean government of the people, nor government for the people, both are essentially totalitarian concepts, it means government by the people. All else is claptrap and delusion. Once the power of people to make decisions at community level is nullified by shunting that power to ever larger centres of administration and control, then what becomes determinative is not the will of the people but factors attendant on the pursuit of power, whether in terms of place, profit or prestige, as an end in itself.

### 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.

#### 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.

### 3

#### 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.

### Case

#### Ontology must be secondary to the prior question of political practice

Jarvis 00 (Darryl, Senior Lecturer in International Relations – University of Sydney, International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism, p. 128-9)

More is the pity that such irrational and obviously abstruse debate should so occupy us at a time of great global turmoil. That it does and continues to do so reflect our lack of judicious criteria for evaluating theory and, more importantly, the lack of attachment theorists have to the real world. Certainly it is right and proper that we ponder the depths of our theoretical imaginations, engage in epistemological and ontological debate, and analyze the sociology of our knowledge. But to support that this is the only task of international theory, let alone the most important one, **smacks of intellectual elitism** and **displays** a certain **contempt** for those who search for guidance in their daily struggle as actors in international politics. What does Ashley’s project, his deconstructive efforts, or valiant fight against positivism say to the truly marginalized, oppressed, and destitute? How does it help solve the plight of the poor, the displaced refugees, the casualties of war, or the émigrés of death squads? Does it in any way speak to those whose actions and thoughts comprise the policy and practice of international relations? On all these questions one must answer **no**. This is not to say, of course, that all theory should be judged by its technical rationality and problem-solving capacity as Ashley forcefully argues. But to support that problem-solving technical theory is not necessary—or in some way bad—is a **contemptuous position** that abrogates any hope of solving some of the **nightmarish realities that millions confront daily**. As Holsti argues, we need ask of these theorists and their theories the ultimate question, **“So what?”** To what purpose do they deconstruct, problematize, destabilize, undermine, ridicule, and belittle modernist and rationalist approaches? Does this get us any further, make the world any better, or enhance the human condition? In what sense can this “debate toward [a] bottomless pit of epistemology and metaphysics” be judged pertinent, relevant, helpful, or cogent to anyone other than those foolish enough to be scholastically excited by abstract and recondite debate. Contrary to Ashley’s assertions, then, a poststructural approach fails to empower the marginalized and, in fact, abandons them. Rather than analyze the political economy of power, wealth, oppression, production, or international relations and render and intelligible understanding of these processes, Ashley succeeds in ostracizing those he portends to represent by delivering an obscure and highly convoluted discourse. If Ashley wishes to chastise structural realism for its abstractness and detachment, he must be prepared also to face similar criticism, especially when he so adamantly intends his work to address the real life plight of those who struggle at marginal places.

#### Can’t solve – other companies don’t have technology – cross –x proves

#### Ontology doesn’t come first

**Owens 2002** (David – professor of social and political philosophy at the University of Southampton, Re-orienting International Relations: On Pragmatism, Pluralism and Practical Reasoning, Millenium, p. 655-657)

Commenting on the ‘philosophical turn’ in IR, Wæver remarks that ‘[a] frenzy for words like “epistemology” and “ontology” often signals this philosophical turn’, although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.4 However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that debates concerning ontology and epistemology play a central role in the contemporary IR theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is no doubt that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn. The first danger with the philosophical turn is that it has an inbuilt tendency to prioritise issues of ontology and epistemology **over explanatory** and/or interpretive **power** as if the latter two were merely a **simple function** of the former. But while the explanatory and/or interpretive power of a theoretical account is not wholly independent of its ontological and/or epistemological commitments (otherwise criticism of these features would not be a criticism that had any value), **it is by no means clear that it is**, in contrast, wholly dependent **on these philosophical commitments**. Thus, for example, one need not be sympathetic to rational choice theory to recognise that it can provide powerful accounts of certain kinds of problems, such as the tragedy of the commons in which dilemmas of collective action are foregrounded. It may, of course, be the case that the advocates of rational choice theory cannot give a good account of why this type of theory is powerful in accounting for this class of problems (i.e., how it is that the relevant actors come to exhibit features in these circumstances that approximate the assumptions of rational choice theory) and, if this is the case, it is a philosophical weakness—but **this does not undermine** the point that, for a certain class of problems, rational choice theory may provide the best account available to us. In other words, while the critical judgement of theoretical accounts in terms of their ontological and/or epistemological sophistication is one kind of critical judgement, **it is not the only or even necessarily the** most important kind. The second danger run by the philosophical turn is that because prioritisation of ontology and epistemology promotes theory-construction from philosophical first principles, it cultivates a theory-driven rather than problem-driven approach to IR. Paraphrasing Ian Shapiro, the point can be put like this: since it is the case that there is always a plurality of possible true descriptions of a given action, event or phenomenon, the challenge is to decide which is the most apt in terms of getting a perspicuous grip on the action, event or phenomenon in question given the purposes of the inquiry; yet, from this standpoint, ‘theory-driven work is part of a reductionist program’ in that it ‘dictates always opting for the description that calls for the explanation that flows from the preferred model or theory’.5 The justification offered for this strategy rests on the mistaken belief that it is necessary for social science because general explanations are required to characterise the classes of phenomena studied in similar terms. However, as Shapiro points out, this is to misunderstand the enterprise of science since ‘whether there are general explanations for classes of phenomena is a **question for social-scientific inquiry**, not to be prejudged before conducting that inquiry’.6 Moreover, this strategy easily slips into the promotion of the pursuit of generality over that of empirical validity. The third danger is that the preceding two combine to encourage the formation of a particular image of disciplinary debate in IR—what might be called (only slightly tongue in cheek) ‘the Highlander view’—namely, an image of warring theoretical approaches with each, despite occasional temporary tactical alliances, dedicated to the strategic achievement of sovereignty over the disciplinary field. It encourages this view because the turn to, and prioritisation of, ontology and epistemology stimulates the idea that there can only be one **theoretical approach which gets things right**, namely, the theoretical approach that gets its ontology and epistemology right. This image feeds back into IR exacerbating the first and second dangers, and so a potentially vicious circle arises.

Davidson 89 (Arnold I., Coeditor – Critical Inquiry and Associate Professor of Philosophy – University of Chicago, Critical Inquiry, Winter, p. 426)

I understand Levinas’ work to suggest another path to the recovery of the human, one that leads through or toward other human beings: “The dimension of the divine opens forth from the human face… Hence metaphysics is enacted where the social relation is enacted- in our relations with men… The Other is not the incarnation of God, but precisely by his face, in which he is disincarnate, is the manifestation of the height in which God is revealed. It is our relations with men… that give to theological concepts the sole signification they admit of.” Levinas places ethics before ontology by beginning with our experience of the human face: and, in a clear reference to Heidegger’s idolatry of the village life of peasants, he associated himself with Socrates, who preferred the city where he encountered men to the country with its trees. In his discussion of skepticism and the problem of others, Cavell also aligns himself with this path of thought, with the recovery of the finite human self through the acknowledgement of others: “As long as God exists, I am not alone. And couldn’t the other suffer the fate of God?… I wish to understand how the other now bears the weight of God, shows me that I am not alone in the universe. This requires understanding the philosophical problem of the other as the trace or scar of the departure of God [CR, p.470].” The suppression of the other, the human, in Heidegger’s thought accounts, I believe, for the absence, in his writing after the war, of the experience of horror. Horror is always directed toward the human; every object of horror bears the imprint of the human will. So Levinas can see in Heidegger’s silence about the gas chambers and death camps “a kind of consent to the horror.” And Cavell can characterize Nazis as “those who have lost the capacity for being horrified by what they do.” Where was Heidegger’s horror? How could he have failed to know what he had consented to? Hannah Arendt associates Heidegger with Paul Valery’s aphorism, “Les evenements ne sont que l’ecume des choses’ (‘Events are but the foam of things’).” I think one understands the source of her intuition. The mass extermination of human beings,however, does not produce foam, but dust and ashes; and it is **here that questioning must stop**.

#### Sociobiology is wrong. It takes observations and fits them into preconceived notions about evolution. No consensus of validity.

Bell 00 (Duncan, Doctoral Candidate in International Studies – Cambridge University, Paul McDonald, Doctoral Candidate in Political Science – Columbia University, and Bradley Thayer, Professor of Political Science – University of Minnesota, Duluth, “Start the Evolution without Us”, International Security, Summer, Lexis)

First, the universality of the sociobiological project—and specifically its applicability to the study of human behavior—is extremely controversial. Thayer downplays the serious disagreements by claiming that the study of humans is central to the sociobiological project (p. 130). In contrast, one commentator has noted that “most ‘sociobiologists’ . . . are quite uninterested in humans.”6 In particular, many biologists themselves dispute the applicability of sociobiological approaches to humans because of the central role of culture, language, and self-reflexivity in determining human behavior.7 Although advocates of human sociobiology acknowledge the dual influences of culture and genetics in shaping human behavior, no consensus exists on how to explain the complex interplay between these factors. Second, sociobiological explanations of human behavior are often unacceptably functionalist. Sociobiologists take a particular form of human behavior and account for it with reference to evolutionary fitness. Different sociobiologists explain behaviors ranging from selfishness to altruism and from monogamy to rape based on the claim that they confer a selective advantage to the individuals or groups who practice them. The quality of sociobiological explanations and the models used to demonstrate them vary tremendously, but such arguments generally fall into the trap of what Richard Lewontin and Stephen Jay Gould call “adaptationism,” the attempt to understand all the physiological and behavioral traits of an organism as evolutionary adaptations.8 Individual traits may in fact be the result of a complex web of design and development in the organism’s growth. The effects of individual genes may not be discernable in isolation from their interaction with other genetic traits and environmental factors. Traits may be nonadaptive and the product of allometry—the relative and incidental growth of a part of an organism in relation to the whole bundle of traits that constitute an organism. Thus a particular behavior may be “a consequence of adaptations rather than an adaptation in its own right.”9 The complexity and unpredictability of interactions between individual selection pressures and particular traits create intractable problems for researchers attempting to isolate the genetic foundations of behavior within variegated environmental and cultural contexts. In other words, even if we develop an account of how any given behavior is functional with reference to evolutionary fitness, we are a long way from being able to conclude that evolutionary mechanisms actually gave rise to that behavior. In this way, sociobiological accounts easily degenerate into examples of the post hoc, ergo propter hoc fallacy generally associated with other versions of functionalist explanations in the social sciences.10 This problem of isolating particular genetic traits is compounded within human populations, which are not generally divided into isolated, distinguishable gene pools and which, as mentioned above, attribute a large role to culture in determining socially acceptable and legitimate behavior.11

#### Global violence is decreasing – their impact is empirically denied

Pinker 7 (Steven, Johnstone Family Professor in the Department of Psychology – Harvard University, “A History of Violence”, Edge: The Third Culture, 3-28, http://www.edge.org/3rd\_culture/pinker07/pinker07\_index.html)

In sixteenth-century Paris, a popular form of entertainment was cat-burning, in which a cat was hoisted in a sling on a stage and slowly lowered into a fire. According to historian Norman Davies, "[T]he spectators, including kings and queens, shrieked with laughter as the animals, howling with pain, were singed, roasted, and finally carbonized." Today, such sadism would be unthinkable in most of the world. This change in sensibilities is just one example of perhaps the **most important and** most **underappreciated** **trend** in the human saga: **Violence has been in decline over long stretches of history, and today we are** probably **living in the most peaceful moment of our species' time on earth**. In the decade of Darfur and Iraq, and shortly after the century of Stalin, Hitler, and Mao, the claim that violence has been diminishing may seem somewhere between hallucinatory and obscene. Yet recent studies that seek to quantify the historical ebb and flow of violence point to exactly that conclusion. Some of the evidence has been under our nose all along. Conventional history has long shown that, in many ways, we have been getting kinder and gentler. Cruelty as entertainment, human sacrifice to indulge superstition, slavery as a labor-saving device, conquest as the mission statement of government, genocide as a means of acquiring real estate, torture and mutilation as routine punishment, the death penalty for misdemeanors and differences of opinion, assassination as the mechanism of political succession, rape as the spoils of war, pogroms as outlets for frustration, homicide as the major form of conflict resolution—all were unexceptionable features of life for most of human history. But, today, they are **rare to nonexistent** in the West, far less common elsewhere than they used to be, concealed when they do occur, and widely condemned when they are brought to light. At one time, these facts were widely appreciated. They were the source of notions like progress, civilization, and man's rise from savagery and barbarism. Recently, however, those ideas have come to sound corny, even dangerous. They seem to demonize people in other times and places, license colonial conquest and other foreign adventures, and conceal the crimes of our own societies. The doctrine of the noble savage—the idea that humans are peaceable by nature and corrupted by modern institutions—pops up frequently in the writing of public intellectuals like José Ortega y Gasset ("War is not an instinct but an invention"), Stephen Jay Gould ("Homo sapiens is not an evil or destructive species"), and Ashley Montagu ("Biological studies lend support to the ethic of universal brotherhood"). But, now that social scientists have started to count bodies in different historical periods, they have discovered that the romantic theory gets it backward: Far from causing us to become more violent, something in modernity and its cultural institutions has made us nobler. To be sure, any attempt to document changes in violence must be soaked in uncertainty. In much of the world, the distant past was a tree falling in the forest with no one to hear it, and, even for events in the historical record, statistics are spotty until recent periods. Long-term trends can be discerned only by smoothing out zigzags and spikes of horrific bloodletting. And the choice to focus on relative rather than absolute numbers brings up the moral imponderable of whether it is worse for 50 percent of a population of 100 to be killed or 1 percent in a population of one billion. Yet, despite these caveats, a picture is taking shape. The decline of violence is a fractal phenomenon, visible at the scale of millennia, centuries, decades, and years. It **applies over several orders** of magnitude of violence, from genocide to war to rioting to homicide to the treatment of children and animals. And it appears to be a **worldwide trend**, though not a homogeneous one. The leading edge has been in Western societies, especially England and Holland, and there seems to have been a **tipping point** at the onset of the Age of Reason in the early seventeenth century. At the widest-angle view, one can see a whopping difference across the millennia that separate us from our pre-state ancestors. Contra leftist anthropologists who celebrate the noble savage, quantitative body-counts—such as the proportion of prehistoric skeletons with axemarks and embedded arrowheads or the proportion of men in a contemporary foraging tribe who die at the hands of other men—suggest that pre-state societies were far more violent than our own. It is true that raids and battles killed a tiny percentage of the numbers that die in modern warfare. But, in tribal violence, the clashes are more frequent, the percentage of men in the population who fight is greater, and the rates of death per battle are higher. According to anthropologists like Lawrence Keeley, Stephen LeBlanc, Phillip Walker, and Bruce Knauft, these factors combine to yield population-wide rates of death in tribal warfare that dwarf those of modern times. If the wars of the twentieth century had killed the same proportion of the population that die in the wars of a typical tribal society, there would have been two billion deaths, not 100 million. Political correctness from the other end of the ideological spectrum has also distorted many people's conception of violence in early civilizations—namely, those featured in the Bible. This supposed source of moral values contains many celebrations of genocide, in which the Hebrews, egged on by God, slaughter every last resident of an invaded city. The Bible also prescribes death by stoning as the penalty for a long list of nonviolent infractions, including idolatry, blasphemy, homosexuality, adultery, disrespecting one's parents, and picking up sticks on the Sabbath. The Hebrews, of course, were no more murderous than other tribes; one also finds frequent boasts of torture and genocide in the early histories of the Hindus, Christians, Muslims, and Chinese. At the century scale, it is hard to find quantitative studies of deaths in warfare spanning medieval and modern times. Several historians have suggested that there has been an increase in the number of recorded wars across the centuries to the present, but, as political scientist James Payne has noted, this may show only that "the Associated Press is a more comprehensive source of information about battles around the world than were sixteenth-century monks." Social histories of the West provide evidence of numerous barbaric practices that became obsolete in the last five centuries, such as slavery, amputation, blinding, branding, flaying, disembowelment, burning at the stake, breaking on the wheel, and so on. Meanwhile, for another kind of violence—homicide—the data are abundant and striking. The criminologist Manuel Eisner has assembled hundreds of homicide estimates from Western European localities that kept records at some point between 1200 and the mid-1990s. In every country he analyzed, murder rates declined steeply—for example, from 24 homicides per 100,000 Englishmen in the fourteenth century to 0.6 per 100,000 by the early 1960s. On the scale of decades, comprehensive data again paint a **shockingly happy picture**: Global violence has **fallen steadily** since the middle of the twentieth century. According to the Human Security Brief 2006, the number of battle deaths in interstate wars has declined from more than 65,000 per year in the 1950s to less than 2,000 per year in this decade. In Western Europe and the Americas, the second half of the century saw a steep decline in the number of wars, military coups, and deadly ethnic riots. Zooming in by a further power of ten exposes yet another reduction. After the cold war, every part of the world saw a steep drop-off in state-based conflicts, and those that do occur are more likely to end in negotiated settlements rather than being fought to the bitter end. Meanwhile, according to political scientist Barbara Harff, between 1989 and 2005 the number of campaigns of mass killing of civilians decreased by 90 percent. The decline of killing and cruelty poses several challenges to our ability to make sense of the world. To begin with, how could so many people be so wrong about something so important? Partly, it's because of a **cognitive** **illusion**: We estimate the probability of an event from how easy it is to recall examples. Scenes of carnage are more likely to be relayed to our living rooms and burned into our memories than footage of people dying of old age. Partly, it's an intellectual culture that is loath to admit that there could be anything good about the institutions of civilization and Western society. Partly, it's the incentive structure of the activism and opinion markets: No one ever attracted followers and donations by announcing that things keep getting better. And part of the explanation lies in the phenomenon itself. The decline of violent behavior has been paralleled by a decline in attitudes that tolerate or glorify violence, and often the attitudes are in the lead. As deplorable as they are, the abuses at Abu Ghraib and the lethal injections of a few murderers in Texas are mild by the standards of atrocities in human history. But, from a contemporary vantage point, we see them as signs of how low our behavior can sink, not of how high our standards have risen. The other major challenge posed by the decline of violence is how to explain it. A force that pushes in the same direction across many epochs, continents, and scales of social organization mocks our standard tools of causal explanation. The usual suspects—guns, drugs, the press, American culture—aren't nearly up to the job. Nor could it possibly be explained by evolution in the biologist's sense: Even if the meek could inherit the earth, natural selection could not favor the genes for meekness quickly enough. In any case, human nature has not changed so much as to have lost its taste for violence. Social psychologists find that at least 80 percent of people have fantasized about killing someone they don't like. And modern humans still take pleasure in viewing violence, if we are to judge by the popularity of murder mysteries, Shakespearean dramas, Mel Gibson movies, video games, and hockey. What has changed, of course, is people's willingness to act on these fantasies. The sociologist Norbert Elias suggested that European modernity accelerated a "civilizing process" marked by increases in self-control, long-term planning, and sensitivity to the thoughts and feelings of others. These are precisely the functions that today's cognitive neuroscientists attribute to the prefrontal cortex. But this only raises the question of why humans have increasingly exercised that part of their brains. No one knows why our behavior has come under the control of the better angels of our nature, but there are four plausible suggestions.

#### Existence is a pre-requisite to examining ontology

Wapner 3 (Paul, Associate Professor and Director of the Global Environmental Policy Program – American University, “Leftist Criticism of”, Dissent, Winter, http://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/?article=539)

THE THIRD response to eco-criticism would require critics to acknowledge the ways in which they themselves silence nature and then to respect the sheer otherness of the nonhuman world. Postmodernism prides itself on criticizing the urge toward mastery that characterizes modernity. But isn't mastery exactly what postmodernism is exerting as it captures the nonhuman world within its own conceptual domain? Doesn't postmodern cultural criticism deepen the modernist urge toward mastery by eliminating the ontological weight of the nonhuman world? What else could it mean to assert that there is no such thing as nature? I have already suggested the postmodernist response: yes, recognizing the social construction of "nature" does deny the self-expression of the nonhuman world, but how would we know what such self-expression means? Indeed, nature doesn't speak; rather, some person always speaks on nature's behalf, and whatever that person says is, as we all know, a social construction. All attempts to listen to nature are social constructions-except one. Even the most radical postmodernist must acknowledge the distinction between physical existence and non-existence. As I have said, postmodernists accept that there is a physical substratum to the phenomenal world even if they argue about the different meanings we ascribe to it. This acknowledgment of physical existence is crucial. We can't ascribe meaning to that which doesn't appear. What doesn't exist can manifest no character. Put differently, yes, the postmodernist should rightly worry about interpreting nature's expressions. And all of us should be wary of those who claim to speak on nature's behalf (including environmentalists who do that). But we need not doubt the simple idea that **a prerequisite of expression is existence**. This in turn suggests that preserving the nonhuman world-in all its diverse embodiments-must be seen by eco-critics as a fundamental good. Eco-critics must be supporters, in some fashion, of environmental preservation. Postmodernists reject the idea of a universal good. They rightly acknowledge the difficulty of identifying a common value given the multiple contexts of our value-producing activity. In fact, if there is one thing they vehemently scorn, it is the idea that there can be a value that stands above the individual contexts of human experience. Such a value would present itself as a metanarrative and, as Jean-François Lyotard has explained, postmodernism is characterized fundamentally by its "incredulity toward meta-narratives." Nonetheless, I can't see how postmodern critics can do otherwise than accept the value of preserving the nonhuman world. The nonhuman is the extreme "other"; it stands in contradistinction to humans as a species. In understanding the constructed quality of human experience and the dangers of reification, postmodernism inherently advances an ethic of respecting the "other." At the very least, respect must involve ensuring that the "other" actually continues to exist. In our day and age, this requires us to take responsibility for protecting the actuality of the nonhuman. Instead, however, we are running roughshod over the earth's diversity of plants, animals, and ecosystems. Postmodern critics should find this particularly disturbing. If they don't, they deny their own intellectual insights and compromise their fundamental moral commitment. NOW, WHAT does this mean for politics and policy, and the future of the environmental movement? Society is constantly being asked to address questions of environmental quality for which there are no easy answers. As we wrestle with challenges of global climate change, ozone depletion, loss of biological diversity, and so forth, we need to consider the economic, political, cultural, and aesthetic values at stake. These considerations have traditionally marked the politics of environmental protection. A sensitivity to eco-criticism requires that we go further and include an ethic of otherness in our deliberations. That is, we need to be moved by our concern to make room for the "other" and hence fold a commitment to the nonhuman world into our policy discussions. I don't mean that this argument should drive all our actions or that respect for the "other" should always carry the day. But it must be a central part of our reflections and calculations. For example, as we estimate the number of people that a certain area can sustain, consider what to do about climate change, debate restrictions on ocean fishing, or otherwise assess the effects of a particular course of action, we must think about the lives of other creatures on the earth-and also the continued existence of the nonliving physical world. We must do so

#### -- 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.

#### -- 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.

#### -- 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.

## 2NC vs Wayne State BN

### Turns Solvency

#### K turns the case --- attempts to grapple with social problems will inevitably fail under centralization --- scale is the vital internal link to successful solutions

Papworth 1 (John, Senior Editor @ Ecologist + Founder of Fourth World Review, “"A PAIR OF CRANKS--Foreword," http://www.cesc.net/radicalweb/academicinn/london/papworth/pairofcranks.html)

If the burden of this volume is concerned with the more immediate and imposing problems confronting the survival prospects of civilisation generally, and more especially in the more advanced mis-developed countries, it is because those problems are here more pronounced. And the overall problem abides, what is the direction our affairs need to take and how do we go about taking it? Of one thing we may be sure, and it is an unspoken affirmation that runs throughout these pages, that attempts to grapple with the problems of the modern world which ignore the factor of scale are predestined to fail because it is precisely such ignoring which has done so much to create the problems in the first place. It does not follow that if this factor is taken fully into account that all our problems will just disappear. We are not perfect beings and there are no perfect solutions to the problems of seeking a harmonious, equitable, peaceful and free society, especially in a context where some forms of global association are already operating; all that can be affirmed is that if it is adopted we will cease to be helpless in seeking to grapple with them; that they will, in many important respects, become manageable and containable, whereas the forces promoting them are now running amok, out of control and defying any attempts to restrain them.

#### Centralization is the root of global crises --- using this form of politics only contributes to the problem

Papworth 4 (John, Senior Editor @ Ecologist + Founder of Fourth World Review, "A New Start," Fourth World Review, http://www.cesc.net/radicalweb/fourthworld/adobe/online/fwr127.pdf)

We are confronted with every kind of crisis and in every case an appropriate knee-jerk reaction from concerned people has been engendered; but a failure to focus on the extent to which these many crisis factors emerge from overlarge and overcentralised degrees of political and economic power now running amok and denying the power of the concerned citizen body to prevent them and their abuses is to make ourselves part of the problem rather than of its solution. People differ widely in their views on the moral principles which should govern economic activity, and the days are over when we could assume a general concurrence with some broad overarching principles which require a powerful centralized structure to apply them and which lead only through the runnels of modern history to the insulting ineffabilities of ‘New Labour’. We have to trust ourselves and our own judgements in every local community wherever we live to make the moral decisions about economic matters which will enable life to flourish, and to insist on the local power to apply them in the confidence that others elsewhere will share our concerns and our perceptions. We must have faith that this sharing will forge together to build a new civilisation, one which rejects the excesses of greed and which promotes a quest for the creative splendours of self-realisation through service.

#### Centralized politics are fragmented and ineffective – localized approaches are the only way to avert catastrophe

Papworth 4 (John, Senior Editor @ Ecologist + Founder of Fourth World Review, "What Next?", Fourth World Review, http://www.cesc.net/radicalweb/fourthworld/adobe/print/fwrp126.pdf)

What form shall such resistance take? How can it be effective without falling into the trap of the inevitable corruption of power when wielded on a mass basis? The failure to address these questions is the principal reason why what might be a radical movement is today so fragmented, confused and wholly ineffective in halting the onward march to Carmageddon. The urgent need of the hour is for a continuous and ever expanding debate on the problem of the democratic deployment and operation of power in political and economic life. May we urge all whom these words reach in every country to plan how we all become catalysts of drives for local power and for the local education needed to achieve it in solving local problems. Such an approach opens up a meaningful vista of progress; a possibility of advance not in terms of campaigns to change parties controlling governments, by electing a different mob of power freaks, but in terms of changing the structure of government itself. It is an approach to ensure that national government is confined strictly to national matters and in no way involved in local affairs; an approach which insists that local representatives and not national appointees control regional bodies for utility functions such as transport, communications, energy and so on, a move towards an organic structure of power, power from the base up, not from the top down. That is the crucial lesson of modern history; that such an approach is the only way of ensuring that the enduring dream of democratic freedom may at last be realised.

### A2: Permutation Solves

#### -- Still links—localism is INCOMPATIBLE with any affirmation of centralization—you can’t solve the problem “with the mind-frame that has created it”—that’s Papworth

#### -- “Doing both” ensures that local control becomes the pawn of centralized, national efforts

Papworth 1 (John, Editor @ Ecologist + editor of Fourth World Review, Bringing Up the Local Issues, The Ecologist, June, http://www.cesc.net/radicalweb/radicalconsultation/papworth/jp3.html)

We now have 'national' schemes and ministries for health, education , welfare and other essentially local matters. The evidence abounds and grows that these bodies are increasingly wasteful and inefficient, where they are not indeed riddled with the maggot of corruption, and not least of course they operate on organisational parameters which make a mockery of democratic principle. Somehow the illusion has been fostered, for example, that people who have devoted their lives to clambering to the top of the greasy pole are better qualified to ordain how children should be educated than are the parents and their local committees . So our public prints are loaded with otiose speculation about 'national' examination standards and results, and about the content of 'national' educational curricula; meanwhile, in rural areas, large numbers of children are bussed to giant 'comprehensive' schools where they learn about computers and nothing about how to grow food. Local government, instead of being a power in its own right but working in tandem, where necessary, with national government, is now the pawn of the latter, which is making a mess of the whole works. It is time to cry halt to the assault on freedom involved in all this centralisation; time to restore the power and the spirit of local power, responsibility and commitment of genuine local government as a precondition of a healthy democratic way of life.

### A2: Perm – Do Both

#### 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]

### Counterplans Solve

#### -- Partial fulfillment of an obligation is sufficient – e.g. the CP

Slote 85 (Michael, Professor of Philosophy – University of Maryland, Common-Sense Morality and Consequentialism, p. 82)

The fact of widespread human suffering makes a moral claim on us not only from the utilitarian or consequentialist point of view, but on common-sense moral grounds as well. Even apart from any responsibility we may have for having made less fortunate other people less well off than they could have been, the common-sense morality of benevolent action seems to regard it as in general wrong never to do anything for those less fortunate people whom one is in a position to help and as morally better to do more for such people rather than less, to sacrifice more of one’s own well-being rather than less in order to give aid to the less fortunate. But this, of course, doesn’t tell us how much one must give in order to give what one morally might to give, to fulfil one’s (imperfect) duty of benevolence. It assumes that it is wrong never to give aid to those worse off than oneself (when one can easily do so, etc.). And it also assumes that it is morally acceptable and morally best (when this involves no violation of side-constraints, etc.) to give all one has to the less fortunate, or, at least, to reduce oneself to the (presumably rising) level of well-being of those one should be trying to help. But these assumptions say nothing about the wide spectrum of cases between giving nothing and giving, as it were, one’s all: and controversy, disagreement, and indecision over where, in that spectrum, the (rough) dividing line between duties and supererogations of benevolence should be drawn have featured time and time again in ethics discussions.

### Reps

#### Representations aren’t everything – they may *influence* policy, but they aren’t more important than it, and tons of things influence policy – including policies themselves. Their evidence isn’t good enough to justify ignoring the case

#### Privileging representations locks in violence – policy analysis is the best challenge to power

**Taft-Kaufman 95** (Jill, Professor of Speech – CMU, Southern Communication Journal, 60(3), Spring)

The postmodern passwords of "polyvocality," "Otherness," and "difference," unsupported by substantial analysis of the concrete contexts of subjects, creates a solipsistic quagmire. The political sympathies of the new cultural critics, with their ostensible concern for the lack of power experienced by marginalized people, aligns them with the political left. Yet, despite their adversarial posture and talk of opposition, their discourses on intertextuality and inter-referentiality isolate them from and ignore the conditions that have produced leftist politics--conflict, racism, poverty, and injustice. In short, as Clarke (1991) asserts, postmodern emphasis on new subjects conceals the old subjects, those who have limited access to good jobs, food, housing, health care, and transportation, as well as to the media that depict them. Merod (1987) decries this situation as one which leaves no vision, will, or commitment to activism. He notes that academic lip service to the oppositional is underscored by the absence of focused collective or politically active intellectual communities. Provoked by the academic manifestations of this problem Di Leonardo (1990) echoes Merod and laments: Has there ever been a historical era characterized by as little radical analysis or activism and as much radical-chic writing as ours? Maundering on about Otherness: phallocentrism or Eurocentric tropes has become a **lazy** **academic substitute for actual engagement** with the detailed histories and contemporary realities of Western racial minorities, white women, or any Third World population. (p. 530) Clarke's assessment of the postmodern elevation of language to the "sine qua non" of critical discussion is an even stronger indictment against the trend. Clarke examines Lyotard's (1984) The Postmodern Condition in which Lyotard maintains that virtually all social relations are linguistic, and, therefore, it is through the coercion that threatens speech that we enter the "realm of terror" and society falls apart. To this assertion, Clarke replies: I can think of few more striking indicators of the political and intellectual impoverishment of a view of society that can only recognize the discursive. If the worst terror we can envisage is the threat not to be allowed to speak, we are appallingly ignorant of terror in its elaborate contemporary forms. It may be the intellectual's conception of terror (what else do we do but speak?), but its projection onto the rest of the world would be calamitous....(pp. 2-27) The realm of the discursive is derived from the requisites for human life, which are in the physical world, rather than in a world of ideas or symbols.(4) Nutrition, shelter, and protection are basic human needs that require collective activity for their fulfillment. Postmodern emphasis on the discursive without an accompanying analysis of how the discursive emerges from material circumstances hides the complex task of envisioning and working towards **concrete social goals** (Merod, 1987). Although the material conditions that create the situation of marginality escape the purview of the postmodernist, the situation and its consequences are not overlooked by scholars from marginalized groups. Robinson (1990) for example, argues that "the justice that working people deserve is economic, not just textual" (p. 571). Lopez (1992) states that "the starting point for organizing the program content of education or political action must be the present existential, concrete situation" (p. 299). West (1988) asserts that borrowing French post-structuralist discourses about "Otherness" blinds us to realities of American difference going on in front of us (p. 170). Unlike postmodern "textual radicals" who Rabinow (1986) acknowledges are "fuzzy about power and the realities of socioeconomic constraints" (p. 255), most writers from marginalized groups are clear about how discourse interweaves with the concrete circumstances that create lived experience. People whose lives form the material for postmodern counter-hegemonic discourse do not share the optimism over the new recognition of their discursive subjectivities, because such an acknowledgment does not address sufficiently their collective historical and current struggles against racism, sexism, homophobia, and economic injustice. They do not appreciate being told they are living in a world in which there are no more real subjects. Ideas have consequences. Emphasizing the discursive self when a person is hungry and homeless represents both a cultural and humane failure. The need to look beyond texts to the perception and attainment of concrete social goals keeps writers from marginalized groups ever-mindful of the specifics of how power works through political agendas, institutions, agencies, and the budgets that fuel them.

#### Representations don’t influence reality

**Kocher 00** (Robert L., Author of “The American Mind in Denial” and Philosopher, “Discourse on Reality and Sanity”, http://freedom.orlingrabbe.com/lfetimes/reality\_sanity1.htm)

While it is not possible to establish many proofs in the verbal world, and it is simultaneously possible to make many uninhibited assertions or word equations in the verbal world, it should be considered that reality is more rigid and does not abide by the artificial flexibility and latitude of the verbal world. The world of words and the world of human experience are **very imperfectly correlated**. That is, saying something doesn't make it true. A verbal statement in the world of words doesn't mean it will occur as such in the world of consistent human experience I call reality. In the event verbal statements or assertions disagree with consistent human experience, what proof is there that the concoctions created in the world of words should take precedence or be assumed a greater truth than the world of human physical experience that I define as reality? In the event following a verbal assertion in the verbal world produces pain or catastrophe in the world of human physical reality or experience, which of the two can and should be changed? Is it wiser to live with the pain and catastrophe, or to change the arbitrary collection of words whose direction produced that pain and catastrophe? Which do you want to live with? What proven reason is there to assume that when doubtfulness that can be constructed in verbal equations conflicts with human physical experience, human physical experience should be considered doubtful? It becomes a matter of choice and pride in intellectual argument. My personal advice is that when verbal contortions lead to chronic confusion and difficulty, better you should stop the verbal contortions rather than continuing to expect the difficulty to change. Again, it's a matter of choice. Does the outcome of the philosophical question of whether reality or proof exists decide whether we should plant crops or wear clothes in cold weather to protect us from freezing? Har! Are you crazy? How many committed deconstructionist philosophers walk about naked in subzero temperatures or don't eat? Try creating and living in an alternative subjective reality where food is not needed and where you can sit naked on icebergs, and find out what happens. I emphatically encourage people to try it with the stipulation that they don't do it around me, that they don't force me to do it with them, or that they don't come to me complaining about the consequences and demanding to conscript me into paying for the cost of treating frostbite or other consequences. (sounds like there is a parallel to irresponsibility and socialism somewhere in here, doesn't it?). I encourage people to live subjective reality. I also ask them to go off far away from me to try it, where I won't be bothered by them or the consequences. For those who haven't guessed, this encouragement is a clever attempt to bait them into going off to some distant place where they will kill themselves off through the process of social Darwinism — because, let's face it, a society of deconstructionists and counterculturalists filled with people debating what, if any, reality exists would have the productive **functionality of a field of diseased rutabagas** and would **never** **survive** the first frost. The attempt to convince people to create and move to such a society never works, however, because they are not as committed or sincere as they claim to be. Consequently, they stay here to work for left wing causes and promote left wing political candidates where there are people who live productive reality who can be fed upon while they continue their arguments. They ain't going to practice what they profess, and they are smart enough not to leave the availability of people to victimize and steal from while they profess what they pretend to believe in.

## 1NR vs Wayne State BN

### Impact

#### DA outweighs – No impact defense means any risk of the DA should be preferred – they have conceded consequentialism – that extinction comes first – means if we win an extinction impact you vote neg

#### It’s the only existential threat

**Bostrum**, March **2002** (Nick – prof of philosophy at Oxford University and recipient of the Gannon Award, Existential Risks, Journal of Evolution and Technology, p. http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)

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] 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.

#### Happens fastest – Russian and US nukes are on hair trigger alert – a world of Romney collapsing relations would create multiple scenarios for conflict – 1AC cross-x was pretty damning – they have no scenario for how extinction occurs and if it does – squo proves it takes a long time – you can only die once which means you vote neg immediately

#### Turns case – GOP rolls back 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."

#### Turns cyborg – causes worse forms of biopolitical control

#### Turns micro-facism args

#### Turns racism

### Link

#### 100% conceded the link/uniqueness and the IL chain to the DA – 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

#### Political controversy over solar energy undermines development – investors won’t invest

Green Solar Cafe, 6/29/**2012** (The Implications of Solyndra’s Scandal & Bankruptcy on Future US Renewable Energy Policy, p. http://www.greensolarcafe.com/uncategorized/the-implications-of-solyndras-scandal-bankruptcy-on-future-us-renewable-energy-policy/)

Politicizing Solyndra’s bankruptcy has potential to negatively effect the future growth and development of domestic renewable energy industry Renewable energy industry in this country has a potential for growing and prospering only in the climate of stable government support. Government policy not only directly aids the industry with financial incentives, but also signals to private investors that they can invest large amounts of capital into the industry. In previous years, US solar investments and support for the renewable energy industry in the US has been for the most part bipartisan, where both Republicans and Democrats saw renewable energy as being good for the country and for the environment in the long run. This mind set in Washington allowed President Obama to implement a number of important incentives programs such as the Production Tax Credit (PTC) the Investment Tax Credit (ITC) and others, that have tremendously helped the growth of both solar and wind sectors of the renewable energy industry. A number of these key incentives are due to expire both at the end of 2012 and in 2013. In the current political climate, where renewable energy has become a deeply divisive issue for Republicans and Democrats it is highly unlikely that these will be renewed. Solyndra’s scandal has really added fuel to the fire, further denigrating the whole industry’s worthiness both in the eyes of Washington’s policy makers and the general public. A telling comment by Rep. Cliff Stearns, who chairs the oversight subcommittee of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, sums it all up:” Solyndra’s downfall proves that green energy isn’t going to be the solution” (Washington Post). How these sentiments will dictate our nation’s future energy policy remains to be seen.

#### 1% risk of DA outweighs because you can only die once

### Group Predictions debate

#### Conceded predictions can be right sometimes – they have conceded our specific evidence that says predictions could be right – you should default to specifics – not generic ev – foreign policy analysts know romney’s effect on IR

#### Not applicable – their evidence indicts pure assertions that aren’t critically tested or compared to alternatives – not our disads which can be assigned probability

#### Predictions are accurate – their studies are wrong

Caplan 5 (Bryan**,** Associate Professor of Economics at George Mason University, EconLog, 12-26, http://econlog.econlib.org/archives/2005/12/tackling\_tetloc\_1.html)

Philip Tetlock, one of my favorite social scientists, is making waves with his new book, Expert Political Judgment. Tetlock spent two decades asking hundreds of political experts to make predictions about hundreds of issues. With all this data under his belt, he then asks and tries to answer a bunch of Big Questions, including "Do experts on average have a greater-than-chance ability to predict the future?," and "What kinds of experts have the greatest forecasting ability?" This book is literally awesome - to understand Tetlock's project and see how well he follows through fills me with awe. And that's tough for me to admit, because it would be easy to interpret Tetlock's work as a great refutation of my own. Most of my research highlights the systematic belief differences between economists and the general public, and defends the simple "The experts are right, the public is wrong," interpretation of the facts. But Tetlock finds that the average expert is an embarassingly bad forecaster. In fact, experts barely beat what Tetlock calls the "chimp" stategy of random guessing. Is my confidence in experts completely misplaced? I think not. Tetlock's sample suffers from severe selection bias. He deliberately asked relatively difficult and controversial questions. As his methodological appendix explains, questions had to "Pass the 'don't bother me too often with dumb questions' test." Dumb according to who? The implicit answer is "Dumb according to the typical expert in the field." What Tetlock really shows is that experts are overconfident if you exclude the questions where they have reached a solid consensus. This is still an important finding. Experts really do make overconfident predictions about controversial questions. We have to stop doing that! However, this does not show that experts are overconfident about their core findings. It's particularly important to make this distinction because Tetlock's work is so good that a lot of crackpots will want to highjack it: "Experts are scarcely better than chimps, so why not give intelligent design and protectionism equal time?" But what Tetlock really shows is that experts can raise their credibility if they stop overreaching.

#### Dropped arguments should be considered certain – its their burden to point out which specific claims are incorrect – they can’t wish away every argument with a sweeping generalization

#### Predictions are necessary for good policy-making, even if imperfect

Chernoff 5 (Fred, Harvey Picker Professor of International Relations – Colgate University, The Power of International Theory, p. 169-170)

Conclusion Over the past century IR developed as a discipline with the primary goal of providing a basis for changing the world for the better; i.e., as a basis for the formulation of policy. Despite the fact that most critical theorists, reflectivists and anti- and post-positivists passionately wish to use the study of IR for that purpose, the meta-theories they adopt, with their attacks on prediction, undermine the project of using the study of IR to change the world. In IR and other social sciences, policy-makers **must predict** and, contrary to post-positivism, if there are no sounder generalizations available, then phenomenal regularities must be enough to go on, at least some of the time. Even for those who accept Bohman’s HT arguments against deterministic explanation in the social sciences, and who thus see explanation as perspectival, incomplete, and circular, it is possible to ground a notion of ‘prediction’ that is capable of satisfying enabling conditions (at least closely enough) to allow policy-makers to use social theory generalizations as a foundation for predictions and thus for policies. The generalizations are neither perfectly reliable nor deterministic. They are probabilistic and offer the decision-maker imperfect guarantees about the future. Still, in many epistemic circumstances that the chosen policy will lead to the desired result that he or she would have if policies were selected randomly. Bohman overlooks the need for social prediction even more than the other authors discussed. Little overlooks it, but at least makes reference to ‘probabilistic prediction’ in some of his writings. Doran begins with an argument for prediction-scepticism but then adds several qualifications, which would seem to open up some room for prediction or forecasting. However those remarks are surrounded by comments that undercut the qualifications and which thereby restore full-blown prediction-scepticism. Bernstein et al. offer a range of criticisms that fail to target the most common sorts of predictions of policy-makers and they offer an alternative that makes use of the sort of theory-based prediction they claim to have rejected. This chapter has thus sought to show that the arguments against prediction offered by each author are flawed and that the sound elements of the foundational positions sketched out by the various authors (especially Bohman and Bernstein et al.) can consistently be brought into line with some notion of ‘prediction’, when that notion is founded on probabilistic rather than deterministic generalizations. Bernstein et al. attempt to discredit ‘prediction’ by arguing that IR is much more similar to evolutionary theory than to physical sciences like classical mechanisms. Is IR very like classical mechanics or evolutionary biology? It shares many features with both but also has many dissimilarities to both and consequently is ‘very like’ neither. A major part of the strategy of the critique of Bernstein et al. has been to show that a further probing of the character of physical science reveals that the dissimilarities that Bernstein et al. claims do not hold. This is not to say that an unrestricted naturalism is justified. Far from it. Comprehensive theories like those of the physical sciences are not likely to emerge in IR. Nevertheless, theoretical and scientific-style investigation in IR has great value and holds out the possibility, at least within tightly circumscribed domains, to achieve natural-science-like consensus and well-founded prediction. Indeed, **prediction is necessary for good policy-making, even though there are limitations** due to hermeneutic interpretation, lack of governing regularities and non-linearities. These considerations lead to the conclusion that there are limitations on the types of predictions one might propose and the confidence that should be displayed in them but not to conclude that policy-makers should avoid prediction. While prediction is necessary for policy-making, prediction alone is not sufficient, since normative considerations must always be addressed. Probabilistic predictions may inform one of things like ‘socialist states go to war with non-socialists states less often than democratic states go to war with non-democracies’. But normative analysis is clearly required in order to determine whether this is a good or bad thing and what policy initiatives should be pursued.

#### Specificity matters – not all predictions are faulty

Chernoff 5 (Fred, Harvey Picker Professor of International Relations – Colgate University, The Power of International Theory, p. 171)

There are, though, applications of IR theory where the chains are not long. When the question is epistemologically local, it will be possible to make high-confidence (but obviously still fallible) predictions. There are more global or distant predictions that will be tempting. But the guidelines discussed above will lead to a lower level of confidence in predictions in those cases. Kyburg’s (1961) argument against the lottery paradox can be taken as a model. In any case, there will be costs associated with accepting policies based on those lower-confidence predictions. However, for the practicing foreign policy-maker, those costs must be weighed against **the costs of suspending judgement and taking no active decision**.

#### Predictions refine our understanding of international politics

Mearsheimer 1 (John, Professor of Political Science – University of Chicago, The Tragedy of Great Power Politics, p. 7-8)

**Despite** these **hazards**, social scientists should nevertheless use their theories to make predictions about the future. Making predictions helps inform policy discourse, because it helps make sense of events unfolding in the world around us. And by clarifying points of disagreement, making explicit forecasts helps those with contradictory views to frame their own ideas more clearly. Furthermore, trying to anticipate new events is a good way to test social science theories, because theorists do not have the benefit of hindsight and therefore cannot adjust their claims to fit the evidence (because it is not yet available). In short, the world can be used as a laboratory to decide which theories best explain international politics. In that spirit, I employ offensive realism to peer into the future, mindful of both the benefits and the hazards of trying to predict events.

#### The difficulty of knowing the future makes the task of prediction even more important – scenario planning now is critical to prevent global catastrophes later

Kurasawa 4 (Fuyuki, Professor of Sociology – York University of Toronto, “Cautionary Tales: The Global Culture of Prevention and the Work of Foresight”, Constellations, 11(4))

A radically postmodern line of thinking, for instance, would lead us to believe that it is pointless, perhaps even harmful, to strive for farsightedness in light of the aforementioned crisis of conventional paradigms of historical analysis. If, contra teleological models, history has no intrinsic meaning, direction, or endpoint to be discovered through human reason, and if, contra scientistic futurism, prospective trends cannot be predicted without error, then the abyss of chronological inscrutability supposedly opens up at our feet. The future appears to be unknowable, an outcome of chance. Therefore, rather than embarking upon grandiose speculation about what may occur, we should adopt a pragmatism that abandons itself to the twists and turns of history; let us be content to formulate ad hoc responses to emergencies as they arise. While this argument has the merit of underscoring the fallibilistic nature of all predictive schemes, it conflates the necessary recognition of the contingency of history with unwarranted assertions about the latter’s total opacity and indeterminacy. Acknowledging the fact that the future cannot be known with absolute certainty **does not imply abandoning the task** of trying to understand what is brewing on the horizon and to prepare for crises already coming into their own. In fact, the incorporation of the principle of fallibility into the work of prevention means that we must be ever more vigilant for warning signs of disaster and for responses that provoke unintended or unexpected consequences (a point to which I will return in the final section of this paper). In addition, from a normative point of view, the acceptance of historical contingency and of the self-limiting character of farsightedness places the duty of preventing catastrophe squarely on the shoulders of present generations. The future no longer appears to be a metaphysical creature of destiny or of the cunning of reason, nor can it be sloughed off to pure randomness. It becomes, instead, a result of human action shaped by decisions in the present – including, of course, trying to anticipate and prepare for possible and avoidable sources of harm to our successors. Combining a sense of analytical contingency toward the future and ethical responsibility for it, the idea of early warning is making its way into preventive action on the global stage.

#### Weigh risks and impacts the best you can – their author demands the normal process of debate judging

Monk 5 (Paul, Research Associate at the School of Asian Studies at Latrobe University, Foxes, Hedgehogs And Algorithms, http://www.austhink.org/monk/tetlock.htm)

Tetlock himself, at the end of the day – or at the end of his book - is, by his own account, a reasonable positivist. He believes that scientific methods give us our best chance of avoiding error and overcoming illusion and prejudice. He also allows that, on an everyday basis, we require something more ‘user friendly’ than a statistically driven scientific research program to monitor our thinking. Here, intriguingly, he refers us to Harold Bloom’s reflections on Shakespeare. “The dominant danger”, he concludes, “remains hubris, the mostly hedgehog vice of close-mindedness, of dismissing dissonant possibilities too quickly. But there is also the danger of cognitive chaos, the mostly fox-vice of excessive open-mindedness, of seeing too much merit in too many stories. Good judgment now becomes a metacognitive skill – akin to ‘the art of self-overhearing’.”[xix] His footnote at this point refers the reader to “Harold Bloom Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human, Riverhead Books, New York, 1998”, with no specific page reference, which is uncharacteristically imprecise. The key passage is, in fact, that in which Bloom wrote of Hamlet overhearing himself speak and changing with every self-overhearing.[xx] Bloom, of course, regards Hamlet as the most supremely realized literary character in history and the very avatar[xxi] of the modern human being, if not the very paragon of animals. Yet he also, in his rather unscientific and flamboyant manner, celebrates Hamlet’s ‘nihilism’ and traces it, with Nietzsche, to Hamlet’s having thought not too much but too well. It is a little difficult to reconcile this with Tetlock’s Enlightenment project, in which our self-overhearing and consequent better thinking would lead to more rational and responsible behaviour. Doubtless, that is why he recommended “something akin to” the self-overhearing of the Prince of Denmark. At the end of his book, Tetlock comes close to specifying more precisely what he means in this regard. “Good judgment, then, is a precarious balancing act…Executing this balancing act requires cognitive skills of a high order: the capacity to monitor our own thought processes and to strike a reflective equilibrium faithful to our conceptions of the norms of intellectual fair play. We need to cultivate the art of self-overhearing, to learn how to eavesdrop on the mental conversations we have with ourselves as we struggle to strike the right balance between preserving our existing worldview and rethinking core assumptions. This is no easy art to master. If we listen carefully to ourselves, we will often not like what we hear. And we will often be tempted to laugh off the exercise as introspective navel-gazing, as an infinite regress of homunculi spying on each other…all the way down.” “No doubt such exercises can be taken to excess,” the psychologist concludes philosophically. “But if I had to bet on the best long term predictor of good judgment among the observers [studied in his project] it would be their commitment – their soul-searching Socratic commitment – to thinking about how they think.”[xxii] The problem here, however, is that this is a veritably monastic, or at least Pythagorean[xxiii], demand to make of any individual human being, given the tide of events, the pressures of the marketplace, the constitutive force of the passions, the insistent demands on us for group cohesion and loyalty, the urgencies of our mundane interests, the fears we hold of competitors and predators and of the looming unknown. That Tetlock, the psychologist, should hold to such a pure faith, after everything his study has revealed, is itself slightly unsettling. He has a more robust suggestion, but one which, for different reasons, as he allows, is likely to find much resistance in the real world. “From a broadly non-partisan perspective,” he reasons, “the situation cries out for remedy. And from the scientific vantage offered by this project, the natural remedy is to apply our performance metrics to actual controversies; to pressure participants in debates – be they passionate partisans or dispassionate analysts – to translate vague claims into testable predictions that can be scored for empirical accuracy and logical defensibility. Of course, the resistance would be fierce, especially with those from the most to lose – those with grand reputations and humble track records.”[xxiv] But, where the stakes are high and we cannot afford to rely on experts keeping their own score cards, perhaps it is time to create serious research and training programs that would generate metrics for market and intelligence analysts and hold them more accountable. One of Tetlock’s consulting roles in recent years has been in critical analysis of political forecasting and risk assessment techniques for U.S. Government intelligence agencies. Such agencies are among those most commonly pilloried for their failures in forecasting, not least in the past few years, so Tetlock plainly has some good work to do. But as he himself remarks, with characteristic restraint, “The recommendations of this book are much in the spirit of Sherman Kent, after whom the CIA named its training school for intelligence analysts.” It is not, therefore, out of any malicious or self-satisfied glee at the errors of intelligence analysts that Tetlock urges new and ambitious programs in research and training; but out of a resilient belief that we can do better. Alluding to Sherman Kent’s own reflections of many years ago, he concludes, “We can draw cumulative lessons from experience only if we are aware of gaps between what we expected and what happened, acknowledge the possibility that those gaps signal shortcomings in our understanding and test alternative interpretations of those gaps in even-handed fashion. This means doing what we did here: obtaining explicit probability estimates (not just vague verbiage), eliciting reputational bets that pit rival worldviews against each other, and assessing the consistency of the standards of evidence experts apply to evidence.”[xxv] Getting this done will require specific and tenacious commitment, at a time when resources are heavily committed to analysis and field operations, to analyzing how analysis is done in intelligence work.

### Epistemology

#### -- Act to save the most lives – imperfect knowledge doesn’t justify inaction

Cowen 4 (Tyler, Professor of Economics – George Mason University, “The Epistemic Problem Does Not Refute Consequentialism”, 11-2, http://www.gmu.edu/jbc/Tyler/Epistemic2.pdf, p. 14-15)

The epistemic critique relies heavily on a complete lack of information about initial circumstances. This is not a plausible general assumption, although it may sometimes be true. The critique may give the impression of relying more heavily on a more plausible assumption, namely a high variance for the probability distribution of our estimates concerning the future. But simply increasing the level of variance or uncertainty does not add much force to the epistemic argument. To see this more clearly, consider another case of a high upfront benefit. Assume that the United States has been hit with a bioterror attack and one million children have contracted smallpox. We also have two new experimental remedies, both of which offer some chance of curing smallpox and restoring the children to perfect health. If we know for sure which remedy works, obviously we should apply that remedy. But imagine now that we are uncertain as to which remedy works. The uncertainty is so extreme that each remedy may cure somewhere between three hundred thousand and six hundred thousand children. Nonetheless we have a slight idea that one remedy is better than the other. That is, one remedy is slightly more likely to cure more children, with no other apparent offsetting negative effects or considerations. Despite the greater uncertainty, we still have the intuition that we should try to save as many children as possible. We should apply the remedy that is more likely to cure more children. We do not say: “We are now so uncertain about what will happen. We should pursue some goal other than trying to cure as many children as possible.” Nor would we cite greater uncertainty about longer-run events as an argument against curing the children. We have a definite good in the present (more cured children), balanced against a radical remixing of the future on both sides of the equation. The definite upfront good still stands firm. Alternatively, let us assume that our broader future suddenly became less predictable (perhaps genetic engineering is invented, which creates new and difficult-to-forecast possibilities). That still would not diminish the force of our reason for saving more children. The variance of forecast becomes larger on both sides of the equation – whether we save the children or not – and the value of the upfront lives remains. A higher variance of forecast might increase the required size of the upfront benefit (to overcome the Principle of Roughness), but it would not refute the relevance of consequences more generally. We could increase the uncertainty more, but consequentialism still will not appear counterintuitive. The remedies, rather than curing somewhere in the range of three to six hundred thousand children, might cure in the broader range of zero to all one million of the children. By all classical statistical standards, this new cure scenario involves more uncertainty than the previous case, such as by having a higher variance of possible outcomes. Yet this higher uncertainty lends little support for the view that curing the children becomes less important. We still have an imperative to apply the remedy that appears best, and is expected the cure the greater number of children. This example may appear excessively simple, but it points our attention to the non-generality of the epistemic critique. The critique appears strongest only when we have absolutely no idea about the future; this is a special rather than a general case. Simply boosting the degree of background generic uncertainty should not stop us from pursuing large upfront benefits of obvious importance.

## 1NC vs Dartmouth CL

### 1NC

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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**.

#### It’s the only existential threat

**Bostrum**, March **2002** (Nick – prof of philosophy at Oxford University and recipient of the Gannon Award, Existential Risks, Journal of Evolution and Technology, p. http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)

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] 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

### 1NC

#### 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.

### 1NC

#### Electricity prices are declining

**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.

#### Renewable energy skyrockets electricity prices – cost of production and transmission lines

Bryce 12 (Robert, Senior Fellow @ Center for Energy Policy and the Environment - Manhattan Institute, "The High Cost of Renewable Energy Mandates," http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/eper\_10.htm)

Although supporters of renewable energy claim that the RPS mandates will bring benefits, their contribution to the economy is problematic because they also impose costs that must be incorporated into the utility bills paid by homeowners, commercial businesses, and industrial users. And those costs are or will be substantial. Electricity generated from renewable sources generally costs more—often much more—than that produced by conventional fuels such as coal and natural gas. In addition, large-scale renewable energy projects often require the construction of many miles of high-voltage transmission lines. The cost of those lines must also be incorporated into the bills paid by consumers.¶ These extra costs amount to a "back-end way to put a price on carbon," says Suedeen Kelly, a former member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.[5] Indeed, with Congress unwilling to approve national carbon dioxide restrictions or renewable-energy quotas, the RPS mandates have become a sprawling state system of de facto carbon-reduction taxes.

#### 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.

#### E. 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.

### 1NC

#### Text: The fifty state governments of the United States should create a permanent wind production tax credit of the equivalent amount as the federal wind 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.

**1NC**

**The United States Federal Government should implement a 15-year tax of $15 per ton of carbon dioxide emissions on electricity generation in the United States.**

**-- Counterplan spurs renewable development – solves the case**

**OEP 12** (Our Energy Policy, “Can We Get It Right on Gas?,” 8-5-12,

http://www.ourenergypolicy.org/can-we-get-it-right-on-gas/)

“A sustained [natural] gas glut could **undermine new investments** in wind, solar, nuclear and energy efficiency systems – which have zero emissions – and thus keep us addicted to fossil fuels for decades,” Friedman writes. He suggests that such a scenario would reduce natural gas’ societal value because the economic and energy security benefits of domestic natural gas come with significant environmental trade-offs, such as climate impact and hydraulic fracturing. To maximize natural gas’ value to society, Friedman argues for “nationally accepted standards for controlling methane leakage, for controlling water used in fracking — where you get it, how you treat the polluted water that comes out from the fracking process and how you protect aquifers — and for ensuring that communities have the right to say no to drilling.” He goes on to say that a carbon tax, which would **raise the price** of natural gas, could raise enough revenue to help pay down the national debt, lower income and corporate taxes, and help make renewables cost-competitive with natural gas.

### 1NC

#### Funding for the RHIC particle collider is on the chopping block now – cutting funding for the project tanks US science leadership

Matson 8/24/12 (John, Scientific American, "Nuclear Decelerator: Last U.S. Particle Collider on Chopping Block," http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=rhic-jlab-frib-budget-cuts&print=true)

Until recently, the American particle collider was a thriving species spanning a variety of habitats from coast to coast. But now it finds itself on the endangered list.¶ Since 2008 the number of colliders in the U.S. has dwindled from four to one. And the last surviving member of the species, the Relativistic Heavy-Ion Collider (RHIC) at Brookhaven National Laboratory in Upton, N.Y., may soon fall victim **to** the same budgetary blight that has already felled so many other towering scientific facilities. Just last year the U.S. Department of Energy (DoE) phased out the larger Tevatron collider at Fermilab in Illinois, citing fiscal constraints. The increasingly rare breed known as the collider is a particle accelerator in which two beams of high-energy particles intersect to collide head-on inside giant detectors, which allow physicists to sift through the wreckage for short-lived particles or evidence of new physical phenomena.¶ The RHIC collider is one of three major projects now under scrutiny as federal science agencies seek to reconcile their portfolios of physics facilities with tightening budgets. The DoE and the National Science Foundation have requested that a panel of nuclear physicists, chaired by Robert Tribble of Texas A&M University, advise the government on how to get the most science out of limited funds. It appears likely that at least one of the costly projects—either RHIC, the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility in Virginia or the planned Facility for Rare Isotope Beams (FRIB) in Michigan—will fall victim to the cost-cutting. Any termination would cost hundreds of jobs and affect thousands of scientist users.¶ "The three of these things … they can't all fit within the budgets that the DoE has been told to anticipate for the next five years or so," says Steven Vigdor, associate laboratory director for nuclear and particle physics at Brookhaven. "It's conceivable, but I think it's a long shot, that there's a compromise solution that doesn't involve terminating something."¶ The RHIC collider, with a staff of about 750, could provide the biggest target for cost-cutters. Its operation costs the DoE roughly $170 million annually. But RHIC is also the only facility of the three that is currently in operation, and it seems to be hitting its peak, having recently been upgraded. RHIC rams protons or heavy nuclei from gold, copper or uranium atoms together at nearly light speed to investigate what produces the proton's spin as well as the universe's composition in the earliest instants after the big bang. The high-speed collisions of heavy ions produce a nearly frictionless fluid called a quark–gluon plasma, a hot bouillabaisse of the fundamental particles that form the heart of all atoms. Quark–gluon plasma was first produced at RHIC in 2005, and scientists there are now working to explore at which temperatures the quarks and gluons freeze out from their fluid state into protons and neutrons.¶ Like the other two facilities, RHIC comes highly recommended by nuclear physics advisory groups. A 2012 report by the National Research Council identified the completed RHIC upgrade, and an ongoing upgrade at Jefferson Lab, as strategic investments whose exploitation "should be an essential component of the U.S. nuclear science program for the next decade.**"** The Tribble panel operates under the auspices of the Nuclear Science Advisory Committee (NSAC), which provides guidance to the federal funding agencies. Tribble's subcommittee will meet in Maryland over four days in early September, during which time representatives of the various facilities will have an opportunity to lobby for their projects. "We and the other laboratories are taking this really seriously in the sense of a threat to our continued operation, and for FRIB to their continued construction," Vigdor says.¶ Each of the labs has a unique case to make: A 2007 long-range plan drafted by NSAC, for instance, highlighted the Jefferson Lab upgrade as the top priority for U.S. nuclear physics. That upgrade, which will double the energy of the electron beams in the lab's particle accelerator, is roughly two thirds complete, says Robert McKeown, deputy director for science at Jefferson Lab. And the machine already has seven to 10 years of experiments queued up for when it returns to active service sometime after 2015. The Jefferson accelerator explores several questions relating to the structure of the atomic nucleus, including how the fundamental particles of matter, quarks and gluons are bound up inside protons and neutrons. The lab received about $160 million this year from the DoE, including $50 million in construction funds for the facility upgrade.¶ Unlike Brookhaven, which hosts a number of large experiments, Jefferson Lab would essentially cease to exist if its accelerator were defunded. "We're a single-purpose laboratory," McKeown says. "So the situation would be very different for us if the decision were made not to continue our electron accelerator." Some 700 jobs depend on the lab's continued operation.¶ Michigan State University's planned FRIB (pronounced "eff-rib"), earned the second-highest slot in the 2007 ranking of nuclear physics priorities. The machine would produce on demand a variety of exotic isotopes—often unstable versions of chemical elements with abnormal numbers of neutrons in the nucleus. FRIB would investigate the origins of the elements that constitute our physical world, many of which are born in the cores of stars and in supernova explosions, and could quickly churn out isotopes for medical research and the development of advanced imaging technologies.¶ The facility is still in the design phase, and though the DoE has not issued formal schedule and budget, preliminary estimates peg FRIB as a 10-year project costing more than $600 million. Once built, however, its operations costs would potentially be lower than those of either Jefferson Lab or RHIC, and its staff would be much smaller. "But being the cheapest may not really be germane here," says FRIB project manager Thomas Glasmacher, a nuclear physicist at Michigan State. "It's kind of like comparing apples and eggs or something like that. It's different science, and they're different experiments."¶ In interviews, the three lab representatives took pains not to disparage the other facilities, choosing instead to highlight the upsides of their own respective experiments. "We are all on each other's advisory committees," Glasmacher says. "It's a very small community." All three facilities are highly touted and in high demand—even FRIB, which will not exist for many years under the best of circumstances, already has more than 1,000 scientists signed on to its user group.¶ Shuttering any of those projects will disrupt a field in which, as McKeown puts it, "the U.S. maintains the frontier facilities and has substantial leadership throughout the world." It falls to the Tribble panel to choose which of three unpalatable options is the least so. "I don't envy anybody on the panel," Glasmacher says.

#### Funding for energy incentives cause appropriators to raid the budgets of large science programs like the HRIC

Koisumi 8 (Kei¶ Koizumi¶ , The American Association for the Advancement of Science, April 10¶ th¶ , 200¶ 8¶ , “Department of Energy R&D in the FY2009 Budget”, <http://www.aaas.org/spp/rd/09pch8.htm>)¶

As always,¶ congressional appropriators will tinker with the DOE request and will rearrange the mix of priorities, especially in the energy area¶ where DOE proposals to eliminate several programs are likely to run into resistance, but¶ the overall outcome will hinge on whether Congress will be any more successful than in the past two years in securing more money overall for domestic appropriations. If not, then as in past years, Congress will most likely raid the large Science increase to shore up funding for domestic programs proposed for steep cuts or elimination.

#### US science leadership is vital in solving pressing global issues – multiple existential risks

Lempinen 12 (Edward, American Association for the Advancement of Science, "Research and Foreign Policy Experts Visit AAAS to Explore the Future of Science Diplomacy," http://www.aaas.org/news/releases/2012/0403roundtable.shtml)

As the 20th century drew to a close, a consensus was emerging in some quarters of the U.S. research and diplomacy communities: Science and technology would be crucial to address the overarching global issues of the 21st century, from energy and food production to economic development, but the U.S. State Department was profoundly lacking in scientific and technological expertise.¶ Fast forward a dozen years into the new century, and the landscape is dramatically different. Starting in 2000 with the appointment of veteran scientist-diplomat Norman P. Neureiter, the post of science and technology adviser to the Secretary of State has become an institution, serving presidential administrations on important foreign policy issues. A corps of scientists and engineers have taken fellowships at State and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and dozens have stayed on in permanent positions. And President Barack Obama has embraced a program proposed by U.S. Senator Richard Lugar (R-Indiana), appointing six widely respected researchers as science envoys.¶ E. William Colglazier¶ Those advances, and Neureiter’s considerable contributions to the field, were assessed during a day-long roundtable convened recently by the AAAS Center for Science Diplomacy. While the gathering of high-level science and foreign policy leaders found much to celebrate, they acknowledged that the gains could be put at risk by severe budget pressures and Washington’s political polarization. And, they said, the State Department and other nations’ foreign ministries must continue to expand their science capacity and expertise to support substantive, science-based relationships among nations.¶ “Science and technology are such strategic assets in terms of U.S. policy and diplomacy,” said E. William Colglazier, the science and technology adviser to U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. “The United States is perceived by the world as a leader in science and technology, and that means every country wants to engage with us on science and technology.”¶ Alice P. Gast¶ “The whole world is looking to science and technology to improve its situation—to science and technology, and to education,” said Lehigh University President Alice P. Gast, the science envoy to the Central Asia and Caucasus region. “They greatly admire our system of science and technology and education. Scientists are welcomed with open arms around the world.”¶ Because so many global challenges have a science component, and because of the growing interest in international science cooperation, “science diplomacy is becoming a more integral part of foreign policy,” said Vaughan Turekian, the AAAS chief international officer and director of the Center for Science Diplomacy. “It has the potential to open new dimensions both in international relations and in research. And so it’s critical to identify mechanisms and approaches for increasing the capacity of foreign ministries to utilize science and scientists.”¶ The 25 January roundtable was convened at AAAS as a substantive way to celebrate Neureiter’s contributions to the field and to explore emerging issues and challenges. It was organized by Turekian and Tom Wang from the AAAS Center for Science Diplomacy, and it featured 32 participants from six countries, including high-ranking officials in the U.S. State Department and their counterparts from other nations. Among them were three of the first four science advisers to the Secretary of State: Neureiter; Colglazier, who served 17 years as executive officer of the National Academy of Sciences; and George H. Atkinson, an internationally known professor of chemistry and optical sciences at the University of Arizona and currently the director of the Institute on Science for Global Policy. (The third science adviser, AAAS Board of Directors Chair Nina V. Fedoroff, was in Saudi Arabia and unable to attend the event.)¶ They met under the Chatham House Rule, which encourages a frank exchange of ideas by assuring that participants will not be identified or quoted. What emerged from the day of discussion was a view that a new generation of science diplomacy is coming into maturity, with advocates at the highest levels of research, education, and government in many nations. But for the idea to develop and prosper, it will need resources, leadership, and engagement of a new generation.¶ The Necessity of Science in U.S. Diplomacy¶ Norman P. Neureiter¶ Trained as a chemist, Neureiter in 1967 became the first American science attaché in Eastern Europe, based at the U.S. Embassy in Warsaw. In the early 1970s, while working in President Richard Nixon's Office of Science and Technology, he helped craft science initiatives with China and the Soviet Union that brought a thaw to the Cold War. He joined AAAS in 2004, and today holds multiple posts: senior adviser to the AAAS Center for Science Diplomacy; acting director of the AAAS Center for Science, Technology and Security Policy; and chairman of the senior advisory board to the new online publication Science & Diplomacy.¶ Neureiter’s appointment at the Department of State was, at the time, the culmination of an informal but long-running initiative by AAAS, the National Academies, and others to encourage development of science capacity in U.S. foreign policy.¶ Several speakers at the roundtable credited the late William T. Golden, a pivotal figure in U.S. science policy and at AAAS, with helping persuade policy leaders to bring science expertise into the U.S. foreign policy realm.¶ In 1998, the AAAS Council urged the State Department to take action. And in November that year, an article in the journal Science explored the theme, noting that “transformation” at State “can take place only with protracted commitment by top foreign policy leaders.”¶ The article’s conclusion was sobering: “Should the State Department fail to muster the requisite intellectual and organizational strength to influence and implement policy on S&T-infused international challenges, this primary foreign policy instrument will gradually lose its relevance to major U.S. interests around the world.”¶ In 1999, the National Research Council published “The Pervasive Role of Science, Technology, and Health in Foreign Policy”. The study, paid for by Golden from personal funds, detailed the role of science in a range of foreign policy issues, including innovation, energy, health, agriculture, and nuclear proliferation, among others. Based on its recommendations, Congress and President Bill Clinton created the position of science and technology adviser to the Secretary of State.¶ Less than 12 years have passed, but the landscape has indeed been transformed. Around the world, developing nations recognize the success of countries as diverse as China, India, Brazil, and Rwanda, and they, too, want science and technology to drive economic and human development. And even nations that have deeply strained relations with the United States recognize that its research enterprise, policymaking, and universities are models for an age of innovation. They want engagement. They want partnerships.

### 1NC Nuke War

#### Most recent evidence proves nuclear winter causes extinction

**Starr 12**

[Steven Starr - Director of the Clinical Laboratory Science Program at the University of Missouri-Columbia, Associate member of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, has been published by the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, his writings appear on the websites of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology Center for Arms Control, Energy and Environmental Studies, Scientists for Global Responsibility, and the International Network of Scientists Against Proliferation, “What is nuclear darkness?,” <http://www.nucleardarkness.org/web/whatisnucleardarkness/>]

In a nuclear war, burning cities would create millions of tons of thick, black smoke. This smoke would rise above cloud level, into the stratosphere, where it would quickly spread around the planet. A large nuclear war would produce enough smoke to block most sunlight from reaching the Earth's surface. Massive absorption of warming sunlight by a global stratospheric smoke layer would rapidly create Ice Age temperatures on Earth . The cold would last a long time; NASA computer models predict 40% of the smoke would still remain in the stratosphere ten years after a nuclear war. Half of 1% of the explosive power of US-Russian nuclear weapons can create enough nuclear darkness to impact global climate. 100 Hiroshima-size weapons exploded in the cities of India and Pakistan would put up to 5 million tons of smoke in the stratosphere . The smoke would destroy much of the Earth's protective ozone layer and drop temperatures in the Northern Hemisphere to levels last seen in the Little Ice Age. Shortened growing seasons could cause up to 1 billion people to starve to death. A large nuclear war could put 150 million tons of smoke in the stratosphere and make global temperatures colder than they were 18,000 years ago during the coldest part of the last Ice Age. Killing frosts would occur every day for 1-3 years in the large agricultural regions of the Northern Hemisphere. Average global precipitation would be reduced by 45%. Earth's ozone layer would be decimated. Growing seasons would be eliminated. A large nuclear war would utterly devastate the environment and cause most people to starve to death . Deadly climate change, radioactive fallout and toxic pollution would cause already stressed ecosystems to collapse. The result would be a mass extinction event that would wipe out many animals living at the top of the food chains - including human beings.

**Any risk of war outweighs- the mere possibility of extinction means you should avoid it**

**Kateb 92**

(George, Professor at Princeton, The Inner Ocean: Individualism and Democratic Culture, p. 110-112)

The highest worth of Schell’s book lies in his insistence that we should all contemplate the nuclear situation from the perspective of possible human extinction and be overcome by the obligation no matter what to try to avoid human extinction. Yet as Schell says, human extinction (as well as the extinction of most species in nature) is not the intention of anyone in power. What must be seen is that the absolute end can come about even though no one intends it. “We can do it,” he says, “only if we don’t quite know what we’re doing.” Schell’s work attempts to force on us an acknowledgement that sounds far-fetched and even ludicrous, an acknowledgement that the possibility of extinction is carried by any use of nuclear weapons no matter how limited or how seemingly rational or seemingly morally justified. He himself acknowledges that there is a difference between possibility and certainty. But in a matter that is more than a matter, more than one practical matter in a vast series of practical matters, in the “matter” or extinction, we are obliged to treat a possibility – a genuine possibility – as a certainty. Humanity is not to take any step that contains even the slightest risk of extinction. The doctrine of no-use us based on the possibility of extinction. Schell’s perspective transforms the subject. He takes us away from the arid stretches of strategy and asks us to feel continuously, if we can, and feel keenly if only for an instant now and then, how utterly distinct the nuclear world is. Nuclear discourse must vividly register that distinctiveness. It is of no moral account that extinction may be only a slight possibility. No one can say how great the possibility is, but no one has yet credibly denied that by some sequence or other a particular use of nuclear weapons may lead to human and natural extinction. If it is not impossible it must be treated as certain; the loss signified by extinction nullifies all calculations of probability as it nullifies all calculations of costs and benefits. Abstractly put, the connections between any use of nuclear weapons and human and natural extinction are several. Most obviously, a sizeable exchange of strategic nuclear weapons can, by a chain of events in nature, lead to the earth’s uninhabitability, to “nuclear winter”, or to Schell’s “republic of insects and grass.” But the consideration of extinction cannot rest with the possibility of a sizeable exchange of strategic weapons. It cannot rest with the imperative that a sizeable exchange must not take place. A so-called tactical or “theater” use, or a so-called limited use, is also prohibited absolutely because of the possibility of immediate escalation into a sizable exchange or because, even if there were not an immediate escalation, the possibility of extinction would reside in the precedent for future use set by any use whatever in a world in which more than one power possesses nuclear weapons. Add other consequences; the contagious effect on nonnuclear powers who may feel compelled by a mixture of fear and vanity to try to acquire their own weapons, this increasing the possibility of use by increasing the number of nuclear powers; and the unleashed emotions of indignation, retribution, and revenge which, if not acted on immediately in the form of escalation, can be counted on to seek expression later. Other than full strategic uses are not confined no matter how small the explosive power each would be a cancerous transformation of the world. All nuclear roads lead to the possibility of extinction. It is true by definition, but let us make it explicit: the doctrine of no-use excludes any first or retaliatory or later use, whether sizable or not. No-use is the imperative derived from the possibility of extinction. By containing the possibility of extinction, any use is tantamount to a declaration of war against humanity. It is not merely a war crime or a single crime against humanity. Such a war is waged by the user of nuclear weapons against every human individual as individual present and future, not as citizen of this or that country. It is not only a war against the country that is the target. To respond with nuclear weapons, where possible, only increases the chances of extinction and can never, therefore, be allowed. The use of nuclear weapons establishes the right of any person or group, acting officially or not, violently or not, to try to punish those responsible for the use. The aim of the punishment is to deter later uses and thus to try to reduce the possibility of extinction, if, by chance, the particular use in question did not directly lead to extinction. The form of the punishment cannot be specified. Of course the chaos ensuing from a sizable exchange could make punishment irrelevant. The important point, however, is to see that those who use nuclear weapons are qualitatively worse than criminals, and at the least forfeit their offices.

### 1NC Warming

#### **Dramatic shift to wind energy only postpones warming *66 hours***

Lomborg 12 (19 March 2012, Bjørn, head of Copenhagen Consensus Center, Ph. D political science, lecturer on statistics and the environment, publisher of five books on global warming and the environment, in conjunction with Project Syndicate, published by The Economic Times: Green Power: Wind power does not help to avert climate change, <http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2012-03-19/news/31210516_1_wind-turbines-wind-power-wind-farms>)

The cheapest backup power by far is provided by open-cycle gas plants, which imply more CO2 emissions. Thus, wind power will ultimately be both costlier and reduce emissions less than officially estimated. (This is also why simple calculations based on costs per kWh are often grossly misleading, helping to make wind and other intermittent renewables appear to be cheaper than they are.) This has been shown in recent reports by KPMG/Mercados and Civitas, an independent think tank. A new report by University of Edinburgh professor Gordon Hughes for the Global Warming Policy Foundation estimates that 36 GW of new wind power would cost £120 billion for just 23 megatons of CO2 reduction per year. In other words, temperature rises would be postponed by a mere 66 hours by the end of the century. Contrary to what many think, the cost of both onshore and offshore wind power has not been coming down. On the contrary, it has been going up over the past decade. The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change acknowledged this in its most recent renewable-energy report. Likewise, the UK Energy Research Center laments that windpower costs have "risen significantly since the mid-2000s".

#### Wind energy is expensive, impractical, and doesn’t solve warming (reductions of only 1.8%)

Carolina Journal Online 11 (Staff Writer Sara Burrows in an Interview with John Droz, environmentalist with degrees in physics and economics. “Wind Power Does Not Help Economy or Environment, Experts Say” <http://www.carolinajournal.com/articles/display_story.html?id=8597>)

Electricity generated from the wind is inefficient, extremely expensive, and bad for the environment, argued scientists and economists at a forum sponsored by the John Locke Foundation Dec. 5, at the University of North Carolina-Wilmington. John Droz, a fellow at the American Tradition Institute, is a physicist, economist, and self-described environmentalist. He spent most of his professional life working in management at General Electric. Droz said he initially supported wind energy. But after some research, he concluded that wind is neither economically viable nor environmentally responsible. For the first hundred years after electricity was invented, Droz said, there were six guiding principles that helped determine which sources we would use in the United States. Traditionally, energy sources were expected to: provide large amounts of electricity; provide reliable and predictable electricity; provide electricity supplies that can be increased or decreased to satisfy demand; meet the demand for either a base load (operating 24 hours a day, seven days a week) or a peak load; have a compact facility; and provide electricity economically. “These criteria became the basis for what developed into the most successful grid system on the planet, which has a large amount to do with our country’s economic success,” Droz said. Today, the power sources that meet those standards are coal, nuclear, natural gas, and hydro, he said. Sources that failed to meet the standards, like oil, which became too expensive, were pushed out of the electricity business. “That’s how the market works when left on its own,” Droz said. But recently a nonmarket-driven principle has been added to the list. The state and federal governments have decided that sources of electricity also must make a positive environmental impact, reducing carbon emissions and fighting global warming. This principle is mandated by the state government — through a law known as the Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard (REPS) or Senate Bill 3 — and subsidized by both the state and federal governments. Before S.B. 3 mandated renewable energy in 2007, a program called NC Green Power allowed North Carolinians to decide if they want to help put renewable energy on the grid voluntarily. “The problem was the public was not supporting NC Green Power,” said Daren Bakst, director of legal and regulatory studies for the John Locke Foundation. “There was no support whatsoever. It was embarrassing how bad it was.” Bakst said there is no way utilities will be able to meet the 7.5 percent renewable energy mandate without including wind energy in their portfolio. There are only two places in the state wind power can work, he said: in the mountains and on the coast. Because the state’s Ridge Law prohibits tall structures from being constructed in the mountains, “there’s going to be intense pressure to allow wind power plants on the coast” over the next couple of years, Bakst said. Talks are under way about building a wind power project in Beaufort County. “One of the justifications for allowing the project is the fact that S.B. 3 exists,” Bakst said. “If you didn’t have the mandate, there wouldn’t be any proposed wind power plants,” he said. “Even with all the subsidies wind power gets, we wouldn’t be discussing it, because the subsidies by themselves weren’t enough. The state actually had to mandate it.” Droz said the mandate will cost North Carolinians millions of dollars in higher energy bills and won’t help the environment in the least. Wind doesn’t meet any of the six traditional market-driven criteria for what makes a good energy source, he said. “Because of the wide fluctuations of wind, it typically produces less than 30 percent of its nameplate capacity,” Droz said. “This problem is made worse by the fact that there is no practical or economical way to store the electricity produced.” It’s not reliable or predictable and cannot be counted on to provide power on demand, he said. Wind power plants aren’t compact either, he added. They cover more than 1,000 times the surface area of a conventional facility. Most importantly to Droz, wind power is not economical. The cost of running a wind power plant is higher than any other type of plant. “The more wind power an energy company uses, the higher the consumer’s electric bill,” he said. “Denmark, which uses more wind power than any country in the world, has the highest cost of electricity of any country in the world. Their residential electricity rate is more than three times as much as ours.” Finally, wind does not make a consequential reduction in carbon emissions, said Droz. “No scientific study has ever proven that wind power saves a meaningful amount of CO2. A National Academy of Sciences study says U.S. CO2 savings by 2020 will be at about 1.8 percent." “More than 90 percent of all CO2 saved in the last 35 years is due to nuclear power, very little due to renewables,” he said. David Schnare, director of the Environmental Law Center at the American Tradition Institute, suggested wind turbines actually create more pollution than other energy sources. Because wind is inconsistent and its energy cannot be stored, wind power plants must be backed up by another type of power plant. “In Colorado, [sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide] — which create smog — were significantly higher than they would have been had they not cycled the coal plants to compensate for wind generation,” Schnare said. “Cycling a coal plant causes more pollution than letting it run constantly.” Droz said a law mandating wind power “makes about as much sense as an edict mandating that a certain percentage of our trucks and automobiles must be operated by horse power in a few years.” It’s a step backward that will decrease our standard of living. Big oil companies like BP have become wind-power investors because they can use their investment in wind power to offset corporate tax liabilities, he said. “The company that pioneered wind power to avoid paying taxes was Enron.”

#### Turn - backup systems emit more C02 than squo systems

The Telegraph 12 (Louise Gray, Environment Correspondent, Jan 9, 2012, “Wind power is expensive and ineffective at cutting CO2 say Civitas” <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/earthnews/9000760/Wind-power-is-expensive-and-ineffective-at-cutting-CO2-say-Civitas.html>)

A study in the Netherlands found that turning back-up gas power stations on and off to cover spells when there is little wind actually produces more carbon than a steady supply of energy from an efficient modern gas station. The research is cited in a new report by the Civitas think tank which warns that Britain is in danger of producing more carbon dioxide (CO2) than necessary if the grid relies too much on wind. Wind turbines only produce energy around 30 per cent of the time. When the wind is not blowing - or even blowing too fast as in the recent storms - other sources of electricity have to be used, mostly gas and coal. However it takes a surge of electricity to power up the fossil fuel stations every time they are needed, meaning more carbon emissions are released. “You keep having to switch these gas fired power stations on and off, whereas if you just have highly efficient modern gas turbines and let it run all the time, it will use less gas,” said Ruth Lea, an economic adviser to Arbuthnot Banking Group and the author of the Civitas report.

#### Wind Energy uses rare earths and fossil fuels – turns environment

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>)

Environment 101. Industrial wind turbine projects require enormous quantities of rare earth metals, concrete, steel, copper, fiberglass and other raw materials, for highly inefficient turbines, multiple backup generators and thousands of miles of high-voltage transmission lines. Extracting and processing these materials, turning them into finished components, and shipping and installing the turbines and power lines involve enormous amounts of fossil fuel and extensive environmental damage. Offshore wind turbine projects are even more expensive, resource intensive and indefensible. Calling wind energy “clean” or “eco-friendly” is an extraordinary distortion of the facts.

#### 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.

#### Transportation outweighs

**Gordon, 10** – nonresident senior associate in Carnegie’s Energy and Climate Program, where her research focuses on climate, energy, and transportation issues in the United States and China (Deborah, December. “The Role of Transportation in Driving Climate Disruption.” http://carnegieendowment.org/files/transport\_climate\_disruption.pdf)

Climate impacts differ by sector. On-road transportation has the greatest negative effect on climate, especially in the short term. This is primarily because of two factors unique to on-road transportation: (1) nearly exclusive use of petroleum fuels, the combustion of which results in high levels of the principal warming gases (carbon dioxide, ozone, and black carbon); and (2) minimal emissions of sulfates, aerosols, and organic carbon from on-road transportation sources to counterbalance warming with cooling effects. Scientists find that cutting on-road transportation climate and air-pollutant emissions would be unambiguously good for the climate (and public health) in the near term. Transportation’s role in climate change is especially problematic, given the dependence on oil that characterizes this sector today. There are too few immediate mobility and fuel options in the United States beyond oil-fueled cars and trucks. U.S. and international policy makers have yet to tackle transportationclimate challenges. In its fourth assessment report, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) found that the global transportation sector was responsible for the most rapid growth in direct greenhouse gas emissions, a 120 percent increase between 1970 and 2004. To further complicate matters, the IPCC projects that, without policy intervention, the rapidly growing global transportation sector has little motivation to change the way it operates, because consumer choices are trumping best practices. Herein lies a fundamental mismatch between the climate problem and solutions: transportation is responsible for nearly one of every three tons of greenhouse gas emissions but represents less than one of every twelve tons of projected emission reductions. Clearly this sector is a major contributor to climate change; therefore, it should be the focus of new policies to mitigate warming. Government must lead this effort as the market alone cannot precipitate the transition away from cars and oil, which dominate this sector.

#### Warming doesn’t cause extinction – past temperature fluctuations prove

**Stampf, 7** (Olaf, staff writer for Spiegel Online, 5/5. “Not the End of the World as we Know it,” <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,481684,00.html>)

But even this moderate warming would likely have far fewer apocalyptic consequences than many a prophet of doom would have us believe. For one thing, the more paleontologists and geologists study the history of the earth's climate, the more clearly do they recognize just how much temperatures have fluctuated in both directions in the past. Even major fluctuations appear to be completely natural phenomena. Additionally, some environmentalists doubt that the large-scale extinction of animals and plants some have predicted will in fact come about. "A warmer climate helps promote species diversity," says Munich zoologist Josef Reichholf. Also, more detailed simulations have allowed climate researchers to paint a considerably less dire picture than in the past -- gone is the talk of giant storms, the melting of the Antarctic ice shield and flooding of major cities. Improved regionalized models also show that climate change can bring not only drawbacks, but also significant benefits, especially in northern regions of the world where it has been too cold and uncomfortable for human activity to flourish in the past. However it is still a taboo to express this idea in public. For example, countries like Canada and Russia can look forward to better harvests and a blossoming tourism industry, and the only distress the Scandinavians will face is the guilty conscience that could come with benefiting from global warming.

Coral reefs have evolved to overcome climate change

NIPCC 10 Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change citing Grimsditch et al. Effects of Habitat on Coral Bleaching. 28 December 2010. <http://nipccreport.org/articles/2010/dec/28dec2010a7.html>

Writing of corals, Grimsditch et al. (2010) say "it has been shown that it is possible for colonies to acclimatize to increased temperatures and high irradiance levels so that they are able to resist bleaching events when they occur." And they note, in this regard, that "threshold temperatures that induce coral bleaching-related mortality vary worldwide -- from 27°C in Easter Island (Wellington et al., 2001) to 36°C in the Arabian Gulf (Riegl, 1999) -- according to the maximum water temperatures that are normal in the area, implying a capacity of corals and/or zooxanthellae to acclimatize to high temperatures depending on their environment." In further exploration of this phenomenon, Grimsditch et al. examined "bleaching responses of corals at four sites (Nyali, Mombasa Marine Park, Kanamai and Vipingo) representing two distinct lagoon habitats on the Kenyan coast (deeper and shallower lagoons)." This was done for the coral community as a whole, while zooxanthellae densities and chlorophyll levels were monitored for three target species (Pocillopora damicornis, Porites lutea and Porites cylindrica) during a non-bleaching year (2006) and a mild bleachig year (2007). The four researchers report that "during the 2007 bleaching season, corals in the shallow lagoons of Kanamai and Vipingo were more resistant to bleaching stress than corals in the deeper lagoons of Mombasa Marine Park and Nyali," which suggests, in their words, that "corals in the shallower lagoons have acclimatized and/or adapted to the fluctuating environmental conditions they endure on a daily basis and have become more resistant to bleaching stress." These results bear further witness to the fact that earth's corals have the ability to evolve in such a way as to successfully adjust to changing environmental conditions that when first encountered may prove deadly to a significant percentage of their populations. Those individuals genetically blessed to better withstand various stresses weather the storm, so to speak, to grow and widely proliferate another day.

#### -- Redundancy and adaptation solve

Doremus 00 (Holly, Professor of Law – UC Davis, Washington & Lee Law Review, "The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection: Toward a New Discourse," 57 Wash & Lee L. Rev. 11, Winter, Lexis)

Notwithstanding its attractions, the material discourse in general, and the ecological horror story in particular, are not likely to generate policies that will satisfy nature lovers. The ecological horror story implies that there is no reason to protect nature until catastrophe looms. The Ehrlichs' rivet-popper account, for example, presents species simply as the (fungible) hardware holding together the ecosystem. If we could be reasonably certain that a particular rivet was not needed to prevent a crash, the rivet-popper story suggests that we would lose very little by pulling it out. Many environmentalists, though, would disagree. n212 Reluctant to concede such losses, tellers of the ecological horror story highlight how close a catastrophe might be, and how little we know about what actions might trigger one. But the apocalyptic vision is less credible today than it seemed in the 1970s. Although it is clear that the earth is experiencing a mass wave of extinctions, n213 the complete elimination of life on earth **seems unlikely**. n214 Life is remarkably robust. Nor is human extinction probable any time soon. Homo sapiens is adaptable to nearly any environment. Even if the world of the future includes far fewer species, it likely will hold people. n215 One response to this credibility problem tones the story down a bit, arguing not that humans will go extinct but that ecological disruption will bring economies, and consequently civilizations, to their knees. n216 But this too may be overstating the case. Most ecosystem functions are performed by multiple species. This functional **redundancy** means that a **high proportion of species can be lost** without precipitating a collapse. n217

#### No impact to Oceans—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!

### 1NC Solvency

#### Doesn’t solve predictability – don’t have a specific expiration date – creates uncertainty

#### Picking Energy Winners Fails

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>)

Clearly, technological advances will ultimately be the means to assure that the U.S. has an adequate supply of energy at reasonable prices, but there is NO reason to assume that such advances are dependent on or result from actions by the U.S. government.¶ In fact, the federal government’s massive spending on “energy R&D” during the past 38 years has failed because it is based on three fundamentally flawed assumptions; specifically that:¶ 1. More R&D spending will inevitably overcome technological hurdles to whatever technology is being pursued.¶ 2. Economics of scale will overcome economic hurdles for selected energy technologies.¶ 3. Governments are capable of picking technology winners.¶ Please check the past 38 years of federal energy policies. You will see that successive administrations, beginning with Nixon (except Reagan) and Congress have picked dozens of what were claimed to be “winning” energy technologies. These were showered with a variety of tax breaks and subsidies, but none has become commercially viable (i.e., without tax breaks and subsidies).¶ Wind energy is merely one of the latest. Wind has received billions in tax breaks and subsidies during the past 20 years but remains a very high cost source of electricity that is low in value. The electricity that is produced is low in true value because it is intermittent, volatile, unreliable and most likely to be produced when least needed – not on hot weekday afternoons in July or August when electricity demand is high. There is no evidence that land-based wind energy will become commercially viable and the prospects for off-shore wind energy are even poorer.¶ New energy technologies that are commercially viable have been and are being developed in the private sector, not by federal or state governments. Advances in oil and gas exploration and production technologies are a good example.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### Financial Incentives for wind create artificial investment – a natural wind industry is impossible

WTF 11 -- Citizens' Task Force on Wind Power, coalition of citizens from around the state drawn together in the common purpose of advocating for responsible, science based, economically and environmentally sound approaches to Maine’s energy policy ("Unsustainable Subsidies," http://www.windtaskforce.org/page/unsustainable-subsidies)

Grid-scale wind is an industry that would not exist without our government reaching into our pockets and separating us from the money we've earned. It's an industry that lectures us about sustainability which is built on unsustainable subsidies. Whereas an event like the California gold rush was set in motion by the discovery of a resource, the "wind rush" we are seeing in Maine was set in motion by lobbyists successfully lobbying our federal government to hand out money for wind like Halloween candy. The heightened intensity of this wind rush which we observe today is likely attributable to the fact that the subsidies may run out. In fact, the main federal incentive for the wind industry, the 2.2 cents per kilowatt hour Production Tax Credit, is set to expire on December 31, 2012. The pending expiration of this favorite freebie has the Maine wind companies in a full parasitic mode, along with their coterie of related parasitic companies that also feed off of this gusher of money, that belongs to us. As in many "hurry up offenses", they are making plenty of mistakes and showing signs of desperation. And while the wind industry would like you to believe that it needs government support to get it to the day it can stand on its own, no changes in technology will ever be able to bring efficacy to wind as it lacks energy density. Stand in a river current producing hydroelectricity and you may drown. Get too close to natural gas combustion producing electricity and you may burn yourself. Stand in the wind quarry of the Maine wind industry and you will likely comment, "that little bit of breeze feels nice". Here's a common sense test. Simply observe how many days in Maine are windy over the course of the year. Wind is far from a developing resource that will one day work for us. Rather it is an old failed energy source that modern society abandoned long ago. The true quarry of the Maine wind industry is not wind at all but rather that hard earned money in our wallets. They want to extract all they can via their government programs and they care not that they also will drive our already oppressive electricity rates through the roof. The coterie of parasites, less than 1% of Maine companies, knows full well they are damaging us financially yet as shameless panderers have no problem at all trying to pass themselves off as an economic panacea as they broadcast their message of JOBS - never telling you they are virtually all temporary and often filled with out of state workers. As others have said, nothing short of a change in the laws of physics will make wind in Maine viable. Every single one of the wind projects set up in the USA is created using a single purpose legal/corporate structure that removes all individual legal and financial liability of the developer/owner/investor/lender to the project. If a project fails for any reason the principles just walk away and the local community and/or state are stuck with the project as is. DOE loan guarantees mean a commercial lender will put up the cash loan for the balance of project cost with the full faith and credit of the US government to pay off the loan if there is a default (a/k/a the Solyndra deal). Most wind deals have been funded using a 50%/50% investor and lender ratio. However, it appears that Record Hill may be close to the maximum 80% debt (too bad for the taxpayers). Commercial lenders have strict credit criteria and are not inclined generally to lend to projects where there are too many unknown risks and little if no collateral value (i.e. if a wind project fails due to mechanical operating failure, low energy generation and/or low prices what value does a project have?) Investors have little or no project risks because they derive 100% of their return on investment from the tax benefits. As long as a project is "available" to produce power (IRS definition) the investor can claim the tax shelter on its tax return. A project does not have to produce power for the investor to claim the tax deductions. After the first 6 years the investor doesn't care if a project fails because they had their full investment and profit returned. That is why you see many of these projects with partnership agreements between the developer and the investor whereby the developer has the option to buy out the investor at a bargain price the end of year ten if the project remains viable.

## 2NC vs Dartmouth CL

### Romney Turns Case – Wind

#### 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.

### Nuke War vs Warming

#### Nuclear war causes warming

**Turco et. Al** **08**

Toon: chair of the Dept of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences and a member of the Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics at the University of Colorado @ Boulder. Robock is a Proff of atmospheric science at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, New Jersey. Turco is a professor of atmospheric science at the University of California, Los Angeles, (Owen B. Toon, Alan Robock, and Richard P. Turco, “Environmental consequences of nuclear war,” 2008 American Institute of Physics, December 2008 Physics Today 37-42, http://www.plu.edu/~haykm/332\_Course\_Material/current\_events/NuclearWar.pdf)

Complementary to temperature change is radiative forcing, the change in energy flux. Figure 3b shows how nuclear soot changes the radiative forcing at Earth’s surface and com- pares its effect to those of two well-known phenomena: warming associated with greenhouse gases and the 1991 Mount Pinatubo volcanic eruption, the largest in the 20th century. Since the Industrial Revolution, greenhouse gases have increased the energy flux by 2.5 W/m. The transient forcing from the Pinatubo eruption peaked at about −4 W/m 2 (the minus sign means the flux decreased). One implication of the figure is that even a regional war between India and Pakistan can force the climate to a far greater degree than the greenhouse gases that many fear will alter the climate in the foreseeable future. Of course, the durations of the forcings are different: The radiative forcing by nuclear-weapons-gen- erated soot might persist for a decade, but that from green- house gases is expected to last for a century or more, allow- ing time for the climate system to respond to the forcing. Accordingly, while the Ice Age–like temperatures in figure 3a could lead to an expansion of sea ice and terrestrial snow- pack, they probably would not be persistent enough to cause the buildup of global ice sheets. Agriculture responds to length of growing season, tem- perature during the growing season, light levels, precipita- tion, and other factors. The 1980s saw systematic studies of the agricultural changes expected from a nuclear war, but no such studies have been conducted using modern climate models. Figure 4 presents our calculations of the decrease in length of the growing season—the time between freezing temperatures—for the second summer after the release of soot in a nuclear attack.

#### Nuke war causes warming

**Ehrlich 08**

Department of Biological Sciences, Stanford U (Paul R. “Key issues for attention from ecological economists”, Environment and Development Economics, Vol. 13, p. 9, http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FEDE%2FEDE13\_01%2FS1355770X07004019a.pdf&code=f361f809439498ab4c8f885f98070afa)

Nuclear war The most important single area deserving attention may be the environmental impacts of nuclear war – what was once subsumed under the rubric ‘nuclear winter’ (e.g., Ehrlich et al., 1983). One of the obvious environmental effects of increasing population size and per capita consumption is to increase the probability of even more resource wars in the future (Klare, 2001, 2004). Those wars carry with them the threat of use of nuclear bombs, whose environmental impacts would have massive economic consequences. Recent studies suggest that even a relatively small exchange of nuclear weapons, as might well occur between India and Pakistan, could have severe climatic impacts. One area that resource and environmental economists should be involved in is putting some broad numbers on the economic costs of such wars, since politicians tend to see theworld through dollar-colored glasses and mostly acquire their outdated economic notions from sources like the Wall Street Journal. This is nothing new. Remember what Keynes said: ‘Practical men, who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influences, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist. Madmen in authority, who hear voices in the air, are distilling their frenzy from some academic scribbler of a few years back’ (Keynes, 1936: 383). In a globalized world, economic effects would travel far and fast, and doubtless interact with ecological impacts with all the usual problems of non-linearities, thresholds, and discontinuities. It would, for instance, be interesting to calculate the cost to the US economy alone of the destruction of the Indian city of Bangalore, and the secondary environmental effects (from, for instance, reallocation of resources) in North America. Indeed, both epidemics and nuclear warfare would likely have severe consequences for the global economy through disruption of trade and travel, the direct reduction of human welfare (utility), and the loss of human capital.

#### Warming Doesn’t Cause War – it’s too slow and only causes low level conflicts – the magnitude of our wars are bigger

### EPA 2NC

#### Romney will rollback EPA protections --- turns warming

**Star Ledger**, 6/3/**2012** (Scary times for environment – especially if Mitt Romney wins, Editorial Page, p. <http://blog.nj.com/njv_editorial_page/2012/06/scary_times_for_environment_--.html>)

The grim report on jobs Friday greatly improves the odds that Republicans will win in November, putting Mitt Romney in the White House and bolstering GOP positions in the House and Senate. If that happens, they promise to roll back the progress made under President Obama and Environmental Protection Agency administrator Lisa Jackson. Romney wants to strip the EPA of its power to regulate carbon emissions. Jackson relied on that power to enact rules that will double automobile efficiency standards by 2025 and toughen truck standards, too. Transportation is the largest single source of air pollution. So cutting emissions in half will make a profound change, especially in a car-centric state such as New Jersey. It also will reduce oil imports sharply, lessening our dangerous dependence on unstable regimes in the Mideast. Jackson’s tough limits on coal-fired power plants rely partly on carbon controls, as well. So those gains would be endangered. Again, the air in New Jersey will get dirtier. Because, while our own coal plants have exotic pollution control equipment, those to the west and south do not. Many lack even the most basic filters, known as scrubbers, and rely only on tall smoke stacks to push the toxins higher into the atmosphere. The catch for New Jersey is this: Their toxins float into our air. Roughly one-third of our air pollution is imported, according to the state Department of Environmental Protection. Romney also has promised to pull back on subsidies for green energy, and to preserve the tax breaks and subsidies for profitable oil and gas companies. With all this, it is no wonder the fossil fuel industries are pouring money into his campaign.

### Climate Deal 2NC

#### Obama reelection is critical to a global climate deal – we solve warming better than the aff

**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.

### China Bashing 2NC

#### 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 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.

#### US-China war goes nuclear

Johnson 1 (Chalmers, President – Japan Policy Research Institute, “Time to Bring the Troops Home”, The Nation, 4-26, http://ieas.berkeley.edu/cks/k12/girling\_troops.doc)

In East Asia, the United States maintains massive and expensive military forces poised to engage in everything from nuclear war to sabotage of governments that Washington finds inconvenient (for example, the government of former President Suharto in Indonesia, which in May 1998 the US government helped to bring down via troops its Special Forces had trained). At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the United States still deploys some 100,000 military personnel and close to an equal number of civilian workers and dependents in Japan and South Korea. These forces include the Third Marine Expeditionary Force in Okinawa and Japan; the Second Infantry Division in South Korea; numerous Air Force squadrons in both countries (Kadena Air Force Base in Okinawa is the largest US military installation outside the United States); the Seventh Fleet, with its headquarters in Yokosuka, Japan, patrolling the China coast and anywhere else that it wants to go; and innumerable submarine pens (for example, White Beach, Okinawa), support facilities, clandestine eavesdropping and intelligence-collecting units, Special Forces and staff and headquarters installations all over the Pacific. From approximately 1950 to 1990, the US government invoked the cold war to justify these so-called forward deployments--actually, in less euphemistic language, imperialist outposts. During the late 1940s, when it became apparent that the Chinese Communist Party was going to win the Chinese civil war, the United States reversed its policy of attempting to democratize occupied Japan and devoted itself to making Japan Washington's leading satellite in East Asia. The United States entered into an informal economic bargain with Japan: In return for Japan's willingness to tolerate the indefinite deployment of US weapons and troops on its soil, the United States would give it preferential access to the American market and would tolerate its protectionism and mercantilism. These were advantages the United States did not extend to its European allies or Latin American neighbors in the cold war. Oddly enough, this policy is still in effect some fifty-four years after it was first implemented. In return for hosting 40,000 US troops and an equal number of dependents in ninety-one US-controlled bases, Japan still has privileged access to the US economy and still maintains protectionist barriers against US sales and investment in the Japanese market. The overall results of this policy became apparent in the 1970s and led to acute problems for the US economy in the 1980s--namely, huge excess manufacturing capacity in Japan and the hollowing out of US manufacturing industries. The costs for the United States have been astronomical. During the year 2000 alone, it recorded its largest trade deficit ever, of which $81 billion was with Japan. During the mid-1980s, Japan became the world's largest creditor nation and the United States became the world's largest debtor nation, thereby turning upside down the original assumptions on which US economic policies toward Japan were based. But neither the United States nor Japan made any changes in its old trade-for-bases deal, despite occasional and futile protests by US business interests. Meanwhile, from the point of view of US elites committed to maintaining hegemony on a global basis, the sudden and unpredicted collapse of the Soviet Union in the period 1989 to 1991 was a disaster. They had to find some new justifications for their overseas presence, particularly in East Asia, where Japan's inherent power and the emergence of a commercially oriented China offered implicit challenges to the old American order. Among these justifications, one of the cleverest was the so-called two-war strategy, which requires the US military establishment to be able to fight two large wars on opposite sides of the globe at the same time. The beauty of this formulation is that it avoids specifying which nations might conceivably want to go to war with the United States and ignores the historical fact that in America's most recent wars--Korea, Vietnam, the Persian Gulf and Yugoslavia--no second nation (on the other side of the globe or nearby) challenged it. More concretely, Pentagon strategists have tried to find replacement enemies for the former USSR by demonizing North Korea and muttering ominously about China's successful transition from a Leninist command economy to a state-guided market system resembling the other successful capitalist countries of East Asia. Until June 2000, North Korea was routinely described as an extremely threatening "rogue state." Then, on the initiative of the South Korean president, the two Koreas began to negotiate their own reconciliation without asking for US permission. The possibility that North and South Korea might achieve some form of peaceful coexistence totally undercuts the main US rationale for a "national missile defense" and a "theater missile defense." Regardless of which ventriloquist is in charge of him on any given day, George W. Bush shows no sign of comprehending these matters. In March, when South Korean President Kim Dae Jung, last year's winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, visited Washington to ask for help in pursuing his country's rapprochement with the North, the newly designated "leader of the free world" rudely brushed him off. Korea policy has become a plaything of Congressional Republican mastodons, and the Bush White House seems much more interested in pleasing them than in the situation in East Asia. It is easy for the United States to attempt to bully both the North and South Koreas; it has been doing so since 1945. China is another matter. No sane figure in the Pentagon wants a war with China, and all serious US militarists know that China's minuscule nuclear capacity is not offensive but a deterrent against the overwhelming US power arrayed against it (twenty archaic Chinese warheads versus more than 7,000 US warheads). Taiwan, whose status constitutes the still incomplete last act of the Chinese civil war, remains the most dangerous place on earth. Much as the 1914 assassination of the Austrian crown prince in Sarajevo led to a war that no one wanted, a misstep in Taiwan by any side could bring the United States and China into a conflict that neither wants. Such a war would bankrupt the United States, deeply divide Japan and probably end in a Chinese victory, given that China is the world's most populous country and would be defending itself against a foreign aggressor. More seriously, it could easily escalate into a nuclear holocaust.

### US/China Relations – Turns Warming

#### Chinese cooperation is a pre-requisite for solving global warming.

**Bush** III, 10/11/**2011** (Richard – director of the Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies, The United States and China: A G-2 in the Making, p. http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2011/10/11-china-us-g2-bush)

Now there are a couple of “germs of reality” in the Brzezinski-Bergsten G-2 idea. In the sixth month of his presidency, President Barack Obama laid out a grand vision for bilateral relations between the two countries. On the occasion of the first Strategic and Economic Dialogue, he said, “The relationship between the U.S. and China will shape the 21st century, which makes it as important as any bilateral relationship in the world.... If we advance [our mutual] interests through cooperation, our people will benefit and the world will be better off—because our ability to partner with each other is a prerequisite for progress on many of the most pressing global challenges.” President Obama and President Hu Jintao have repeatedly stated their “commitment to building a positive, cooperative, and comprehensive U.S.-China relationship for the 21st century, which serves the interests of the American and Chinese peoples and of the global community.” Moreover, there are some “pressing global challenges” that stem from the policies of the two countries. Global macroeconomic imbalances are the result, primarily of the bilateral economic imbalance between the United States and China and the related domestic policies. China saves too much and the United States consumes too much. That asymmetry leads to a large bilateral trade imbalance and the necessity for China to recycle its export earnings, usually by purchasing American debt. This bilateral imbalance affects the stability of the global economy, and the only way to reduce this instability is for China to consume more and the United States to save more. The problem of climate change is similar. China and the United States are the two largest emitters of greenhouse gases. Unless they are willing to tackle the problem, global warming will continue to endanger the planet.

### Iran Strikes 2NC

#### 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.

### AT: Romney’s Agenda = Gridlocked

#### Romney will get enough Congressional support for his agenda.

**Klein**, 6/4/**2012** (Ezra – editor of Wonkblog and columnist at the Washington Post, The Keynesian case for Romney, The Wonk Blog at the Washington Post, p. http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/the-keynesian-case-for-romney/2012/06/04/gJQAIETuDV\_blog.html)

There’s no reason to believe Romney could “break” gridlock. But there’s reason to believe he wouldn’t face it in the first place. Republicans control the House. They’re three seats from controlling the Senate — and, because this Senate election follows 2006, which was a wave election for Democrats, Republicans are defending 10 seats while Democrats are defending 23. It’s difficult to imagine a scenario in which Romney wins the White House and Republicans don’t control the House and Senate. On the other side, while it’s not impossible to imagine President Obama winning the White House and Democrats taking back the House, it’s unlikely. Romney and the Republicans are not likely to reach 60 seats in the Senate, but they won’t need them. The major issues on the table are budgetary. That means they can be considered using the budget reconciliation process, which can’t be filibustered. So if Republicans can maintain party unity — and they usually can — they’ll be able to govern effectively. And there’s no way that they’ll permit the Bush tax cuts to expire or the debt ceiling to lapse. Investors, knowing that, would likely stop worrying about the debt ceiling the moment a Romney win became clear.

### Iowa U – Obama Winning

#### Obama is ahead in Iowa --- applies to both likely and registered voters.

**Murray**, **9/20**/2012, (Mark – NBC News senior political editor, Polls: Obama ahead in Colorado, Iowa, and Wisconsin, NBC News, p. http://firstread.nbcnews.com/\_news/2012/09/20/13993186-polls-obama-ahead-in-colorado-iowa-and-wisconsin?lite)

President Barack Obama leads Mitt Romney in Colorado, Iowa and Wisconsin, reaching the key 50 percent support threshold in all three battlegrounds, according to the latest NBC News/Wall Street Journal/Marist polls of these states. In both Colorado and Wisconsin, Obama is ahead by 5 points among likely voters (including those learning toward a candidate), 50 percent to 45 percent. And in Iowa, the president’s edge over Romney is 8 points, 50 percent to 42 percent. Among a wider sample of registered voters, Obama’s lead is even larger – 6 points in Colorado, 8 in Wisconsin and 11 in Iowa.

### Clean Energy 2NC

#### 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.

#### 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.”

**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.

#### Even if voters support clean energy, they don’t want government spending.

**Freed et. al**, February **2012** (Josh – Third Way and Matt Bennett – Third Way, Al Quinlan – Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, and Andrew Baumann – Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, Moving Clean Energy to the Center: Insights from Swing Voters in the Midwest and South, p. http://content.thirdway.org/publications/486/Third\_Way\_Report\_-\_Moving\_Clean\_Energy\_to\_the\_Center\_-\_Insights\_from\_Swing\_Voters\_in\_the\_Midwest\_and\_South.pdf)

While there is a strong desire to get America running on clean energy, there is a gap between what participants want and how they think the country can achieve it. Much of the public focus for clean energy advocates in recent years simply did not resonate with these participants. While voters did believe clean energy will spur economic growth—eventually—they did not see it creating a significant number of jobs today, particularly in manufacturing. In addition, climate change was simply not on voters’ minds—virtually none of the participants connected a focus on clean energy with addressing global warming. Finally, there was no faith that direct government spending would spur innovation or adoption of clean energy.

#### Government spending on clean energy is a hard sell.

**Freed et. al**, February **2012** (Josh – Third Way and Matt Bennett – Third Way, Al Quinlan – Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, and Andrew Baumann – Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, Moving Clean Energy to the Center: Insights from Swing Voters in the Midwest and South, p. http://content.thirdway.org/publications/486/Third\_Way\_Report\_-\_Moving\_Clean\_Energy\_to\_the\_Center\_-\_Insights\_from\_Swing\_Voters\_in\_the\_Midwest\_and\_South.pdf)

Our findings could provide an outline of a new political path to get this done. They include focusing on long-term economic growth and the consequences of inaction, emphasizing government’s role as a “facilitator” for America’s businesses to move to clean energy, and tapping into voters’ concerns about pollution—especially coal (which is viewed as antiquated and dirty). As important, we found that selling clean energy as a way to jump start near-term job creation was not an effective way to build support, nor was advocating direct government spending on clean energy. Climate change alone is an even tougher sell—it was not on the radar screen of our participants.

### Link Turns Case – Political Controversy

#### Political controversy over wind energy undermines development.

Green Solar Cafe, 6/29/**2012** (The Implications of Solyndra’s Scandal & Bankruptcy on Future US Renewable Energy Policy, p. http://www.greensolarcafe.com/uncategorized/the-implications-of-solyndras-scandal-bankruptcy-on-future-us-renewable-energy-policy/)

Politicizing Solyndra’s bankruptcy has potential to negatively effect the future growth and development of domestic renewable energy industry Renewable energy industry in this country has a potential for growing and prospering only in the climate of stable government support. Government policy not only directly aids the industry with financial incentives, but also signals to private investors that they can invest large amounts of capital into the industry. In previous years, US solar investments and support for the renewable energy industry in the US has been for the most part bipartisan, where both Republicans and Democrats saw renewable energy as being good for the country and for the environment in the long run. This mind set in Washington allowed President Obama to implement a number of important incentives programs such as the Production Tax Credit (PTC) the Investment Tax Credit (ITC) and others, that have tremendously helped the growth of both solar and wind sectors of the renewable energy industry. A number of these key incentives are due to expire both at the end of 2012 and in 2013. In the current political climate, where renewable energy has become a deeply divisive issue for Republicans and Democrats it is highly unlikely that these will be renewed. Solyndra’s scandal has really added fuel to the fire, further denigrating the whole industry’s worthiness both in the eyes of Washington’s policy makers and the general public. A telling comment by Rep. Cliff Stearns, who chairs the oversight subcommittee of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, sums it all up:” Solyndra’s downfall proves that green energy isn’t going to be the solution” (Washington Post). How these sentiments will dictate our nation’s future energy policy remains to be seen.

### Link Booster – Negative Voting Theory

#### Our voters are more likely to turnout than the aff’s because of negative voting theory.

**Abramowitz**, 9/3/**2009** (Alan – Director of Undergraduate Studies at Emory University, Alben W. Barkley Distinguished Chair in Political Science at Emory University, Forecasting the Midterm Elections: An Early Look at What to Expect in 2010, Sabato’s Crystal Ball, p. <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/aia2009090301/>)

There are several theories that attempt to explain why the president’s party almost always loses seats in midterm elections. Surge and decline theory argues that midterm elections represent a return to normal voting patterns following presidential elections in which short-term forces can produce unusual gains for the winning candidate’s party. Negative voting theory argues that those who are dissatisfied with the status quo are more motivated to turn out and express their discontent in midterm elections than those who are satisfied. And balancing theory argues that, knowing that the president will be in office for the next two years, some voters seek to provide greater balance in government by electing members of the opposition party to Congress. All of these theories may be partially correct. Whatever the explanation, midterm elections are generally not kind to the president’s party.

#### Angry voter theory means that backlash against Obama will be more intense.

**Harpuder 2003** (Lieutenant Junior Grade Brian, Electoral Behavior in U.S. Senate Elections, A Simultaneous Choice Model, Dissertation, The Degree of Philosophy, Ohio State University, p. ii)

With respect to evaluations of the economy and personal finances the research clearly shows support for the angry voter hypothesis. Citizens who are dissatisfied with the state of the national economy, angry voters, are more likely to turnout than those who are satisfied. Their dissatisfaction is expressed toward incumbents because they become more likely to vote for the challenging party. Personal financial evaluations are also shown to have a limited impact on electoral behavior.

### Obama Win 2NC

#### Obama is winning --- momentum

**Blake**, **9/20**/2012 (Aaron, Is the 2012 election tilting toward Democrats?, The Washington Post, p. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2012/09/20/is-the-2012-election-tilting-toward-democrats/>)

Either we’re at a turning point in the 2012 election, or a lot of pollsters are getting it wrong. The question for the past week-plus has been whether President Obama’s convention bounce and a series of stumbles for Mitt Romney have recast the 2012 race. Some national polls say yes, and a few say no. But more and more, the data at the state level point to some real movement in Democrats’ favor. At least for now. As we wrote Tuesday, Gallup polling shows that the bump Obama got from the Democratic convention two weeks ago has subsided. And another new poll, released Wednesday by the Associated Press and pollster GfK, shows basically the same picture, with 47 percent of likely voters supporting Obama and 46 percent backing Romney — a tie ballgame nationally. But almost every state-specific poll in the last few days has shown progress for Democrats — both at the presidential level and in the very important contest for the Senate — with some showing unprecedented leads for the blue side in the the most important states. Swing-state polls from CBS News, the New York Times and Quinnipiac University released Wednesday morning in three key states — Colorado, Virginia and Wisconsin — showed Obama either gaining since last month or, in the case of Virginia, holding his lead. And Fox News polls released Wednesday evening showed Obama with a solid lead in the three biggest swing states; he’s up by seven points each in Ohio and Virginia and five points in Florida. The results confirm polls from NBC News and Marist College in the same three states last week. A Washington Post poll released Tuesday confirms the movement in Virginia, with Obama up by an unprecedented eight points. And a Marquette University Law School poll released Wednesday supports the idea that the race in Wisconsin has shifted, with Obama leading by an astounding 14 points. Even if some of these margins seem a little big, just consider that even the best polls for Romney haven’t shown him with that kind of lead in these states — or really anything close to it. In fact, Nate Silver points out that, of the 16 live-interview swing state polls conducted in the last two weeks, Obama is leading in all of them except Colorado by at least four points.

#### Obama will win --- economic factors, Romney’s favorability, increased approval rating, and swing states.

**Lombardo**, **9/20**/2012 (Steve – Global CEO of Edelman Berland, Election Monitor: 47 Days to Go and the Pendulum Has Swung Toward Obama, The Huffington Post, p. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steve-lombardo/election-monitor-47-days_b_1900540.html>)

We can talk about 47 percent, the Libya stumbles, the lack of message discipline and a weak convention, but the simple fact is that the president and his team have had a better strategy than Team Romney from Day 1 and they have executed it to perfection. The result? Governor Romney has a damaged political persona and he's running behind the President in key states like Ohio, Virginia and -- to a lesser extent -- Florida. Losses in those three guarantee an Obama victory. With 47 days to go, the president has reversed his decline after his "you didn't build that" comment, is on a three week message win roll and is now likely to be reelected. How did we get here? As usual, it hasn't been just one thing; instead, the cumulative impact of a series of external events and strategic and tactical moves by each team has resulted in a significant competitive advantage for the president. In no particular order, here is our take on the most important of those events: 1. Romney entered the general election as a damaged and flawed candidate. Yes, this has happened to others who have rebounded, but this is different. Governor Romney's political persona was formed during the primaries when voters began to view him as elitist, rich and out of touch. This is where the Democrats' early advertising was crucial. Remember, Romney had to fight a two-front war as both Gingrich and the Democrats attacked Bain. It helped to galvanize a perception that has stuck like glue. Of course, miscues by the candidate and the campaign both old (the $10,000 bet) and new (47 percent) have reinforced this perception. That is why the 47 percent comment was so problematic. It was another layer on an already existing perception. The problem now is that this thing has hardened, making it virtually impossible to change. 2. Team Obama's early advertising strategy to make Romney an unacceptable alternative worked. They were able to define Romney before he had a chance to define himself. Of course, the Romney team inadvertently aided that effort but not doing a substantial positive media buy to explain who Mitt Romney is and what kind of President he might be. Romney's favorability rating is currently underwater with 44 percent favorable and 45 percent unfavorable. In the latest WSJ/NBC poll only 38 percent of the electorate had a positive impression of him. According to the latest CBS/NYT poll, only 37 percent of Virginia voters think that Romney "cares about people like them." This is politically debilitating. 3. Perceptions of the economy are improving. While unemployment remains high and GDP growth is abysmal, the stock market has improved (taking 401(k)s with it). Additionally, don't underestimate how effectively Team Obama has hammered home the idea that the president inherited a big problem. He has been saying it since he was inaugurated with extraordinarily good message discipline. Voters are likely to give him partial credit here. 4. Obama's approval rating is now in the "likely reelect zone. " We have been saying for months that an approval rating in the low- to mid-40s makes reelection difficult. Since last year, however, Obama's approval rating has improved by 5-6 points. He is now at approximately 49 percent approval, which is comparable to where President George W. Bush was in 2004. 5. The President had a strong convention and Romney had a weak one. Poor speeches and Eastwood's chair aside, the fact is that the RNC did not achieve its principal objective: to re-launch a re-branded Romney and create momentum heading into September. Forget all the talk about the convention's mechanics; this was about transforming the narrative. And they did not do that. Of course, the Democrats had the advantage of going second but the RNC did not put Team Obama on its heels. Speaking of which... 6. Team Romney has been in reactive mode for a month. Of course, part of this is a continuous cycle of damage control but there does not appear to be a forward-looking strategy. By now, we fully expected to see some sort of economic proposal or initiative that would have forced the Obama campaign to respond. This has not happened. 7. Last but certainly not least there was Libya. With respect to Team Romney, there seemed to be little recognition of the most basic political tenet of a foreign crisis: when there is an international incident in which America is attacked, voters in this country will (at least in the short term) rally around the flag and the president. Always. It is stunning that Team Romney failed to recognize this. In times of domestic crisis (the BP oil spill is a great example) voters will look to their political leaders and can be pretty quick to lay blame. On the other hand, it usually takes some time for voters to sour on how their leaders have handled international crises. Iraq is the perfect example. 8. The result is that the President is now running ahead (beyond the margin of error) of Romney in key battleground states including Virginia, Ohio, Florida and New Hampshire. Ohio is particularly troubling since it is awfully hard to see a winning Romney coalition without it.

## 1NR vs Dartmouth CL

### Jobs Add-on

#### 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.

### Nuclear War

#### Extend the 1NC Starr evidence – it’s from this year which means it cites the most recent scientific models – even a regional nuclear war would create so much smoke that it would block out the Sun, replicating the Ice Age – that combined with radioactive fallout will result in mass extinction – not just nuke winter theory – args they don’t respond to

#### Multiple additional warrants –

#### A. Famine, disease and radiation

Choi 11

[Charles Q. Choi – National Geographic News, “Small Nuclear War Could Reverse Global Warming for Years”, February 22nd, 2011, <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2011/02/110223-nuclear-war-winter-global-warming-environment-science-climate-change/>, Chetan]

Even a regional nuclear war could spark "unprecedented" global cooling and reduce rainfall for years, according to U.S. government computer models. Widespread famine and disease would likely follow, experts speculate. During the Cold War a nuclear exchange between superpowers—such as the one feared for years between the United States and the former Soviet Union—was predicted to cause a "nuclear winter." In that scenario hundreds of nuclear explosions spark huge fires, whose smoke, dust, and ash blot out the sun for weeks amid a backdrop of dangerous radiation levels. Much of humanity eventually dies of starvation and disease. Today, with the United States the only standing superpower, nuclear winter is little more than a nightmare. But nuclear war remains a very real threat—for instance, between developing-world nuclear powers, such as India and Pakistan. To see what climate effects such a regional nuclear conflict might have, scientists from NASA and other institutions modeled a war involving a hundred Hiroshima-level bombs, each packing the equivalent of 15,000 tons of TNT—just 0.03 percent of the world's current nuclear arsenal. (See a National Geographic magazine feature on weapons of mass destruction.) The researchers predicted the resulting fires would kick up roughly five million metric tons of black carbon into the upper part of the troposphere, the lowest layer of the Earth's atmosphere. In NASA climate models, this carbon then absorbed solar heat and, like a hot-air balloon, quickly lofted even higher, where the soot would take much longer to clear from the sky. (Related: "'Nuclear Archaeologists' Find World War II Plutonium.") Reversing Global Warming? The global cooling caused by these high carbon clouds wouldn't be as catastrophic as a superpower-versus-superpower nuclear winter, but "the effects would still be regarded as leading to unprecedented climate change," research physical scientist Luke Oman said during a press briefing Friday at a meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Washington, D.C. Earth is currently in a long-term warming trend. After a regional nuclear war, though, average global temperatures would drop by 2.25 degrees F (1.25 degrees C) for two to three years afterward, the models suggest. At the extreme, the tropics, Europe, Asia, and Alaska would cool by 5.4 to 7.2 degrees F (3 to 4 degrees C), according to the models. Parts of the Arctic and Antarctic would actually warm a bit, due to shifted wind and ocean-circulation patterns, the researchers said. After ten years, average global temperatures would still be 0.9 degree F (0.5 degree C) lower than before the nuclear war, the models predict. (Pictures: "Red Hot" Nuclear-Waste Train Glows in Infrared.) Years Without Summer For a time Earth would likely be a colder, hungrier planet. "Our results suggest that agriculture could be severely impacted, especially in areas that are susceptible to late-spring and early-fall frosts," said Oman, of NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, Maryland. "Examples similar to the crop failures and famines experienced following the Mount Tambora eruption in 1815 could be widespread and last several years," he added. That Indonesian volcano ushered in "the year without summer," a time of famines and unrest. (See pictures of the Mount Tambora eruption.) All these changes would also alter circulation patterns in the tropical atmosphere, reducing precipitation by 10 percent globally for one to four years, the scientists said. Even after seven years, global average precipitation would be 5 percent lower than it was before the conflict, according to the model. In addition, researcher Michael Mills, of the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Colorado, found large decreases in the protective ozone layer, leading to much more ultraviolet [uv] radiation reaching Earth's surface and harming the environment and people. "The main message from our work," NASA's Oman said, "would be that even a regional nuclear conflict would have global consequences."

#### C. Researchers confirm this conclusion

Wickersham 10

(University of Missouri adjunct professor of Peace Studies and a member of The Missouri University Nuclear Disarmament Education Team, author book about nuclear disarmament education (Bill, 4/11/10, “Threat of ‘nuclear winter’ remains New START treaty is step in right direction.” <http://www.columbiatribune.com/news/2010/apr/11/threat-of-nuclear-winter-remains/>)

In addressing the environmental consequences of nuclear war, Columbian Steve Starr has written a summary of studies published by the Bulletin of the International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation, which concludes: “U.S. researchers have confirmed the scientific validity of the concept of ‘nuclear winter’ and have demonstrated that any conflict which targets even a tiny fraction of the global arsenal will cause catastrophic disruptions of the global climate.” In another statement on his Web site, Starr says: “If 1% of the nuclear weapons now ready for war were detonated in large cities, they would utterly devastate the environment, climate, ecosystems and inhabitants of Earth. A war fought with thousands of strategic nuclear weapons would leave the Earth uninhabitable.”

### Warming - Inevitable

#### Climate change will continue for the next 1000 years - the ANI evidence indicates that even if we stopped ALL emissions, the temperature increases to the point where it would cause extinction. That makes their impacts inevitable

#### Can’t solve warming

Hamilton 10 – Professor of Public Ethics @ ANU Clive Hamilton, Professor of Public Ethics in Australia, 2010, “Requiem for a Species: Why We Resist the Truth About Climate Change,” pg 27-28

The conclusion that, even if we act promptly and resolutely, the world is on a path to reach 650 ppm is almost too frightening to accept. That level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere will be associated with warming of about 4°C by the end of the century, well above the temperature associated with tipping points that would trigger further warming.58 So it seems that even with the most optimistic set of assumptions—the ending of deforestation, a halving of emissions associated with food production, global emissions peaking in 2020 and then falling by 3 per cent a year for a few decades—we have no chance of preventing emissions rising well above a number of critical tipping points that will spark uncontrollable climate change. The Earth's climate would enter a chaotic era lasting thousands of years before natural processes eventually establish some sort of equilibrium. Whether human beings would still be a force on the planet, or even survive, is a moot point. One thing seems certain: there will be far fewer of us. These conclusions arc alarming, co say the least, but they are not alarmist. Rather than choosing or interpreting numbers to make the situation appear worse than it could be, following Kevin Anderson and Alice Bows 1 have chosen numbers that err on the conservative side, which is to say numbers that reflect a more buoyant assessment of the possibilities. A more neutral assessment of how the global community is likely to respond would give an even bleaker assessment of our future. For example, the analysis excludes non-CO2, emissions from aviation and shipping. Including them makes the task significantly harder, particularly as aviation emissions have been growing rapidly and are expected to continue to do so as there is no foreseeable alternative to severely restricting the number of flights.v' And any realistic assessment of the prospects for international agreement would have global emissions peaking closer to 2030 rather than 2020. The last chance to reverse the trajectory of global emissions by 2020 was forfeited at the Copenhagen climate conference in December 2009. As a consequence, a global response proportionate to the problem was deferred for several years.

### Warming – Transportation

#### 1NC evidence indicates you can’t solve without transportation emissions – represents 1/3rd of GHG emissions that you don’t solve for

#### Can’t solve without reducing transportation emissions – leading cause of warming

**Gordon, 10** – nonresident senior associate in Carnegie’s Energy and Climate Program, where her research focuses on climate, energy, and transportation issues in the United States and China (Deborah, December. “The Role of Transportation in Driving Climate Disruption.” http://carnegieendowment.org/files/transport\_climate\_disruption.pdf)

Through the twenty-first century, on-road transportation is expected to be a leading climate-forcing activity worldwide. Cars and trucks emit almost no sulfates (cooling agents) but are major emitters of carbon dioxide, black carbon, and ozone—all of which cause warming and are detrimental to human health. U.S. on-road transportation is responsible for 40 percent of global on-road climate warming (“radiative forcing” in climate terms). U.S. on-road transportation is projected to have a net radiative forcing of 66 mWm-2 on a twenty-year horizon, as shown in Figure 11. U.S. on-road transportation represents nearly half (41 percent) of global radiative forcing in this sector over a twenty-year timeframe.

### Warming – No Impact

#### 1NC Stampf ev says there is no impact to warming whatsoever – moderate warming causes some form of biodiversity but doesn’t lead to the extreme scenarios of the aff

#### No global impact – climate change affects different parts of the world

Theisen et al 12 [Ole Magnus Theisen is a doctoral candidate at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) and Associate Researcher at the Centre for the Study of Civil War (CSCW) at the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO). Helge Holtermann is Doctoral Researcher at CSCW, PRIO. Halvard Buhaug is Research Professor at CSCW, PRIO. “Climate Wars? Assessing the Claim That Drought Breeds Conflict”, International Security, Vol. 36, No. 3 (Winter 2011/12), pp. 79–106, Chetan]

Climate change is not felt equally in all corners of the world, however. Warming occurs disproportionately in the Northern Hemisphere, and particularly at higher latitudes. Precipitation patterns display similar, though not always overlapping, changes, with considerable interregional and interannual variations. According to the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report, precipitation will increase in higher latitudes and decrease in the subtropics, where droughts will become more frequent and more intense.11 Just as climate change differs among regions, so does vulnerability to shifting environmental conditions. Africa is projected to be hit first and most extensively by a less hospitable climate, given its economic dependence on rain-fed agriculture, high environmental vulnerability, and weak institutional coping capacity.12 Only 4 percent of arable land in Sub-Saharan Africa is irrigated, making the predominantly agricultural African economies poorly suited to withstand increasing drought. The result might be substantial vegetation dieoff in exposed regions, with negative implications for agricultural productivity and food security.13 One-third of the African population lives in drought-prone areas today, and almost all Sub-Saharan countries are projected to be in a state of water stress by 2025.14 Moreover, two-thirds of the workforce in Sub- Saharan Africa is employed in the rural sector, making this region especially sensitive to future climate changes.15

### Solvency – Temporary Sufficient

#### Wind energy currently approaching new levels of success

CNN Money 8/6 (Steve Hargreaves, 6 Aug 2012, Wind power hits 57% mark in Colorado, <http://money.cnn.com/2012/08/06/news/economy/wind-power-Colorado/index.htm?iid=HP_River>)

During the early morning hours of April 15, with a steady breeze blowing down Colorado's Front Range, the state's biggest utility set a U.S. record -- nearly 57% of the electricity being generated was coming from wind power. As dawn came and the 1.4 million customers in Xcel Energy's service district began turning on the lights, toasters and other appliances, the utility's coal and natural gas-fired power plants ramped up production and brought wind's contribution back closer to its 2012 average of 17%. Utilities have long been wary of placing too much finicky renewable power on the grid. "A lot of utilities don't want to contract large amounts of wind because it's volatile," said Amy Grace, a wind analyst at Bloomberg New Energy Finance. "Anything over 25%, and utilities get nervous." Colorado's overnight high-water mark demonstrated that utilities can indeed incorporate cleaner power sources into the mix.

#### Wind power coming now – Walmart

Forbes 8/6/12 (Todd Woody, Walmart Erects Its First Megawatt Wind Turbine In California, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/toddwoody/2012/08/06/walmart-winds-up-wind-power-in-california/>)

The 1-megawatt, General Electric turbine in Red Bluff is Walmart’s first such installation and the next stage in the company’s efforts to eventually obtain 100% of its energy from renewable sources. “It looks like our renewable energy strategy is going to take a lot of tools,” says Greg Pool, a director of energy for Walmart. “We are pursuing wind energy and renewable energy at a lot of different levels.” The company has installed micro-turbines a top light poles at stores in California and Massachusetts that generate between 2 to 3 kilowatts of electricity but Red Bluff is the first facility that will boast a full-sized wind turbine like those found on wind farms that generate hundreds of megawatts of power. The GE wind turbine is expected to supply between 15% and 20% of the Red Bluff distribution’s electricity demand. As with Walmart’s solar installations, the retailer won’t own the turbine. In this case, Walmart will buy the electricity it generates under a 15-year power purchase agreement with Foundation Windpower, a Silicon Valley company that installs large turbines for businesses.

### Solvency – Warming

#### Wind energy is expensive, impractical, and doesn’t solve warming (reductions of only 1.8%)

Carolina Journal Online 11 (Staff Writer Sara Burrows in an Interview with John Droz, environmentalist with degrees in physics and economics. “Wind Power Does Not Help Economy or Environment, Experts Say” <http://www.carolinajournal.com/articles/display_story.html?id=8597>)

Electricity generated from the wind is inefficient, extremely expensive, and bad for the environment, argued scientists and economists at a forum sponsored by the John Locke Foundation Dec. 5, at the University of North Carolina-Wilmington. John Droz, a fellow at the American Tradition Institute, is a physicist, economist, and self-described environmentalist. He spent most of his professional life working in management at General Electric. Droz said he initially supported wind energy. But after some research, he concluded that wind is neither economically viable nor environmentally responsible. For the first hundred years after electricity was invented, Droz said, there were six guiding principles that helped determine which sources we would use in the United States. Traditionally, energy sources were expected to: provide large amounts of electricity; provide reliable and predictable electricity; provide electricity supplies that can be increased or decreased to satisfy demand; meet the demand for either a base load (operating 24 hours a day, seven days a week) or a peak load; have a compact facility; and provide electricity economically. “These criteria became the basis for what developed into the most successful grid system on the planet, which has a large amount to do with our country’s economic success,” Droz said. Today, the power sources that meet those standards are coal, nuclear, natural gas, and hydro, he said. Sources that failed to meet the standards, like oil, which became too expensive, were pushed out of the electricity business. “That’s how the market works when left on its own,” Droz said. But recently a nonmarket-driven principle has been added to the list. The state and federal governments have decided that sources of electricity also must make a positive environmental impact, reducing carbon emissions and fighting global warming. This principle is mandated by the state government — through a law known as the Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard (REPS) or Senate Bill 3 — and subsidized by both the state and federal governments. Before S.B. 3 mandated renewable energy in 2007, a program called NC Green Power allowed North Carolinians to decide if they want to help put renewable energy on the grid voluntarily. “The problem was the public was not supporting NC Green Power,” said Daren Bakst, director of legal and regulatory studies for the John Locke Foundation. “There was no support whatsoever. It was embarrassing how bad it was.” Bakst said there is no way utilities will be able to meet the 7.5 percent renewable energy mandate without including wind energy in their portfolio. There are only two places in the state wind power can work, he said: in the mountains and on the coast. Because the state’s Ridge Law prohibits tall structures from being constructed in the mountains, “there’s going to be intense pressure to allow wind power plants on the coast” over the next couple of years, Bakst said. Talks are under way about building a wind power project in Beaufort County. “One of the justifications for allowing the project is the fact that S.B. 3 exists,” Bakst said. “If you didn’t have the mandate, there wouldn’t be any proposed wind power plants,” he said. “Even with all the subsidies wind power gets, we wouldn’t be discussing it, because the subsidies by themselves weren’t enough. The state actually had to mandate it.” Droz said the mandate will cost North Carolinians millions of dollars in higher energy bills and won’t help the environment in the least. Wind doesn’t meet any of the six traditional market-driven criteria for what makes a good energy source, he said. “Because of the wide fluctuations of wind, it typically produces less than 30 percent of its nameplate capacity,” Droz said. “This problem is made worse by the fact that there is no practical or economical way to store the electricity produced.” It’s not reliable or predictable and cannot be counted on to provide power on demand, he said. Wind power plants aren’t compact either, he added. They cover more than 1,000 times the surface area of a conventional facility. Most importantly to Droz, wind power is not economical. The cost of running a wind power plant is higher than any other type of plant. “The more wind power an energy company uses, the higher the consumer’s electric bill,” he said. “Denmark, which uses more wind power than any country in the world, has the highest cost of electricity of any country in the world. Their residential electricity rate is more than three times as much as ours.” Finally, wind does not make a consequential reduction in carbon emissions, said Droz. “No scientific study has ever proven that wind power saves a meaningful amount of CO2. A National Academy of Sciences study says U.S. CO2 savings by 2020 will be at about 1.8 percent." “More than 90 percent of all CO2 saved in the last 35 years is due to nuclear power, very little due to renewables,” he said. David Schnare, director of the Environmental Law Center at the American Tradition Institute, suggested wind turbines actually create more pollution than other energy sources. Because wind is inconsistent and its energy cannot be stored, wind power plants must be backed up by another type of power plant. “In Colorado, [sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide] — which create smog — were significantly higher than they would have been had they not cycled the coal plants to compensate for wind generation,” Schnare said. “Cycling a coal plant causes more pollution than letting it run constantly.” Droz said a law mandating wind power “makes about as much sense as an edict mandating that a certain percentage of our trucks and automobiles must be operated by horse power in a few years.” It’s a step backward that will decrease our standard of living. Big oil companies like BP have become wind-power investors because they can use their investment in wind power to offset corporate tax liabilities, he said. “The company that pioneered wind power to avoid paying taxes was Enron.”

### Picking Winners

#### Incentives focus on deployment, not R&D -- makes failure inevitable and deters innovation

Stepp 12 -- Senior Analyst with the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation (ITIF) specializing in climate change and clean energy policy, M.S. degree in Science, Technology, and Public Policy @ Rochester Inst of Tech (Matthew, 3/12/12, "Innovation Strategy, Not Just Deployment," http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/03/should-government-subsidize-en.php)

More of today’s energy incentives and subsidies aren’t the answer for a number of reasons. First, existing clean technologies are not ready for primetime except in very niche markets and require significant innovations to make them viable both nationwide and globally. We need new battery technologies, new solar architectures, alternatives to critical materials, utility scale energy storage options, scalable advanced biofuels, and so on. These aren’t small technological challenges that can be overcome by boosting production of existing technologies. Second, counter to some advocates, deployment alone doesn’t spur enough innovation. At least not the types of innovations I just briefly mentioned. Ultimately, we need entirely new clean technology learning curves. Subsidizing 1 million more existing EV batteries isn’t going to lead to the step-function leaps in innovation. Scaling up production through deployment does spur incremental innovations and it does play a part in an innovation strategy. But today’s clean technologies aren’t at the precipice of competitiveness and our deployment policies aren’t aligned or correctly structured to spur the necessary innovations. Third, subsidizing existing clean technologies in America does little to reduce global carbon emissions. Without clean energy innovations, we cannot expect developing countries to subsidize their way to a clean economy given its higher costs when those countries are simply trying to gain access to any affordable energy (and food, housing, healthcare, etc.). Thus we need to make clean energy more than a global “luxury good” to drastically reduce carbon emissions, which will take innovation, not just more domestic subsidies and tax breaks.

## 1NC vs GMU KL

### 1

#### A. Interpretation – “energy production” includes preparation for transportation – but excludes the actual process of transportation

TPU 94 (Toxic Protection Unit, Division of Environmental Management in North Carolina’s Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources, “Investigation of Bulk Gasoline Terminals at Paw Creek,” 1-18, http://daq.state.nc.us/toxics/studies/Paw\_Creek/Paw\_Creek\_I.pdf)

The terminals at Paw Creek depict an intermediate sector of the petroleum industry. in general, the petroleum industry can be broken down into four basic segments; exploration and production**,** transportation**,** reﬁning**,** and marketing. As shown in Figure 2, petroleum industry operations begin with exploration for sources of crude oil. Production includes recovering the crude oil from the wells and preparing it for transportation to the reﬁnery. The crude oil may be transported to the reﬁnery via pipeline, tankers, barges, rail tank cars or tank trucks. Processing of crude into the various petroleum products through physical separation of crude oil components and chemical conversions takes place at the refinery. Products leaving the reﬁnery are transported to distribution outlets via pipeline, rail, marine vessel, and tank truck. These distribution outlets are called bulk terminals and bulk plants. Terminals and plants store the reﬁned products until distributed to service stations or other large commercial users, usually by tank truck or rail car. North Carolina Administrative Code (NCAC) 15A 213.0927 and Mecklenburg County Air Pollution Control Ordinance (MCAPCO) 2.0927’ defines a bulk gasoline terminal as the breakout tanks of an interstate oil pipeline facility or a gasoline storage facility which usually receives gasoline from refineries primarily by pipeline, ship, or barge; and delivers gasoline to bulk gasoline plants or to commercial or retail naaccounts primarily by tank truck; and has an average daily throughput fofmore than 20,000gallons of gasoline. Bulk plants are generally those facilities having less than 20,000 gallonsper day throughput. There are no bulk plants at Paw Creek

#### “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.

#### B. Violations – export restrictions are not production restrictions

Shih 9 Wen-chen Shih is an associate professor of law in the Department of International Trade at National Chengchi University, Taiwan. "ARTICLE: Energy Security, GATT/WTO, and Regional Agreements" Natural Resources Journal Spring, 2009 Natural Resources Journal 49 Nat. Resources J. 433 lexis

Such an argument has been questioned by others. Broome cautions that a material distinction remains between export restrictions and production restrictions. n91 He argues that oil in its natural state--oil still in the ground--cannot be characterized as a "product" within the meaning of Article XI, as it has not gone through a production process. n92 Only oil in commerce--oil that is extracted and produced for consumption can be regarded as falling under the GATT jurisdiction. n93 Therefore, only when OPEC countries restrict the quantity of oil in commerce made available for export to foreign consumers could they then violate Article XI:1. n94 He further points out that, while the jurisprudence tends to interpret Article XI:1 broadly, absurd and unintended consequences could arise if the panel or the Appellate Body does not pay attention to such differences; when a WTO Member took some measure to reduce domestic production in a particular industry, any WTO Member could complain that the country was violating Article XI:1 by influencing prices via supply restrictions. n95 In other words, "any measure that prevents an industry from operating at maximum capacity might constitute an export restriction." n96 Broome, thus, concludes that the production quotas maintained by OPEC countries should not constitute quantitative restrictions that contravene Article XI:1. n97

#### C. Standards –

#### A. Limits – any transportation aff becomes topical and the topic functionally becomes the energy trading topic – explodes the number of aff mechanisms and advantages

#### B. Ground – export restrictions allow them to change where the energy goes which is a distinct location from where the production occurs – they can spike out all of our DAs and CP

### 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.

#### Plan kills support with environmentalists.

**Dlouhy**, 4/16/**2012** (Jennifer, Environmentalists challenge natural gas export plans, Fuel Fix, p. http://fuelfix.com/blog/2012/04/16/environmentalists-challenge-natural-gas-export-plans/)

Environmentalists are challenging Freeport LNG’s bid to export natural gas from a facility in Texas — the latest attempt to undercut a push by more than a half dozen companies to send the fossil fuel overseas. The move by the Sierra Club came in the form of a formal protest lodged with the Energy Department, which is considering a request by Freeport LNG and other firms for licenses to export liquefied natural gas. Texas-based companies, such as Cheniere Energy and Freeport LNG, are eager to take advantage of the glut of natural gas produced in the U.S., using horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing techniques that allow the fossil fuel to be freed from dense shale rock formations. But the Sierra Club wants the federal government to put the brakes on those plans, amid concerns about air pollution and potential water contamination from hydraulic fracturing. The group has challenged other LNG export plans and asked top Obama administration officials to require a broader review of the environmental consequences of the likely surge in natural gas drilling that would result from selling the fuel overseas.

#### Environmentalists backlash swings the election --- it puts Romney over the top.

**Lehrer**, 6/11/**2012** (Eli – President of R Street, How Mitt Romney Can Win the Environmental Vote, The Huffington Post, p. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/eli-lehrer/post_3484_b_1583319.html>)

Mitt Romney just had an awesome week but, unless he and attracts new groups to the Republican coalition, it still seems he won't win the November election. If he wants to win, he'll need to broaden his base. One reasonably easy way he can do that is by attracting gay and lesbian voters and the other is by attracting environmentalists. Since it seems hugely unlikely he'd make the policy flip-flop he'll need to get the gay vote, environmentalists may be his best bet for broadening the base without sacrificing a single stated principles. A bit on Romney's great week first and why it probably won't deliver the election. Wisconsin governor Scott Walker just survived a recall attempt, President Obama claimed (bizarrely) that "the private sector is doing fine," after bad job numbers raised questions about his stewardship of the economy, and Ron Paul's son, Rand, even endorsed him. In fact, it's difficult to think of a better turn of events for Romney's campaign. That said, barring a full-scale recession between now and the election, I'd still put money on Obama to win: Romney hasn't led in the polls since last September. Quite simply, Obama will likely be able to make up for a decidedly lackluster domestic economic record by relying on a few genuine foreign policy successes, the power of the incumbency, and a mobilized base. Since the (few) positives in Obama's record and the incumbency are unalterable, the Romney camp can only win by shaving parts of Obama's base. And environmentalists are one place big place where it could work. Stanford University researchers have found that about 38 million Americans care a lot about the environment and might vote on it. Assuming that environmental voters turn out at roughly the same rate as other citizens who can vote, this means that somewhere between 15 and 19 percent of the electorate will vote partly on environmental issues. Although there's no current, detailed polling, it's likely that Obama currently stands to get around 75 percent of this group -- taking 50 percent of it would probably be enough to put Romney over the top. So how can he do it?

#### 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

#### 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.

**Plan destroys renewables, keeps us hooked on gas**

**Inman 12** (Mason, reporter for National Geographic, specializes in reporting climate change and energy, “Shale Gas: A Boon That Could Stunt Alternatives, Study Says,” 1-7-12, <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/2012/01/120117-shale-gas-boom-impact-on-renewables/>)

"Given current U.S. policies, abundant and relatively cheap natural gas puts all other energy sources at a competitive disadvantage," he said. "It is particularly important for decision-makers to . . . usher in more renewable energy by creating incentives to help this industry thrive," including policies to increase innovation and encourage investment in electric grids. The infrastructure people build today—power plants fired by coal or **natural gas**, or solar panels or wind turbines—will likely **last for decades**, Bradbury said. "The longer it takes for the [United States] to pass climate policy," he added, "the more likely it is that we will see . . . gas-related infrastructure become effectively **locked in** to our energy system for decades." The MIT study noted that natural gas is often thought of as a "bridge" to a low-carbon future. But the study also emphasizes that there is also a risk of "**stunting" other technologies** for reducing carbon emissions. "While taking advantage of this gift in the short run, treating gas as a 'bridge' to a low-carbon future," the study said, "it is crucial not to allow the greater ease of the near-term task to erode efforts to prepare a landing at the other end of the bridge."

#### Renewables solve extinction

Wood 10 (Duncan, Director – Program in International Relations and Canadian Studies Program – Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México, “Environment, Development and Growth: U.S.-Mexico Cooperation in Renewable Energies,” Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars – Mexico Institute, May, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/topics/pubs/U.S.%20Mexico%20Cooperation%20in%20Renewable%20Energies.pdf)

It is by now common knowledge that the world is facing a climate change crisis caused by the effects of fossil fuel driven industrialization. A significant rise in global temperatures, combined with more severe weather conditions, more frequent floods and droughts, are bringing a paradigm shift to the way we think about our relationship with the planet. For the first time in over 150 years policy makers are thinking seriously about decreasing dependency on fossil fuels and looking for alternatives that may be more expensive in the short and medium terms, but ultimately more sustainable. 7 All of this has happened at the same time as two other, related phenomena. The first is that the global population is reaching new highs and by 2040‐50 will total over 9 billion people. Experts predict that 85% of the world’s population will be located in the developing world, which will mean a rapidly growing demand for goods and for energy. Both of these factors will result in a need to increase energy efficiency as well as find new sources of energy. What’s more, this massive jump in population will coincide not only with climate change but also with increasingly difficult conditions for hydrocarbons exploration and production. As most of the world’s “easy” oil has already been discovered, oil companies and nation states are turning to alternatives such a non‐conventional oil reserves (tar sands, complex fields) and reserves that in the past would have been considered unrecoverable, such as in very deep ocean waters. Furthermore, political conditions in many of the world’s oil rich regions are uncertain, unstable and often unfriendly to private oil companies and to the countries of the West. Climate change and natural disasters The urgency of finding alternatives to fossil fuels has been confirmed in recent years by mounting scientific evidence that we are undergoing a noticeable **anthropogenic shift** in the world’s weather and temperature. Not only are a range of indicators showing that the planet is warming, but the retreat of the polar ice caps, the melting of glaciers, and most importantly in the short term extreme weather conditions and increased incidence of natural disasters have highlighted the consequences of maintaining the status quo in our patterns of energy consumption and industrial development. It is estimated that we have experienced a 1 degree Celsius rise in global temperatures over the past 100 years and that by the end of the current century global temperatures may have risen by as much 7 or 8 degrees. Even with the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions that is contemplated by the most ambitious mitigation strategies, global temperatures may rise by as much as 6%. This would have a dramatic and disastrous impact on both developed and developing nations and will **threaten the existence of both humans and animal and plant species**. Though the connection between man‐made greenhouse gases and global warming was denied for many years by industry and governments alike, it has now been accepted that something must be done to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases released into the atmosphere. Given that 86% of all global energy comes from fossil fuels, and that these fossil fuels produce 27,000,000,000 tons of CO2 emissions annually, finding alternative sources of energy is a crucial component of climate change mitigation strategies.

#### Exports cause warming

Romm 12 (Joe, Senior Fellow at American Progress, editor of Climate Progress, assistant secretary of energy for energy efficiency and renewable energy in 1997, Ph.D. in physics from MIT, “Exporting Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Is Still Bad For The Climate — And A Very Poor Long-Term Investment,” 8-16-12, <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/08/16/699601/exporting-liquefied-natural-gas-lng-bad-for-climate-poor-long-term-investment/>)

And as we’ve seen, LNG shipped from the U.S. is much worse from a GHG perspective than regular gas, so by the time a lot of new LNG terminals are up and running in this country, it seems likely that LNG-fired plants overseas will be have a higher GHG intensity than the average plant in the electric generation system needed to be anywhere near a non-catastrophic emissions path. We do not want to build a global energy system around natural gas (see IEA’s “Golden Age of Gas Scenario” Leads to More Than 6°F Warming and Out-of-Control Climate Change). At the time, the UK Guardian‘s story put it well: At such a level, global warming could run out of control, deserts would take over in southern Africa, Australia and the western US, and sea level rises could engulf small island states. The extra emissions from LNG all but eliminate whatever small, short-term benefit there might be of building billion-dollar export terminals and other LNG infrastructure, which in any case will last many decades, long after a sustainable electric grid will not benefit one jot from replacing coal with gas. Asserting any net benefit requires assuming the new gas replaces only coal — and isn’t used for, say, natural gas vehicles, which, as noted, are worse for the climate or that it doesn’t replace new renewables. If even a modest fraction of the imported LNG displaces renewables, it renders the entire expenditure for LNG counterproductive from day one. Remember, a major 2012 study on “technology warming potentials” (TWPs) found that a big switch from coal to gas would only reduce TWP by about 25% over the first three decades (see “Natural Gas Is A Bridge To Nowhere Absent A Carbon Price AND Strong Standards To Reduce Methane Leakage“). And that is based on “EPA’s latest estimate of the amount of CH4 released because of leaks and venting in the natural gas network between production wells and the local distribution network” of 2.4%. Many experts believe the leakage rate is higher than 2.4%, particularly for shale gas. Also, recent air sampling by NOAA over Colorado found 4% methane leakage, more than double industry claims. A different 2012 study by climatologist Ken Caldeira and tech guru Nathan Myhrvold finds basically no benefit in the switch whatsoever — see You Can’t Slow Projected Warming With Gas, You Need ‘Rapid and Massive Deployment’ of Zero-Carbon Power. That study takes into account the near-term impact of the construction of new infrastructure. BOTTOM LINE: Investing billions of dollars in new shale gas infrastructure for domestic use is, at best, of limited value for a short period of time if we put in place both a CO2 price and regulations to minimize methane leakage. Exporting gas vitiates even that limited value and so investing billions in LNG infrastructure is, at best, a waste of resources better utilized for deploying truly low-carbon energy. At worst, it helps accelerates the world past the 2°C (3.6°F) warming threshold into Terra incognita — a planet of amplifying feedbacks and multiple simultaneous catastrophic impacts.

### 4

#### 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-reservemark 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.

### 5

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should grant authority for decision making over pending applications to export natural gas to the states. The fifty state governments of the United States should approve pending applications to export natural gas. 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.

### Exports

#### Exports allowed now – no significant political opposition

Kirkland 12 (Joel Kirkland, E&E reporter, EnergyWire “U.S. throws open doors to LNG exports with Cheniere approval,” 4-17-12, http://www.eenews.net/public/energywire/2012/04/17/1)

Cheniere Energy Inc. has cleared a major regulatory hurdle to building a $5 billion liquefied natural gas (LNG) export facility along the Gulf Coast of Louisiana. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission yesterday granted approval for Cheniere to build the first LNG export terminal in the lower 48 states, a project met with criticism from environmental groups concerned about pollution tied to the U.S. gas boom. It also faces concern in corners of the industrial sector that shipping gas overseas will increase domestic prices and make U.S. manufacturers less competitive. U.S. gas producers will have the capacity to export up to 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas per day if Cheniere goes ahead with its Sabine Pass LNG project to be located at an existing import terminal in Cameron Parish, La. Earlier yesterday, Cheniere Energy Partners LP, the Houston-based subsidiary developing the project, said it asked eight large financial institutions to help it arrange debt financing. After securing a $2 billion investment in a February deal with private equity firm Blackstone Group, Cheniere is searching for an additional $3 billion to $4 billion to start construction. In recent months, the prospect that the United States could become a significant exporter of natural gas to Europe and Asia caught fire in an election-year atmosphere colored by energy issues. The Sierra Club, in particular, has tried to slow the permitting of Sabine Pass and other LNG export projects. Critics on Capitol Hill have said they are concerned that, despite today's rock-bottom U.S. natural gas prices, over time global demand for LNG could drive up prices for American households and for U.S. makers of steel, chemicals, plastics and energy-intensive manufactured goods. Yet the FERC permit throws open the door to federal authorization of other LNG export projects that can land export approval from the U.S. Energy Department and meet safety standards. With at least eight applications before the federal government, the Obama administration so far has been reluctant to shut down U.S. LNG export potential. Yesterday, FERC also vacated its 2009 approval of the Jordan Cove LNG import terminal proposed near Coos Bay, Ore., which had been stymied by flagging LNG demand. The developer plans to build an export terminal instead. DOE in December authorized Jordan Cove to export gas. The developer filed a preliminary application with FERC in February that kicked off the permitting process for the large Pacific Northwest LNG project. In its Sabine Pass order, FERC settled on DOE's earlier findings about potential energy security issues tied to LNG exports. "Among other things," the commission said, "DOE found that natural gas production associated with exports in the Sabine Pass application will result in increased production that could be used for domestic requirements if market conditions warrant such use, and this will tend to enhance U.S. domestic energy security." Further, FERC dismissed charges by the Sierra Club and the Gulf Coast Environmental Labor Coalition that the commission shortchanged its environmental and safety reviews. Super-chilling gas into a liquid is an industrial process that can be just as polluting as other forms of energy and chemicals production. But the commission cited conditions that Cheniere comply with the federal Clean Air Act, including rules governing greenhouse gas emissions and the use of "best available" pollution control technology.

#### Long-term solvency – 2016 at best

The Wall Street Transcript 12 (“U.S. Energy Independence: A Strategic Portfolio,” 9-6-12,

<http://seekingalpha.com/article/851091-u-s-energy-independence-a-strategic-portfolio>)

The increase in supply will continue to come from the "fracking" of extensive shale formations all over the continental U.S. Since there are currently a grand total of zero LNG export terminals in the lower 48 states, the export of significant amounts of liquefied natural gas from the U.S. will not become a reality until 2016 at the earliest. Simply put, the natgas found within the U.S. is going to stay here. The equity values of the domestic producers of natural gas have dropped dramatically as the ever increasing supply of this commodity has driven prices to historic lows. Interestingly, the pipelines that deliver natgas to the electricity utilities that use it are enjoying new growth prospects. Similar to railroads in the 19th century, these "midstream" pipeline companies are deriving the benefit from being the intermediary between the increase in natural gas supply with the increase in demand from electrical generation utilities.

#### Some Exports inevitable – supply glut

Gold 12 (Russell, Senior energy reporter with the Wall Street Journal, “Energy: The Gas Glut,” 9-3-12, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390443618604577623353182630034.html>)

Market watchers expect gas prices to stay low into the fall, continuing to grab market share from coal, and the trend may continue into next year. Barclays recently noted that there isn't a single analyst predicting that natural-gas supplies will drop far enough next year to raise prices and let idled coal plants fire up again. Moreover, new gas pipelines are likely to deliver much more of the fuel to market later this year and into 2013. If these new pipes get filled up, as many expect, the result will be low natural-gas prices well into next year. If the glut doesn't end, the only hope for weary energy producers struggling with pinched profits may come from liquefying more natural gas and exporting it to other countries. This fall, the Department of Energy is expected to decide how many new export terminals to allow. "If we want to retain any credibility with free trade," says Severin Borenstein, co-director of the Energy Institute at the University of California, Berkeley, "we can't come out with an explicit policy against exporting natural gas."

#### No large US market share – Aussie, Qatar exports, Chinese production, De-linkage

Das 11 (D.K., MBA degree from the University of Chicago and an MS in engineering from the University of British Columbia in Canada, “Prospects of LNG Exports From the United States to Japan,” 5-13-11, <http://www.energytribune.com/articles.cfm/7707/Prospects-of-LNG-Exports-From-the-United-States-to-Japan>)

Fifth, risk to potential US export of LNG may arise from concerns over the environmental impact of frac jobs, over-supply of LNG, potential carbon tax imposition, wide-scale shale gas discovery in China (and Europe) and de-linkage from JCC indexation. The US Environmental Protection Agency has proposed a new study to investigate the frac job process and determine whether drilling techniques pose a risk to drinking and underground water. A preliminary report is scheduled for release by the end of 2012, with a complete report to be published in 2014. The fast ramp-up in LNG production in Qatar and Australia has the potential to create a LNG glut in global markets. Within the next five years Australian exports are planned to exceed 50 million tpa from current levels of less than 20 million tpa, ranking it just behind Qatar. Risks to US gas exports may also arise due to the incentives being offered to the drillers by the Chinese government [18]. In case China becomes self-sufficient in unconventional gas, it would reduce imports of LNG. De-linkage of LNG prices from JCC may be detrimental to US gas export. In this regard, CERA energy executives (2011) have predicted that despite increasing influence of Western spot prices in short- to mid-term LNG contracts, longterm LNG contracts will continue to be linked to oil prices, perhaps with adjustments in the face of any ongoing gas glut. Permitting delays and any postponement in constructing the liquefaction facilities on the Gulf coast may also lead to US losing out the LNG race to Australia, Qatar and Malaysia.

#### No Export solvency – not economical

Phillips 12 (Matthew, Associate editor for Bloomberg Businessweek, “Strange Bedfellows Debate Exporting Natural Gas,” 8-22-12, <http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2012-08-22/strange-bedfellows-debate-exporting-natural-gas#p1>)

While the recent bounty of cheap natural gas helped revive U.S. manufacturing, which has added 500,000 jobs since February 2010, its broader benefits to the U.S. economy are harder to come by. There simply aren’t enough uses for cheap natural gas to make a big impact on growth or costs; not yet, at least. As a result, natural gas producers have fallen victim to their own success. They’ve drilled so much so quickly that they’ve crashed the price to below $3 per million Btu. In many cases, drilling natural gas these days is a losing proposition, which is why it’s slowed down so much. There are only 484 natural gas rigs operating in the U.S. right now, about half as many as a year earlier. An obvious remedy to this glut would be to start exporting the stuff to Asia and Europe, where prices are as much as five times higher. Easier said than done. The U.S. has virtually zero capability to do that right now. Not only would companies have to build a handful of multibillion-dollar export facilities to liquefy natural gas so it can be loaded onto ships, they first have to get the government’s approval. That’s a trickier and more fraught debate than it might seem, one that’s creating some unlikely bedfellows that cut across traditional political alliances. For starters, oilman T. Boone Pickens and the environmental group Sierra Club both oppose exporting natural gas, though for very different reasons. Pickens’s opposition is more strategic; the Sierra Club’s stance is strictly based on its environmental concerns. The group opposes “unrestricted” fracking and feels that natural gas competes with renewables like wind and solar. In a recent, scathing letter printed in USA Today, Pickens wrote that current Americans would go down as the “dumbest generation ever” if the U.S. exported its natural gas. “Why let our foreign competitors take advantage of our cheap energy?” he asked. In a phone interview last month, Pickens tried to soften his position, pointing out that he believes private natural gas producers have the right to sell in any market they want. Pickens would much rather find more domestic uses for natural gas, such as equipping cars and trucks to run on it instead of gasoline. That still qualifies him as an outlier. Most of the oil-and-gas crowd strongly supports exporting domestic natural gas to overseas markets. Lacking any huge rise in domestic demand, gas producers see exports as their primary salvation from this pit they’ve dug themselves. Users, on the other hand—such as utilities and big chemical and industrial manufacturers—would rather keep natural gas captive to the domestic market. Their fear is that by exporting it, you expose natural gas to international prices and make it more expensive domestically. Natural gas is the rare commodity with a big price disparity in different markets. Connecting those markets would bring those prices more in line with each other, or so the theory goes. A report (PDF) issued by the Energy Information Agency in January concluded that the more we export, the more domestic prices will likely rise.

#### Fracking is unsustainable – means there’s no supply to export

Dorsey 12 (Gregory, Managing Editor – Leeb’s Income Performance Letter, “Fractured Logic: The Myth of Abundant Natural Gas,” Leeb’s Market Forecast, 5-9, http://leebsmarketforecast.com/content/fractured-logic-myth-abundant-natural-gas)

A popular meme these days is the idea that natural gas is America’s salvation on the road to energy independence. Production of the clean burning fuel has reached record levels in this country and stockpiles are bursting at the seams. Natural gas prices recently dipped to their lowest level since the late 1990s below $2 before clawing their way back to $2.50. The supply glut has occurred thanks to an extraction technique known as hydraulic fracturing, or “fracking,” as it’s commonly known. In contrast to the conventional method where companies merely drill into the earth to exploit natural gas and oil deposits below the surface, fracturing entails pumping a highly pressurized mixture of water, sand and chemicals into the well. The highly pressurized cocktail opens up cracks in tight rock formations, facilitating the flow of natural gas and other hydrocarbons from the source rock. Since fracking was approved for energy production through its exemption from the 2005 Safe Drinking Water Act, its popularity has grown immensely. Fracking has allowed producers to exploit resources that were otherwise considered too difficult to access. However, we would **stop short of calling fracking a true energy revolution** for a number of reasons, just one of which we want to address today. What’s typically overlooked is the huge amount of water resources required for hydraulic fracturing. While many believe fresh water to be an abundant resource, it’s actually anything but. As we’ve pointed out in the past, natural resources tend to be inter-correlated through the energy required to extract and process them. As one resource becomes scarcer, it will affect the cost or availability of other resources as well. In the long run, we see natural gas extraction from unconventional sources as no exception. And fresh water is the key connection. The mainstream political opposition to fracking comes from the environmental concern that the chemicals injected into the ground can leak into the groundwater, contaminating an important source of drinking water. We’ll leave the environmental argument to the experts in that field, but what has become increasingly clear in our research is that the amount of fresh water required for large-scale hydraulic fracturing is massive, far surpassing any estimates put forward by the oil and gas industry today. Depending on which numbers you use, unconventional shale fracking uses between six and 50 times the amount of water as conventional gas drilling. And the bulk of that water is required up front, as opposed to being used throughout the extraction process. The higher figures come from actual operational data, while the lower estimates are just that: estimates. As a result, many of the US shale plays that have been lauded as an abundant source of clean energy may produce far less natural gas than current forecasted estimates after all costs and resource inputs are accounted for. If these unconventional shale plays require much more water than conventional wisdom expects, as we suspect they will, there will be much less gas coming on line in the future than expected. And the cost of much of the gas that may eventually be extracted will be much higher than anticipated. Either way, the result is the same, causing the natural gas market to tighten and prices to rise. So if you heat and cool your home with natural gas, enjoy the current bonanza while it lasts. The takeaway for investors, meanwhile, is not simply to pile into the energy stocks most leveraged to natural gas prices, as tempting as that may be from a contrarian perspective. Unconventional gas deposits that will require fracking now make up a large portion of total natural gas assets for many E&P companies. And while higher water requirements will drive natural gas prices northward, it will also drive up costs for unconventional producers. The result for those producers will not be pretty. We would therefore stick with conventional natural gas producers who will benefit from higher gas prices. For safety sake, companies that also have a healthy exposure to crude oil earn the highest honors.

#### **New state and federal regulations are coming now – that makes** fracking unsustainable

Plumer 12 (Brad, “How states are regulating fracking (in maps)”, 2012, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/wp/2012/07/16/how-states-are-regulating-fracking-in-maps/)

Armed with new drilling techniques, companies are spreading out across the United States, cracking open shale rock in search of vast new stores of natural gas. It’s not an exaggeration to say that hydraulic fracturing, or “fracking,” has revolutionized the U.S. energy industry. Cheap natural gas has become America’s top source for electricity, displacing coal and bringing back jobs to once-decaying states like Ohio.But the fracking boom has also led to plenty of environmental concerns. Local communities are worried that the chemicals used to pry open the shale rock can contaminate nearby drinking water supplies. (So far, there’s scant evidence this is happening in places like Pennsylvania, but the science is still in its infancy.) Excess gas is often vented off, producing air pollution. And the disposal of fracking wastewater underground appears to be linked to earthquakes in places like Ohio. Confronted with these worries, states have responded with a patchwork of different regulations. But there’s a lot of variation between different states. And here’s a good way to track what’s going on: A helpful series of new maps, put together by Resources for the Future (RFF), gives an overview of how 31 states with significant shale gas reserves are treating different aspects of fracking. Here, for instance, is a look at which states require companies to disclose the chemicals they use in drilling. (Fracking is exempt from federal disclosure rules under the Safe Water Drinking Act.) Some states, like Pennsylvania — which sits above the gas-rich Marcellus shale formation — now require a full disclosure of chemicals. By contrast, Kansas, which is just beginning to see widespread fracking activity, is further behind: Meanwhile, the map below details how different states treat the “venting” or release of excess gas into the air. Just 22 of the 31 gas states have restrictions on this process, which can release both heat-trapping methane into the atmosphere as well as “volatile organic compounds” such as benzene that can produce smog and trigger health problems. Some states ban this practice entirely; others restrict it to emergencies or require that operators not harm public health: There are many more maps on RFF’s Web site, which is worth poking around on. In an introductory essay, RFF’s Nathan Richardson notes that these maps still provide just a partial picture — the details of laws matter, and more importantly, different states may enforce their rules with different levels of vigor. But it’s an invaluable resource all the same. The regulation of fracking has become a low-level campaign issue, as well. The Obama administration is gradually putting forward federal regulations. The Department of Interior is drafting rules for fracking on publicly-owned lands (where about 38 percent of the country’s gas reserves sit, according to the American Petroleum Institute). The Environmental Protection Agency, meanwhile, is slowly getting in on regulation and has proposed rules that will require all producers to phase out venting by 2015 and capture their waste methane instead. Mitt Romney, by contrast, has criticized the federal approach. In his “Believe in America” economic plan (pdf), he warns that the EPA should not “pursue overly aggressive interventions designed to discourage fracking altogether.” By contrast, Romney praises states for having “carefully and effectively regulated the process for decades.” Indeed, many Republicans believe that fracking regulations should be mainly left to the states, which can issue rules more speedily and can tailor regulations to the specific needs of their communities. Environmentalists, by contrast, worry that this will create a race to the bottom whereby states pare back their rules — or enforce them weakly — in order to compete for business. Both sides agree that addressing the public health and environmental aspects of fracking isn’t costless. The International Energy Agency recently estimated that addressing all of the various concerns could boost the price of natural gas by roughly 7 percent. Yet the IEA also warned that if these rules weren’t adopted, public outcry and protests could stop the shale gas boom altogether. Anti-fracking protests like those in New York state could become the norm. And that, the IEA notes, could prove even more costly to the gas industry

#### -- 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.

#### -- 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.

#### No REM internal – No embargo, market work-arounds

Tamny 12 (John Tamny, Forbes Staff, China's "Rare Earths", and the Hypocrisy of the Obama Administration, 3-25-12, http://www.forbes.com/sites/johntamny/2012/03/25/chinas-rare-earths-and-the-hyprocrisy-of-the-obama-administration/2/)

The above is important considering what Sternberg also alerted readers to in his recent Journal op-ed. Sternberg observed that Beijing doesn’t have much control over rare-earths producers in China, and to prove his point he noted that roughly 40% of exports to Japan “weren’t registered with Chinese customs authorities.” Translated, rare earths from China are one way or the other exiting the country, and once they do we, along with everyone else, have access to them at whatever the prevailing market price may be. Just as every oil producing country on earth could “embargo” the U.S. with zero impact on our access to their oil (we’d simply buy it from those they’re not embargoing), so long as rare earths are exiting China, U.S. producers will be able to purchase them in the marketplace in the same way they buy other commodities. Barring a decision by Beijing that forces Chinese producers to hoard rare earths, we’ll be able to buy them. All this raises a question centering on what if the Chinese government chooses to do the unlikely, and restricts all rare earths exports? If so, it’s none of our business. Just as we wouldn’t want the Chinese demanding from us “American oil”, we shouldn’t presume to tell them what to sell to American producers. Of course the scenario just mentioned is as mentioned, highly unlikely. For one, it’s hard to imagine that a still desperately poor country would turn its back on the dollars it would gain if it were to hoard commodities heavily demanded by market participants. Second, markets have for centuries proven expert at working around shortages of most anything. Assuming the Chinese choose to halt or severely restrict rare earths exports, it’s a fair bet that alternatives will soon find their way to those in need.

#### US has exported LNG to Japan for the last 43 years – still going on

Rosen 12 (Yereth, Reuters, “ConocoPhillips restarts LNG exports from Alaska,” 6-14-12,

http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/14/us-conoco-lng-idUSBRE85D06C20120614)

ConocoPhillips (COP.N) has resumed shipments of liquefied natural gas (LNG) from its Alaska plant, an aged facility that was previously targeted for closure, a company spokeswoman said Wednesday. The company sent a shipment of LNG last month to Japan, spokeswoman Natalie Lowman said. ConocoPhillips expects to deliver four or five cargoes of Alaska LNG this year, all of them to Japan, Lowman said. However, she said she could not disclose the customer. The plant, in the Kenai Peninsula community of Nikiski, is the only LNG export facility in the United States. It began operations in 1969, supplying LNG to Tokyo Gas and Tokyo Electric for most of its operating life.

#### No Asian War –

#### A) Economics

Eskildsen 9 (Robert, Assistant Professor of Japanese History – Smith College “Whither East Asia? Reflections on Japan’s Colonial Experience in Taiwan”, The Asia-Pacific Journal, 3-22, http://japanfocus.org/-Robert-Eskildsen/2058)

The Meiji Restoration gave Japan the flexibility to pursue changes in the diplomatic status quo in East Asia, but the changes carried with them enormous risks. Domestically, Japan implemented radical institutional changes in order to conform more closely to Western norms, but doing so alienated important constituencies—farmers and samurai—and ultimately provoked armed rebellion. In foreign relations, Japan set out to learn the norms of Western diplomacy and use them to clarify a number of border relationships: with Russia in the north, Korea in the west, and China in the south—through a complex intermediate zone that included the Ryukyu archipelago and Taiwan. The process of redefining Japan’s borders in the west and south proved particularly troublesome and embroiled Japan in a sustained challenge to China’s diplomatic supremacy in East Asia that involved gunboat diplomacy, diplomatic coercion and armed conflict. Although it involved no clash with Chinese forces, the Taiwan Expedition was the earliest of these armed conflicts.Fast forward to the present, and we see that some of the issues that clouded the future of East Asia in the second half of the nineteenth century have contemporary analogues, although the geopolitical context has changed dramatically in the last 150 years. The biggest difference in the geopolitical context, of course, is that all the states in the region, with the possible exception of North Korea, are committed to operating within the international system and they have developed a measure of economic interdependence. These factors will mitigate the possibility of armed conflict in the future. On the other hand, nationalism, the legacies of Japanese imperialism, World War II and the Cold War, and China’s growing economic stature already exacerbate diplomatic conflicts, and they undoubtedly will continue to do so for many years to come. Against this geopolitical backdrop, three contemporary strategic conflicts stand out as particularly troublesome.

### LNG

#### -- No attacks – terrorists are weak

Mueller 9 (John, Professor of Political Science – Ohio State University and Contributor – Foreign Affairs, “How Dangerous Are the Taliban?”, Foreign Affairs, April / May, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/64932/john-mueller/how-dangerous-are-the-taliban)

In addition, al Qaeda has yet to establish a significant presence in the United States. In 2002, U.S. intelligence reports asserted that the number of trained al Qaeda operatives in the United States was between 2,000 and 5,000, and FBI Director Robert Mueller assured a Senate committee that al Qaeda had "developed a support infrastructure" in the country and achieved both "the ability and the intent to inflict significant casualties in the U.S. with little warning." However, after years of well funded sleuthing, the FBI and other investigative agencies have been unable to uncover a single true al Qaeda sleeper cell or operative within the country. Mueller's rallying cry has now been reduced to a comparatively bland formulation: "We believe al Qaeda is still seeking to infiltrate operatives into the U.S. from overseas." Even that may not be true. Since 9/11, some two million foreigners have been admitted to the United States legally and many others, of course, have entered illegally. Even if border security has been so effective that 90 percent of al Qaeda’s operatives have been turned away or deterred from entering the United States, some should have made it in -- and some of those, it seems reasonable to suggest, would have been picked up by law enforcement by now. The lack of attacks inside the United States combined with the inability of the FBI to find any potential attackers suggests that the terrorists are either not trying very hard or are **far less clever and capable** than usually depicted. Policymakers and the public at large should keep in mind the words of Glenn Carle, a 23 year veteran of the CIA who served as deputy national intelligence officer for transnational threats: "We must see jihadists for the small, lethal, disjointed and miserable opponents that they are." Al Qaeda "has only a handful of individuals capable of planning, organizing and leading a terrorist operation," Carle notes, and "its capabilities are far inferior to its desires."

#### -- No nuclear terrorism – acquisition impossible – prefer recent evidence

Krepon 9 (Michael, Co-Founder – Henry L. Stimson Center and Diplomat Scholar – University of Virginia, “The Mushroom Cloud That Wasn’t”, Foreign Affairs, May / June, Lexis)

At the height of the Cold War, almost no one was bold enough or foolish enough to predict the Soviet Union's collapse, let alone without the eruption of a nuclear exchange between the two superpowers. One of the few who prophesied its demise, George Kennan, was deeply worried about a nuclear cataclysm. Kennan, a former U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union and the father of containment policy, warned repeatedly that unwise U.S. nuclear policies could lead to Armageddon. The Cold War is now history, but warnings of an impending nuclear catastrophe are still very much alive. Anxieties today stem not from the threat of a surprise Soviet missile attack but from the fear of Iran, North Korea, Pakistan, and terrorist groups seeking to carry out catastrophic attacks against soft targets in the United States. And yet, not a single death has occurred as a result of nuclear terrorism. Since 9/11, there have been more than 36,000 terrorist attacks, resulting in approximately 57,000 fatalities and 99,000 casualties. A terrible, mass-casualty attack using nuclear or biological weapons could occur at any time, and much more can be done to keep the United States safe. As the attacks that have occurred have repeatedly demonstrated, terrorists do not need weapons of mass destruction (WMD) to cause grievous harm; they can do so using hijacked airplanes, fertilizer, automatic weapons, and grenades. But the situation is far from bleak. It is not easy for terrorist groups to acquire the skills and materials necessary to construct a nuclear weapon. Meanwhile, Washington and Moscow have reduced their nuclear arsenals by 34,000 weapons over the past two decades, nuclear testing is now rare, the list of countries with worrisome nuclear programs is very short by historical standards, and the permanent members of the UN Security Council now have less to fight about -- and more reasons to cooperate in preventing worst-case scenarios from occurring -- than ever before.

#### -- Chemical industry demand declining despite supply increases

Fulp 11 (Mickey, Certified Professional Geologist with a B.Sc. Earth Sciences with honor from the University of Tulsa, and M.Sc. Geology from the University of New Mexico, “What's Up (or Down) with the Nat Gas Market?,” 7-12-11, The Energy Report, <http://www.theenergyreport.com/pub/na/10247>)

Domestic demand for natural gas comes from four general uses: Residential and commercial: 22%; space heating and cooking. Industrial: 38%; fuel for the pulp and paper, metal, chemical, petroleum refining and food-processing industries; feedstock for plastic, chemical and fertilizer production. These uses are projected to decline as the economy moves toward less energy-intensive manufacturing processes.

#### -- Chemical industry doesn’t solve sustainability

Elkington 12 (John, executive chairman of Volans and non-executive director at SustainAbility. “Chemical industry isn't doing enough to embrace sustainability,” 9-12-12, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/sustainable-business/sustainability-with-john-elkington/chemical-industry-embrace-sustainability-environment?newsfeed=true>)

One speaker showed a slide headed 'Sustainability is …', spotlighting Shin-Etsu, a Japanese chemical company that suffered a major explosion. Instead of clamming up, as Japanese corporate leaders are wont to do, the CEO took a voluntary pay-cut and went out to apologise to the local community. Apologising to people when you have accidentally blown them up makes sense, most of the time, but in the context of the global challenges we face I struggle to see this as a definitive (indeed, even a legitimate) case of sustainability in practice. Then another speaker, this time from ExxonMobil Chemical, asserted that – based on the latest life-cycle assessment data – shopping bags made out of high density polyethylene (HDPE) are the sustainable option. Paper bags, he insisted, should be dropped because of the energy and water consumption involved. Ah. When the discussion period came, I asked whether the data had taken into account the great swirling gyres of plastic debris that now scar large areas of the world ocean? No, he admitted. For such people, as a speaker from BASF assured us, sustainability means we "are on a journey". Like many others, this German company has talked to a considerable number of stakeholders (350, by their reckoning) and boiled it all down to a shortlist of issues (just 40 of those). The main conclusion seems to be that we must all create more shared value while, simultaneously, shrinking our environmental footprints. Good, but by how much? That's a question that the sector finds it hard to answer, except in areas where there is a legal requirement that the use of particular chemicals be driven to zero, like hexavalent chromium. And, while most participants intensely dislike the idea of further regulation, there were those – including Peter Kunze of the European Automobile Manufacturers Association – who argued for much clearer signals on which chemicals would be banned ultimately, coupled with "smart legislation" to ensure that the process of conversion didn't undermine industrial or regional competitiveness. It was intriguing to see successive speakers through the lenses of vested interests. A panel of four speakers, for example, agreed that renewable feedstocks were very unlikely to make much of an impression on the industry in the next decade or two. Then a colleague from another chemical company whispered in my ear that three of the four companies were backwards-integrated into the oil sector, effectively making them fossil fuel junkies. Hardly surprising, then, that they find it hard to imagine – or at least publicly admit the possibility of – a radically different future. Behind the scenes people spoke quietly of lobbying that is underway by parts of the industry: in the US, for example, chemical companies are fighting tooth-and-nail to ensure suspect chemicals and products like formaldehyde and styrene continue to be allowed in LEED-certified buildings. On the upside, Nicholas Denis of McKinsey & Co reported results of their recent market survey showing that green products are now seen much more positively by both consumers and industry executives, with between 82 and 93% of both categories saying they want to go greener, even though "the road to green chemicals is harder than we thought initially" and the notion of a "green premium is still a Holy Grail for most companies." Procter & Gamble promptly disagreed, to a degree, noting that their efforts to promote greener products like compact detergents had been stymied by the unwillingness of most consumers to change to seemingly smaller products at the same price-point. So the detergent industry went to government, asked for permission to avoid anti-trust rules, and moved as a group of companies to strip non-compact products from the shelves. "I would love it if consumers wanted greener products, mused P&G's Peter Kunze, "because we would then have a business model!"

#### -- No impact to environmental destruction ---

**Easterbrook 95** (Gregg, Distinguished Fellow – Fullbright Foundation, A Moment on Earth, p. 25)

In the aftermath of events such as Love Canal or the Exxon Valdez oil spill, every reference to the environment is prefaced with the adjective "fragile." "Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. **The environment** that contains them **is** close to **indestructible**. The living environment of Earth has survived ice ages; bombardments of cosmic radiation more deadly than atomic fallout; solar radiation more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion; thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global air pollution far worse than that made by any factory; reversals of the planet's magnetic poles; the rearrangement of continents; transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream; 300-foot vacillations in sea levels; shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by shifts in the planetary axis; collisions of asteroids and comets bearing far more force than man's nuclear arsenals; and the years without summer that followed these impacts. Yet hearts beat on, and petals unfold still. Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of the industrial affronts of the dreaming ape. **Human assaults** on the environment, though mischievous, **are** **pinpricks** compared to forces of the magnitude nature is **accustomed to resisting**.

**-- Russia will remain dominant in the European market**

**Ryan 12** (Margaret, US Gas Regulation columnist at Interfax, Natural Gas Daily; Partner at Dynamic Risk LLC, “Oil-linked Natural Gas Pricing Under Continued Pressure in Europe,” 8-28-12, <http://energy.aol.com/2012/08/28/oil-linked-natural-gas-pricing-under-continued-pressure-in-europ/?icid=apb2#page2>)

Europe is supplied by a combination of North Sea gas, where fields are in decline; pipeline gas from Russia; and LNG from Africa and the Middle East. Natural gas has long been priced on a basket of refined products, which usually rise or fall with the price of crude oil. Recent high crude prices have pushed natural gas prices unusually high, and major distributors who can't pass on the prices are losing significant money, said Howard Rogers, Senior Research Fellow, Oxford Institute for Energy Studies. That's led to customer rebellion, just as the recession has sapped gas and electricity demand. "Germany is the combat zone,"said James Jensen of Jensen Associates, with powerful utilities E.On and RWE wrestling down gas contracts with Russia's Gazprom. "Russia is trying to hold the line on the oil linkage," Jensen said, but is having to accept some concessions, as is Norway's Statoil which markets North Sea gas. Jensen said northern Europe is moving to competitive hub pricing, and southern Europe may follow. Bros said 58% of natural gas was still oil-indexed in OECD Europe in 2011, but he expects that by 2014, less than 50% will be, increasing pressure to shift all trading to indexation on hub market prices. "Confidence in the hubs is improving," said Rogers, pointing to growing liquidity at the UK's National Balancing Point and the Dutch TTF hubs. A major unknown for potential US LNG exports is Russia's response, said Rogers. Even with a change in pricing basis, Russia will **remain dominant**, supplying a quarter of Europe's gas. Russia could choose to **dump gas** in Europe and **undercut the LNG market**, depressing prices when US supplies arrive, said Rogers, or it could cut back deliveries and try to prop up its price. Bros warned that gas consumption in the last couple of years has been consistently below previous usage, with Gazprom holding 11 billion cubic meters of gas that customers contracted for but on which they couldn't take delivery. Bros said demand looks likely to stay low, since the big growth in natural gas use in the past decade, and the biggest contractions now, are in Greece, Portugal, Spain and Italy, the nations worst hit by the ongoing economic crisis.

**-- Expansion inevitable – Russian geography**

**Stratfor 8** (“The Russian Resurgence and the New-Old Front”, 9-15,

http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/20080915\_russian\_resurgence\_and\_new\_old\_front)

Russia is attempting to reforge its Cold War-era influence in its near abroad. This is not simply an issue of nostalgia, but a perfectly logical and predictable reaction to the Russian environment. Russia lacks easily definable, easily defendable borders. There is no redoubt to which the Russians can withdraw, and the only security they know comes from establishing buffers — buffers which tend to be lost in times of crisis. The alternative is for Russia to simply trust other states to leave it alone. Considering Russia’s history of occupations, from the Mongol horde to Napoleonic France to Hitler’s Germany, it is not difficult to surmise why the Russians tend to choose a more activist set of policies.

## 2NC vs GMU KL

### Precision

#### Precise definitions are a prerequisite to effective policymaking.

Hosseus and Pal 97 (Daniel Hosseus, School of Public Administration at Carleton University, & Leslie A. Pal, Professor of Public Policy and Administration at Carleton University, Canadian Public Policy, Volume 23, Number 4, “Anatomy of a Policy Area: The Case of Shipping,” p. 399-400)

Do policy analysts really know what they are talking about? For example, how do we know the difference between transportation policy and agricultural policy, or between environmental policy and social policy? Pigeon-holing is probably one of the most fundamental aspects of any policy analysis, and yet also one of the least examined. Policy analysis and policy development clearly cannot occur without some implicit boundaries and categories that define a policy field. Wildavsky thought of “public policies as divided into sectors” and used a spatial metaphor to argue that these sectors could be “densely rather than lightly packed” (1979, p. 64). In practice, while there may be deductive principles that help define a policy field (e.g., transportation policy self-evidently is about moving people and things through space), most analysts rely on conventional understandings of core legislation and instruments (e.g., transportation policy is largely defined by legislation with the word transportation in it). When policy fields are stable or “lightly packed,” this conventional approach works reasonably well. As turbulence increases and as fields get more crowded and overlapped, however, the need for precision and more systematic definitions increases. Major changes in policy can have “second- and third-order consequences that impair or change institutions, patterns, and arrangements” in unanticipated ways (Dror 1971, p. 65). Policies are intimately linked: changing one will often affect another. To understand what we are doing, we need in the first instance to know with what we are working. Taking Wildavsky’s metaphor a step further, we need to inventory the existing “policy space.” For example, the Canadian government has recently begun a review of the Canada Shipping Act. The century-old act is archaic in structure and content, yet constitutes the core of the current policy framework for Canada’s shipping industry. Over the years, the Shipping Act has spawned a plethora of regulations and guidelines, and is referenced by other laws. Any overhaul of the Canada Shipping Act will have ramifications for all these laws, regulations, and guidelines. A systematic, comprehensive, and empirical inventory of the policy space would seem to be a useful prerequisite for an overhaul of core legislation such as the Canada Shipping Act. Moreover, a generic inventory methodology could be applied across policy fields in any single jurisdiction, and across the same policy field in different jurisdictions, to allow more precise comparisons of policy profiles. A careful inventory of a policy space should make for better policy analysis, policy making, and policy management, as well as a better general understanding of a policy area.

### A2: Counter-interpretation – Expands Gas Market

Limits

Ground

Effects T

#### Explodes limits biatch

Schuck 84 (Peter H., Professor of Law – Yale Law School, “Article: When the Exception Becomes the Rule: Regulatory Equity and the Formulation of Energy Policy through an Exceptions Process,” Duke Law Journal, April, 1984 Duke L.J. 163, Lexis)

A. The Petroleum Industry and Federal Regulation. n97

Since the first oil wells were drilled at Titusville, Pennsylvania in 1859, the American oil industry has become the most complex in the world, an extraordinarily intricate network of companies and activities linking crude oil sources and consumer markets, both foreign and domestic. Industry activities fall into four general categories: production (exploration for and removal of crude oil from natural formations); refining (the manufacture of crude into gasoline, motor oil, heating oil, petrochemicals, and other intermediate and end-use products); distribution (physical transportation, storage, handling, and delivery of petroleum [\*201] products); and marketing (sales of approximately 500 refined products to wholesale and retail customers). n98

Different segments of the industry combine the four basic activities in various ways. Approximately fifteen to twenty large, usually multinational companies integrate all four operations. This group (Exxon, Gulf, Texaco, and others -- "the majors" in industry parlance) dominates the industry. In September 1981, for example, the fifteen largest integrated refiners processed nearly 70 percent of all motor gasoline and approximately 55 percent of middle distillates -- a decline in both categories from 1972 but still accounting for the majority of refinery production. Independent refiners, which produce little or none of the crude they refine, processed the remainder. Independent refiners range from small firms, with capacities as low as 10,000 barrels per day (BPD), to large independents, like Ashland Oil, with a capacity as high as 400,000 BPD, rivaling the integrated companies' capacities. Geographically, refiners tend to cluster near port facilities, major markets, or large domestic oil fields. n99 In less densely populated regions, such as the Midwest and Rocky Mountain states, small and independent refiners often process a relatively large proportion of total product.

### Financial Incentives

#### “Financial incentives” require disbursement of public funds – excludes indirect incentives and non-financial incentives

Webb 93 (Dr. Kernaghan, Associate Professor of Law and Business – Ryerson University's Ted Rogers School of Management, Adjunct Research Professor – School of Public Policy and Administration and Department of Law –Carleton University, “Thumbs, Fingers, and Pushing on String: Legal Accountability in the Use of Federal Financial Incentives,” Alta Law Review, 31 Alta L. Rev 501-535, Hein Online, p.505-6)

In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean disbursements\*\* of public funds or contingent commitments to individuals and organizations, intended to encourage, support or induce certain behaviours in accordance with express public policy objectives. They take the form of grants, contributions, repayable contributions, loans, loan guarantees and insurance, subsidies, procurement contracts and tax expenditures."' Needless to say, the ability of government to achieve desired behaviour may vary with the type of incentive in use: up-front disbursements of funds (such as with contributions and procurement contracts) may put government in a better position to dictate the terms upon which assistance is provided than contingent disbursements such as loan guarantees and insurance. In some cases, the incentive aspects of the funding come from the conditions attached to use of the monies."' In others, the mere existence of a program providing financial assistance for a particular activity (eg. low interest loans for a nuclear power plant, or a pulp mill) may be taken as government approval of that activity, and in that sense, an incentive to encourage that type of activity has been created.2' Given the wide variety of incentive types, it will not be possible in a paper of this length to provide anything more than a cursory discussion of some of the main incentives used.2- And, needless to say, the comments made herein concerning accountability apply to differing degrees depending upon the type of incentive under consideration. By limiting the definition of financial incentives to initiatives where public funds are either disbursed or contingently committed, a large number of regulatory programs with incentive effects which exist, but in which no money is forthcoming,3 are excluded from direct examination in this paper. Such programs might be referred to as indirect incentives. Through elimination of indirect incentives from the scope of discussion, the definition of the incentive instrument becomes both more manageable and more particular. Nevertheless, it is possible that much of the approach taken here may be usefully applied to these types of indirect incentives as well.24 Also excluded from discussion here are social assistance programs such as welfare and ad hoc industry bailout initiatives because such programs are not designed primarily to encourage behaviours in furtherance of specific public policy objectives. In effect, these programs are assistance, but they are not incentives.

[\*\*Continues to footnote]

The word "disbursement." while admittedly lacking in elegance, is used to convey the wide spectrum of ways in which public funds can be conveyed, from loans to loan guarantees, grants, contributions, allowances, deductions and so on.

#### Interpretation – “financial incentives” are funding for investors to develop a project – that excludes nonfinancial incentives like procurement

**Czinkota et al, 9 -** Associate Professor at the McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University (Michael, Fundamentals of International Business, p. 69 – google books)

Incentives offered by policymakers to facilitate foreign investments are mainly of three types: fiscal, financial, and nonfinancial. **Fiscal incentives** are specific tax measures designed to attract foreign investors. They typically consist of special depreciation allowances, tax credits or rebates, special deductions for capital expenditures, tax holidays, and the reduction of tax burdens. **Financial incentives** offer special funding for the investor by providing, for example, land or buildings, loans, and loan guarantees. **Nonfinancial incentives** include guaranteed government purchases; special protection from competition through tariffs, import quotas, and local content requirements, and investments in infrastructure facilities.

### For

#### “For” is exclusive

**Clegg 95** (Roger, JD – Yale Law School and Vice President and General Counsel – National Legal Center for the Public Interest, “Reclaiming the Text of the Takings Clause”, 46 S.C. L. Rev. 531, Summer, Lexis)

Even if it made no sense to limit the clause to takings "for public use"--and, as discussed below, it might make very good sense--that is the way the clause reads. It is not at all ambiguous. The prepositional phrase simply cannot be read as broadening rather than narrowing the clause's scope. Indeed, a prepositional phrase beginning with "for" appears twice more in the Fifth Amendment, and in both cases there is no doubt that the phrase is narrowing the scope of the Amendment. n20

#### -- Even if “for” isn’t exclusive – it still must, at a minimum, contain a direct relation to the object

**Words and Phrases 4** (Permanent Edition, “For,” Volume 17, p. 338-343, November, Thomson West)

W.D.Tenn. 1942. The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 uses the words “production for commerce” as denoting an intention to deal in a restricted way with question of coverage in connection with those employed directly in production of articles to be sold, shipped or transported across state lines in commerce, producing goods “for” a certain purpose implying a direct relation as distinguished from producing something which only “affects” a certain purpose which implies an indirect relation.

### restrict

#### That excludes financial barriers

Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison 99 (LLP, “V. LAW FIRMS AND ASSOCIATIONS,” *CALIFORNIA LEGAL ETHICS*, http://www.law.cornell.edu/ethics/ca/narr/CA\_NARR\_5.HTM)

Addressing the scope of the term "restrict" in CRPC 1-500, the California Supreme Court held that, while an outright prohibition of future representation would violate CRPC 1-500, "[a]n agreement that assesses a reasonable cost against a partner who chooses to compete with his or her former partners does not restrict" a lawyer from practicing law in the sense contemplated by CRPC 1-500 because (i) a reasonable cost assessed against a departing lawyer would not discourage the lawyer from representing those clients who wished to continue using his or her services, and (ii) "[t]he traditional view of the law firm as a stable institution with an assured future is now challenged by an awareness that even the largest and most prestigious firms are fragile economic units" that require compensation from a departing partner in order to maintain stability. Howard v. Babcock (1993) 6 Cal.4th 409, 420, 424, 25 Cal.Rptr.2d 80, 863 P.2d 150. Rather, a reasonable cost merely "attaches an economic consequence to a departing partner's unrestricted choice to pursue a particular kind of practice." Howard v. Babcock (1993) 6 Cal.4th 409, 419, 25 Cal.Rptr.2d 80, 863 P.2d 150; L.A. Op. 1995-450 (partnership agreement that imposes only reasonable costs on a departing partner is enforceable).

### Case

#### Price differential not competitive

Helman 12 (Christopher, Southwest Bureau Chief – Forbes, “The U.S. Has A Natural Gas Glut; Why Exporting It As LNG Is A Good Idea,” Forbes, 6-13, http://www.forbes.com/sites/energysource/2012/06/13/the-u-s-has-a-natural-gas-glut-why-exporting-it-as-lng-is-a-good-idea/)

LNG exports will help to provide better balance between supply and demand in the market, dampening price volatility in North America, and providing circumstances in which industrial gas investments and feedstock natural gas purchases can be made with greater confidence in long-term natural gas pricing. As recently as 2007, North America was looking at a significant gas shortage and more than sixty LNG import projects were proposed. Just five years later, the implementation of horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing has led North America to a sizable excess of gas supply. The latest figures from the U.S. Energy Information Agency (EIA) indicate that natural gas supply could exceed demand by 2016, enabling North America to become a net exporter of LNG. The rapid increase in natural gas production has had a substantial impact on gas pricing in North America. While gas prices in North America are not directly correlated to oil prices, up until late 2008, natural gas prices generally matched oil price trends. Since the increase in shale gas production was first identified in Navigant’s groundbreaking North American Natural Gas Supply Assessment in 2008, natural gas prices have headed downwards from $5.00 per million British thermal units (mmBtu) to approximately $2.50 per mmBtu in May 2012. However, although natural gas prices decreased, crude oil prices increased during the same period. While the EIA indicates that long term North American natural gas prices will rise to $4.00 to $6.00 per mmBtu, natural gas will continue to trade at a sizable discount to oil on an energy equivalent basis. Unlike crude oil, there is not yet a large tradable global market for natural gas and consequently, prices vary across the world. In Asia, prices for major LNG importers closely correlate to oil prices, and LNG is currently priced over $17.00 per mmBtu. In Europe, prices are lower at $12.00 to $14.00 per mmBtu. For North American producers to benefit from higher global prices they must successfully construct costly and complex LNG facilities and related infrastructure costing billions of dollars. Assuming a long-term North American natural gas price of $4.00 to $6.00 per mmBtu, liquefaction and shipping costs will add approximately $4.00 per mmBtu. This offers an attractive $3.00 to $5.00 per mmBtu arbitrage opportunity to the $13.00 per mmBtu price currently achievable at Europe’s LNG terminals. The real prize, however, would be realizing LNG exports to Asia. While shipping costs would be higher (due to the much greater distance to Asia than to Europe), the current Asian LNG price of $17 per mmBtu provides the prospect of a much greater arbitrage opportunity. What are the risks to the current export strategy? Shale gas production has increased rapidly, offsetting a steady decline in conventional gas production across North America. While more natural gas can be produced from what is largely agreed upon as an “abundant gas resource,” the pace of future development is subject to factors such as changing environmental legislation. Competition for the Asian markets, notably from the large number of Australian-based LNG projects in development, is expected to be fierce. LNG project costs are on the increase, due in part to the considerable number of projects seeking to be developed in a short period of time. Finally, shale gas resources are not exclusive to North America. Europe and Asia both have significant shale gas potential; however, the pace at which shale gas resources will be developed in these regions has yet to become clear.

hydraulic fracturing and at the same time preserve the environment. It cannot be a choice of one or the other.”

### Environment – General

#### -- Environment is resilient

Easterbrook 95 (Gregg, Distinguished Fellow – Fullbright Foundation, A Moment on Earth, p. 25)

In the aftermath of events such as Love Canal or the Exxon Valdez oil spill, every reference to the environment is prefaced with the adjective "fragile." "Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. The environment that contains them is close to indestructible. The living environment of Earth has survived ice ages; bombardments of cosmic radiation more deadly than atomic fallout; solar radiation more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion; thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global air pollution far worse than that made by any factory; reversals of the planet's magnetic poles; the rearrangement of continents; transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream; 300-foot vacillations in sea levels; shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by shifts in the planetary axis; collisions of asteroids and comets bearing far more force than man's nuclear arsenals; and the years without summer that followed these impacts. Yet hearts beat on, and petals unfold still. Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of the industrial affronts of the dreaming ape. Human assaults on the environment, though mischievous, are pinpricks compared to forces of the magnitude nature is accustomed to resisting.

#### -- Long time-frame

Kay 1 (Jane, “Study Takes Historical Peek at Plight of Ocean Ecosystems”, San Francisco Chronicle, 7-26, Lexis)

The collapse of ecosystems often occur over a long period. In one example, when Aleut hunters killed the Alaskan sea otter about 2,500 years ago, the population of their natural prey, the sea urchin, grew larger than its normal size. In turn, the urchins grazed down the kelp forests, important habitat for a whole host of ocean life. Then, when fur traders in the 1800s hunted the otters and sea cows almost to extinction, the kelp forests disappeared and didn't start to regenerate until the federal government protected the sea otters in the 20th century. In California, the diversity of spiny lobsters, sheephead fish and abalone kept down the urchin numbers. At present in Alaska, the kelp beds are declining again in areas where killer whales are preying on sea otters. Biologists think the killer whales switched to otters for food because there are fewer seals and sea lions to eat.

#### -- Environment strong and improving – their authors lie

Dutton 1 (Dr. Dennis, Professor of Philosophy – University of Canterbury (New Zealand), “Greener Than You Think”, The Washington Post, 10-21, http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&node=& contentId=A12789-2001Oct18)

That the human race faces environmental problems is unquestionable. That environmental experts have regularly tried to scare us out of our wits with doomsday chants is also beyond dispute. In the 1960s overpopulation was going to cause massive worldwide famine around 1980. A decade later we were being told the world would be out of oil by the 1990s. This was an especially chilly prospect, since, as Newsweek reported in 1975, we were in a climatic cooling trend that was going to reduce agricultural outputs for the rest of the century, leading possibly to a new Ice Age. Bjorn Lomborg, a young statistics professor and political scientist at the University of Aarhus in Denmark, knows all about the enduring appeal -- for journalists, politicians and the public -- of environmental doomsday tales, having swallowed more than a few himself. In 1997, Lomborg -- a self-described left-winger and former Greenpeace member -- came across an article in Wired magazine about Julian Simon, a University of Maryland economist. Simon claimed that the "litany" of the Green movement -- its fears about overpopulation, animal species dying by the hour, deforestation -- was hysterical nonsense, and that the quality of life on the planet was radically improving. Lomborg was shocked by this, and he returned to Denmark to set about doing the research that would refute Simon. He and his team of academicians discovered something sobering and cheering: In every one of his claims, Simon was correct. Moreover, Lomborg found on close analysis that the factual foundation on which the environmental doomsayers stood was deeply flawed: exaggeration, prevarications, white lies and even convenient typographical errors had been absorbed unchallenged into the folklore of environmental disaster scenarios.

## 1NR vs GMU KL

### Impact – 2NC

#### DA outweighs – No impact defense means any risk of the DA should be preferred – they have conceded consequentialism – that extinction comes first – means if we win an extinction impact you vote neg

#### It’s the only existential threat

**Bostrum**, March **2002** (Nick – prof of philosophy at Oxford University and recipient of the Gannon Award, Existential Risks, Journal of Evolution and Technology, p. http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)

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] 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.

#### Faster – regional tensions can quickly escalate. Obama is fixing the relations issues right now

#### 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.

#### Turns trade – nuclear war means we would draw back US exports to protect domestic concerns and wouldn’t trade with other countries – turns that advantage

#### Turns their LNG advantage – creates cooperation with Russia so they don’t become aggressive.

### U – 2NC

#### Obama will win the election --- a consensus of polls and the Five Thirty Eight forecast prove. That’s the 1NC Silver 9/20 evidence. Prefer our evidence because it’s predictive and cites multiple battleground polls that Obama has pulled ahead in.

#### Obama is winning --- momentum

**Blake**, **9/20**/2012 (Aaron, Is the 2012 election tilting toward Democrats?, The Washington Post, p. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2012/09/20/is-the-2012-election-tilting-toward-democrats/>)

Either we’re at a turning point in the 2012 election, or a lot of pollsters are getting it wrong. The question for the past week-plus has been whether President Obama’s convention bounce and a series of stumbles for Mitt Romney have recast the 2012 race. Some national polls say yes, and a few say no. But more and more, the data at the state level point to some real movement in Democrats’ favor. At least for now. As we wrote Tuesday, Gallup polling shows that the bump Obama got from the Democratic convention two weeks ago has subsided. And another new poll, released Wednesday by the Associated Press and pollster GfK, shows basically the same picture, with 47 percent of likely voters supporting Obama and 46 percent backing Romney — a tie ballgame nationally. But almost every state-specific poll in the last few days has shown progress for Democrats — both at the presidential level and in the very important contest for the Senate — with some showing unprecedented leads for the blue side in the the most important states. Swing-state polls from CBS News, the New York Times and Quinnipiac University released Wednesday morning in three key states — Colorado, Virginia and Wisconsin — showed Obama either gaining since last month or, in the case of Virginia, holding his lead. And Fox News polls released Wednesday evening showed Obama with a solid lead in the three biggest swing states; he’s up by seven points each in Ohio and Virginia and five points in Florida. The results confirm polls from NBC News and Marist College in the same three states last week. A Washington Post poll released Tuesday confirms the movement in Virginia, with Obama up by an unprecedented eight points. And a Marquette University Law School poll released Wednesday supports the idea that the race in Wisconsin has shifted, with Obama leading by an astounding 14 points. Even if some of these margins seem a little big, just consider that even the best polls for Romney haven’t shown him with that kind of lead in these states — or really anything close to it. In fact, Nate Silver points out that, of the 16 live-interview swing state polls conducted in the last two weeks, Obama is leading in all of them except Colorado by at least four points.

#### Obama will win --- increased approval rating and swing states.

**Lombardo**, **9/20**/2012 (Steve – Global CEO of Edelman Berland, Election Monitor: 47 Days to Go and the Pendulum Has Swung Toward Obama, The Huffington Post, p. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steve-lombardo/election-monitor-47-days_b_1900540.html>)

We can talk about 47 percent, the Libya stumbles, the lack of message discipline and a weak convention, but the simple fact is that the president and his team have had a better strategy than Team Romney from Day 1 and they have executed it to perfection. The result? Governor Romney has a damaged political persona and he's running behind the President in key states like Ohio, Virginia and -- to a lesser extent -- Florida. Losses in those three guarantee an Obama victory. With 47 days to go, the president has reversed his decline after his "you didn't build that" comment, is on a three week message win roll and is now likely to be reelected. How did we get here? As usual, it hasn't been just one thing; instead, the cumulative impact of a series of external events and strategic and tactical moves by each team has resulted in a significant competitive advantage for the president. In no particular order, here is our take on the most important of those events: 1. Romney entered the general election as a damaged and flawed candidate. Yes, this has happened to others who have rebounded, but this is different. Governor Romney's political persona was formed during the primaries when voters began to view him as elitist, rich and out of touch. This is where the Democrats' early advertising was crucial. Remember, Romney had to fight a two-front war as both Gingrich and the Democrats attacked Bain. It helped to galvanize a perception that has stuck like glue. Of course, miscues by the candidate and the campaign both old (the $10,000 bet) and new (47 percent) have reinforced this perception. That is why the 47 percent comment was so problematic. It was another layer on an already existing perception. The problem now is that this thing has hardened, making it virtually impossible to change. 2. Team Obama's early advertising strategy to make Romney an unacceptable alternative worked. They were able to define Romney before he had a chance to define himself. Of course, the Romney team inadvertently aided that effort but not doing a substantial positive media buy to explain who Mitt Romney is and what kind of President he might be. Romney's favorability rating is currently underwater with 44 percent favorable and 45 percent unfavorable. In the latest WSJ/NBC poll only 38 percent of the electorate had a positive impression of him. According to the latest CBS/NYT poll, only 37 percent of Virginia voters think that Romney "cares about people like them." This is politically debilitating. 3. Perceptions of the economy are improving. While unemployment remains high and GDP growth is abysmal, the stock market has improved (taking 401(k)s with it). Additionally, don't underestimate how effectively Team Obama has hammered home the idea that the president inherited a big problem. He has been saying it since he was inaugurated with extraordinarily good message discipline. Voters are likely to give him partial credit here. 4. Obama's approval rating is now in the "likely reelect zone. " We have been saying for months that an approval rating in the low- to mid-40s makes reelection difficult. Since last year, however, Obama's approval rating has improved by 5-6 points. He is now at approximately 49 percent approval, which is comparable to where President George W. Bush was in 2004. 5. The President had a strong convention and Romney had a weak one. Poor speeches and Eastwood's chair aside, the fact is that the RNC did not achieve its principal objective: to re-launch a re-branded Romney and create momentum heading into September. Forget all the talk about the convention's mechanics; this was about transforming the narrative. And they did not do that. Of course, the Democrats had the advantage of going second but the RNC did not put Team Obama on its heels. Speaking of which... 6. Team Romney has been in reactive mode for a month. Of course, part of this is a continuous cycle of damage control but there does not appear to be a forward-looking strategy. By now, we fully expected to see some sort of economic proposal or initiative that would have forced the Obama campaign to respond. This has not happened. 7. Last but certainly not least there was Libya. With respect to Team Romney, there seemed to be little recognition of the most basic political tenet of a foreign crisis: when there is an international incident in which America is attacked, voters in this country will (at least in the short term) rally around the flag and the president. Always. It is stunning that Team Romney failed to recognize this. In times of domestic crisis (the BP oil spill is a great example) voters will look to their political leaders and can be pretty quick to lay blame. On the other hand, it usually takes some time for voters to sour on how their leaders have handled international crises. Iraq is the perfect example. 8. The result is that the President is now running ahead (beyond the margin of error) of Romney in key battleground states including Virginia, Ohio, Florida and New Hampshire. Ohio is particularly troubling since it is awfully hard to see a winning Romney coalition without it.

#### Models predicts an Obama win --- it’s highly accurate but the plan can still disrupt Obama.

**Donavan**, **9/20**/2012 (Patricia, Campbell predicts close race: Obama likely to win popular vote, UB Reporter, p. <http://www.buffalo.edu/ubreporter/2012_09_20/campbell_election_forecasts>)

A UB political scientist internationally recognized for highly accurate election prediction models says President Obama is likely to receive 51.3 percent of votes cast in the November election. James E. Campbell, UB Distinguished Professor in the Department of Political Science, notes that while the forecast does not predict the electoral vote winner, it is quite rare for a candidate to win a plurality of the vote and not a plurality of electoral votes. Of course, the 2000 Bush-Gore presidential race proved that it is possible. “I estimate that there is a 67 percent chance that President Obama’s vote will be over 50 percent,” he says, “so the forecast is for a close race tilted to Obama. “The prediction is not so definite that a Romney win is impossible,” he says, “but an Obama win is more likely.”

### Obama

#### Plan results in massive backlash and Obama isn’t openly pro exports now – he’s waiting it out so he’ll do the plan post election

Reuters 12 ( “As Congress looks away, U.S. tiptoes toward exporting a gas bounty”, 6/27, 12 http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/27/us-usa-lng-exports-idUSBRE85Q05820120627 )

Reuters) - In a bitterly divided U.S. political environment, there's at least one thing Republicans and Democrats can agree on: Avoid a public showdown on natural gas exports, arguably the most important energy policy decision in recent memory. While fluctuating gasoline prices, the Keystone pipeline and the fight over fracking steal headlines, the question of how much of the newfound U.S. shale gas bounty should be shared with the rest of the world goes largely without comment or coverage -- despite holding far wider and longer-lasting consequences. The reason is clear: unlike the relatively simple, black-and-white issues that politicians often favor and voters connect to, liquefied natural gas (LNG) is deep, deep gray. It affects a tangled web of constituents, from Big Oil to international allies such as Japan, pits free-trade orthodoxy against the domestic economy, and requires an awkward explanation of why allowing some exports -- inevitably raising U.S. energy prices in the short term, even if at the margin -- may ultimately be better for the country in the long run. All the same, this U.S. president or the next will have to make a tricky decision, and its consequences may only become clear years from now: How much U.S. gas should be sold to other countries if it means boosting prices for consumers at home? "Right now I don't think this issue is getting anywhere near the attention it deserves," said Democratic congressman Edward Markey, one of a small number of politicians actively seeking to rein in energy exports. "Keystone and Solyndra are election-year political sideshows," he said, referring to the bankruptcy of a government-funded solar panel maker. "This is the main event." But lobbyists on both sides of the issue say it suits them best to keep the subject out of the headlines. The gas producers that stand to benefit from higher selling prices see no upside from a public brawl, while many manufacturers who could benefit from continuing low prices shy away from anti-export statements. With Congress unlikely to weigh in, the decision falls to a small, obscure unit of the Energy Department, the Office of Natural Gas Regulatory Activities. The department's statistical branch has been criticized for failing to predict how new drilling techniques would revolutionize the sector, and how quickly the vast stores of unearthed gas would send domestic prices to unsustainable lows. So the natural gas office is now awaiting advice from a second and final report on the economic implications of exports -- a report so sensitive that the government has kept it under wraps, including the identity of the consultants preparing it. SHHHHHHHH, SOFTLY-SOFTLY Not since the liberalization of power markets in the 1980s have politicians had more sway over future energy costs -- or been less willing to grapple publicly with the issue. Only one hearing on LNG exports has been held to date in the Senate, and in the House of Representatives, the Energy and Commerce Committee has no plan to hold hearings at the moment. Markey has struggled to get traction behind legislation that would block gas exports, a measure almost certain to fail to pass through the divided Congress. Few lawmakers openly oppose exports, though even fewer vocally advocate a fully open market that would raise prices at home. The Obama administration has said it will wait until the gas office releases the final economic analysis of LNG exports to make any decision on eight pending applications to sell liquefied natural gas to countries with which the United States has no free-trade agreement -- the most political step of the multiple state and federal approvals needed to send LNG abroad. The report was due out this spring, but in March the administration pushed back the release until later in the year. A White House official said on Monday the report could be released in the next few weeks. Overall, the boom in the energy sector, coupled with a slow recovery in domestic manufacturing, could raise gross domestic product by 2 to 3.3 percent by 2020, according to a recent analysis by Citigroup. But exports could force politicians to play favorites, effectively choosing between energy companies and industry. Democrats, often critical of the oil and gas sector, are wary of getting out in front of an issue that divides even the manufacturers benefitting from low gas prices. Republicans, who favor free trade and support fossil fuel development, are leery of being accused of raising costs for consumers and industry. "No politician wants to be accused of raising end-user prices to add to oil companies' bottom lines," says Kevin Book, an energy analyst at Clearview Energy Partners. So for most officials willing to take a stand, it is inevitably one of moderation. Few are ready to weigh in on the toughest question: How much is too much?

### AT: Link Turn – Jobs Key to Swing States

#### Increasing jobs will not swing key states --- it does not translate into economic growth.

**Huffington Post**, 7/9/**2012** (Swing States Where Unemployment is Dropping Rapidly, p. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/07/06/swing-state-unemployment\_n\_1653972.html)

The jobs gains in a handful of swing states has been a bright spot for Obama's campaign. Of the ten states that made the most rapid employment gains over the last year, five are swing states. The recent economic success in states like Florida -- where unemployment has fallen by 2 percent -- may be worrying Republican strategists. Republican lawmakers in successful swing states have reportedly been told to play down their home state's recovery by the national party in an aim to prevent the President from benefiting politically in the November elections. But swing state job growth may not guarantee Obama's reelection. In New Hampshire, New England's only swing state, the unemployment rate was 5 percent in May. Despite the state's stellar jobs numbers, a recent NBC News/Marist Poll shows that the race in the Granite State is in a statistical dead heat. Nor do rising employment numbers necessarily indicate 'strong' economic recoveries. Wages have fallen in every one of the ten states posting the most rapid job gains, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The National Employment Law Project estimates that 71 percent of re-employed -- individuals who lost their jobs and subsequently found new work -- received a lower wage than the one they earned at their previous job, with half of this group earning a paycheck 25 percent lower than what they had earned previously.

### Environmentalist

#### Obama needs environmentalist support --- they are a key part of his base.

**Bloomberg**, 8/31/**2011** (Green Vote Cools Toward Obama Risking a Replay of Gore-Nader, p. http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-08-31/green-vote-cools-to-obama-over-pipeline-concerns.html)

Democratic Vice President Al Gore paid a price in his 2000 presidential campaign for the splintering of environmentalists’ votes. Leaders of some groups, including in Florida, endorsed the independent candidacy of Ralph Nader instead. Gore, who later won the Nobel Peace Prize for his advocacy of limits on greenhouse-gas emissions, lost Florida by 537 votes in the official tally, making Republican George W. Bush president. Nader garnered 97,488 votes in the state. Nader predicted in April that Obama will win re-election, in part because “the liberal base has nowhere to go to send a message” this time. Still, apathy among voters sympathetic to environmentalist goals may prove costly to Obama, according to Doug Schoen, who was a strategist for President Bill Clinton. “Obama won the election because the left, young people who are disproportionately environmentalists, came out in huge numbers,” Schoen said in an interview yesterday. “If he doesn’t have the kind of support he had from the left, from young people, from environmentalists, he is not going to be re- elected. It’s as simple as that.”

### Link Shield – Blame Booster

#### The link only goes one way –

#### A) Negativity bias.

**Lariscy**, 1/2/**2012** (Ruthann Weaver – professor in the department of advertising and public relations in the Grady College at the University of Georgia, Why Negative Political Ads Work, CNN, p. http://www.cnn.com/2012/01/02/opinion/lariscy-negative-ads/index.html)

So if we don't like negative ads and even perhaps suspect they contribute to political malaise, why are they increasingly dominating candidates' strategies? Gingrich's drop in polls in Iowa last month was no accident -- it was choreographed by negative advertising. Ruthann Lariscy The answer is simple: They work. And they work very well. Gingrich's drop in polls in Iowa last month was no accident -- it was choreographed by negative advertising. Our brains process information both consciously and non-consciously. When we pay attention to a message we are engaged in active message processing. When we are distracted or not paying attention we may nonetheless passively receive information. There is some evidence that negative messages may be more likely than positive ones to passively register. They "stick" for several reasons. First, one of the most important contributors to their success may be the negativity bias. Negative information is more memorable than positive -- just think how clearly you remember an insult. Second, negative ads are more complex than positive ones. A positive message that talks about the sponsoring candidate's voting record, for example, is simple and straightforward. Every negative ad has at least an implied comparison. If Mitt Romney is "not a true conservative," then by implication the candidate sponsoring the ad is saying he or she is a true conservative. This complexity can cause us to process the information more slowly and with somewhat more attentiveness. I often use an analogy of running water from my garden hose. If I stand at the top of a smooth concrete driveway and turn on the water, it flows quickly, directly, and fairly seamlessly to the bottom. This is much how a positive message goes through the brain. If I take my same hose and stand at the top of a grassy hill and turn it on, the water travels more slowly than on the concrete hill, it picks up some loose dirt, and inevitably some of it gets "stuck" in grass along the way. Negative information, too, travels more slowly because of its enhanced complexity. It benefits from the negativity bias, and inevitably some of that negative information gets "stuck" in our minds, even if we don't like the ad or agree with its contents.

#### B) Sleeper Effect.

**Lariscy**, 1/2/**2012** (Ruthann Weaver – professor in the department of advertising and public relations in the Grady College at the University of Georgia, Why Negative Political Ads Work, CNN, p. http://www.cnn.com/2012/01/02/opinion/lariscy-negative-ads/index.html)

There is another benefit negative messages achieve that positive messages largely do not. In psychology the principle is called the sleeper effect. Over time, a message is likely to become disassociated from its sponsor. There is some evidence that negative ads benefit from this effect: Immediately upon hearing and seeing an attack, you might dismiss it as being "just politics." Then, typically several weeks later when you are making your voting decision, something in your mind recollects the negative information. You have likely forgotten when or where or from whom you heard it -- but the negative content "stuck." I wish I could say that mud-slinging in politics will end -- that since we are largely disgusted by its usage, negative political advertising will fade away. But I can't. Though negative political messages have always been around, they are increasing in quantity and are reaching different kinds of campaigns. While at one time attacks were reserved largely for campaigns for national office, today they are evident in local and statewide campaigns as well. Unfortunately, negative political ads work. And unless you live in a cave, you are likely not immune to their effects.

### Plan Raises Prices

#### Plan causes domestic gas to go up.

Wall Street Journal, 9/13/**2012** (Should the U.S. Export Natural Gas?, p. http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390444226904577561300198957854.html)

The U.S. is awash in natural gas—a historic surplus that has driven domestic prices to lows not seen in decades. But amid this sea change, a surprising debate has arisen: Are gas exports bad for the U.S. economy? Shipping natural gas outside North America can't occur without a green light from the U.S. Department of Energy, which isn't expected to weigh in on the issue until after the November elections. In the meantime, the debate has split into two camps. Supporters see little negative impact and, on the contrary, benefits for U.S. political influence abroad. The other side argues, among other things, that natural-gas exports are likely to give rise to an international cartel similar to OPEC which would compete with U.S. exports and put further pressure on the U.S. economy. The Wall Street Journal recently sat down with two opponents in the export debate: Leslie Palti-Guzman, an analyst with the global energy and natural-resources consulting group Eurasia Group; and Anne Korin, an adviser to the U.S. Energy Security Council and co-director of the Institute for the Analysis of Global Security, an energy-security think tank. Here are edited excerpts of the discussion. WSJ: Should Washington allow increased exports of liquefied natural gas? MS. PALTI-GUZMAN: There is no question that LNG exports could have numerous economic benefits. It could increase GDP, create jobs, and reverse account deficits as well as reduce international energy prices. There are also numerous energy-security benefits associated with LNG exports. The U.S. gas bonanza is giving Washington a key geostrategic opportunity to reposition itself in Asia-Pacific, and slowly away from the Middle East, and to help key allies. MS. PALTI-GUZMAN: There is no question that LNG exports could have numerous economic benefits. It could increase GDP, create jobs, and reverse account deficits as well as reduce international energy prices. There are also numerous energy-security benefits associated with LNG exports. The U.S. gas bonanza is giving Washington a key geostrategic opportunity to reposition itself in Asia-Pacific, and slowly away from the Middle East, and to help key allies. MS. KORIN: I don't support government action to restrict exports of LNG. That said, exporting gas may not be the most economic use of that commodity. Once gas is exported., local excess supply falls and the domestic price of gas begins to rise.

#### Exports raise prices.

**Levi**, 8/15/**2012** (Michael – senior fellow for energy and the environment at the Council on Foreign Relations, The Case for Natural Gas Exports, The New York Times, p. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/16/opinion/the-case-for-natural-gas-exports.html)

Exports would also raise natural gas prices a bit, adding as much as $50 to the annual electric bills for the poorest American households by the end of the decade. But the federal Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program could help shield the most vulnerable as long as its financing is protected.

### Gas Prices Key

#### Gas prices are key to the election

**Washington Post**, 2/24/**2012** (Gas prices could cause election-year headache for Obama, p. http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/gas-prices-could-cause-election-year-headache-for-obama/2012/02/24/gIQAgvw4XR\_story.html)

Gas prices have risen 29 cents per gallon since December, with regular-grade gas now averaging $3.64 a gallon in the Washington region at a time of year when consumers usually enjoy a respite from price hikes. The high cost at the pump could turn into an election-year mess for the president, whose approval ratings have surged recently as the economy improved. Republicans, sensing an opportunity, have blamed Obama for not giving oil companies greater freedom to drill for new U.S. supplies that might ease prices.

#### Gas prices are key

**Raum**, 9/17/**2012** (Tom, Gas prices, not jobs stats, are key numbers for voters, The Christian Science Monitor, p. <http://www.csmonitor.com/Business/Latest-News-Wires/2012/0917/Gas-prices-not-jobs-stats-are-key-numbers-for-voters-video>)

The economy has lost a staggering 8.8 million jobs in the downturn and has clawed back only 4.1 million. Just two jobs reports remain before the Nov. 6 election — on Oct. 5 and Nov. 2 — and they could be crucial to the outcome. "To the average person, the economy is a very personal thing," says White House communications director Dan Pfeiffer. He said people look at different factors. But which ones? "Jobs is still No. 1," said Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Analytics. "It's at the top of everyone's list. People might not know the government jobs number that comes out each month, but they see it every day in their lives." A close second right now, Zandi says, are gasoline prices, with the national average grazing $4 a gallon. But otherwise, inflation is generally muted.

### AT: Pennsylvania

#### Can’t flip Pennsylvania --- it’s too late.

**Silver, 9/18**/2012 (Nate, How to Solve the Swing-State Puzzle, New York Time Magazine, p. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/23/magazine/nate-silver-solves-the-swing-state-puzzle.html?pagewanted=all)

Judging by where the campaigns are allocating their money and time, both are concentrating on slightly Republican-leaning states (Florida) or true bellwethers (Iowa). It’s clear that Romney is playing defense while Obama is on offense — a notion reinforced by the fact that Romney and company have taken an on-again, off-again approach toward slightly Democratic-leaning states like Pennsylvania and Michigan. In Michigan, Romney’s opposition to the auto bailout may be too much of an albatross. In Pennsylvania, though, the issue may be that while the polls are close, they are also hard to move; each party has its respective constituencies, and there may be few true undecided voters left. Obama’s lead in Pennsylvania has often been narrow, but he has nevertheless led by some margin in the state’s last 22 polls. My calculations suggest that, despite Romney’s deficit, the upside of his winning Pennsylvania is so great that he might want to take a chance. It’s Obama’s closest equivalent to a must-win state, and the combination of losing Pennsylvania and Ohio would essentially ensure his defeat. Unfortunately for Romney, it may be too late to adopt that strategy, as Obama has come close to clinching a majority of the state’s electorate in recent surveys.

### Ohio U – Obama Winning

#### Obama is winning the majority of polls in Ohio.

**Silver, 9/18**/2012 (Nate, How to Solve the Swing-State Puzzle, New York Time Magazine, p. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/23/magazine/nate-silver-solves-the-swing-state-puzzle.html?pagewanted=all)

The Big Two: Ohio (32 percent chance of determining the Electoral College winner) and Florida (20 percent). This year, Obama’s polling has been stronger than many observers (myself included) expected in each state, both of which typically lean slightly Republican. In Ohio, which Obama won by 5 points in 2008, the president has held the lead in 16 polls conducted since June (Romney led in only 4). In Florida, which Obama won by 3 points in the last election, the numbers have been more even but still slightly favor the president (14 leads for Obama, 9 for Romney).\ The reasons behind Obama’s strong polling performance differ in each state. The auto industry’s recovery has helped drop Ohio’s unemployment rate from 8.6 percent when he took office to 7.2 percent now, making it one state where voters really are better off than they were four years ago. While studies show that national economic conditions figure more heavily into voters’ decisions, a state’s economic climate can matter in cases like this.

### Ext – Romney Kills US/Russian Relations

#### 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.

## 1NC vs Emory HR

### 1

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### Romney will reject Taliban peace talks --- that undermines Afghanistan stability.

**Crowley**, 4/18/**2012** (Michael – senior correspondent at TIME Magazine, Romney’s Radical Position on Afghanistan, Swampland at TIME Magazine, p. http://swampland.time.com/2012/04/18/romneys-radical-position-on-afghanistan/)

In its story today about Mitt Romney’s rather opaque views about Afghanistan, the New York Times mentions, almost in passing, something important that has drawn strangely little attention: Romney opposes talking to the Taliban. That’s a relatively extreme position. For some time now, it’s been widely accepted within the foreign policy establishment that any realistic endgame in Afghanistan will involve some kind of negotiated peace deal with our enemies in Afghanistan. (Hillary Clinton has called the approach, “Fight, talk and build.”) Talks have been underway for months, and while they have been halting, superficial, and at times tragicomic, they’re not very controversial anymore, as this 2011 RAND paper explains: In early 2010, when the [RAND paper's] authors began to participate in exploratory discussions… regarding the possibility of a negotiated peace in Afghanistan, the very concept of talking to the enemy was controversial in official circles and little discussed beyond them. The objective of a negotiated peace has since been firmly embraced by both the Afghan and American governments, supported by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and endorsed by most of Afghanistan’s neighbors. On the main issue that most Americans think about–troop levels and withdrawal deadlines–Romney’s rhetoric suggests mostly subtle differences with Obama. Romney whacks Obama for being too open about his intentions for exiting the country, and implies he’ll listen more closely to the military’s advice, but he doesn’t disavow Obama’s 2014 goal for ending America’s combat role in the country. Rejecting peace talks, by contrast, is a game-changer. It casts into doubt all our assumptions about the war–including that 2014 deadline. “We should not negotiate with the Taliban. We should defeat the Taliban,” Romney has said. But we’ve been trying to do that for an awfully long time, with awfully limited results. That’s why even people like George W. Bush’s last national security adviser, Steve Hadley, say things like this: U.S. political leaders, Democrats and Republicans alike, and our military commanders, have consistently argued that the conflict in Afghanistan will not end by military means alone. The elimination of al Qaeda’s safe havens and the establishment of long-term peace and security in Afghanistan and the region — the key U.S. national security objectives — is best assured by a sustainable political settlement that strengthens the Afghan state so that it can assume greater responsibility for addressing the country’s security and economic challenges.

#### Failure to stabilize Afghanistan threatens multiple scenarios of nuclear conflict --- terrorism, Russian aggression, Pakistani break-up and NATO credibility are a few.

**Miller**, March/April **2012** (Paul D. – former director for Afghanistan on the National Security Council staff under Presidents Bush and Obama, assistant professor of the International Security affairs at the National Defense University, director for the Afghanistan-Pakistan program at the college of International Security Affairs, It’s Not just Al-Qaeda: Stability in the Most Dangerous Region, World Affairs Journal, p. http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/article/it%E2%80%99s-not-just-al-qaeda-stability-most-dangerous-region)

The Afghanistan Study Group, a collection of scholars and former policymakers critical of the current intervention, argued in 2010 that al-Qaeda is no longer in Afghanistan and is unlikely to return, even if Afghanistan reverts to chaos or Taliban rule. It argued that three things would have to happen for al-Qaeda to reestablish a safe haven and threaten the United States: “1) the Taliban must seize control of a substantial portion of the country, 2) Al Qaeda must relocate there in strength, and 3) it must build facilities in this new ‘safe haven’ that will allow it to plan and train more effectively than it can today.” Because all three are unlikely to happen, the Study Group argued, al-Qaeda almost certainly will not reestablish a presence in Afghanistan in a way that threatens US security. In fact, none of those three steps are necessary for al-Qaeda to regain its safe haven and threaten America. The group could return to Afghanistan even if the Taliban do not take back control of the country. It could—and probably would—find safe haven there if Afghanistan relapsed into chaos or civil war. Militant groups, including al-Qaeda offshoots, have gravitated toward other failed states, like Somalia and Yemen, but Afghanistan remains especially tempting, **given the network’s familiarity with the terrain and local connections**. Nor does al-Qaeda, which was never numerically overwhelming, need to return to Afghanistan “in strength” to be a threat. Terrorist operations, including the attacks of 2001, are typically planned and carried out by very few people. Al-Qaeda’s resilience, therefore, means that stabilizing Afghanistan is, in fact, necessary even for the most basic US war aims. The international community should not withdraw until there is an Afghan government and Afghan security forces with the will and capacity to deny safe haven without international help. Setting aside the possibility of al-Qaeda’s reemergence, the United States has other important interests in the region as well—notably preventing the Taliban from gaining enough power to destabilize neighboring Pakistan, which, for all its recent defiance, is officially a longstanding American ally. (It signed two mutual defense treaties with the United States in the 1950s, and President Bush designated it a major non-NATO ally in 2004.) State failure in Pakistan brokered by the Taliban could mean regional chaos and a possible loss of control of its nuclear weapons. Preventing such a catastrophe is clearly a vital national interest of the United States and cannot be accomplished with a few drones. Alarmingly, Pakistan is edging toward civil war. A collection of militant Islamist groups, including al-Qaeda, Tehrik-e Taliban Pakistan (TTP), and Tehrik-e Nafaz-e Shariat-e Mohammadi (TNSM), among others, are fighting an insurgency that has **escalated dramatically** since 2007 across Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, the Federally Administered Tribal Areas, and Baluchistan. According to the Brookings Institution’s Pakistan Index, insurgents, militants, and terrorists now regularly launch more than one hundred and fifty attacks per month on Pakistani government, military, and infrastructure targets. In a so far feckless and ineffectual response, Pakistan has deployed nearly one hundred thousand regular army soldiers to its western provinces. At least three thousand soldiers have been killed in combat since 2007, as militants have been able to seize control of whole towns and districts. Tens of thousands of Pakistani civilians and militants—the distinction between them in these areas is not always clear—have been killed in daily terror and counterterror operations. The two insurgencies in Afghanistan and Pakistan are linked. Defeating the Afghan Taliban would give the United States and Pakistan momentum in the fight against the Pakistani Taliban. A Taliban takeover in Afghanistan, on the other hand, will give new strength to the Pakistani insurgency, which would **gain an ally** in Kabul, **safe haven to train and arm and** from which to **launch attacks into Pakistan, and a huge morale boost** in seeing their compatriots win power in a neighboring country. Pakistan’s collapse or fall to the Taliban is (at present) unlikely, but the implications of that scenario are so dire that they cannot be ignored. Even short of a collapse, increasing chaos and instability in Pakistan could give cover for terrorists to increase the intensity and scope of their operations, perhaps even to achieve the cherished goal of stealing a nuclear weapon. Although our war there has at times seemed remote, Afghanistan itself occupies crucial geography. Situated between Iran and Pakistan, bordering China, and within reach of Russia and India, **it sits on a crossroads of Asia’s great powers**. This is why it has, since the nineteenth century, been home to the so-called Great Game—in which the US should continue to be a player. Two other players, Russia and Iran, are aggressive powers seeking to establish hegemony over their neighbors. Iran is seeking to build nuclear weapons, has an elite military organization (the Quds Force) seeking to export its Islamic Revolution, and uses the terror group Hezbollah as a proxy to bully neighboring countries and threaten Israel. Russia under Vladimir Putin is seeking to reestablish its sphere of influence over its near abroad, in pursuit of which it (probably) cyber-attacked Estonia in 2007, invaded Georgia in 2008, and has continued efforts to subvert Ukraine. Iran owned much of Afghan territory centuries ago, and continues to share a similar language, culture, and religion with much of the country. It maintains extensive ties with the Taliban, Afghan warlords, and opposition politicians who might replace the corrupt but Western-oriented Karzai government. Building a stable government in Kabul will be a small step in the larger campaign to limit Tehran’s influence. Russia remains heavily involved in the Central Asian republics. It has worked to oust the United States from the air base at Manas, Kyrgyzstan. It remains interested in the huge energy reserves in Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan. Russia may be wary of significant involvement in Afghanistan proper, unwilling to repeat the Soviet Union’s epic blunder there. But a US withdrawal from Afghanistan followed by Kabul’s collapse would likely embolden Russia to assert its influence more aggressively elsewhere in Central Asia or Eastern Europe, especially in the Ukraine. A US departure from Afghanistan will also continue to resonate for years to come in the strength and purpose of NATO. Every American president since Harry Truman has affirmed the centrality of the Atlantic Alliance to US national security. The war in Afghanistan under the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), the Alliance’s first out-of-area operation in its sixty-year history, was going poorly until the US troop surge. Even with the limited success that followed, allies have complained that the burden in Afghanistan has been distributed unevenly. Some, like the British, Canadians, and Poles, are fighting a shooting war in Kandahar and Helmand, while others, like the Lithuanians and Germans, are doing peacekeeping in Ghor and Kunduz. The poor command and control—split between four regional centers—left decisionmaking slow and poorly coordinated for much of the war. ISAF’s strategy was only clarified in 2008 and 2009, when Generals David McKiernan and Stanley McChrystal finally developed a more coherent campaign plan with counterinsurgency-appropriate rules of engagement. A bad end in Afghanistan could have dire consequences for the Atlantic Alliance, leaving the organization’s future, and especially its **credibility as a deterrent to Russia, in question**. It would not be irrational for a Russian observer of the war in Afghanistan to conclude that if NATO cannot make tough decisions, field effective fighting forces, or distribute burdens evenly, it cannot defend Europe. The United States and Europe must prevent that outcome by salvaging a credible result to its operations in Afghanistan—one that both **persuades Russia that NATO is still a fighting alliance** and preserves the organization as a pillar of US national security.

### 2

#### Electricity prices are declining

**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.

#### Renewable energy skyrockets electricity prices – cost of production and transmission lines

Bryce 12 (Robert, Senior Fellow @ Center for Energy Policy and the Environment - Manhattan Institute, "The High Cost of Renewable Energy Mandates," http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/eper\_10.htm)

Although supporters of renewable energy claim that the RPS mandates will bring benefits, their contribution to the economy is problematic because they also impose costs that must be incorporated into the utility bills paid by homeowners, commercial businesses, and industrial users. And those costs are or will be substantial. Electricity generated from renewable sources generally costs more—often much more—than that produced by conventional fuels such as coal and natural gas. In addition, large-scale renewable energy projects often require the construction of many miles of high-voltage transmission lines. The cost of those lines must also be incorporated into the bills paid by consumers.¶ These extra costs amount to a "back-end way to put a price on carbon," says Suedeen Kelly, a former member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.[5] Indeed, with Congress unwilling to approve national carbon dioxide restrictions or renewable-energy quotas, the RPS mandates have become a sprawling state system of de facto carbon-reduction taxes.

#### 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.

#### 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.

### 3

#### Text: The fifty state governments of the United States should provide loan guarantees for Dish Stirling generation facilities

#### 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.

### 4

#### Text – The United States federal government should allocate existing energy-related grant funding to provide cash prizes to the first private firm able to develop Dish Stirling generation facilities.

#### Prizes solve better, avoid picking winners, and don’t link to politics

Adler 11 -- Professor of Law and Director of the Center for Business Law & Regulation, Case Western Reserve University School of Law (Johnathan, 3/14/11, "EYES ON A CLIMATE PRIZE:REWARDING ENERGY INNOVATION TO ACHIEVE CLIMATE STABILIZATION," http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/elr/vol35\_1/HLE101.pdf)

Traditional grant-driven funding for research and development has several limitations. 200 First, decisions about projects or efforts to fund are centralized, limiting the range of promising ventures that may receive funding and increasing the risk that research funding will not result in useful technological innovations. As the history of prizes detailed in the prior section shows, valuable technological innovations often come from surprising directions. Second, with ex ante grants, the government pays for R&D whether or not the R&D produces anything of value in return. Third, traditional grant funding is more subject to political pressure and may create negative incentives among researchers. Like traditional R&D grants, governmentsupported prizes reward innovations that “are publicly valued but not privately marketable.” 201 Yet prizes do not suffer from these other drawbacks. Therefore, the federal government should reallocate portions of existing energy-related R&D funding from traditional research grants to the creation of technology inducement prizes. Allocating grant money effectively requires the grant-making entity to pick “winners” and “losers,” something the government has rarely done well. 202 This is particularly difficult to do when the awarding agency is not the primary “customer” of the technological solution that is to be funded. 203 Supporters of increased R&D funding often point to the successes of the Manhattan and Apollo projects as examples of successful, government-directed research. 204 Yet these are poor models for the climate technology challenge. 205 As Mowery, Nelson, and Martin note, both “were designed, funded and managed by federal agencies to achieve a specific technological solution for which the government was effectively the sole ‘customer.’” 206 In the climate context, there is no single technology that will solve the problem, nor is there a single “customer” to satisfy. 207 Meeting the climate policy challenge will require the development and adoption of multiple, costeffective technological innovations that are capable of satisfying consumers (or governments) the world over. 208

### 5

#### Funding for the RHIC particle collider is on the chopping block now – cutting funding for the project tanks US science leadership

Matson 8/24/12 (John, Scientific American, "Nuclear Decelerator: Last U.S. Particle Collider on Chopping Block," http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=rhic-jlab-frib-budget-cuts&print=true)

Until recently, the American particle collider was a thriving species spanning a variety of habitats from coast to coast. But now it finds itself on the endangered list.¶ Since 2008 the number of colliders in the U.S. has dwindled from four to one. And the last surviving member of the species, the Relativistic Heavy-Ion Collider (RHIC) at Brookhaven National Laboratory in Upton, N.Y., may soon fall victim **to** the same budgetary blight that has already felled so many other towering scientific facilities. Just last year the U.S. Department of Energy (DoE) phased out the larger Tevatron collider at Fermilab in Illinois, citing fiscal constraints. The increasingly rare breed known as the collider is a particle accelerator in which two beams of high-energy particles intersect to collide head-on inside giant detectors, which allow physicists to sift through the wreckage for short-lived particles or evidence of new physical phenomena.¶ The RHIC collider is one of three major projects now under scrutiny as federal science agencies seek to reconcile their portfolios of physics facilities with tightening budgets. The DoE and the National Science Foundation have requested that a panel of nuclear physicists, chaired by Robert Tribble of Texas A&M University, advise the government on how to get the most science out of limited funds. It appears likely that at least one of the costly projects—either RHIC, the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility in Virginia or the planned Facility for Rare Isotope Beams (FRIB) in Michigan—will fall victim to the cost-cutting. Any termination would cost hundreds of jobs and affect thousands of scientist users.¶ "The three of these things … they can't all fit within the budgets that the DoE has been told to anticipate for the next five years or so," says Steven Vigdor, associate laboratory director for nuclear and particle physics at Brookhaven. "It's conceivable, but I think it's a long shot, that there's a compromise solution that doesn't involve terminating something."¶ The RHIC collider, with a staff of about 750, could provide the biggest target for cost-cutters. Its operation costs the DoE roughly $170 million annually. But RHIC is also the only facility of the three that is currently in operation, and it seems to be hitting its peak, having recently been upgraded. RHIC rams protons or heavy nuclei from gold, copper or uranium atoms together at nearly light speed to investigate what produces the proton's spin as well as the universe's composition in the earliest instants after the big bang. The high-speed collisions of heavy ions produce a nearly frictionless fluid called a quark–gluon plasma, a hot bouillabaisse of the fundamental particles that form the heart of all atoms. Quark–gluon plasma was first produced at RHIC in 2005, and scientists there are now working to explore at which temperatures the quarks and gluons freeze out from their fluid state into protons and neutrons.¶ Like the other two facilities, RHIC comes highly recommended by nuclear physics advisory groups. A 2012 report by the National Research Council identified the completed RHIC upgrade, and an ongoing upgrade at Jefferson Lab, as strategic investments whose exploitation "should be an essential component of the U.S. nuclear science program for the next decade.**"** The Tribble panel operates under the auspices of the Nuclear Science Advisory Committee (NSAC), which provides guidance to the federal funding agencies. Tribble's subcommittee will meet in Maryland over four days in early September, during which time representatives of the various facilities will have an opportunity to lobby for their projects. "We and the other laboratories are taking this really seriously in the sense of a threat to our continued operation, and for FRIB to their continued construction," Vigdor says.¶ Each of the labs has a unique case to make: A 2007 long-range plan drafted by NSAC, for instance, highlighted the Jefferson Lab upgrade as the top priority for U.S. nuclear physics. That upgrade, which will double the energy of the electron beams in the lab's particle accelerator, is roughly two thirds complete, says Robert McKeown, deputy director for science at Jefferson Lab. And the machine already has seven to 10 years of experiments queued up for when it returns to active service sometime after 2015. The Jefferson accelerator explores several questions relating to the structure of the atomic nucleus, including how the fundamental particles of matter, quarks and gluons are bound up inside protons and neutrons. The lab received about $160 million this year from the DoE, including $50 million in construction funds for the facility upgrade.¶ Unlike Brookhaven, which hosts a number of large experiments, Jefferson Lab would essentially cease to exist if its accelerator were defunded. "We're a single-purpose laboratory," McKeown says. "So the situation would be very different for us if the decision were made not to continue our electron accelerator." Some 700 jobs depend on the lab's continued operation.¶ Michigan State University's planned FRIB (pronounced "eff-rib"), earned the second-highest slot in the 2007 ranking of nuclear physics priorities. The machine would produce on demand a variety of exotic isotopes—often unstable versions of chemical elements with abnormal numbers of neutrons in the nucleus. FRIB would investigate the origins of the elements that constitute our physical world, many of which are born in the cores of stars and in supernova explosions, and could quickly churn out isotopes for medical research and the development of advanced imaging technologies.¶ The facility is still in the design phase, and though the DoE has not issued formal schedule and budget, preliminary estimates peg FRIB as a 10-year project costing more than $600 million. Once built, however, its operations costs would potentially be lower than those of either Jefferson Lab or RHIC, and its staff would be much smaller. "But being the cheapest may not really be germane here," says FRIB project manager Thomas Glasmacher, a nuclear physicist at Michigan State. "It's kind of like comparing apples and eggs or something like that. It's different science, and they're different experiments."¶ In interviews, the three lab representatives took pains not to disparage the other facilities, choosing instead to highlight the upsides of their own respective experiments. "We are all on each other's advisory committees," Glasmacher says. "It's a very small community." All three facilities are highly touted and in high demand—even FRIB, which will not exist for many years under the best of circumstances, already has more than 1,000 scientists signed on to its user group.¶ Shuttering any of those projects will disrupt a field in which, as McKeown puts it, "the U.S. maintains the frontier facilities and has substantial leadership throughout the world." It falls to the Tribble panel to choose which of three unpalatable options is the least so. "I don't envy anybody on the panel," Glasmacher says.

#### Funding for energy incentives cause appropriators to raid the budgets of large science programs like the HRIC

Koisumi 8 (Kei¶ Koizumi¶ , The American Association for the Advancement of Science, April 10¶ th¶ , 200¶ 8¶ , “Department of Energy R&D in the FY2009 Budget”, <http://www.aaas.org/spp/rd/09pch8.htm>)¶

As always,¶ congressional appropriators will tinker with the DOE request and will rearrange the mix of priorities, especially in the energy area¶ where DOE proposals to eliminate several programs are likely to run into resistance, but¶ the overall outcome will hinge on whether Congress will be any more successful than in the past two years in securing more money overall for domestic appropriations. If not, then as in past years, Congress will most likely raid the large Science increase to shore up funding for domestic programs proposed for steep cuts or elimination.

#### US science leadership is vital in solving pressing global issues – multiple existential risks

Lempinen 12 (Edward, American Association for the Advancement of Science, "Research and Foreign Policy Experts Visit AAAS to Explore the Future of Science Diplomacy," http://www.aaas.org/news/releases/2012/0403roundtable.shtml)

As the 20th century drew to a close, a consensus was emerging in some quarters of the U.S. research and diplomacy communities: Science and technology would be crucial to address the overarching global issues of the 21st century, from energy and food production to economic development, but the U.S. State Department was profoundly lacking in scientific and technological expertise.¶ Fast forward a dozen years into the new century, and the landscape is dramatically different. Starting in 2000 with the appointment of veteran scientist-diplomat Norman P. Neureiter, the post of science and technology adviser to the Secretary of State has become an institution, serving presidential administrations on important foreign policy issues. A corps of scientists and engineers have taken fellowships at State and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and dozens have stayed on in permanent positions. And President Barack Obama has embraced a program proposed by U.S. Senator Richard Lugar (R-Indiana), appointing six widely respected researchers as science envoys.¶ E. William Colglazier¶ Those advances, and Neureiter’s considerable contributions to the field, were assessed during a day-long roundtable convened recently by the AAAS Center for Science Diplomacy. While the gathering of high-level science and foreign policy leaders found much to celebrate, they acknowledged that the gains could be put at risk by severe budget pressures and Washington’s political polarization. And, they said, the State Department and other nations’ foreign ministries must continue to expand their science capacity and expertise to support substantive, science-based relationships among nations.¶ “Science and technology are such strategic assets in terms of U.S. policy and diplomacy,” said E. William Colglazier, the science and technology adviser to U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. “The United States is perceived by the world as a leader in science and technology, and that means every country wants to engage with us on science and technology.”¶ Alice P. Gast¶ “The whole world is looking to science and technology to improve its situation—to science and technology, and to education,” said Lehigh University President Alice P. Gast, the science envoy to the Central Asia and Caucasus region. “They greatly admire our system of science and technology and education. Scientists are welcomed with open arms around the world.”¶ Because so many global challenges have a science component, and because of the growing interest in international science cooperation, “science diplomacy is becoming a more integral part of foreign policy,” said Vaughan Turekian, the AAAS chief international officer and director of the Center for Science Diplomacy. “It has the potential to open new dimensions both in international relations and in research. And so it’s critical to identify mechanisms and approaches for increasing the capacity of foreign ministries to utilize science and scientists.”¶ The 25 January roundtable was convened at AAAS as a substantive way to celebrate Neureiter’s contributions to the field and to explore emerging issues and challenges. It was organized by Turekian and Tom Wang from the AAAS Center for Science Diplomacy, and it featured 32 participants from six countries, including high-ranking officials in the U.S. State Department and their counterparts from other nations. Among them were three of the first four science advisers to the Secretary of State: Neureiter; Colglazier, who served 17 years as executive officer of the National Academy of Sciences; and George H. Atkinson, an internationally known professor of chemistry and optical sciences at the University of Arizona and currently the director of the Institute on Science for Global Policy. (The third science adviser, AAAS Board of Directors Chair Nina V. Fedoroff, was in Saudi Arabia and unable to attend the event.)¶ They met under the Chatham House Rule, which encourages a frank exchange of ideas by assuring that participants will not be identified or quoted. What emerged from the day of discussion was a view that a new generation of science diplomacy is coming into maturity, with advocates at the highest levels of research, education, and government in many nations. But for the idea to develop and prosper, it will need resources, leadership, and engagement of a new generation.¶ The Necessity of Science in U.S. Diplomacy¶ Norman P. Neureiter¶ Trained as a chemist, Neureiter in 1967 became the first American science attaché in Eastern Europe, based at the U.S. Embassy in Warsaw. In the early 1970s, while working in President Richard Nixon's Office of Science and Technology, he helped craft science initiatives with China and the Soviet Union that brought a thaw to the Cold War. He joined AAAS in 2004, and today holds multiple posts: senior adviser to the AAAS Center for Science Diplomacy; acting director of the AAAS Center for Science, Technology and Security Policy; and chairman of the senior advisory board to the new online publication Science & Diplomacy.¶ Neureiter’s appointment at the Department of State was, at the time, the culmination of an informal but long-running initiative by AAAS, the National Academies, and others to encourage development of science capacity in U.S. foreign policy.¶ Several speakers at the roundtable credited the late William T. Golden, a pivotal figure in U.S. science policy and at AAAS, with helping persuade policy leaders to bring science expertise into the U.S. foreign policy realm.¶ In 1998, the AAAS Council urged the State Department to take action. And in November that year, an article in the journal Science explored the theme, noting that “transformation” at State “can take place only with protracted commitment by top foreign policy leaders.”¶ The article’s conclusion was sobering: “Should the State Department fail to muster the requisite intellectual and organizational strength to influence and implement policy on S&T-infused international challenges, this primary foreign policy instrument will gradually lose its relevance to major U.S. interests around the world.”¶ In 1999, the National Research Council published “The Pervasive Role of Science, Technology, and Health in Foreign Policy”. The study, paid for by Golden from personal funds, detailed the role of science in a range of foreign policy issues, including innovation, energy, health, agriculture, and nuclear proliferation, among others. Based on its recommendations, Congress and President Bill Clinton created the position of science and technology adviser to the Secretary of State.¶ Less than 12 years have passed, but the landscape has indeed been transformed. Around the world, developing nations recognize the success of countries as diverse as China, India, Brazil, and Rwanda, and they, too, want science and technology to drive economic and human development. And even nations that have deeply strained relations with the United States recognize that its research enterprise, policymaking, and universities are models for an age of innovation. They want engagement. They want partnerships.

### Solvency

#### Turn – picking winners collapses the solar industry

Glover 9/13 -- European associate editor for the independent online magazine Energy Tribune (Peter, 2012, "Solar Eclipsed?" http://www.energytribune.com/articles.cfm/11672/Solar-Eclipsed)

The global solar power industry is in crisis. The industry blames widespread national subsidy cuts and over productivity; China, in particular, being widely vilified on the second count. However, the real cause of the solar industry’s malaise runs deeper, rooted, as it is, in the inescapable fact that, in terms of current technology, commercial scale solar energy remains a non-viable proposition. Wherever you look the solar power industry is mired in financial problems, all of which lead back to the (life support) of public subsidy, the impact of market-skewing regulations (creating the appearance of commercial viability) and, ultimately, protectionist trade wars (US and Europe v China). In economic good-times, three natural consequences of government-sponsored global industries that can be obfuscated by a network of feed-in tariffs, levies and other ‘green’ taxes to pay for them. But in leaner economic climes, the real cost of ‘free’ energy becomes all too clear. Germany’s solar industry has led the way in Europe. Until recently the country was the world leader in manufacturing solar cells. Half of the world’s total solar power generating capacity is installed in Germany. But, according to Klaus Dieter Maubach, Technology Chairman at the country’s power major EON, Germany’s solar industry is in a death spiral. Speaking to Focus magazine, Maubach states that “not a single company is in the black” and that the entire German solar industry “will disappear within five years”. His bleak prediction merely echoed the view of investment consultants Citigroup who warned in March that Germany’s subsidy cuts would “nearly kill Germany’s solar industry”. Widespread complaints of Chinese solar companies dumping cut price solar panels on the European market have merely added to the malaise. In early September, the European Commission announced a formal inquiry into this allegation that could well trigger a cut-throat solar trade war with China. But as Eon’s Maubach points out with regard to the international solar market, China itself is suffering from precisely the same market problems as all its competitors. While Beijing will attempt to stave off decline through government stimulus, it is only a question of time before the loss of European and US markets for cheap Chinese goods, including solar panels, causes an economic downturn there, too. In fact, the threat of a Europe v China solar ‘war’ is little more than a replay of last year’s dust up between the United States and China. In the wake of the infamous Solyndra scandal (which Solyndra execs blamed on cheap Chinese imports), the U.S. imposed savage protectionist anti-dumping tariffs. These ranged from 31 percent to as high as 250 percent on imported Chinese-made panels. No surprise then that the Chinese companies should turn their attention to key European markets to offload a product they are unable to sell domestically. The problems for U.S. solar cannot be laid at the door of Chinese competition alone. Once the massive infusion of government stimulus cash ran out and subsidies slowed in early 2011, U.S. solar companies had already begun filing for bankruptcy. And Solyndra wasn’t the only company desperate for more cash. One heavily-subsidized firm, First Solar, was even caught using the U.S. taxpayer loan guarantee to sell solar panels to itself. So are the Chinese really the chief villains of the global solar piece? Depends how you look at it. China’s over production only came about because Beijing’s economic stimulus for its solar industry led to explosive growth and, ultimately, unfettered over production. Given enormous government subsidies there was literally no incentive to slow production down. In the game of who could sustain massive public subsidy longest, cash-rich China clearly won. But the fact is that the sun looks to be setting on China’s solar industry, too. Beijing has also become aware it cannot go on subsidizing its solar and renewable industries. China is dumping its solar panels in a bid to at least redeem some of its costs. Meanwhile the dark clouds have gathered over China’s economy too with the solar sector there also now facing bankruptcy. Since 2005, Chinese solar companies saw heady growth receiving significant government support as a “strategic emerging industry”. But since 2010, the price of the key polysilicon wafers crucial to production has fallen by around 75 percent. In recent times, China’s big five firms have all reported disastrous trading losses. Worse still, according to the investment boys at Energy and Capital and others, China’s much-vaunted booming economy, already over-heating, is about to implode. Taken as a whole, government incentive schemes around the world have created a glut of suppliers that the capitalist free market would never have sanctioned. The eclipse of Europe’s solar industry is in truth down to simple economic realities hitting home as commercial scale solar power is simply too expensive a proposition to attract serious private sector investment and end massive public subsidies. In January, Spain’s economic crisis forced it to cut its renewable subsidy regime entirely. In April, a near-bankrupt Italian government estimated that its subsidy regime left it facing a $60 billion bill to photovoltaic generators over the next 20 years. In The Great British Solar Scam I wrote about how the UK’s bid to cuts its ludicrously generous solar subsidy regime saw it prevented from making subsidy cuts by a European court after the UK solar industry inevitably claimed widespread bankruptcies would result(1). What marks out both the entire renewable energy sector for economic decline above all else is the fact that it is effectively an expensive government-sponsored enterprise, not a child of the free and democratic marketplace. Consider again the elements colluding to produce the current crisis: the lifeline of public subsidy, energy levies and taxes and market-skewing regulation dove-tailing with incentivized over-capacity, protectionism and, ultimately, trade wars. All marks of an industry kept afloat by ideological fiat and not free market capitalism geared to meeting actual market need. To gain a final key perspective, a report by United Nations Environment Programme in June announced that global renewable energy investment generally reached $257 billion in 2011 rivalling the $302 billion invested in hydrocarbon power. Germany alone has committed over €100 billion in solar subsidies over the next 20 years – for a power that will produce a very small energy return. In total, renewable energy, of which solar is just a tiny fraction, makes up just 3 percent of our electricity. As the green utopian clouds obscuring the real cost of ‘free’ solar power clear, it’s easy to see why the industry is in eclipse.

#### 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.

#### Nat gas prevents solar development

Dumaine 12 -- senior editor-at-large @ CNNMoney (Brian, 4/17/12, "Will gas crowd out wind and solar?" http://tech.fortune.cnn.com/2012/04/17/yergin-gas-solar-wind/?iid=HP\_LN)

Fracking technology has given the U.S. a 100-year supply of cheap natural gas. What's its impact on coal, nuclear, wind, and solar power? Inexpensive natural gas is transforming the competitive economics of electric power generation in the U.S. Coal plants today generate more than 40% of our electricity. Yet coal plant construction is grinding to a halt: first, because of environmental reasons and second, because the economics of natural gas are so compelling. It is being championed by many environmentalists as a good substitute for coal because it is cleaner and emits about 50% less carbon dioxide. Nuclear power now generates 20% of our electricity, but the plants are getting old and will need to be replaced. What will replace them? Only a few nuclear plants are being built in the U.S. right now. The economics of building nuclear are challenging -- it's much more expensive than natural gas. Isn't the worry now that cheap natural gas might also crowd out wind and solar? Yes. The debate is over whether natural gas is a bridge fuel to buy time while renewables develop or whether it will itself be a permanent, major source of electricity. What do you think? Over the past year the debate has moved beyond the idea of gas as a bridge fuel to what gas means to U.S. manufacturing and job creation and how it will make the U.S. more globally competitive as an energy exporter. The President's State of the Union speech was remarkable in the way it wrapped the shale gas boom into his economic policies and job creation. I believe natural gas in the years ahead is going to be the default fuel for new electrical generation. Power demand is going to go up 15% to 20% in the U.S. over this decade because of the increasing electrification of our society -- everything from iPads to electric Nissan Leafs. Utilities will need a predictable source of fuel in volume to meet that demand, and natural gas best fits that description. And that won't make the environmental community happy? Well, natural gas may be a relatively clean hydrocarbon, but it's still a hydrocarbon. So wind and solar will have a hard time competing? Remember that wind and solar account for only 3% of our electric power, whereas natural gas is 23%, and its share will go up fast. Most of that 3% is wind. Natural gas has a new role as the partner of renewables, providing power when the wind is not blowing and the sun is not shining. Will solar scale? Solar is still under 1% of U.S. electric generation, and even though its costs have come down dramatically, they must come down a lot more. Solar is generally much more expensive than coal and natural gas. You have to remember that energy is a huge, capital-intensive business, and it takes a very long time for new technologies to scale. The euphoria that comes out of Silicon Valley when you see how quickly a Twitter or a YouTube can emerge doesn't apply to the energy industry.

#### 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.

#### Problem is that prices are too low – industry failure inevitable

IER 12 -- Inst for Energy Research (7/31/12, "The Obama Solar and Oil Shale Legacies," http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2012/07/31/the-obama-solar-and-oil-shale-legacies/)

The Obama Solar Legacy Since taking office in 2009, the Obama administration has approved 17 major solar projects on public lands that could produce about 6,000 megawatts of power when operating at full capacity — and assuming the sun is shining. According to the Department of Interior (DOI), the current plan will expedite solar project approval and cut some up-front costs for developers. The Interior Department has already performed National Environmental Policy Act assessments, is planning to work with regional personnel to link the solar projects to transmission lines that will carry the electricity to substations, and has included financial incentives in the competitive leasing process. If developed, DOI estimates that the areas in the solar road map will potentially supply 23,700 megawatts of power by 2030. Besides making public lands available for solar power development, the Obama Administration has provided the solar industry with generous subsidies and taxpayer-funded loan guarantees. The Section 1603 Treasury grant program allows the solar industry to get 30 percent of its investment cost returned as an immediate rebate — read up front cash payout — from the Treasury, rather than as a tax subsidy. That program expired at the end of 2011. But, the solar power industry can still receive an investment tax credit that can be applied to its tax returns. Besides subsidies, the solar industry has received loan guarantees that have cost the American public millions – if not billions — of dollars. Of course the most famous is Solyndra, the now bankrupt firm that received $528 million in loans before going belly up. Solyndra was not the only solar panel manufacturer that went under after receiving government funds. Abound Solar Inc. received $400 million in U.S. loan guarantees to build two solar panel manufacturing facilities and has collected about $70 million of its taxpayer-funded loan guarantee.[ii] Other solar-related companies filing for bankruptcy are SpectraWatt, Evergreen Solar, Energy Conversion Devices, Beacon Power, and Amonix; the list goes on. Solar companies are having problems because prices and demand for solar panels have declined, and it is difficult to compete against China’s low labor costs and subsidies. According to GTM Research, solar panel manufacturers are expected to supply 59 gigawatts worldwide this year, but demand is only expected to be 30 gigawatts. The study expects that about 21 gigawatts of existing factories will need to close to re-establish a healthy balance of supply and demand. This oversupply problem that began to surface in early 2011 led to an almost 50 percent decline in wholesale solar panel prices last year.[iii]

#### Chinese tariffs cause retaliatory trade actions, destroying solar adoption

Bloomberg 12 -- editors of the Bloomberg View (5/15/12, "Obama’s Tariffs on China’s Solar Products Will Cost U.S." http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-05-15/obama-s-tariffs-on-china-s-solar-products-will-cost-u-s-.html)

Simple economics holds that if you want to promote mass adoption of something, you have to make it affordable and available. This week, the Obama administration is poised to slap potentially hefty tariffs on imports of Chinese solar products, a move that will satisfy a protectionist urge but undercut the U.S. energy agenda. It’s no secret China is aggressively subsidizing its solar manufacturers, driving down prices for solar panels and components. Here’s the question: Is that a bad thing? One of the administration’s overarching goals -- and one we heartily endorse -- is fostering the adoption of clean, non- carbon-based energy, including solar. In a perfect world it should matter less where the technology comes from than whether affordable solar is enabling office buildings, universities and households to install the technology and cut down on fossil-fuel use. Slapping tariffs on the Chinese may make for good politics, but it will slow solar adoption and almost undoubtedly provoke retaliatory trade actions by a country with which the U.S., like it or not, is inextricably linked. It’s not lost on the Chinese that the U.S. has its own share of clean-energy subsidies. A better approach would be to try to negotiate a clean-energy trade agreement with China and other countries trying to promote renewables. Such an agreement would have to spell out the types and levels of allowable government assistance; restrict protectionist measures, such as requiring locally produced components and services; and be subject to dispute resolution by the World Trade Organization. China’s Subsidies The lure of punitive tariffs is easy to understand: China, through the use of overly generous subsidies to domestic manufacturers, has helped drive down the price of solar panels 80 percent over the past five years and more than 40 percent in just the past 12 months. Several U.S. solar companies such as Solar Trust of America LLC, Solyndra LLC, Evergreen Solar Inc. and SpectraWatt Inc. have filed for bankruptcy protection, while others are teetering on the edge. The Coalition for American Solar Manufacturing, which has petitioned the U.S. Commerce Department for trade sanctions, says China’s tactics have cost 2,000 jobs in the photovoltaic industry alone. Yet there are other reasons for the solar shakeout. Manufacturers, racing to meet demand over the past decade, are now sitting on a glut of panels as subsidy cuts in Europe and declining natural-gas prices take their toll. As Bloomberg News recently reported, even the largest producers in China say their profits will slump this year as shipments grow. President Barack Obama has singled out trade actions against China as a hallmark of his administration, saying tariffs such as the 2009 Chinese tire duties have saved jobs. Labor groups and other important constituencies have praised his position. But a growing body of research shows tariffs might actually cost U.S. jobs, drive up prices and hurt domestic businesses that use imported materials. The Peterson Institute for International Economics, for instance, found that Obama’s tire tariffs came at a steep price to consumers and to workers in other sectors. The analysts concluded the measure did save about 1,200 tire manufacturing jobs but raised tire costs by about $1.1 billion in 2011. Higher-priced tires reduced spending elsewhere, indirectly lowering retail employment by as many as 3,700 jobs. The money didn’t land in the pockets of tire workers but in “the coffers of tire companies, mainly abroad but also at home,” the study said. How Duties Backfire Businesses, particularly smaller companies that lack scale to negotiate bulk prices, can also face higher prices from trade sanctions, according to a Bloomberg Government analysis of 35 recent trade sanctions on Chinese goods. A 2009 decision to impose duties on Chinese imports of citric acid, which is used in everything from detergent to soda, resulted in higher prices, the analysis found. U.S. actions don’t happen without consequences. The Chinese routinely retaliate against U.S. trade sanctions by imposing tariffs on American imports such as cars and chicken parts. Energy analysts say China will probably respond to the solar tariffs by imposing a tax on U.S.-made polysilicon, a solar component, further hurting the market. In March, the Commerce Department imposed preliminary tariffs of as much as 4.73 percent on Chinese solar panels. The move was seen mainly as a slap on the wrist, given that China sells its modules for about 12 percent less. The tariffs being decided this week stand to be much higher -- as much as 100 percent -- which could have major ramifications, particularly for U.S. companies using Chinese materials in their products. It’s no wonder the solar industry is split on the issue. The political reality is the U.S. will probably decide in favor of tariffs, and we hope the level is low enough that the tax doesn’t hobble solar. But rather than giving in to protectionist tendencies, we encourage the U.S. to take a more diplomatic approach and begin earnest negotiations for a clean- energy trade agreement. Such an idea had been discussed as part of the stalled Doha trade talks and should be revived. One idea promoted by economists is to model an agreement on the 1996 Information Technology Agreement. The ITA, which now has 70 member countries, eliminated tariffs on hundreds of goods and products, and resulted in skilled countries like the U.S. designing technology products (think iPad) and labor-rich countries like China assembling them (think iPad). Any agreement would have to deal with government subsidies and be subject to dispute settlement by the WTO. The market is already tilted against renewable sources of energy, with fossil fuels cheap, available and benefiting from entrenched tax benefits. Rather than throwing up roadblocks, the U.S. should be encouraging clean energy, regardless of the country of origin.

### 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.

#### Developing world

#### Transportation outweighs

**Gordon, 10** – nonresident senior associate in Carnegie’s Energy and Climate Program, where her research focuses on climate, energy, and transportation issues in the United States and China (Deborah, December. “The Role of Transportation in Driving Climate Disruption.” http://carnegieendowment.org/files/transport\_climate\_disruption.pdf)

Climate impacts differ by sector. On-road transportation has the greatest negative effect on climate, especially in the short term. This is primarily because of two factors unique to on-road transportation: (1) nearly exclusive use of petroleum fuels, the combustion of which results in high levels of the principal warming gases (carbon dioxide, ozone, and black carbon); and (2) minimal emissions of sulfates, aerosols, and organic carbon from on-road transportation sources to counterbalance warming with cooling effects. Scientists find that cutting on-road transportation climate and air-pollutant emissions would be unambiguously good for the climate (and public health) in the near term. Transportation’s role in climate change is especially problematic, given the dependence on oil that characterizes this sector today. There are too few immediate mobility and fuel options in the United States beyond oil-fueled cars and trucks. U.S. and international policy makers have yet to tackle transportationclimate challenges. In its fourth assessment report, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) found that the global transportation sector was responsible for the most rapid growth in direct greenhouse gas emissions, a 120 percent increase between 1970 and 2004. To further complicate matters, the IPCC projects that, without policy intervention, the rapidly growing global transportation sector has little motivation to change the way it operates, because consumer choices are trumping best practices. Herein lies a fundamental mismatch between the climate problem and solutions: transportation is responsible for nearly one of every three tons of greenhouse gas emissions but represents less than one of every twelve tons of projected emission reductions. Clearly this sector is a major contributor to climate change; therefore, it should be the focus of new policies to mitigate warming. Government must lead this effort as the market alone cannot precipitate the transition away from cars and oil, which dominate this sector.

#### Warming doesn’t cause extinction – past temperature fluctuations prove

**Stampf, 7** (Olaf, staff writer for Spiegel Online, 5/5. “Not the End of the World as we Know it,” <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,481684,00.html>)

But even this moderate warming would likely have far fewer apocalyptic consequences than many a prophet of doom would have us believe. For one thing, the more paleontologists and geologists study the history of the earth's climate, the more clearly do they recognize just how much temperatures have fluctuated in both directions in the past. Even major fluctuations appear to be completely natural phenomena. Additionally, some environmentalists doubt that the large-scale extinction of animals and plants some have predicted will in fact come about. "A warmer climate helps promote species diversity," says Munich zoologist Josef Reichholf. Also, more detailed simulations have allowed climate researchers to paint a considerably less dire picture than in the past -- gone is the talk of giant storms, the melting of the Antarctic ice shield and flooding of major cities. Improved regionalized models also show that climate change can bring not only drawbacks, but also significant benefits, especially in northern regions of the world where it has been too cold and uncomfortable for human activity to flourish in the past. However it is still a taboo to express this idea in public. For example, countries like Canada and Russia can look forward to better harvests and a blossoming tourism industry, and the only distress the Scandinavians will face is the guilty conscience that could come with benefiting from global warming.

#### Solar insufficient in solving warming

Post 12 -- BSME New Jersey Institute of Technology, MSME Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, MBA, University of Connecticut. P.E. Connecticut. Consulting Engineer and Project Manager (Willem, 7/1/12, "Wind Energy CO2 Emissions Reductions are Overstated," http://theenergycollective.com/node/89476)

Solar energy is variable (during a day and during variable cloudiness) and intermittent; usually it is minimal in the morning, maximal at noon about 3-5 hours before the daily peak demand, minimal in the afternoon, minimal during foggy, overcast, snowy days, and zero at night. About 65-70 percent of the hours of a year solar energy is near zero, and it cannot be turned off, as in Southern Germany with about 1 million PV systems, when on sunny summer days solar energy surges to about 12,000 MW to 14,000 MW and has to be partially exported to France and the Czech Republic at fire sale prices, 5.5 euro cent/kWh or less, after having been subsidized at an average of about 50 euro cent/kWh. Example: German solar power is as little as 2% of rated capacity, or 340 MW, on cloudy days and when snow covers the panels. This means there are many hours during a year when no wind or solar energy is generated. Therefore, all conventional generator units will need to be kept in good operating condition, AND staffed 24/7/365, AND fueled to serve the daily demand when wind and solar energy is near zero. Without utility-scale energy storage, wind turbines and solar systems cannot replace any conventional units. All the units that would be needed WITHOUT the existence of wind turbines and solar systems, would also be needed WITH the existence of wind turbines and solar systems. Some of the conventional units would have less energy production with wind and solar energy on the grid, thereby adversely affecting their economics, due to increasingly inefficient start/stop, part-load and part-load-ramping operations, but without wind and solar energy on the grid, the energy production of almost all the conventional units would be needed to serve the daily demand. Building Wind Turbines Everywhere?: There are some (mostly wind turbine vendors, project developers, trade organizations, NRELs, financial types setting up LLC tax shelters for the top 1% of households, etc.) who say that building wind turbines everywhere there is wind, and connecting all of them with a national HVDC overlay grid into a super grid (similar to the US Interstate Highway System overlaying state and local roads), the variation and intermittency of wind energy in the diverse geographical areas will largely be canceling each other out so that the overall energy production will become increasingly steadier as more wind turbines are connected to the super grid, and that therefore there will be little need for balancing plants, and that there will always be wind energy somewhere no matter what the weather conditions in one or more geographical areas. Several National Renewable Energy Laboratories and other entities have made studies of this scheme, using mathematical modeling, as described in the EWITS and NEWITS reports. However, someone went one step further and combined the outputs of 5 widely dispersed geographical areas: - http://transmission.bpa.gov/Business/Operations/Wind/default.aspx Bonneville Power Administration, which serves 3.5 GW of installed capacity in the Pacific Northwest - The Australian Energy Market Operator, which serves 1.8 GW of installed capacity in New South Wales - The Independent Electricity System Operator, which serves 1.2 GW of installed capacity in Ontario - The Alberta Electric System Operator, which serves 0.8 GW of installed capacity in Alberta - http://www.eirgrid.com/operations/systemperformancedata/windgeneration/ EirGrid, which serves 1.4 GW of installed capacity in Ireland The result of the analysis is described in this article which concludes geographical dispersion of wind turbines does not reduce the variation and intermittency of wind energy. http://www.ethiopianreview.com/business/122605 A French energy systems analyst, Hubert Flocard, combined the wind energy outputs of several European nations. The results of his analysis yielded the same conclusion. http://www.dimwatt.eu/index.php/our-campaigns/keeping-the-lights-on/documents/108-ground-breaking-french-study-should-stop-further-expenses-on-the-so-called-super-grid Energy Cost Projections The US Energy Information Administration projects levelized production costs (national averages, excluding subsidies) of NEW plants coming on line in 2016 as follows (2009$) : Offshore wind $0.243/kWh, PV solar $0.211/kWh (higher in marginal solar areas, such as New England), Onshore wind $0.096/kWh (higher in marginal wind areas with greater capital and O&M costs, such as on ridge lines in New England), Conventional coal (base-loaded) $0.095/kWh, Advanced CCGT (base-loaded) $0.0631/kWh. http://www.energytransition.msu.edu/documents/ipu\_eia\_electricity\_generation\_estimates\_2011.pdf IS WIND ENERGY GOOD ENERGY POLICY? Within federal, state and local governments tens of thousands of people are busying themselves promoting renewables by with holding meetings and public hearings, preparing studies, writing reports, energy plans, laws, rules and regulations, monitoring projects for compliance, etc. Outside of government wind turbine vendors (Siemens, GE, Vestas, Iberdrola, etc,), project developers/owners, financiers managing tax shelters, trade organizations, etc., are busying themselves popularizing wind energy as saving the planet from global warming with PR campaigns that claim there would be significant reductions of fossil fuel consumption and CO2 reductions/kWh, that capital costs/MW would decrease, and that wind energy costs/kWh would be at grid parity in the near future. These claims have largely not been realized. Global Warming is a Given: A just-released report from EIA shows the actual world energy consumption data and projected consumption data for the 1990 to 2035 period. The report shows world energy consumption is estimated to increase from 505 quads in 2008 to 770 quads in 2035, a 52% increase. The biggest part of the increase is by (non-OECD nations + Asia). http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/ieo/world.cfm See spreadsheet associated with figure 12 World energy consumption by fuel (quadrillion Btu) Liquids: From 173.2 in 2010 to 225.1 in 2035; 30% more Natural gas: 116.7 to 174.7; 50% more Coal: 149.4 to 209.1; 49% more Nuclear: 27.6 to 51.2; 86% more Renewables: 55.2 to 109.5; 98% more Renewables fraction of total consumption: From 10.6% in 2010 to 15.2% in 2035 Fossil fraction of total consumption: 84.1% to 79.1% The significant increase in projected fossil fuel consumption during the next 24 years means global warming will continue unabated, because (non-OECD + ASIA) will have energy consumption growth far outpacing the energy consumption growth of the rest of the world; i.e., global warming is a given. The above indicates the enormous investments required to achieve the 2035 projected renewables energy production would have practically no benefit regarding global warming.

#### Solar can only account for one sixth of global emissions – this assumes the most liberal estimates

IEA 12 (7-9,"Solar energy could meet one-sixth of global demand for heating and cooling in under 40 years" http://www.iea.org/newsroomandevents/news/2012/july/name,28298,en.html)

Solar energy could account for around one-sixth of the world’s total low-temperature heating and cooling needs by 2050, according to a roadmap launched today by the International Energy Agency (IEA). This would eliminate some 800 megatonnes of carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions per year, or more than Germany’s total CO2 emissions in 2009. The IEA’s Solar Heating and Cooling Roadmap outlines how best to advance the global uptake of solar heating and cooling (SHC) technologies, which produce very low levels of greenhouse-gas emissions. Some SHC technologies, such as domestic hot water heaters, are already widely in use in certain countries, but others are just entering the development phase. While solar heating and cooling today makes a modest contribution to world energy demand, the roadmap envisages that if governments and industry took concerted action, solar energy could annually produce more than 16% of total final energy use for low-temperature heat and nearly 17% for cooling. This would correspond to a 25-fold increase in absolute terms of SHC technology deployment in the next four decades. “Given that global energy demand for heat represents almost half of the world’s final energy use – more than the combined global demand for electricity and transport – solar heat can make a significant contribution in both tackling climate change and strengthening energy security,” said Paolo Frankl, Head of the IEA’s Renewable Energy Division. Benefiting warm climate countries In addition to replacing fossil fuels that are directly burned to produce heat, solar heating technologies can also replace electricity used for heating water as well as individual rooms and buildings. This would be especially welcome in warm climate countries without gas infrastructure and lacking alternative heating fuels. South Africa is cited as an example of a country that would benefit, as electric water heating currently accounts for a third of average household (coal-based) power consumption there. On top of this, the report notes that solar thermal cooling technology – in which the sun’s heat can be used to cool air – can reduce the burden on electric grids at times of peak cooling demand by fully or partially replacing conventional electrically powered air conditioners in buildings.

#### -- Ozone stable – and no impact

Lieberman 7 (Ben, Senior Policy Analyst – Heritage Foundation, “Ozone: The Hole Truth”, The Washington Times, 9-19, Lexis)

Environmentalists have made many apocalyptic predictions over the last several decades. Virtually none has come to pass. Yet each time, the greens and their political allies proclaim victory, arguing their preventive prescriptions averted disaster. Such is the case with the 1987 Montreal Protocol On Substances That Deplete The Ozone Layer (Montreal Protocol). The lurid predictions of ozone depletion-induced skin cancer epidemics, ecosystem destruction and others haven't come true, for which Montreal Protocol proponents congratulate themselves. But in retrospect, the evidence shows ozone depletion was an exaggerated threat in the first place. As the treaty parties return to Montreal for their 20th anniversary meeting it should be cause for reflection, not celebration, especially for those who hope to repeat this "success story" in the context of global warming. The treaty came about over legitimate but overstated concerns that chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs, a then-widely used class of refrigerants) and other compounds were rising to the stratosphere and destroying ozone molecules. These molecules, collectively known as the ozone layer, shield the Earth from excessive ultraviolet-B radiation (UVB) from the sun. The Montreal Protocol's provisions were tightened in 1990 and again in 1992, culminating with a CFC ban in most developed nations by 1996. So what do we know now? As far as ozone depletion is concerned, the thinning of the ozone layer that occurred throughout the 1980s apparently stopped in the early 1990s, too soon to credit the Montreal Protocol. A 1998 World Meteorological Organization (WMO) report said: "Since 1991, the linear [downward] trend observed during the 1980s has not continued, but rather total column ozone has been almost **constant**." However, the same report noted that the stratospheric concentrations of the offending compounds were still increasing through 1998. This lends credence to the skeptical view, widely derided at the time of the Montreal Protocol, that natural variations better explain the fluctuations in the global ozone layer. More importantly, the feared increase in ground level UVB radiation has also failed to materialize. Keep in mind that ozone depletion, in and of itself, doesn't really harm human health or the environment. It was the concern that an eroded ozone layer will allow more of the sun's damaging UVB rays to reach the Earth that led to the Montreal Protocol. But WMO concedes no statistically significant long-term trends have been detected, noting earlier this year that "outside the polar regions, ozone depletion has been relatively small, hence, in many places, increases in UV due to this depletion are difficult to separate from the increases caused by other factors, such as changes in cloud and aerosol." In short, the impact of ozone depletion on UVB over populated regions is so small it's hard to detect. Needless to say, if UVB hasn't gone up, then the fears of increased UVB-induced harm are unfounded. Indeed, the much-hyped acceleration in skin cancer rates hasn't been documented. U.S. National Cancer Institute statistics show malignant melanoma incidence and mortality, which had been undergoing a long-term increase that predates ozone depletion, has actually been leveling off during the putative ozone crisis. Further, no ecosystem or species was ever shown to be seriously harmed by ozone depletion. This is true even in Antarctica, where the largest seasonal ozone losses, the so-called Antarctic ozone hole, occur annually. Also forgotten is a long list of truly ridiculous claims, such as the one from Al Gore's 1992 book "Earth in the Balance" that, thanks to the Antarctic ozone hole, "hunters now report finding blind rabbits; fisherman catch blind salmon."

#### No impact to Oceans—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!

### Water

#### Solar industry strong and domestic demand robust

Andrew 12 -- reporting and writing on a wide range of topics at the nexus of economics, technology, ecology/environment @ Clean Technica (8/27/12, "1H 2012 US Solar PV Installations Grow 120%; US Poised to be World’s 3rd-Largest Market," http://cleantechnica.com/2012/08/27/1h-2012-us-solar-pv-installations-grow-120-us-poised-to-be-worlds-3rd-largest-market/)

Solar photovoltaic (PV) installations in the Americas more than doubled in the first half of 2012 (1H 2012) and will reach nearly 4.3 GW for the year. Solar PV installations rose more than 120% in the Americas in the first six months of 2012, according to IMS Research’s latest quarterly report, to reach 1.7 GW. That compares to 750 MW in the 1H 2011. Looking at the global picture, the German and Americas markets led growth in solar PV installations through June, with global installations exceeding 13 GW for the first time ever. IMS forecasts 3 GW of new solar PV capacity coming on-line for the full year, according to IMS’ “Q3 PV Demand Report.” “Despite the lackluster financial performance of the industry’s suppliers, underlying demand was robust in the first six months of this year, with first half installations 35 percent up on 2011,” commented IMS Research PV Research Director Ash Sharma. “The Americas market, led by the USA was unseasonably strong in the first half and did not show any significant slowdown resulting from the anti-dumping duties.” The US solar PV market will contribute most to growth globally in 2012, making the US the third-largest solar PV market in the world, according to IMS. The US accounted for 40% of new solar PV capacity growth in 1H 2012. The European market, in contrast, is forecast to contract nearly 3 GW for the year despite strong first-half performance in Germany. 1H 2012′s strong growth in US solar PV installations puts paid to the contention that the imposition of anti-dumping tariffs and countervailing duties on imports of crystalline solar PV cells and modules from China would stall growth in US solar PV demand, according to the Coalition for Solar Manufacturing (CASM), which filed the WTO petitions against China with US international trade authorities. “The new report by IMS Research effectively debunks two of the arguments made by Chinese solar manufacturers and their allies regarding the potential impact of tariffs on the U.S. solar market. First, preliminary tariffs did not slow growth of the U.S. solar market in the first half of 2012. Second, they have not had hurt downstream employment,” stated Gordon Brinser, president of SolarWorld Industries America Inc., the Oregon-based subsidiary of Germany’s SolarWorld AG, which leads CASM’s WTO trade litigation effort. “The IMS study notes that demand for solar in the U.S. market grew 120 percent through the end of June, compared with the same period in 2011, and did ‘not show any significant slowdown resulting from the anti-dumping duties.’ “This statement undercuts claims that dumped Chinese panels helped ignite a boom in the U.S. solar market. The fact that demand increased 120 percent – a significantly higher level than in past years, despite significantly reduced Chinese imports over the past three months – shows that there is significant demand for solar, even without dumped and subsidized Chinese products. “At the same time, the 35 percent increase in installations of solar panels cited in the IMS study shows there has been no negative impact on solar employment in the United States,” Brinser continued. “This result undermines the opposition’s prediction of tens of thousands of lost jobs if tariffs were imposed to counter the impact of illegally dumped and subsidized Chinese panels.” Moreover, Brinser added, these early indications show that the penalties being preliminarily imposed on Chinese imports are having the desired effect. “Based on what we are seeing in the marketplace, the U.S. solar market is robust, despite challenges for producers. However, as the Associated Press pointed out, the challenge is greatest for Chinese solar producers who have racked up huge losses in their attempt to dump their way to market dominance over the past two years.” Looking at global solar PV demand going forward, IMS foresees growth in solar PV installations accelerating in the second half of 2012 (2H 2012), despite slowdowns in Germany and Italy, two key European markets. The outlook beyond year-end is uncertain, however, IMS says. “IMS Research remains optimistic about the potential for the US PV market, and we predict it will grow to at least 3.5 GW in 2012 and become the world’s third largest PV market. The longer-term outlook for this market is less certain, although the speed at which it is developing so far in 2012 provides some encouragement,” IMS’ Sharma elaborated.

#### Can’t solve Ogallala --- it cannot be replenished --- decline inevitable.

**Wilder**, 8/31/**2010** (Forrest, The Late, Great Ogallala Aquifer, Texas Observer, p. http://www.texasobserver.org/forrestforthetrees/the-late-great-ogallala-aquifer)

As you can, the overall picture is one of severe decline. Unfortunately, there are no do-overs in the Ogallala. Once the water is pumped out and used, it’s gone for good. For decades, there were no limits on pumping. Indeed, it was widely believed that the Ogallala was a free-flowing subterranean river that could yield as much as man demanded. It wasn’t until well into the 19th century that farmers realized that they were depleting their lifeblood and began to move towards some semblance of conservation. Still, the rate of decline hasn't appreciably slowed. I should also note that over the years a host of Cassandras has predicted the rapid, even apocalyptic, demise of irrigated farming. Nothing like that has come to pass – yet. More likely is a slow, halting decline in High Plains agriculture and the regional economy. Like so many other natural resources, the Ogallala is entering an Age of Scarcity in which rationing becomes a matter of economic survival. In concrete terms that means increased regulation and pumping limits. Case in point: Here’s a story ("Farmers face water limits") from earlier this month in the Lubbock Avalanche-Journal: But within a year, locally-elected water regulators said, the region will discuss limiting how much water irrigated agriculture worth billions of dollars may pump from the Ogallala Aquifer. “Well-production limits are an option,” said Jim Conkwright, manager of the High Plains Underground Water Conservation District. The move could mark the latest concession to keep conservation of a massive, waning resource meted out by local hands, which traces its roots back decades to the formation of the state’s first efforts by landowners to influence how the Ogallala Aquifer was preserved. Wary grower groups and the landowners who will ultimately approve any rules looked to start the process in earnest some months after finishing this year’s harvest. “We’re just concerned,” said David Gibson, executive director of the Texas Corn Producers Association. “We don’t want any large shocks to the economy, the landowners and the producers. I think even the water districts are concerned about that as well, to make sure it’s done in a manner that doesn’t negatively impact the area’s economy in a way that could be done differently.” There are no engineering miracles that can solve the withering-away of the Ogallala. No amount of rainfall will replenish the aquifer, either. The choices that face everyone in that region are difficult. You can't turn off the spigot and destroy an ag-based economy. Nor can you pump full-bore until the water is gone. So for now the region walks a middle path, gradually cutting back and preparing (hopefully) for the day when the well is dry.

#### Doesn’t escalate and alt caus

Hill 8/30 (http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/economy/246803-world-bank-rising-food-prices-means-governments-should-strengthen-social-net)

On the other side of the Atlantic, droughts in Russia, Ukraine and Kazakhstan have dragged down wheat production. Rice prices, however, dropped by 4 percent. At the same time, the World Bank says it does not yet believe conditions will get as bad as in 2008, when rising food prices led to instability, and even riots, in a string of countries around the world. Still, the bank also said that a spike in energy prices and continued weather issues could force the same sort of hike in grain prices that happened four years ago.

#### Numerous checks and balances

Bailey 98 (Kathleen, Snr Fellow @ Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, August, NIPP, http://www.nipp.org/5.php)

Neither U.S. nor Russian nuclear weapons can be fired accidentally, nor can an illegitimate order to fire be acted upon. There are **numerous checks and balances** to **assure a very high level of control** over weapons (see Table 2). Nuclear weapons require a series of steps not only to issue the order to fire (and for the recipient to authenticate the order once received), but also to execute the order. For example, instruction codes to issue a command to fire U.S. nuclear weapons are kept in a safe. To open the safe requires that an order from the commander-in-chief (or his successor) be received and de-coded. Two individuals, each with complementary components of the combination or key to the safe must then participate in opening it. (In Russia, there are three individuals.) A single person cannot do the action, nor can it be done by only the two people with the key; others must be aware and complicit in the action. The weapons themselves also have codes and/or mechanical devices, which must be implemented or activated correctly to enable the weapon to be fired.

#### Give Russia war zero probability – politics, military superiority, and nuclear security

Graham 7 (Thomas, Russia in Global Affairs, "The dialectics of strength and weakness", http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/20/1129.html)

An astute historian of Russia, Martin Malia, wrote several years ago that “Russia has at different times been demonized or divinized by Western opinion less because of her real role in Europe than because of the fears and frustrations, or hopes and aspirations, generated within European society by its own domestic problems.” Such is the case today. To be sure, mounting Western concerns about Russia are a consequence of Russian policies that appear to undermine Western interests, but they are also a reflection of declining confidence in our own abilities and the efficacy of our own policies. Ironically, this growing fear and distrust of Russia come at a time when Russia is arguably less threatening to the West, and the United States in particular, than it has been at any time since the end of the Second World War. Russia does not champion a totalitarian ideology intent on our destruction, its **military poses no threat** to sweep across Europe, its economic growth depends on constructive commercial relations with Europe, and its strategic arsenal – while still capable of annihilating the United States – is under more reliable control than it has been in the past fifteen years and the threat of a strategic strike **approaches zero probability.** Political gridlock in key Western countries, however, precludes the creativity, risk-taking, and subtlety needed to advance our interests on issues over which we are at odds with Russia while laying the basis for more constructive long-term relations with Russia.

#### -- Food wars are a myth – there’s zero empirical evidence

Salehyan 7 (Idean, Professor of Political Science – University of North Texas, “The New Myth About Climate Change”, Foreign Policy, Summer, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story\_id=3922)

First, aside from a few anecdotes, there is **little systematic empirical evidence** that resource scarcity and changing environmental conditions lead to conflict. In fact, several studies have shown that an abundance of natural resources is more likely to contribute to conflict. Moreover, even as the planet has warmed, the number of civil wars and insurgencies has decreased dramatically. Data collected by researchers at Uppsala University and the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo shows a steep decline in the number of armed conflicts around the world. Between 1989 and 2002, some 100 armed conflicts came to an end, including the wars in Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Cambodia. If global warming causes conflict, we should not be witnessing this downward trend.

Furthermore, if famine and drought led to the crisis in Darfur, why have scores of environmental catastrophes failed to set off armed conflict elsewhere? For instance, the U.N. World Food Programme warns that 5 million people in Malawi have been experiencing chronic food shortages for several years. But famine-wracked Malawi has yet to experience a major civil war. Similarly, the Asian tsunami in 2004 killed hundreds of thousands of people, generated millions of environmental refugees, and led to severe shortages of shelter, food, clean water, and electricity. Yet the tsunami, one of the most extreme catastrophes in recent history, did not lead to an outbreak of resource wars. Clearly then, there is much more to armed conflict than resource scarcity and natural disasters.

#### -- No shortages – food is abundant

Poole 6 (Holly Kavana, Institute for Food and Development Policy,“12 Myths About Hunger”, Backgrounder, 12(2), Summer, 4-9, http://www.foodfirst.org/12myths)

Myth 1: Not Enough Food to Go Around Reality: Abundance, not scarcity, best describes the world's food supply. Enough wheat, rice and other grains are produced to provide every human being with 3,200 calories a day. That doesn't even count many other commonly eaten foods - ­vegetables, beans, nuts, root crops, fruits, grass-fed meats, and fish. Enough food is available to provide at least 4.3 pounds of food per person a day worldwide: two and half pounds of grain, beans and nuts, about a pound of fruits and vegetables, and nearly another pound of meat, milk and eggs - ­enough to make most people fat! The problem is that many people are too poor to buy readily available food. Even most "hungry countries" have enough food for all their people right now. Many are net exporters of food and other agricultural products.

#### No risk of water wars

Victor 7 (David G., Professor of Law – Stanford Law School and Director – Program on Energy and Sustainable Development, “What Resource Wars?”, The National Interest, 11-12, http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=16020)

While there are many reasons to fear global warming, the risk that such dangers could cause violent conflict ranks extremely low on the list because it is highly unlikely to materialize. Despite decades of warnings about water wars, what is striking is that **water wars don't happen**-usually because countries that share water resources have a lot more at stake and armed conflict rarely fixes the problem. Some analysts have pointed to conflicts over resources, including water and valuable land, as a cause in the Rwandan genocide, for example. Recently, the UN secretary-general suggested that climate change was already exacerbating the conflicts in Sudan. But none of these supposed causal chains stay linked under close scrutiny-the conflicts over resources are usually symptomatic of deeper failures in governance and other primal forces for conflicts, such as ethnic tensions, income inequalities and other unsettled grievances. Climate is just one of many factors that contribute to tension. The same is true for scenarios of climate refugees, where the moniker "climate" conveniently obscures the deeper causal forces.

#### -- Water scarcity spurs cooperation – not conflict

Deen 7 (Thalif, Staff – IPS, “Water Wars A Myth”, Inter Press Service, 8-25, Lexis)

"Despite the potential problem, history has demonstrated that cooperation, rather than conflict, is likely in shared basins," UNESCO concludes. The Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI) says that 10- to 20-year-old arguments about conflict over water are still being recycled. "Such arguments **ignore massive amounts of recent research** which shows that water-scarce states that share a water body tend to find cooperative solutions rather than enter into violent conflict," the institute says. SIWI says that during the entire "intifada" -- the ongoing Palestinian uprising against Israel in the occupied territories of West Bank and Gaza -- the only thing on which the two warring parties continued to cooperate at a basic level was their shared waters. "Thus, rather than reaching for arguments for the 'water war hypotheses,' the facts seem to support the idea that water is a uniting force and a potential source of peace rather than violent conflict." SIWI said. Ghosh, co-author of the UNDP study, pointed out several agreements which were "models of cooperation", including the Indus Waters Treaty, the Israel-Jordan accord, the Senegal River Development Organisation and the Mekong River Commission. A study sponsored by the Washington-based Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars points that despite newspaper headlines screaming "water wars are coming!", these apocalyptic warnings fly in the face of history. "**No nations have gone to war** specifically **over** **water** resources **for thousands of years**. International water disputes -- even among fierce enemies -- are resolved peacefully, even as conflicts erupt over other issues," it says. The study also points out instances of cooperation between riparian nations -- countries or provinces bordering the same river -- that outnumbered conflicts by more than **two to one** between 1945 and 1999. Why? "Because water is so important, nations cannot afford to fight over it. Instead, **water fuels greater interdependence**. By coming together to jointly manage their shared water resources, countries can build trust and prevent conflict," argues the study, jointly co-authored by Aaron Wolf, Annika Kramer, Alexander Carius and Geoffrey Dabelko.

## 2NC vs Emory HR

### 2NC Picking Winners

#### Extend 1NC #4 – picking winners collapses the solar industry – that’s Glover.

#### Deregulation and increased subsidies promotes of over-supply of shitty technology because there is no incentive to innovate when new capital investments are guaranteed. Solyndra proves are example – once loans were cut off, the company immediately filed for bankruptcy. Status quo solves better because it relies on the free market.

#### Prefer our evidence – it cites empirical examples. All of their evidence is industry bias – no pun intended, but they have an incentive to ask for money.

#### Incentives focus on deployment, not R&D -- makes failure inevitable and deters innovation

Stepp 12 -- Senior Analyst with the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation (ITIF) specializing in climate change and clean energy policy, M.S. degree in Science, Technology, and Public Policy @ Rochester Inst of Tech (Matthew, 3/12/12, "Innovation Strategy, Not Just Deployment," http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/03/should-government-subsidize-en.php)

More of today’s energy incentives and subsidies aren’t the answer for a number of reasons. First, existing clean technologies are not ready for primetime except in very niche markets and require significant innovations to make them viable both nationwide and globally. We need new battery technologies, new solar architectures, alternatives to critical materials, utility scale energy storage options, scalable advanced biofuels, and so on. These aren’t small technological challenges that can be overcome by boosting production of existing technologies. Second, counter to some advocates, deployment alone doesn’t spur enough innovation. At least not the types of innovations I just briefly mentioned. Ultimately, we need entirely new clean technology learning curves. Subsidizing 1 million more existing EV batteries isn’t going to lead to the step-function leaps in innovation. Scaling up production through deployment does spur incremental innovations and it does play a part in an innovation strategy. But today’s clean technologies aren’t at the precipice of competitiveness and our deployment policies aren’t aligned or correctly structured to spur the necessary innovations. Third, subsidizing existing clean technologies in America does little to reduce global carbon emissions. Without clean energy innovations, we cannot expect developing countries to subsidize their way to a clean economy given its higher costs when those countries are simply trying to gain access to any affordable energy (and food, housing, healthcare, etc.). Thus we need to make clean energy more than a global “luxury good” to drastically reduce carbon emissions, which will take innovation, not just more domestic subsidies and tax breaks.

#### Picking winners destroys innovation – makes collapse inevitable

Kerpen 12 -- president of American Commitment, served as vice president for policy at Americans for Prosperity (Phil, 3/13/12, "It’s Time to End Energy Subsidies," http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/03/should-government-subsidize-en.php)

The most important question for the United States Senate as it considers the Stabenow, Burr/Menendez, and DeMint amendments on energy subsidies is not what our country’s energy mix should be, but who should decide. For decades, Washington’s so-called experts, bureaucrats, technocrats, and would-be central planners have insisted that consumers are massively irrational and make bad energy choices. Politicians across the political spectrum have fallen under their sway and created a vast array of incentives, subsidies, mandates, and regulations to push consumers toward their favored technologies. It hasn’t worked. It won’t work. It can’t work. Just as central economic planning was exposed as a tragedy of unprecedented scale in the Soviet Union and elsewhere in the 20th century, the idea that experts can successfully displace the essentially dispersed knowledge of millions of consumers is doomed to fail on a piecemeal basis. Not in spectacular fashion, but in the usual dreary way – higher prices, less choice, less innovation. Obama looks at the scandals, corruption, and waste that large-scale subsidies of renewables have wrought and insists that we should “double down.” Like a reckless gambler desperately trying to get back to even, Obama is risking our tax dollars and economic future. According to the EIA, Washington gave away $37 billion in energy subsidies in 2010, more than double what it gave in 2007. Renewables received about 3.5 times as much in subsidies as fossil fuels. Some on the left attempt to mischaracterize legitimate cost recovery mechanisms for oil companies as subsidies, but it should be noted that EIA’s official estimates correctly do not. Getting the base right is the most important part of designing any tax system, and legitimate business costs should be deductible for everyone, including politically vulnerable oil and gas companies. But actual subsidies – market distortions designed to change behavior and replace consumer preference with political preference – should all be eliminated. That includes the $2.8 billion in annual subsidies received by oil and gas companies.

### 2NC Nat Gas Wins

#### Extend 1NC #2 – cheap natural gas blocks solar power – energy decisions are made on long-term contracts – investors like the predictability of natural gas over solar – that’s Dumaine. Prefer it – it’s predictive, cites insiders about the energy industry, and is comparative. Solar is more expensive and economies of scales are too far off.

#### There’s already oversupply of wind and solar – natural gas still wins out

Hunt 12 -- President of Tech and Creative Labs, more than 30 years experience as a utility executive, state utility regulator and as a strategic energy consultant and for the last 20 years years, he has been a strategic energy strategy consultant serving as global division president for energy analytics and advisory services as Ventyx/Global Energy Advisors; and in Standard & Poor’s Regional and Energy Economics Group; Master’s Degree in Public Administration, University of Kansas (Gary, 7/10/12, "The Importance of Balancing Energy Economics for the Success of Sustainability," http://oilprice.com/Energy/Energy-General/The-Importance-of-Balancing-Energy-Economics-for-the-Success-of-Sustainability.html)

The question is what will replace it? Environmental advocates hope it will be renewable wind and solar. We are certainly building plenty of it. But volatility happens and it does not spare the politically correct. Oversupply of photovoltaic panels and wind turbines from China flood world markets to suction up subsidies and feed in tariff supports to capture market share. Today we have two times more PV supply than demand and PV producers and wind manufacturers are feeling the pain. This market imbalance is rapidly bankrupting the solar and wind producers we are counting on to meet the next wave of growth in the energy business cycle. And then there is this. Despite environment policies opposing fossil fuels, the least cost, best fit, most sustainable alternative to coal is not solar and wind but natural gas fired generation. That is why we are fighting over fracking because low gas prices force renewable energy to compete despite rules jury rigged to favour it.

### 2NC Oversupply/Prices Low

#### Extend 1NC #6 – there’s already an oversupply of solar panels – public lands, subsidies, loan guarantees, and China’s cheap labor costs all make solar extremely cheap – that’s IER. Prefer it – it’s from the leading research on energy and is comparative between supply and demand.

#### Problem isn’t investment but the overall industry

Lamonica 12 -- senior writer covering green tech and cutting-edge technologies, joined CNET in 2002 to cover enterprise IT and Web development, previously executive editor of IT publication InfoWorld (Martin, 7/26/12, "The Dog Days of Solar," http://www.technologyreview.com/news/428583/the-dog-days-of-solar/)

The solar industry has done a spectacular job lowering costs in the past three years, slashing per-watt costs in half. But that price freefall, driven by the massive scale-up of Chinese manufacturers, has put dozens, if not hundreds, of solar companies on the endangered list. To survive, fledging solar technology companies are rethinking strategies that seemed rock solid just a few years ago. The danger is clear. Abound Solar went out of business earlier this summer because it simply couldn't stay ahead of the blistering pace of industry cost reductions (see "Abound Solar: Another Solar Casualty"). Its demise follows the spectacular collapse of Solyndra and bankruptcies, plant closings, and restructurings at many other solar providers. So how can solar startups survive? The challenge isn't lack of innovation or financing (see "Can Energy Startups Be Saved"). In the U.S., innovative solar startups have attracted billions of dollars in venture capital and government loans. But even with compelling technology, smaller players face the powerful headwinds of competing against giant incumbent providers with access to large amounts of cheap capital, all while needing to work out the kinks of a new production process at scale.

### Past Tippiing Point

#### CCS Fails

Favreau 10 (Didier, a senior analyst with IFP Energies nouvelles, France and graduated engineer from the Ecole Nationale Superieure des Mines de Saint-Etienne, France, “Economics act against CCS retrofits,” Oil and Gas Journal, October 4, 2010, http://www.ogj.com/articles/print/volume-108/issue-37/transportations/economics-act-against-ccs-retrofits.html,)

Economics will likely prevent retrofitting carbon capture and sequestration technologies to existing power plants with a capture efficiency <40% and a residual life <15 years. Only capture of flue gases (postcombustion) is practical for existing units, although even this is often made difficult by space constraints. Other solutions use processes (oxycombustion or gasification), which cannot generally be adapted to existing installations except with major revamping. Current CO2 capture, transport, and storage costs are high because they apply to demonstration projects, requiring considerable research and development. These costs will drop by 2020-30 for new units, the various technologies being better demonstrated and commercial products benefiting from their larger scale. Some experts estimate potential cost reductions of about 40%. A high degree of uncertainty remains, however, regarding storage costs, which represent about 20% of the total CCS expenses.

#### CSS will fail – no capacity for storage and increases reliance on fossil fuels in the long term

Johnson et al. 10 – PhD in Atmospheric Science

Andrew Simms, policy director of New Economics Foundation, UK think tank, and head of NEF's Climate Change Programme, Dr. Victoria Johnson, researcher for the climate change and energy programme at NEF, MSc with distinction in Climate Change from the University of East Anglia and PhD in Atmospheric Physics at Imperial College, London and Peter Chowla, Policy and Advocacy Officer at the Bretton Woods Project. “Growth isn’t possible”. New Economics Foundation, January 25,2010. http://www.neweconomics.org/sites/neweconomics.org/files/Growth\_Isnt\_Possible.pdf

A detailed analysis (rather than an estimate) of known US geological sequestration sites undertaken by the US Department of Energy revealed that only 3GtC could be stored in abandoned oil and gas fields.303 This estimate, however, does exclude saline aquifers (very little is known about potential US saline aquifers). Assuming that the USA took responsibility for CO2 emissions that were directly proportional to its share of global emissions, the USA’s capacity to store its own carbon in known geological sequestration sites would be exhausted in 12 years. Similarly, a recent analysis explored the potential storage capacity in Europe. The study found that based on Europe’s current annual emission rate of 4.1 GtCO2 per year in the EU 25, the medium-range estimate of storage capacity is only 20 times this.304 In other words, CCS is clearly not a long-term solution, as ‘peak storage’ could be reached relatively quickly. Further sequestration would require expensive and potentially unsafe pipelines directing CO2 to sequestration sites further a field. This would be an energy-intensive process which is why CCS not only poses significant future risks in terms of leakage, but also reduces the net energy gained from a particular fuel – what has been called the ‘energy penalty’.305 Given these problems, to put such faith in schemes which are operationally immature, instead of decreasing our carbon emissions, seems outrageously risky. Surely it would be better not to produce the emissions in the first place? One further limitation of CCS is that, only one-third of emissions in industrialised countries are actually produced in fossil-fuelled power stations. A significant proportion comes from the transport sector (around 30 per cent), and as yet CCS has only been developed for static CO2 sources. By pursuing a CCS pathway, we are encouraging our continued reliance on fossil fuels delivering energy through a centralised system. Should CCS become economically viable, it could act to undermine initiatives to move towards a more efficient distributed energy system with diverse arrays of low carbon energy sources.

#### Too slow

Rochon et al 08 Peer Reviewed, Greenpeace International: Greenpeace is an independent global campaigning organisation that acts to change attitudes and behaviour, to protect and conserve the environment and to promote peace, Authors include: Dr Erika Bjureby, Dr Paul Johnston, Robin Oakley, Dr David Santillo, Nina Schulz, Dr Gabriela von Goerne (Emily, May 2008, “False Hope: Why carbon capture and storage won’t save the climate,” http://www.probeinternational.org/False%20Hope%20--%20Why%20carbon%20capture%20and%20storage%20won%92t%20save%20the%20climate.pdf)//DR. H

Carbon capture and storage (CCS) aims to reduce the climate impact of burning fossil fuels by capturing carbon dioxide (CO2) from power station smokestacks and disposing of it underground. Its future development has been widely promoted by the coal industry as a justification for the construction of new coal-fired power plants. However, the technology is largely unproven and will not be ready in time to save the climate.

### China/India

#### Can’t solve – China and domestic politics

**Hale 11** (Thomas, PhD Candidate in the Department of Politics – Princeton University and a Visiting Fellow – LSE Global Governance, London School of Economics, “A Climate Coalition of the Willing,” Washington Quarterly, Winter, http://www.twq.com/11winter/docs/11winter\_Hale.pdf)

Intergovernmental efforts to limit the gases that cause climate change have all but failed. After the unsuccessful 2010 Copenhagen summit, and with little progress at the 2010 Cancun meeting, it is hard to see how major emitters will agree any time soon on mutual emissions reductions that are sufficiently ambitious to prevent a substantial (greater than two degree Celsius) increase in average global temperatures. It is not hard to see why. No deal excluding the United States and China, which together emit more than 40 percent of the world’s greenhouse gases (GHGs), is worth the paper it is written on. But domestic politics in both countries effectively block ‘‘G-2’’ leadership on climate. In the United States, the Obama administration has basically given up on national cap-and-trade legislation. Even the relatively modest Kerry-Lieberman-Graham energy bill remains dead in the Senate. The Chinese government, in turn, faces an even harsher constraint. Although the nation has adopted important energy efficiency goals, the Chinese Communist Party has staked its legitimacy and political survival on raising the living standard of average Chinese. Accepting international commitments that stand even a small chance of reducing the country’s GDP growth rate below a crucial threshold poses an unacceptable risk to the stability of the regime. Although the G-2 present the largest and most obvious barrier to a global treaty, they also provide a convenient excuse for other governments to avoid aggressive action. Therefore, the international community should not expect to negotiate a worthwhile successor to the Kyoto Protocol, at least not in the near future.

### 2NC Warming

#### Extend that solar power can’t solve warming – it’s intermittent, can’t outpace consumption of coal in Asia, and takes too long – that’s Post. Even if solar does lower emissions, the plan doesn’t solve on a large enough scale – no chance it’s cost competitive and infrastructure is too small – that’s IEA.

#### Solar can’t solve warming –

#### Takes too long, no wide scale adoption, and investment is low – we’ll be past the tipping point before we can solve

Bosetti et al 10 -- senior researcher at the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM) and principal investigator of the European Research Council–funded ICARUS Project (Valentina, Carlo Carraro, Romain Duval, Massimo Tavoni, 3/10, "What Should we Expect from Innovation? A Model-Based Assessment of the Environmental and Mitigation Cost Implications of Climate-Related R&D," http://www.cesifo-group.de/portal/pls/portal/docs/1/1185642.PDF)

We start by analysing the environmental effectiveness of standalone innovation policies, looking at their impact on carbon emission and concentration trajectories over the century. We simulate innovation policies assuming global R&D funds of various sizes are used to subsidize the three categories of Table 1. As a central value, we use a fund size equal to 0.08% of Global World 6 Product (GWP). This share is consistent with the optimal R&D investments needed to comply with a stringent climate stabilisation policy in the WITCH model (Bosetti et. al. 2009a), and is in line with the peak level of public energy R&D expenditures achieved across the OECD area in the early 1980s. Similar values have also been suggested in other recent analyses (IEA, 2008). For robustness check, and in order to assess the maximum world emission reduction that could be achieved through a stand-alone innovation policy, we pursued additional experiments with incrementally larger funds amounting to up to 2% of GWP. The international R&D fund is assumed to be financed by contributions from OECD regions that are proportional to their GDP (0.08% in most of our analysis). In turn, each world region receives from the international R&D fund a subsidy which adds to its own regional R&D investments in innovation. The fund is distributed across regions on an equal per capita basis, although alternative distribution rules were also tested to check for robustness. Figure 1 and 2 report CO2 emissions and concentrations for the 4 innovation policies, as well as for the reference (BAU, no policy) and a climate stabilisation pathway at 450 CO2 (535 CO2-e) ppmv. The main result is that all innovation policies fall short of generating the mitigation action needed to stabilise carbon concentrations. In all cases, the atmospheric stock of CO2 keeps increasing and so does the global temperature, which remains rather close to the baseline case. There are differences across innovation policies, however. The “Advanced Techs” R&D policy, under which two advanced technologies become competitive via R&D investments, yields the higher mitigation and manages to stabilise carbon emissions – albeit not concentrations. Given the improvements needed and commercialisation lags, these technologies become effectively available around mid-century, leading to some emission reductions afterwards. The “W+S & CCS” R&D policy achieves somewhat smaller reductions relative to BAU, and with a different time profile. Unlike new breakthrough technologies, wind, solar and CCS can quickly penetrate the market if supported by R&D subsidies, allowing some emission reductions during the first half of the century. However, in the long term returns to R&D investments in both technologies are limited by the resource constraints in terms of site availability (for Wind and Solar) and storage repository (for CCS). The last option, namely R&D dedicated to energy efficiency (E.E.), is almost ineffective for two reasons. First, some decline in energy intensity is already embedded in baseline scenarios, consistent with the dynamics of the last 50 years. As a consequence, achieving additional energy efficiency improvements via R&D is fairly expensive at the margin. Second, efforts to decarbonise the economy will ultimately be crucial to make a dent in emissions. This cannot be achieved through improvements in energy efficiency alone, and rather requires the progressive phasing-out of fossil-fuel-based energy technologies. 8 While the above simulations assume sizeable R&D spending, roughly four times higher than current public energy-related expenditures, one open question is whether even higher spending might overturn our conclusions. Likewise, mixed strategies combining all three types of R&D could in principle deliver higher returns, especially since alternative options differ in the time profile and long-run potential of the emission reductions they can achieve. We have therefore carried out a number of sensitivity analyses, varying the size and allocation of the technology fund. A very robust finding across all simulations is that the largest achievable reduction in emissions with respect to the baseline is in the order of 13%-14% in cumulated terms throughout the century, in the range of the “Advanced Techs” case discussed above. In particular, while a larger international R&D fund induces larger emission reductions over the medium term, its long-term impact is limited by declining marginal returns to R&D, as well as by the positive counteracting impact of the fund on world GDP and emissions. This is illustrated in Figure 3 through a comparison between two funds amounting to 2% of GWP and 0.2% respectively, both of which are assumed to subsidise equally all three types of R&D. Although the larger fund implies lower emissions in the medium term, by the end of the century the two innovation policies result in similar and growing emissions, due to the reallocation of consumption from earlier to later periods in time. Furthermore, the medium-term impact of a large R&D fund is insufficient to put world emissions, even for the first few decades, on a path consistent with long-run stabilisation of carbon concentrations at safe levels.

### Environment – General

They said the impact to the auifier is bioD

#### -- Environment is resilient

Easterbrook 95 (Gregg, Distinguished Fellow – Fullbright Foundation, A Moment on Earth, p. 25)

In the aftermath of events such as Love Canal or the Exxon Valdez oil spill, every reference to the environment is prefaced with the adjective "fragile." "Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. **The environment** that contains them **is** close to **indestructible**. The living environment of Earth has survived ice ages; bombardments of cosmic radiation more deadly than atomic fallout; solar radiation more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion; thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global air pollution far worse than that made by any factory; reversals of the planet's magnetic poles; the rearrangement of continents; transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream; 300-foot vacillations in sea levels; shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by shifts in the planetary axis; collisions of asteroids and comets bearing far more force than man's nuclear arsenals; and the years without summer that followed these impacts. Yet hearts beat on, and petals unfold still. Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of the industrial affronts of the dreaming ape. **Human assaults** on the environment, though mischievous, **are** **pinpricks** compared to forces of the magnitude nature is **accustomed to resisting**.

#### -- Long time-frame

Kay 1 (Jane, “Study Takes Historical Peek at Plight of Ocean Ecosystems”, San Francisco Chronicle, 7-26, Lexis)

The collapse of ecosystems often occur over a **long period**. In one example, when Aleut hunters killed the Alaskan sea otter about **2,500 years ago**, the population of their natural prey, the sea urchin, grew larger than its normal size. In turn, the urchins grazed down the kelp forests, important habitat for a whole host of ocean life. Then, when fur traders in the 1800s hunted the otters and sea cows almost to extinction, the kelp forests disappeared and didn't start to regenerate until the federal government protected the sea otters in the 20th century. In California, the diversity of spiny lobsters, sheephead fish and abalone kept down the urchin numbers. At present in Alaska, the kelp beds are declining again in areas where killer whales are preying on sea otters. Biologists think the killer whales switched to otters for food because there are fewer seals and sea lions to eat.

### Econ Outweighs – Probability

#### Probability -- conflict now is highly likely given other economic stressors

Mootry 9 (Primus, B.A. Northern Illinois University “Americans likely to face more difficult times” - The Herald Bulletin, http://www.theheraldbulletin.com/columns/local\_story\_282184703.html?keyword=secondarystory)

These are difficult times. The direct and indirect costs associated with the war on Iraq have nearly wrecked our economy. The recent $700 billion bailout, bank failures, and the failure of many small and large businesses across the nation will take years — perhaps decades — to surmount. Along with these rampant business failures, we have seen unemployment rates skyrocket, record numbers of home foreclosures, an explosion of uninsured Americans, and other economic woes that together have politicians now openly willing to mention the "D" word: Depression. These are difficult days. We have seen our international reputation sink to all time lows. We have seen great natural disasters such as hurricanes Ike and Katrina leaving hundreds of thousands of citizens stripped of all they own or permanently dislocated. In all my years, I have never seen a time such as this. To make matters worse, we are witnessing a resurgence of animosities between the United States and Russia, as well as the rapid growth of India and China. As to the growth of these two huge countries, the problem for us is that they are demanding more and more oil — millions of barrels more each week — and there is not much we can say or do about it. In the meantime, if America does not get the oil it needs, our entire economy will grind to a halt. In short, the challenges we face are complex and enormous. Incidentally, one of the factors that makes this time unlike any other in history is the potential for worldwide nuclear conflict. **There has never been a time in** the long **history** of man **when**, through his own technologies — and his arrogance — he can destroy the planet. Given the tensions around the world, **a mere spark could lead to global conflagration.**[This evidence has been gender paraphrased].

### Econ Collapse = War

#### Decline cause miscalculation and conflict – prefer statistically significant evidence

**Royal 10** (Jedediah, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction – U.S. Department of Defense, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises”, Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, Ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases**,** as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularlyduring periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. "Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate externalmilitary conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in theuse of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflictat systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

#### Economic collapse causes extinction

**Bearden 00** (T.E., Director of Association of Distinguished American Scientists, The Unnecessary Energy Crisis: How to Solve It Quickly,” Space Energy Access Systems, http://www.seaspower.com/EnergyCrisis-Bearden.htm)

History bears out that desperate nations take desperate actions. Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress on nations will have increased the intensity and number of their conflicts, to the point where the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) now possessed by some 25 nations, are almost certain to be released.  As an example, suppose a starving North Korea launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response. Or suppose a desperate China — whose long-range nuclear missiles (some) can reach the United States — attacks Taiwan. In addition to immediate responses, the mutual treaties involved in such scenarios will quickly draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly. Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, once a few nukes are launched, adversaries and potential adversaries are then compelled to launch on perception of preparations by one's adversary.  The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed. Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible. As the studies showed, rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs. Today, a great percent of the WMD arsenals that will be unleashed, are already on site within the United States itself. The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere, at least for many decades.

#### Growth solves war – econometric studies prove

**Hupreys 03** (Macartan Huphreys is a Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Columbia University And Director, Center for the Study of Development Strategies Feb 2003 “Economics and Violent Conflict” http://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/issues\_doc/Peace\_and\_Business/Economics\_and\_Violent\_Conflict.pdf)

One might expect rich nations to be more violent than poor ones because the rich ones have more to fight over. 10 The econometric evidence however suggests the opposite. Most research shows that wealth reduces the likelihood of civil war, 11 and that economic growth also reduces risks while recessions worsen them. Figures derived from World Bank econometric models (Figure 1) show a striking relationship between the wealth of a nation and its chances of having a civil war. 12 The figure suggests that differences in wealth are most relevant among poorer countries. A country with GDP per person of just $250 has a predicted probability of war onset (at some point over the next five years) of 15%, even if it is otherwise considered an “average” country. This probability of war reduces by half for a country with GDP of just $600 per person and is reduced by half again to below 4% for a country with income of $1250. Countries with income per person over $5000 have a less than 1% chance of experiencing civil conflicts, all else being equal. There are various explanations for why this is so. But so far little work has been undertaken to distinguish between them. The most common is that wealthier societies are better able to protect assets, thus making violence less attractive for would-be rebels. 13 Another explanation, given by political scientist Thomas Homer Dixon argues that poverty causes violence, and points to cases where scarcity leads to migrations that result in conflicts between identity groups over resources. Alternatively, the relationship could be spurious in the sense that there are other features of a country, such as a democratic culture, that make it at once more prosperous and less violent. And causality may in fact run in the opposite direction: rich countries may be rich in part because they have had little civil conflict in their recent past. 14 Whatever the reason, the figures suggest that growth oriented initiatives and conflict prevention initiatives are mutually reinforcing. And the figures provide a rationale for those who say that it is in the interest of wealthy nations to promote economic growth in poor countries in order to avoid the spillover effects of likely conflicts there. In terms of policy implications, the analysis suggests that the greatest gains in conflict prevention are to be made by focusing development efforts on the very poor rather than on countries of intermediate wealth.

#### Growth solves conflict

**Marquardt 5** (Michael J., Professor of Human Resource Development and International Affairs, George Washington University, Globalization: The Pathway to Prosperity, Freedom and Peace,” Human Resource Development International, March 2005, Volume 8, Number 1, pg. 127-129)

Perhaps the greatest value of globalization is its potential for creating a world of peace. Economic growth has been identiﬁed as one of the strongest forces that turn people away from conﬂict and wars among groups, tribes, and nations. Global companies strongly discourage governments from warring against countries in which they have investments. Focusing on economic growth encourages cooperation and living in relative peace (Marquardt, 2001, 2002).

### Uniqueness Wall – 2NC

#### Group the uniqueness debate –

#### Electricity prices are on the decline and will remain low for the next years – the natural gas boom means that current supply is already meeting demand – that’s Burtraw. Prefer our evidence –

#### A. Predictive – it assumes rising demands for the next 20 years, their evidence is a snapshot and doesn’t occur for future changes.

#### B. More qualified – Burtraw is an expert is the electricity sector – their evidence is from a random news outlet.

#### Uniqueness determines the direction of the link – the only chance for consequence is a scenario where the plan increases prices. It means there’s no chance of their link turn being offense.

#### More reasons –

#### 1. Natural gas boom and decreased demand

EIA 8/10/12 ("Today in Energy," http://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.cfm?id=7490)

A combination of natural gas prices at 10-year lows and the warmest winter on record led to lower on-peak wholesale electricity prices so far in 2012. On-peak prices fell between 24% and 39% across major wholesale price hubs from January to June of 2012 compared to the same period of 2011 (see map above).¶ Off-peak (nights and weekends) electricity prices were also down for first-half 2012 compared to first-half 2011, although generally less than the declines in on-peak prices over that period (see map below). In contrast to other major power trading locations, off-peak prices in Northern California at CAISO NP15 increased 10% when compared to first-half 2011, mainly because of more nuclear outages this spring and record-breaking hydroelectric output during the spring of 2011. Off-peak prices generally reflect the cost of maintaining output from baseload generators, while on-peak prices reflect the price of generating from intermediate and peak generators throughout a given day.¶ Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration, based on SNL Energy.¶ Spot natural gas prices during the first half of 2012 generally fell about 40-50% compared to the same period in 2011 and on some days neared their lowest levels in a decade. Lower natural gas prices led to increasing use of natural gas to generate electricity, contributing to lower wholesale electricity prices, especially for on-peak prices.¶ In 2012, twenty-eight states, mainly in the middle and eastern portions of the United States, reported their highest average daily temperatures for first half of any year during the past 118 years according to information reported by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (see map below). Warm weather at the start of 2012 contributed to reduced demand for both electricity and natural gas to heat homes, and contributed to lower wholesale natural gas and electricity prices.

#### 2. Even if electricity prices rise, it will be small and stable

EIA 9/11/12 ("Short-term energy outlook," http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/steo/report/electricity.cfm)

EIA expects the nominal U.S. residential electricity price will rise by 1.0 percent during 2012 to an average of 11.91 cents per kilowatthour. During 2013, U.S. residential retail electricity prices increase 0.9 percent over the average 2012 price. When measured in real terms, the U.S. residential electricity price declines by an annual average of 0.8 percent in both 2012 and 2013.

### Solar/Wind – 2NC

#### Group the link debate –

#### Renewable energy drives up electricity prices – construction costs of transmission lines and lower efficiency ratings – that’s Bryce. All of those costs get directly placed on ratepayers, not the company. Prefer our evidence – it’s from an economic fellow. All of their evidence is from the solar industry that are bias and have an incentive to lie.

#### Link outweighs the link turn – the costs of construction get put on taxpayers BEFORE the energy is generated.

#### Renewables are 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.

### Prices K2 Manufacturing – 2NC

#### Prices are key to manufacturing – companies are making the move to the US due to low electricity prices. The plan causes those companies to move back offshore – removing any competitive advantage the US has in terms of economic growth.

#### This is an important framing issue – we don’t have to win “total collapse of the industry” just that they move out of the US – that’s Perry.

#### Independently – they’ve conceded that high electricity prices collapse consumer spending which is vital to economic recovery.

#### We have a unique internal link – economic growth is happening because of manufacturing “rehoring” that’s occurring due to low electricity prices – the plan reverses that trend

Schoenberger 5/31/12 (Robert, Plain Dealer, "Shale gas boom could bring manufacturing jobs back to U.S., economists say," http://www.cleveland.com/shalegas/index.ssf/2012/05/shale\_gas\_boom\_could\_bring\_man.html)

"By 2025, the manufacturing sector alone could save $11.5 billion in energy costs," Robert McCutcheon, an economist with consulting group PwC, said at a manufacturing summit hosted by the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland. McCutcheon's company, formerly called PriceWaterhouseCoopers, released a study late last year predicting that as many as 1 million new U.S. manufacturing jobs could come from lower-cost energy.¶ "If we save $11.5 billion, that's investment capital that could be redirected elsewhere," McCutcheon added.¶ Cleveland Fed President and Chief Executive Sandra Pianalto said manufacturing businesses have been leading the economic recovery in the United States for the past two years, but she added that job growth hasn't been as strong as profit and sales growth. To add jobs, the sector needs to attract new manufacturers and bring production back to the United States from other countries.¶ That's where shale gas and cheap energy could come in.¶ Pianalto said one steel producer told her recently that energy costs in North America are one-third the cost of European steel plants [reporter's note: an earlier version of this story said U.S. costs were one-tenth of Europe's. Pianalto's office said the Cleveland Fed chief went over her notes and found that one-third was the more accurate figure]. Those costs, coupled with weak demand, has ArcelorMittal expanding in Ohio while it cuts production in Europe. Several other steel plants in the region have also increased production to sell pipeline tubes and other parts to oil and gas companies.¶ Marianne Kah, chief economist for energy company ConocoPhillips, called the ongoing shale boom the "most significant change in the energy industry since the 1940s."¶ Kah said over the past five years, energy companies have learned that most of their early predictions on shale gas were wrong. The companies knew that there were huge reserves of oil and gas trapped within hard rocks that needed to be hydraulically fractured to release that energy, but they vastly overestimated the costs of doing that.¶ Production in Texas and Pennsylvania has produced far more gas, far more cheaply than the industry expected, and gas prices are now near historic lows. Low gas costs have drawn huge interest from chemical companies that convert natural gas into plastics and other materials. In March, Shell Oil said it would build a multi-billion petrochemical refinery near Pittsburgh. Several other chemical plants have announced shale-related expansions.¶ "And these are the very early days. We're likely to learn a lot more about how to optimize this process" and lower production costs in the future, she added.¶ From a competitive standpoint, she said shale is already making the United States a more attractive place to do business. Natural gas prices are lower here than in China, Germany of Great Britain.¶ William Strauss, senior economist for the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, said the boom has meant U.S. electricity prices are the lowest of any industrial nation in the world. Those low energy prices could help the country lure back work sent to Asia over the years where low-cost labor has been the draw. Strauss said labor is still cheaper overseas, but the total production costs can be higher after figuring in energy and the cost to ship goods across the Pacific Ocean.

### Consumer Spending Key to Econ

#### Consumer spending is the backbone of US growth

Lazzaro 8/6/12 (Joseph, International Business Times, "Globalization: The Economic Structural Changes Continue," http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/370786/20120806/globalization-jobs-unemployment-income-corporations-trade-rate.htm)

At the outset of the 2007-2009 U.S. recession, few doubted the link between U.S. consumer spending and U.S. GDP growth: if U.S. consumer spending dips, GDP growth pulls-back; a deep, protracted decline in spending, and a recession ensues. It happened, starting in December 2007, as it had in many previous U.S. cyclical downturns/recessions.¶ However, few onlookers could have imagined -- there was no precedent, the world had never experienced a cross-hemisphere trade period with as many linkages as it had in 2002-2007 -- the revelation of the relationship between the U.S. consumer and global GDP growth. It's now pretty clear that the U.S. consumer was not only the backbone of the U.S. economy, John and Jane Smith were driving much of global GDP growth, as well.

## 1NR vs Emory HR

### Afghanistan Impact 2NC

#### Ukraine intervention sparks global nuclear war.

**Kingston**, February **2009** (Brian, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs – CIFP, “Ukraine: A Risk Assessment Report”, p. http://www.carleton.ca/cifp/app/serve.php/1214.pdf)

Russia: Russia seeks to influence the weakened Ukraine, inflaming ethnic-Russian separatism; Crimea declares independence; Ukraine resists, perhaps seeing an external war as a distraction from internal strife; Russia comes to the aid of Crimea/ethnic-Russians resulting in open warfare between Russia and Ukraine. The West: The West also suffers from the global recession, but (perhaps following a period of inward looking protectionism) realizes that it cannot allow Russian success in Ukraine; open hostilities erupt between Russian and NATO forces triggering World War III and the strong possibility of nuclear war, or at least the drawing in of many other countries.

#### Pakistani break-up triggers nuclear war.

**Morgan 2007** (Stephen J., Political Writer and Former Member of the British Labour Party Executive Committee, “Better another Taliban Afghanistan, than a Taliban NUCLEAR Pakistan!?”, 9-23, http://www.freearticlesarchive .com/article/\_Better\_another\_Taliban\_Afghanistan\_\_than\_a\_Taliban\_NUCLEAR\_Pakistan\_\_\_/99961/0/)

However events may prove him sorely wrong. Indeed, his policy could completely backfire upon him. As the war intensifies, he has no guarantees that the current autonomy may yet burgeon into a separatist movement. Appetite comes with eating, as they say. Moreover, should the Taliban fail to re-conquer al of Afghanistan, as looks likely, but captures at least half of the country, then a Taliban Pashtun caliphate could be established which would act as a magnet to separatist Pashtuns in Pakistan. Then, the likely break up of Afghanistan along ethnic lines, could, indeed, lead the way to the break up of Pakistan, as well. Strong centrifugal forces have always bedevilled the stability and unity of Pakistan, and, in the context of the new world situation, the country could be faced with civil wars and popular fundamentalist uprisings, probably including a military-fundamentalist coup d’état. Fundamentalism is deeply rooted in Pakistan society. The fact that in the year following 9/11, the most popular name given to male children born that year was “Osama” (not a Pakistani name) is a small indication of the mood. Given the weakening base of the traditional, secular opposition parties, conditions would be ripe for a coup d’état by the fundamentalist wing of the Army and ISI, leaning on the radicalised masses to take power. Some form of radical, military Islamic regime, where legal powers would shift to Islamic courts and forms of shira law would be likely. Although, even then, this might not take place outside of a protracted crisis of upheaval and civil war conditions, mixing fundamentalist movements with nationalist uprisings and sectarian violence between the Sunni and minority Shia populations. The nightmare that is now Iraq would take on gothic proportions across the continent. The prophesy of an arc of civil war over Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq would spread to south Asia, stretching from Pakistan to Palestine, through Afghanistan into Iraq and up to the Mediterranean coast. Undoubtedly, this would also spill over into India both with regards to the Muslim community and Kashmir. Border clashes, terrorist attacks, sectarian pogroms and insurgency would break out. A new war, and possibly nuclear war, between Pakistan and India could not be ruled out. Atomic Al Qaeda Should Pakistan break down completely, a Taliban-style government with strong Al Qaeda influence is a real possibility. Such deep chaos would, of course, open a “Pandora's box” for the region and the world. With the possibility of unstable clerical and military fundamentalist elements being in control of the Pakistan nuclear arsenal, not only their use against India, but Israel becomes a possibility, as well as the acquisition of nuclear and other deadly weapons secrets by Al Qaeda. Invading Pakistan would not be an option for America. Therefore a nuclear war would now again become a real strategic possibility. This would bring a shift in the tectonic plates of global relations. It could usher in a new Cold War with China and Russia pitted against the US.

#### NATO collapse causes nuclear wars

**Duffield 1994** (John, Assistant Professor of Government and Foreign Affairs – University of Virginia, Political Science Quarterly, 109, p. 766-767)

Initial analyses of NATO's future prospects overlooked at least three important factors that have helped to ensure the alliance's enduring relevance. First, they underestimated the extent to which external threats sufficient to help justify the preservation of the alliance would continue to exist. In fact, NATO still serves to secure its members against a number of actual or potential dangers emanating from outside their territory. These include not only the residual threat posed by Russian military power, but also the relatively new concerns raised by conflicts in neighboring regions. Second, the pessimists failed to consider NATO's capacity for institu­tional adaptation. Since the end of the cold war, the alliance has begun to develop two important new functions. NATO is increasingly seen as having a significant role to play in containing and controlling milita­rized conflicts in Central and Eastern Europe. And, at a deeper level, it works to prevent such conflicts from arising at all by actively pro­moting stability within the former Soviet bloc. Above all, NATO pessimists overlooked the valuable intra-alliance functions that the alliance has always performed and that remain rele­vant after the cold war. Most importantly, NATO has helped stabilize Western Europe, whose states had often been bitter rivals in the past. By damping the security dilemma and providing an institutional mech­anism for the development of common security policies, NATO has contributed to making the use of force in relations among the countries of the region virtually inconceivable. In all these ways, NATO clearly serves the interests of its European members. But even the United States has a significant stake in preserving a peaceful and prosperous Europe. In addition to strong transatlantic historical and cultural ties, American economic interests in Europe— as a leading market for U.S. products, as a source of valuable imports, and as the host for considerable direct foreign investment by American companies — remain substantial. If history is any guide, moreover, the United States could easily be drawn into a future major war in Europe, the consequences of which would likely be even more devastating than those of the past, given the existence of nuclear weapons.

#### Most probable scenario for conflict

Blank 2000 (Stephen, Prof Research – Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College, “U.S. Military Engagement with Transcaucasia and Central Asia”, www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub113.pdf)

Washington’s burgeoning military-political-economic involvement seeks, inter alia, to demonstrate the U.S. ability to project military power even into this region or for that matter, into Ukraine where NATO recently held exercises that clearly originated as an anti-Russian scenario. Secretary of Defense William Cohen has discussed strengthening U.S.-Azerbaijani military cooperation and even training the Azerbaijani army, certainly alarming Armenia and Russia. 69 And Washington is also training Georgia’s new Coast Guard. 70 However, Washington’s well-known ambivalence about committing force to Third World ethnopolitical conflicts suggests that U.S. military power will not be easily committed to saving its economic investment. But this ambivalence about committing forces and the dangerous situation, where Turkey is allied to Azerbaijan and Armenia is bound to Russia, create the potential for wider and more protracted regional conflicts among local forces. In that connection, Azerbaijan and Georgia’s growing efforts to secure NATO’s lasting involvement in the region, coupled with Russia’s determination to exclude other rivals, foster a polarization along very traditional lines. 71 In 1993 Moscow even threatened World War III to deter Turkish intervention on behalf of Azerbaijan. Yet the new Russo-Armenian Treaty and Azeri-Turkish treaty suggest that Russia and Turkey could be dragged into a confrontation to rescue their allies from defeat. 72 Thus many of the conditions for conventional war or protracted ethnic conflict in which third parties intervene are present in the Transcaucasus. For example, many Third World conflicts generated by local structural factors have a great potential for unintended escalation. Big powers often feel obliged to rescue their lesser proteges and proxies. One or another big power may fail to grasp the other side’s stakes since interests here are not as clear as in Europe. Hence commitments involving the use of nuclear weapons to prevent a client’s defeat are not as well established or apparent. Clarity about the nature of the threat could prevent the kind of rapid and almost uncontrolled escalation we saw in 1993 when Turkish noises about intervening on behalf of Azerbaijan led Russian leaders to threaten a nuclear war in that case. 73 Precisely because Turkey is a NATO ally, Russian nuclear threats could trigger a potential nuclear blow (**not a small possibility** given the erratic nature of Russia’s declared nuclear strategies). The real threat of a Russian nuclear strike against Turkey to defend Moscow’s interests and forces in the Transcaucasus makes the danger of major war there **higher than almost everywhere else**. As Richard Betts has observed, The greatest danger lies in areas where (1) the potential for serious instability is high; (2) both superpowers perceive vital interests; (3) neither recognizes that the other’s perceived interest or commitment is as great as its own; (4) both have the capability to inject conventional forces; and, (5) neither has willing proxies capable of settling the situation.

#### Turns warming – Obama key to 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.

#### 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."

### Obama Win – AT: U Overwhelms the Link

#### Obama will win the election --- a consensus of polls and the Five Thirty Eight forecast prove. That’s the 1NC Silver 9/20 evidence. Prefer our evidence because it’s predictive and cites multiple battleground polls that Obama has pulled ahead in.

#### Romney can still swing the election back --- the plan turns the first debate into a winner.

**Ambinder**, **9/20**/2012 (Marc – editor-at-large of The Week, contributing editor for the Atlantic, former White House correspondent for National Journal, 5 ways Romney can still win, The Week, p. http://theweek.com/article/index/233101/five-ways-romney-can-still-win)

I first began to write this post on September 12, the day when Mitt Romney was supposed to don the fall collection of campaign clothing and start new and fresh. And then Libya happened, and then the leaked videotape happened, and then came a crunch of state polls showing that almost all routes to electoral victory were blocked by a president with leads outside the margin of error. Gallup's tracking has provided the only comfort data for Boston, so perhaps that's a place to start. But when your pollster has to tell the press not to believe the polls, you know you're looking at an uphill climb to the presidency. Romney has high hurdles ahead of him. But his cause is not lost. Here are five ways he can still win. Some combination of the following events and contingencies will have to intrude upon the race for him to do so, but a Romney/Ryan administration remains within the realm of possibility. Keep in mind: There will be natural tightening (as opposed to the political Botox kind) between now and election day. 1. Romney has a stellar first debate, which galvanizes his campaign and allows late-breaking independents to finally see the man that Ann Romney so loves dearly. Likelihood: 60 percent. Every Romney route to victory has to include a great first debate, because the first debates tend to matter the most, and because Romney will have a relatively unfiltered opportunity to try to make his case, probably his last. Debate 1 is about domestic policy, and the economy is lackluster. If ever there was a time to step up and force Barack Obama to explain to the American people just what he would do to create jobs — if ever there was an opportunity to refocus the campaign back onto the jobs issue — it's on October 3 at the University of Denver. No doubt Romney will be prepared. Jim Lehrer, the moderator, is not going to throw anything Romney's way that he hasn't already anticipated.

#### Romney is competitive enough to flip the election.

**Khan and Bell**, **9/20**/2012 (Naureen and Peter, Insiders: Obama More Likely to Win, National Journal, p. <http://hotlineoncall.nationaljournal.com/archives/2012/09/insiders.php>)

Nevertheless, several insiders also said that it was too early to call the race for anybody, particularly with three presidential debates left on the general election calendar, trouble brewing in the Middle East and the economy still struggling to recover. "This is still closer than people think and money does work," one Democrat said, alluding to Romney's formidable fundraising advantage, aided by GOP-allied super PAC money. "Romney remains competitive virtually everywhere he needs to win, despite weeks of feckless campaigning," another Republican added. "This means that voters are cringing at the idea of four more years of Obama."

#### Models predicts an Obama win --- it’s highly accurate but the plan can still disrupt Obama.

**Donavan**, **9/20**/2012 (Patricia, Campbell predicts close race: Obama likely to win popular vote, UB Reporter, p. <http://www.buffalo.edu/ubreporter/2012_09_20/campbell_election_forecasts>)

A UB political scientist internationally recognized for highly accurate election prediction models says President Obama is likely to receive 51.3 percent of votes cast in the November election. James E. Campbell, UB Distinguished Professor in the Department of Political Science, notes that while the forecast does not predict the electoral vote winner, it is quite rare for a candidate to win a plurality of the vote and not a plurality of electoral votes. Of course, the 2000 Bush-Gore presidential race proved that it is possible. “I estimate that there is a 67 percent chance that President Obama’s vote will be over 50 percent,” he says, “so the forecast is for a close race tilted to Obama. “The prediction is not so definite that a Romney win is impossible,” he says, “but an Obama win is more likely.”

### AT: Partisan Divide = No Persuasion

#### Voters are open to switching --- most recent polling proves.

**Page**, **9/19**/2012 (Susan, Poll: In 2-point presidential race, Romney trips over 47%, USA Today, p. http://www.usatoday.com/news/politics/story/2012-09-18/obama-romney-swing-states-poll/57803524/1)

That history might leave the impression that the electorate is so firmly set in their choices that there is nobody open to persuasion, despite news developments on everything from the unemployment rate to Middle East violence, and in the face of an estimated half a trillion dollars spent so far on TV ads in the swing states. But the new poll finds a surprising number of voters not yet firmly aligned with one side or the other. More than one in five registered voters say they don't know who they are going to vote for or that there is at least the possibility they will change their minds. Romney supporters are slightly more set in their choice: 21% of Obama's supporters and 14% of Romney's supporters say there is "some" or a "slight" chance they will switch their vote.

#### There are enough undecided.

**Trende**, **9/20**/2012 (Sean – senior elections analyst at Real Clear Politics, State of the Race, Part 2: Why Romney Wins, Real Clear Politics, p. <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/09/20/state_of_the_race_part_2_why_romney_wins_115513.html>)

8) People haven’t made up their minds. Finally, it is important to remember that all the claims about people’s minds being set in stone don’t jibe with what respondents tell pollsters. Table 3 shows when voters have made up their minds over the past four elections. Though the percentage of late-undecideds is diminishing, unless there is a major drop-off this cycle, we can safely say that the decisions of a fairly wide swath of the electorate are not yet firm.

#### Don’t discount the link --- even a small shift can change a close election.

**Abramowitz**, 6/7/**2012** (Alan – Director of Undergraduate Studies at Emory University, Alben W. Barkley Distinguished Chair in Political Science at Emory University, Persuasion versus Mobilization: Obama & Romney’s Swing State Strategy, Sabato’s Crystal Ball, p. <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/persuasion-versus-mobilization-what-strategy-should-the-obama-and-romney-campaigns-emphasize-in-the-battleground-states/>)

With five months to go until Election Day 2012, all indications are that the presidential race between Barack Obama and Mitt Romney is going to go down to the wire and that the outcome will ultimately be decided by voters in 10-15 battleground states in which neither candidate has a decisive advantage. These findings raise an important question for the Obama and Romney campaigns. In deciding how to allocate money and other resources, how much emphasis should they give to mobilizing potential supporters versus persuading undecided voters? The answer to this question depends on the characteristics and political attitudes of two key groups of voters in the battleground states: unregistered supporters and undecided registered voters. In order to compare the potential payoffs of a strategy emphasizing mobilization compared with a strategy emphasizing persuasion, I analyzed data from a March 20-26 Gallup Poll in 12 key battleground states: Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin. This was the most recent battleground state polling data available for analysis. A total of 1,046 adults were interviewed on landline and cellular telephones, including 871 registered voters. Swing voters: Unhappy with Obama but unenthusiastic about voting One important finding from Gallup’s March swing state poll is that there were relatively few swing voters in these swing states. Among registered voters, 49% supported Barack Obama and another 1% indicated that they leaned toward Obama, while 41% supported Mitt Romney and another 2% leaned toward Romney. The March 20-26 survey was conducted at a time when Mitt Romney was still battling with Rick Santorum for the Republican nomination. Now that Romney has locked up the GOP nomination, Obama’s lead in these battleground states may very well be smaller. What is striking, however, is that as early as March, relatively few registered voters were unwilling to state a preference in a Romney-Obama contest. Even combining leaners with the undecided, swing voters made up less than 10% of the electorate in these 12 states. Still, with the race between Obama and Romney expected to be very close, even a small group of swing voters could decide the outcome. So who are these swing voters? To answer this question, I compared the characteristics and political attitudes of swing voters (those who were undecided or only leaning toward a candidate) with the characteristics and attitudes of voters who were supporting either Obama or Romney. The results are displayed in Table 1.

### No blame

#### Obama will get the blame --- clean energy is highly politicized and attached to Obama.

**Crooks**, 5/6/**2012** (Ed, Changed Climate, Financial Times, p. http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/64c05094-952d-11e1-ad72-00144feab49a.html#axzz266dJyaWG)

In the US, as in those other countries, there is pressure to cut subsidies to ease the strain on the national budget and household finances, in terms of taxes and energy bills. In America, though, the issue has become particularly highly politicised. “The clean energy industry has become identified with President Obama’s agenda, and so is under extreme attack from Republicans as the election approaches,” says Christine Tezak of Baird, a Wisconsin-based investment firm. The collapse of Solyndra, a California-based maker of innovative solar panels that went bankrupt last year having borrowed $527m from the federal government, has been seized on by Republicans as an example of Mr Obama’s mismanagement.

#### 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.”

### Energy Policies Key

#### Energy attacks will matter in a close election.

**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)

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."

### Gas Thumper

#### Voters will blame oil companies not Obama.

**Schnur**, 4/9/**2012** (Dan – director of the Jesse M. Unruh Institute of Politics at the University of Southern California, served as the national communications director of Senator John McCain’s presidential campaign in 2000, The President, Gas Prices and the Pipeline, New York Times, p. <http://campaignstops.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/04/09/the-president-gas-prices-and-the-keystone-pipeline/>)

Obama won’t actually lose California in November, of course. Gas prices would have to hit $10 a gallon for Mitt Romney to win the state this fall. And the same poll shows that voters blame oil companies, rather than either the president or Congress, for those high prices. However, the dissatisfaction that emanates from even a heavily Democratic patch of electoral turf such as California carries much more significant consequences in Ohio, Florida and other swing states. For the time being, Obama is gambling that directing popular anger toward the oil companies — a convenient villain if there ever was one — will allow him to keep the price of gasoline from becoming a roadblock for his campaign.

#### Gas prices will not result in more votes.

**Trumbull**, 3/12/**2012** (Mark – staff writer at the Christian Science Monitor, Obama trails Romney in new poll. Are gas prices the key?, The Christian Science Monitor, p. http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Elections/President/2012/0312/Obama-trails-Romney-in-new-poll.-Are-gas-prices-the-key)

Not every American punches his or her ballot based on pump prices, of course. The Monitor poll, conducted by TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence, found only a minority of voters saying the issue is likely to affect their voting decision. (And people blame a wide variety of forces for the recent price hikes. Only 12 percent put primary blame on the president.)

### AT: Plan Happens After the Election

#### --Kills ground – it makes the aff a moving target and removes uniqueness considerations from DA evaluation.

#### --Double-bind – either Congress will use a special session or the executive branch should do the plan now. Either way --- the plan is immediate.

#### --It’s real world – recent special sessions prove.

**Time**, 8/10/**2010** (Congressional Special Sessions, p. <http://www.time.com/time/politics/article/0,8599,2009480,00.html>)

Where do you think you're going, Congress? House members, scheduled for a recess that would have released them to head back home and stump for votes, will be in Washington on Tuesday, Aug. 9, to vote on a $26 billion state-aid bill as part of a special session. That privileged-sounding title is a bit misleading, though, given that it's the equivalent of getting dismissed for summer break, only to be marched back to class for a special geometry lesson. The power to call a special session is listed among presidential responsibilities in the Constitution, though Congressional leadership has on occasion authorized them. This summer recess was supposed to be the House's second longest since 1970, but the Senate's late passage of the bill forced the lower chamber to reconvene after their work was already presumed done. The last time the House was plucked out of summer recess was to pass an emergency spending bill in 2005, following Hurricane Katrina. And earlier that year, Republican leaders had called members back on Palm Sunday to deal with the case of Terri Schiavo, whose husband wanted to remove her feeding tube following Schiavo's 15 years in a vegetative state. (Republican leaders opposed the measure alongside Schiavo's parents, though they were eventually overruled by the courts.) But, according to the House historian's office, House members have only returned during summer breaks to do business two other times — once in 1980 and once in 1991 — in the past 30 years.