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#### Advantage 1: Environment

#### **Domestic ground water pollution causes extinction**

**Miller 4** (Prof of Geology, 04 http://www.geosun.sjsu.edu/~jmiller/Geo1\_Lecture12\_SurfaceProcesses.html, 08-Dec-2004 EARTH SURFACE PROCESSES II: GROUNDWATER)

Groundwater is extremely important because it is a source of clean drinkable water for human survival. In arid areas especially (like the western U.S.) it has allowed humans to flourish and in the early part of the colonization of the west it was vital to the establishiment of agriculture because we tapped the groundwater by digging wells and then used it to irrigate our crops. It is still important today for this reason (although we also now impond water in dams and divert it for agriculture using aqueducts). As the population of the west has grown, the demands put on groundwater to provide for human well-being have been increasing, and their is great concern today about how long our groundwater will last, and whether or not we can make sure that it is clean and drinkaable over the long term. It is for this reason, one of the most pressing environmental issues faced by citizens the world over.

#### So does air pollution

**Driesen 2003 –** Professor of Law, Syracuse, Buffalo Environmental Law Journal (David,, Fall, 2002 / Spring, 2003, p. LN)

Air pollution can **make life unsustainable** by harming the ecosystem upon which all life depends and harming the health of both future and present generations. The Rio Declaration articulates six key principles that are relevant to air pollution. These principles can also be understood as goals, because they describe a state of affairs [\*27] that is worth achieving. Agenda 21, in turn, states a program of action for realizing those goals. Between them, they aid understanding of sustainable development's meaning for air quality. The first principle is that "human beings. . . are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature", because they are "at the center of concerns for sustainable development." n3 While the Rio Declaration refers to human health, its reference to life "in harmony with nature" also reflects a concern about the natural environment. n4 Since air pollution damages both human health and the environment, air quality implicates both of these concerns.

#### Soil depletion causes extinction

**Horne and McDermott 2001** (James and Maura, Kerr Center for Sustainable Agriculture, “The Next Green Revolution: Essential Steps to a Healthy, Sustainable Agriculture”, p. 69, Google Print)

Topsoil is crucial to agriculture. This first step-creating and conserving healthy soil-is the foundation of a sustainable agriculture. It is closely linked to the next two steps-conserving water and protecting its quality, and managing organic wastes and farm chemicals so they don't pollute. How well agriculture manages soil, water, and organic wastes will determine its future health. Conserving healthy soil by guarding it against erosion and other forces that would degrade it is the most basic step. This step has as its corollary actively building soil health, because soil used for agricultural purposes today is not as healthy as it could be. It is both less diverse and less active biologically. Without healthy topsoil, the world cannot begin to feed its billions. Although American popular culture discourse in recent years has speculated on the fate of live on earth in case of alien invasion, asteroid bombardment, or rampaging killer viruses, the slow loss of quality soil is more of a threat to life on the planet than any of these scenarios.

#### Livestock agriculture is the key link—drives all forms of persistent pollution—biogas solves it as well as methane emissions

**Cuellar and Webber 8**—Department of Chemical Engineering, UT-Austin AND Center for International Energy and Environmental Policy, UT-Austin

(Amanda and Michael, “Cow power: the energy and emissions beneﬁts of converting manure to biogas”, Environ. Res. Lett. 3 (2008) 034002 (8pp). dml)

In the United States livestock animals produce over one billion tons of manure annually [1]. Currently, most of this manure is collected in lagoons or stored outdoors to decompose. Animal waste stored in this fashion can emit unpleasant odors, harmful air pollutants and greenhouse gases. The air pollutants emitted from manure include ammonia, VOCs, hydrogen sulﬁde and particulate matter, many of which can cause health problems in humans [2]. Besides polluting the air, ammonia emissions from manure can contaminate ground water and lead to eutrophication of the soil [3]. Manure also emits methane and nitrous oxide, two potent greenhouse gases [4]. Using standards developed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), methane has 21 times the global warming potential of carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide has 310 times the warming potential of carbon dioxide over a 100 year timespan [5]. According to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), in total, GHG emissions from the agricultural sector in the US amounted to 536 million metric tons (MMT) of carbon dioxide equivalent, or 7% of the total US emissions in 2005 [6]. Of this agricultural contribution at least 50.8 MMT of carbon dioxide equivalent (and possibly much more) resulted from methane and nitrous oxide emissions from livestock manure alone [6]. Moreover, methane and nitrous oxide emissions from manure show an increasing trend from 1990 to 2005 [6]. Because of the scale and growth in GHG emissions from manure, ﬁnding other approaches to manure management that decrease these emissions represents a valuable starting point for mitigating concerns about global climate change in the agricultural sector. Notably, through anaerobic digestion, which is a wellknown and time-tested process [7, 8], animal manure can be converted to methane-rich biogas and sludge, which is nearly odorless [7, 9] and useful as a fertilizer [10]. Furthermore, the biogas is a valuable fuel that can be used in a variety of applications such as cooking and home heating. It can also be converted into compressed natural gas (CNG) after a scrubbing process that removes carbon dioxide and hydrogen sulﬁde [11, 12]. Biogas’ greatest potential for mitigating greenhouse gas emissions, though, is as a substitute for coal in electricity generation due to coal’s role as the primary source of carbon dioxide emissions [13] from the power sector.

#### Plan’s sufficient to solve methane — ground-level emissions key

**NASA 5**—the space people

(“Methane's Impacts on Climate Change May Be Twice Previous Estimates,” <http://www.nasa.gov/centers/goddard/news/topstory/2005/methane.html>, dml)

Scientists face difficult challenges in predicting and understanding how much our climate is changing. When it comes to gases that trap heat in our atmosphere, called greenhouse gases (GHGs), scientists typically look at how much of the gases exist in the atmosphere. However, Drew Shindell, a climatologist at NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, New York, NY, believes we need to look at the GHGs when they are emitted **at Earth's surface**, instead of looking at the GHGs themselves after they have been mixed into the atmosphere. "The gas molecules undergo chemical changes and once they do, looking at them after they've mixed and changed in the atmosphere doesn't give an accurate picture of their effect," Shindell said. "For example, the amount of methane in the atmosphere is affected by pollutants that change methane's chemistry, and it doesn't reflect the effects of methane on other greenhouse gases," said Shindell, "so it's not directly related to emissions, which are what we set policies for." Chemically reactive GHGs include methane and ozone (carbon dioxide, the most important GHG, is largely unreactive). Once methane and the molecules that create ozone are released into the air by both natural and human-induced sources, these gases mix and react together, which transforms their compositions. When gases are altered, their contribution to the greenhouse warming effect also shifts. So, the true effect of a single GHG emission on climate becomes very hard to single out. Some of the major investigations into the state of our warming planet come from a series of reports from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Assessment. These reports involved the work of hundreds of climate experts. The reports rely on measurements of greenhouse gases as they exist in the atmosphere, after they may have mixed with other gases. In other words, the findings in the report do not reflect the quantities that were actually emitted. Shindell finds there are advantages to measuring emissions of greenhouse gases and isolating their impacts, as opposed to analyzing them after they have mixed in the atmosphere. His study on the subject was recently published in the journal Geophysical Research Letters. In the study, when the individual effects of each gas on global warming were added together, the total was within 10 percent of the impacts of all the gases mixed together. The small difference in the two amounts was a sign to Shindell that little error was introduced by separating the emissions from one another. After isolating each greenhouse gas and calculating the impact of each emission on our climate with a computer model, Shindell and his colleagues found some striking differences in how much these gases contribute overall to climate change. The leading greenhouse gases include carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and halocarbons. These gases are called ‘well mixed’ greenhouse gases because of their long lifetimes of a decade or more, which allows them to disperse evenly around the atmosphere. They are emitted from both man-made and natural sources. Ozone in the lower atmosphere, called tropospheric ozone, a major component of polluted air or smog that is damaging to human and ecosystem health, also has greenhouse warming effects. In the upper atmosphere, ozone protects life on Earth from the sun’s harmful ultraviolet rays. **According to new calculations**, the impacts of methane on climate warming may be double the standard amount attributed to the gas. The new interpretations reveal methane emissions may account for a third of the climate warming from well-mixed greenhouse gases between the 1750s and today. The IPCC report, which calculates methane’s affects once it exists in the atmosphere, states that methane increases in our atmosphere account for only about one sixth of the total effect of well-mixed greenhouse gases on warming. Part of the reason the new calculations give a larger effect is that they include the sizeable impact of methane emissions on tropospheric ozone since the industrial revolution. Tropospheric ozone is not directly emitted, but is instead formed chemically from methane, other hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides. The IPCC report includes the effects of tropospheric ozone increases on climate, but it is not attributed to particular sources. By categorizing the climate effects according to emissions, Shindell and colleagues found the total effects of methane emissions are substantially larger. In other words, the true source of some of the warming that is normally attributed to tropospheric ozone is really due to methane that leads to increased abundance of tropospheric ozone. According to the study, **the effects of other pollutants were relatively minor**. Nitrogen oxide emissions can even lead to cooling by fostering chemical reactions that destroy methane. This is partly why estimates based on the amount of methane in the atmosphere give the gas a smaller contribution to climate change. Molecule for molecule, Methane is 20 times more potent than carbon dioxide as a greenhouse gas, but CO2 is much more abundant than methane and the predicted growth rate is far greater. Since 1750, methane concentrations in the atmosphere have more than doubled, though the rate of increase has slowed during the 1980-90s, and researchers don’t understand why. **Controlling methane could reap a big bang for the buck**. Another bonus of this perspective is that in order to manage greenhouse gases, policy decisions must focus on cutting emissions, because that's where humans have some control. "If we control methane, which the U.S. is already starting to do, then we are likely to mitigate global warming more than one would have thought, so that's a very positive outcome," Shindell said. "Control of methane emissions turns out to be a more powerful lever to control global warming than would be anticipated."

#### Extinction

**Ryskin 3** (Gregory, Department of Chemical Engineering, Northwestern University, Illinois, “Methane-driven oceanic eruptions and mass extinctions” Geology 31(9): 741-744, dml)

The consequences of a methane-driven oceanic eruption for marine and terrestrial life are likely to be catastrophic. Figuratively speaking, the erupting region ‘‘boils over,’’ ejecting a large amount of methane and other gases (e.g., CO2, H2S) into the atmosphere, and flooding large areas of land. Whereas pure methane is lighter than air, methane loaded with water droplets is much heavier, and thus spreads over the land, mixing with air in the process (and losing water as rain). The air methane mixture is explosive at methane concentrations between 5% and 15%; as such mixtures form in different locations near the ground and are ignited by lightning, explosions2 and conflagrations destroy most of the terrestrial life, and also produce great amounts of smoke and of carbon dioxide. Firestorms carry smoke and dust into the upper atmosphere, where they may remain for several years (Turco et al., 1991); the resulting darkness and global cooling may provide an additional kill mechanism. Conversely, carbon dioxide and the remaining methane create the greenhouse effect, which may lead to global warming. The outcome of the competition between the cooling and the warming tendencies is difficult to predict (Turco et al., 1991; Pierrehumbert, 2002). Upon release of a significant portion of the dissolved methane, the ocean settles down, and the entire sequence of events (i.e., development of anoxia, accumulation of dissolved methane, the metastable state, eruption) begins anew. No external cause is required to bring about a methane-driven eruption—its mechanism is self-contained, and implies that eruptions are likely to occur repeatedly at the same location.¶ Because methane is isotopically light, its fast release must result in a negative carbon isotope excursion in the geological record. Knowing the magnitude of the excursion, one can estimate the amount of methane that could have produced it. Such calculations (prompted by the methane-hydrate-dissociation model, but equally applicable here) have been performed for several global events in the geological record; the results range from 1018 to 1019 g of released methane (e.g., Katz et al., 1999; Kennedy et al., 2001; de Wit et al., 2002). These are very large amounts: the total carbon content of today’s terrestrial biomass is ;2 3 1018 g. Nevertheless, relatively small regions of the deep ocean could contain such amounts of dissolved methane; e.g., the Black Sea alone (volume ;0.4 3 1023 of the ocean total; maximum depth only 2.2 km) could hold, at saturation, ;0.5 3 1018 g. A similar region of the deep ocean could contain much more (the amount grows quadratically with depth3). Released in a geological instant (weeks, perhaps), 10**18** to 10**19** g of methane could **destroy** the **terrestrial life** almost entirely. Combustion and explosion of 0.75 x 10**19** g of methane would liberate energy equivalent to 108 Mt of TNT, ;10,000 times greater than the world’s stockpile of nuclear weapons, implicated in the nuclear winter scenario (Turco et al., 1991).

#### Animal waste is key—proper treatment prevents antibiotic resistance and epidemic spread

**Sayre 9**—writer for Mother Earth, cites IDSA and FDA reports

(Lauren, “The Hidden Link Between Factory Farms and Human Illness”, <http://www.motherearthnews.com/Natural-Health/Meat-Poultry-Health-Risk.aspx>, dml)

You may be familiar with many of the problems associated with concentrated animal feeding operations, or CAFOs. These “factory farm” operations are often criticized for the smell and water pollution caused by all that concentrated manure; the unnatural, grain-heavy diets the animals consume; and the stressful, unhealthy conditions in which the animals live. You may not be aware, however, of the threat such facilities hold for you and your family’s health — even if you never buy any of the meat produced in this manner. Factory farms are **breeding grounds for virulent disease**, which can then spread to the wider community via many routes — not just in food, but also in water, the air, and the bodies of farmers, farm workers and their families. Once those microbes become widespread in the environment, it’s very difficult to get rid of them. A 2008 report from the Pew Commission on Industrial Farm Animal Production, a joint project of the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, underscores those risks. The 111-page report, two years in the making, outlines the public health, environmental, animal welfare and rural livelihood consequences of what they call “industrial farm animal production.” Its conclusions couldn’t be clearer. Factory farm production is intensifying worldwide, and rates of new infectious diseases are rising. Of particular concern is the rapid rise of antibiotic-resistant microbes, an inevitable consequence of the widespread use of antibiotics as feed additives in industrial livestock operations. Scientists, medical personnel and public health officials have been sounding the alarm on these issues for some time. The World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) have recommended restrictions on agricultural uses of antibiotics; the American Public Health Association (APHA) proposed a moratorium on CAFOs back in 2003. All told, more than 350 professional organizations — including the APHA, American Medical Association, the Infectious Diseases Society of America, and the American Academy of Pediatrics — have called for greater regulation of antibiotic use in livestock. The Infectious Diseases Society of America has declared antibiotic-resistant infections an epidemic in the United States. The FAO recently warned that global industrial meat production poses a serious threat to human health. The situation is akin to that surrounding global climate change four or five years ago: near-universal scientific consensus matched by government inaction and media inattention. Although the specter of pandemic flu — in which a virulent strain of the influenza virus recombines with a highly contagious strain to create a bug rivaling that responsible for the 1918 flu pandemic, thought to have killed as many as 50 million people — is the most dire scenario, antibiotic resistance is a clear and present danger, already killing thousands of people in the United States each year. People, Animals and Microbes From one perspective, picking up bugs from our domesticated animals is nothing new. Approximately two-thirds of the 1,400 known human pathogens are thought to have originated in animals: Scientists think tuberculosis and the common cold probably came to us from cattle; pertussis from pigs or sheep; leprosy from water buffalo; influenza from ducks. Most of these ailments probably appeared relatively early in the 10,000-year-old history of animal domestication. Over time, some human populations developed immunity to these diseases; others were eventually controlled with vaccines. Some continued to kill humans until the mid-20th century discovery of penicillin, a miracle drug that rendered formerly life-threatening infections relatively harmless. Other antibiotics followed, until by the 1960s leading researchers and public health officials were declaring that the war on infectious diseases had been won. Beginning in the mid 1970s, however, the numbers of deaths from infectious diseases in the United States started to go back up. Some were from old nemeses, such as tuberculosis, newly resistant to standard antibiotic treatments; others were wholly novel. “In recent decades,” writes Dr. Michael Greger, director of public health and animal agriculture for the Humane Society of the United States and author of Bird Flu: A Virus of Our Own Hatching, “previously unknown diseases have surfaced at a pace unheard of in the recorded annals of medicine: more than 30 newly identified human pathogens in 30 years, most of them newly discovered zoonotic viruses.” (Zoonotic viruses are those that can be passed from animals to humans.) Why is this happening? There are many reasons, including the increased pace of international travel and human incursions into wild animals’ habitats. But one factor stands out: the rise of industrial farm animal production. “Factory farms represent the most significant change in the lives of animals in 10,000 years,” Greger writes. “This is not how animals were supposed to live.” Chicken and pig production are particularly bad. In 1965, the total U.S. hog population numbered 53 million, spread over more than 1 million pig farms in the United States — most of them small family operations. Today, we have 65 million hogs on just 65,640 farms nationwide. Many of these “farms” — 2,538, to be exact — have upwards of 5,000 hogs on the premises at any given time. Broiler chicken production rose from 366 million in 1945 to 8,400 million in 2001, most of them in facilities housing tens of thousands of birds. On a global scale, the situation is even worse. Fifty-five billion chickens are now reared each year worldwide. The global pig inventory is approaching 1 billion, an estimated half of which are raised in confinement. In China and Malaysia, it’s not unheard of for hog facilities to house 20,000 or even 50,000 animals. The Mechanics of Resistance “Concentrated animal feeding operations are comparable to poorly run hospitals, where everyone is given antibiotics, patients lie in unchanged beds, hygiene is nonexistent, infections and re-infections are rife, waste is thrown out the window, and visitors enter and leave at will,” write Johns Hopkins researchers Ellen Silbergeld, Jay Graham and Lance Price in the 2008 Annual Review of Public Health. By concentrating large numbers of animals together, factory farms are terrific incubators for disease. The stress of factory farm conditions weakens animals’ immune systems; ammonia from accumulated waste burns lungs and makes them more susceptible to infection; the lack of sunlight and fresh air — as well as the genetic uniformity of industrial farm animal populations — facilitates the spread of pathogens. The addition of steady doses of antibiotics to this picture tips the balance from appalling to catastrophic. Poultry producers discovered by accident in the 1940s that feeding tetracycline fermentation byproducts accelerated chickens’ growth. Since then, the use of antibiotics as feed additives has become standard practice across much of the industry. The Union of Concerned Scientists estimates that non-therapeutic animal agriculture use (drugs given to animals even when they are not sick) accounts for 70 percent of total antibiotic consumption in the United States. The medical community has been cautioning for years against irresponsible antibiotic use among people, but in terms of sheer numbers, livestock use is far more significant. It’s a simple scientific fact that the more antibiotics are used — especially prolonged use at low doses as in factory farms — the more antibiotic-resistant microbes will become. Bacteria and viruses are also notoriously promiscuous, swapping genes across species and even across genera, creating what the Johns Hopkins researchers call “reservoirs of resistance.” “In some pathogens, selection for resistance also results in increased virulence,” they note. In other cases, otherwise harmless microbes can transfer resistance genes to pathogenic species. There also are indications that factory farm conditions make animals more likely to excrete pathogenic microbes — suggesting another mechanism by which conversion to more humane farming methods would offer greater protection for human health. Routes of Transmission Most so-called bio-containment procedures for confinement livestock operations are more concerned with protecting the crowded animals from disease outbreaks than from preventing human pathogens from escaping into the wider environment. As the report from the Pew Commission points out, every step in the industrial farm animal production system holds the potential for disease transmission, from transportation and **manure handling**, to meat processing and animal rendering. The increasingly globalized nature of the farm animal production system means that live animals, as well as fresh and frozen meat, are constantly crossing international borders, ensuring that diseases present in one location will soon spread elsewhere. But the biggest transmission route is waste: Confined livestock operations in the United States produce three times as much waste each year as our country’s entire human population — and yet all that manure is much more loosely regulated and handled than human waste. Antibiotic-resistant microbes, as well as the antibiotics themselves, are now widely present as environmental contaminants, with unknown consequences for everything from soil microorganisms to people. Canada’s largest waterborne disease outbreak, which infected 1,346 people and killed six, was traced to runoff from livestock farms into a town’s water supply. The U.S. Geological Survey found antimicrobial residues in 48 percent of 139 streams tested nationwide from 1999 to 2000. Other studies have detected resistant bacteria in the air up to 30 meters upwind and 150 meters downwind of industrial hog facilities. A wealth of evidence links industrial meat and poultry directly with foodborne illness. When dioxin-contaminated chicken feed led to the removal from the market of all chicken and eggs in Belgium for several weeks in June of 1999, doctors there noted a 40 percent decline in the number of human Campylobacter infections. Repeated studies have concluded that as much as 80 percent of retail supermarket chicken in the United States is contaminated with Campylobacter. Similarly, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that Salmonella-contaminated eggs caused 180,000 cases of sickness in the United States in 2000. E. coli O157:H7 is blamed for 73,000 illnesses in this country each year, including about 2,000 hospitalizations and 60 deaths. Although thorough cooking and careful handling can minimize your risks, antibiotic resistance raises the stakes when someone gets ill: “One in two human cases of Campylobacter, and one in five cases of Salmonella are now antibiotic-resistant,” says Steve Roach, public health program director for the Food Animal Concerns Trust and a member of the executive committee for the Keep Antibiotics Working coalition. “And when you have antibiotic resistance, you have more complications, more blood infections, more mortality.” In fact, public health experts are beginning to suspect that a whole host of infections not previously thought of as food-related may ultimately be linked to the overuse of antibiotics in animal agriculture. Researchers at the University of California-Berkeley, for example, traced a multi-state outbreak of urinary tract infections among women in 1999 and 2000 to contamination with a single strain of drug-resistant E. coli found in cows. Dr. Lee Riley, lead author of a paper on the findings published in Clinical Infectious Diseases, cautioned that the findings indicated that “the problem of foodborne disease is much greater in scope than we had ever previously thought.” And then there’s methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus, or MRSA. Previously confined largely to hospitals, MRSA is now killing more people in the United States each year than HIV/AIDS. A series of recent studies in Europe have demonstrated a strong causal link between MRSA and intensive pig farming in the Netherlands, Germany and France. Little or no data are available on MRSA in animals in the United States, but the bacterium is widely present on pig farms in Canada, which sells millions of live pigs to the United States annually, so it seems pretty likely it’s in U.S. pig factories, too. All in all, the CDC reports that 2 million people in the United States now contract an infection each year while in the hospital. Of those, a staggering 90,000 die — a toll higher than that from diabetes. Numbers such as that are prompting some medical investigators to suggest that we may be entering a “post-antibiotic era,” one in which (as a paper published in Environmental Health Perspectives in 2007 put it) “there would be no effective antibiotics available for treating many life-threatening infections in humans.” Connections such as these aren’t always easy to prove, however, especially for drugs that have already been in widespread use for decades, which is one reason why regulations to reign in the non-therapeutic use of antimicrobials have so far been largely lacking in the United States. The pending approval of an antibiotic called cefquinome to treat respiratory diseases in cattle offered a recent test case. Cefquinome is similar to cefepime, a last-resort antibiotic used to treat serious infections in people. (Both are fourth-generation cephalosporins, one of the small number of new antibiotics developed in recent years.) The FDA’s Veterinary Medicine Advisory Committee, along with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the American Medical Association, recommended against approval, warning that using cefquinome for animals would almost certainly render cefepime less effective for humans. But the FDA has apparently caved to industry pressure, claiming it lacks the authority to deny the drug companies’ request.

#### Extinction

**GREGER 08 –** M.D., is Director of Public Health and Animal Agriculture at The Humane Society of the United States (Michael Greger, , Bird Flu: A Virus of Our Own Hatching, <http://birdflubook.com/a.php?id=111>)

Senate Majority Leader Frist describes the recent slew of emerging diseases in almost biblical terms: “All of these [new diseases] were advance patrols of a great army that is preparing way out of sight.”3146 Scientists like Joshua Lederberg don’t think this is mere rhetoric. He should know. Lederberg won the Nobel Prize in medicine at age 33 for his discoveries in bacterial evolution. Lederberg went on to become president of Rockefeller University. “Some people think I am being hysterical,” he said, referring to pandemic influenza, “but there are catastrophes ahead. We live in evolutionary competition with microbes—bacteria and viruses. There is no guarantee that we will be the survivors.”3147 There is a concept in host-parasite evolutionary dynamics called the Red Queen hypothesis, which attempts to describe the unremitting struggle between immune systems and the pathogens against which they fight, each constantly evolving to try to outsmart the other.3148 The name is taken from Lewis Carroll’s Through the Looking Glass in which the Red Queen instructs Alice, “Now, here, you see, it takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place.”3149 Because the pathogens keep evolving, our immune systems have to keep adapting as well just to keep up. According to the theory, animals who “stop running” go extinct. So far our immune systems have largely retained the upper hand, but the fear is that given the current rate of disease emergence, the **human race is losing the race**.3150 In a Scientific American article titled, “Will We Survive?,” one of the world’s leading immunologists writes: Has the immune system, then, reached its apogee after the few hundred million years it had taken to develop? Can it respond in time to the new evolutionary challenges? These perfectly proper questions lack sure answers because we are in an utterly unprecedented situation [given the number of newly emerging infections].3151 The research team who wrote Beasts of the Earth conclude, “Considering that bacteria, viruses, and protozoa had a more than two-billion-year head start in this war, a victory by recently arrived Homo sapiens would be remarkable.”3152 Lederberg ardently believes that emerging viruses may imperil human society itself. Says NIH medical epidemiologist David Morens, When you look at the relationship between bugs and humans, the more important thing to look at is the bug. When an enterovirus like polio goes through the human gastrointestinal tract in three days, its genome mutates about two percent. That level of mutation—two percent of the genome—has taken the human species eight million years to accomplish. So who’s going to adapt to whom? Pitted against that kind of competition, Lederberg concludes that the human evolutionary capacity to keep up “may be dismissed as almost totally inconsequential.”3153 To help prevent the evolution of viruses as threatening as H5N1, the least we can do is take away a few billion feathered test tubes in which viruses can experiment, a few billion fewer spins at pandemic roulette. The human species has existed in something like our present form for approximately 200,000 years. “Such a long run should itself give us confidence that our species will continue to survive, at least insofar as the microbial world is concerned. Yet such optimism,” wrote the Ehrlich prize-winning former chair of zoology at the University College of London, “might easily transmute into a tune whistled whilst passing a graveyard.”3154

### 1ac Adv 2

#### Advantage 2: Agriculture

#### Farms vulnerable now—energy input costs weaken US agriculture—plan’s key to resilience

**Kruger 9—**Director of Outreach, Climate Friendly Farming, Washington State University

(Chad, “On-Farm Evaluation and Demonstration of Small-Scale Biogas Technology”, http://mysare.sare.org/mySARE/ProjectReport.aspx?do=viewRept&pn=FW06-325&y=2009&t=1, dml)

Rapidly rising costs for energy and agricultural inputs produced from non-renewable sources pose a critical threat to the economic viability of US farms. Small diversified and organic farms, while more insulated than chemically intensive farms, are still not immune to the effects of volatile energy markets and stand to gain considerably from the use of renewable energy technologies on farm. In particular, energy technologies focused on waste biomass – or bioenergy technologies – hold great promise for efficiently and inexpensively treating organic farm wastes, reducing odor and methane emissions (a powerful greenhouse gas), providing nutrient-rich material for land application, as well as producing renewable energy for use on farm. Biogas technology, also known as anaerobic digestion, is a natural, biological process that has been used worldwide for the treatment of wet, organic wastes and the production of biogas which is a form of renewable energy. Currently, less than 100 US farms use the technology. Eighty seven percent of Washington’s farmers are classified as “small farms.” Many of these farms have shown a significant interest in the adoption of small-scale on-farm technologies for production and use of bioenergy and related co-products. These farmers are underserved by existing biogas technology providers as no commercially available technologies are suited to small-farm applications in the northern latitudes of the US. Currently available commercial biogas technologies of US or European design have limited applicability on small farms – they are primarily designed for digesting manure from large Confined Animal Feedlot Operations (CAFO’s) – and do not meet the technical or economic needs of the majority of small farmers in Washington State. Several small-scale biogas technologies are currently available from Asia. Three primary technologies are the Chinese fixed dome digester (Figure 1), the Indian floating cover digester (Figure 2), and the Taiwanese polyethylene tubular digester (Figure 3). Each of these technologies has been used successfully by subsistence farmers in the developing world, but could be improved with additional research and development. Furthermore, commercial application of these technologies in northern latitude, cold-climate regions such as Washington State will require improvements in engineering and design as these existing technologies were developed for tropical and sub-tropical application. Washington’s small farmers have requested research, education, and technology development in regard to small-scale biogas technology. Refinement of small-scale biogas technology will improve the resiliency of small farms in the Western region to volatile energy prices and ultimately improve their sustainability. Key challenges for deploying commercially appropriate biogas technology on small-scale farms in the region include developing climate appropriate applications of the technology and financially appropriate turn-key packages, evaluating the role of biogas technology in the farming systems (including trade-offs with other waste-management practices, such as composting), education on use and maintenance of the systems, and identification of technologies for making the most valuable uses of the biogas (i.e. water heaters and stoves, small generators, liquid fuel conversions, etc.). The development of successful, small-scale biogas technology has tremendous application for farms throughout the Western region for improved waste management and as a substitute for non-renewable sources of energy. For example, the average cost/person for heating water in California in 2003 ranged from $163 (natural gas) to $488 (electricity) (California Energy Commission). As prices for non-renewable energy continue to rise, the use of on-farm biogas could provide a significant financial savings.

#### Ag collapse causes extinction

**Lugar 4** – U.S. Senator (Richard, http://www.unep.org/OurPlanet/imgversn/143/lugar.html)

In a world confronted by global terrorism, turmoil in the Middle East, burgeoning nuclear threats and other crises, it is easy to lose sight of the long-range challenges. But we do so at our peril. One of the most daunting of them is meeting the world’s need for food and energy in this century. At stake is not only preventing starvation and saving the environment, but also world peace and security. History tells us that states may go to war over access to resources, and that poverty and famine have often bred fanaticism and terrorism. Working to feed the world will minimize factors that contribute to global instability and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

With the world population expected to grow from 6 billion people today to 9 billion by mid-century, the demand for affordable food will increase well beyond current international production levels. People in rapidly developing nations will have the means greatly to improve their standard of living and caloric intake. Inevitably, that means eating more meat. This will raise demand for feed grain at the same time that the growing world population will need vastly more basic food to eat.

Complicating a solution to this problem is a dynamic that must be better understood in the West: developing countries often use limited arable land to expand cities to house their growing populations. As good land disappears, people destroy timber resources and even rainforests as they try to create more arable land to feed themselves. The long-term environmental consequences could be disastrous for the entire globe.   Productivity revolution  To meet the expected demand for food over the next 50 years, we in the United States will have to grow roughly three times more food on the land we have. That’s a tall order. My farm in Marion County, Indiana, for example, yields on average 8.3 to 8.6 tonnes of corn per hectare – typical for a farm in central Indiana. To triple our production by 2050, we will have to produce an annual average of 25 tonnes per hectare.

Can we possibly boost output that much? Well, it’s been done before. Advances in the use of fertilizer and water, improved machinery and better tilling techniques combined to generate a threefold increase in yields since 1935 – on our farm back then, my dad produced 2.8 to 3 tonnes per hectare. Much US agriculture has seen similar increases.

But of course there is no guarantee that we can achieve those results again. Given the urgency of expanding food production to meet world demand, we must invest much more in scientific research and target that money toward projects that promise to have significant national and global impact. For the United States, that will mean a major shift in the way we conduct and fund agricultural science. Fundamental research will generate the innovations that will be necessary to feed the world.

The United States can take a leading position in a productivity revolution. And our success at increasing food production may play a decisive humanitarian role in the survival of billions of people and the health of our planet.

#### Small farms solve extinction

**Boyce 2006** (James, Prof. Econ. @ UMass Amherst, in “Human Development in the Era of Globalization: Essays in Honor of Keith B. Griffin”, Ed. Keith B. Griffin, Stephen Cullenberg, Prasanta K. Pattanaik, p. 99, Google Print)

There is a future for small farms. Or, to be more precise, there can be and should be a future for them. Given the dependence of 'modern' low-diversity agriculture on 'traditional' high-diversity agriculture, the long-term food security of humankind will depend on small farms and their continued provision of the environmental service of in situ conservation of crop genetic diversity. Policies to support small farms can be advocated therefore not merely as a matter of sympathy, or nostalgia, or equity. Such policies are also a matter of human survival.

#### Plan solves monocultures

**Thran 12**—Head of department Bioenergy Systems, DBFZ

(Daniela, “Focus on Biomethane”, <http://www.greengasgrids.eu/sites/default/files/files/fh_biomethane_engl_2.pdf>, dml)

Energy crops for biogas production are cultivated according to the requirements and obligations of traditional agricultural production. Legal standards on good agricultural practise (e.g. through the Plant Protection Act (PflSchG), thefederal soil protection act and the fertiliser ordinance) are just as relevant for the cultivation of energy crops as for the cultivation of other crops (for example, for the feed market). The cultivation of energy crops within the fremwork of multiple crop rotation has significant advantages from an agricultural point of view. For example, multiple crop rotations with a sensible mix of shallow and deep-rooted plants, humus augmenters and digesters reduce attack by weeds, fungal diseases and other pests and increase general nutrient and water availability in the soil compared to monoculture cultivation. Among other things, this reduces pesticide costs. Due to possible all-year ground cover, energy crop cultivation in crop rotation also provides opportunities for reducing soil erosion and possible nitrogen washout during the winter months.

#### Extinction

**Mulvany and Berger 2001** – \*chair of the Ford Group, senior policy advisor at Practical Action, Oxfam trustee, member of the Institute of Biology, \*\*climate change Policy Advisor with Practical Action (Patrick and Rachel, "Agricultural biodiversity: farmers sustaining the web of life", http://practicalaction.org/docs/advocacy/fwn\_bio-div\_briefing.pdf)

Agricultural biodiversity embraces the living matter that produces food and other farm products, supports production and shapes agricultural landscapes. The variety of tastes, textures and colours in food is a product of agricultural biodiversity. This biodiversity is the result of the interaction by smallholder farmers, herders and artisanal fisherfolk with other species over millennia. Selecting and managing these for local nutritional, social and economic needs has produced the agricultural biodiversity on which humanity depends. Food production systems need to be rooted in sustaining agricultural biodiversity so that farmers everywhere can continue to provide food and livelihoods and maintain life on Earth.STRENGTH IN DIVERSITYAt a time of unprecedented changes in society, population and the environment, agricultural biodiversity also provides some security against future adversity, be it from climate change, war, industrial developments, biotechnological calamities or ecosystem collapse. There is greater strength in diversity than in susceptible uniformity. A diversity of varieties, breeds and species will ensure that there will continue to be agricultural production whatever the threat, and hidden in the genetic code of today's crop plants and livestock are many invisible traits that may become useful in confronting future challenges.

### 1ac Adv 3

#### Advantage 3: California

#### Initial federal funding is key to viability and cost-competitiveness—stimulates the California dairy industry which is critical to their economy

**Krich et al 5**—Research Manager for ABC

(Ken, with Don Augenstein, JP Batmale, John Benemann, Brad Rutledge, and Dara Salour, “Biomethane from Dairy Waste”, <http://www.americanbiogascouncil.org/pdf/biomethaneFromDairyWaste.pdf>, dml)

Like other pioneering renewable energy technologies, the production and distribution of dairy biomethane is not currently cost effective for the private developer without a public subsidy. In time, after a number of small-scale plants are built, costs are likely to come down. Our estimated costs for producing biogas and upgrading it to biomethane can compete only marginally with today’s natural gas prices. Pioneering plants may have higher costs due to inexperience. At today’s market prices, a large dairy could likely produce biomethane for a price lower than that paid by small retail commercial users (like dairies); while a smaller dairy’s cost of production would be higher than the going market rate. Added to the cost of production is the cost of storage and transportation. In contrast, generating electricity from biogas can offset retail electric purchases and can be simpler and more profitable than biomethane production. However, the farmer may produce more electricity than he can use; if this occurs, the farmer cannot be compensated for the excess dairy biogas electricity under California’s current market structure, and the present net metering program in California is not as attractive for the small biogas electric generator as it is for the solar generator. Also, obtaining an interconnection agreement is time-consuming and expensive. Why Support the Development of the Biomethane Industry? Swedish experience demonstrates that a viable biomethane industry is possible. It is important to note, however, that the economics in Sweden are much more favorable for a biomethane industry than they are in the USA. The most important lesson we learned during our trip to Sweden was that no biomethane plant should be built until a market for the biomethane has been established and a distribution system designed that can move the biomethane to the market. The current economics for development of the biomethane industry in the USA are challenging if there is no public subsidy. We feel, however, that there are a number of valid reasons to support the development of this industry through publicly funded subsidies, regulation, or tax incentives. Such subsidies and incentives are always necessary to develop a new source of renewable energy or an alternative transportation fuel. A society that is heavily dependent on fossil fuel energy should be actively developing a wide variety of alternative energy resources. We cannot always predict which technologies will prove the most viable for our future needs. We need to invest in research and development and to build pilot plants for a variety of these technologies. Biomethane production addresses California’s commitment to renewable energy and to reducing dependence on imported petroleum. Development of a dairy biomethane industry would help to stimulate California’s economy, particularly its rural economy. Biomethane production provides a series of environmental benefits both during the production process and because it can be substituted for fossil fuels. Development of biomethane production technologies and markets today will ensure future preparedness for the growth of this industry should conditions arise that make the production and use of biomethane a more financially viable and/or necessary option. The biomethane industry, like the rest of the renewable energy sector, needs public subsidies, tax credits, or market rules that will help earn a premium for the product during its start-up phase. Regulators and lobbyists for the industry also need to be aware of the cost structure of the biomethane industry. In contrast to anaerobic digester systems that generate electricity, which have higher capital costs than operating costs, biogas upgrading plants that produce biomethane typically have higher operating costs than capital costs. Subsidies that cover even a large portion of the capital costs may be insufficient to stimulate industry growth. If biomethane facilities are to become viable, ongoing sources of renewable energy, they will likely need the support of ongoing production tax credits, a long-term fixed price contract, and/or market rules that provide a premium for its output.

#### The plan sustains California growth and it’s reverse causal—federal commitment is key

**Coleman 11**—California Chamber of Commerce

(Brenda, “Energy Infrastructure Upgrade/Expansion Critical for State’s Economy to Grow”, <https://www.calbizcentral.com/GovernmentRelations/IssueReports/Documents/2011-Reports/energy_2011.pdf>, dml)

Although these certainly are steps in the right direction, much more needs to be done if the United States wants to advance its renewable energy commitment. According to policy experts, the country must focus on federal subsidies, streamlining the approval process for projects, and of course, transmission infrastructure in order to update and expand the electrical grid to accommodate new sources of energy. Subsidies in the form of tax credits and loan guarantees will help stimulate production. With expired federal tax credits for several renewable development projects, however, investors remain cautious until Congress commits to multiyear programs of support. Finally, streamlining the approval process for projects is just as important at the federal level as it is at the state level. The projects recently certified by the Interior Department took five years and nine years to receive all permits. In order to advance renewable energy goals and job creation promised with clean energy projects, the permit process must be more responsive with swifter completion of regulatory hurdles. CalChamber Position It is critical that California’s electricity generation keeps pace with its growing population and increasing demand. The state should focus its attention on the construction of new transmission lines to sustain future economic growth and to ensure renewables are able to come on line in time to keep up with the various programs being implemented across agencies. With the various new programs undergoing implementation in the next couple of years, California will be expected to have a far more diversified portfolio of energy sources. In order for the state to meet these energy efficiency and renewable standards, projects must be streamlined through the approval process, which means effective interagency collaboration and communication is necessary. The construction of the state’s energy infrastructure is vital to the economic growth of California. Moreover, investments must be made in natural gas pipelines to more efficiently move the gas to where it is needed. Continued research and development is needed in technologies like smart grid that help advance energy efficiency goals, reduce cost and increase grid reliability. Finally, continued research in fuel technology is necessary for understanding the role of alternative fuels in enhancing the state’s energy mix and reaching California’s environmental goals. If the state delays growth of much-needed infrastructure and development, California will fail to meet tomorrow’s energy demand.

#### Can’t delay—demand is increasing and imports are tenuous—now is key

**Coleman 11**—California Chamber of Commerce

(Brenda, “Energy Infrastructure Upgrade/Expansion Critical for State’s Economy to Grow”, <https://www.calbizcentral.com/GovernmentRelations/IssueReports/Documents/2011-Reports/energy_2011.pdf>, dml)

The production, transmission and cost of energy continue to be a central issue to California residents, the business community and the state’s economy. The success of California’s economy, and by extension the nation’s, relies on the ability of local, state and federal leaders to find common ground and determine the most efficient and equitable means of upgrading and expanding energy infrastructure. As California pursues its goal to address climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions, the driving force for the state’s energy policies continues to be maintaining a reliable, efficient and affordable energy system that is aligned with the state’s economic growth and environmental initiatives. Although the economic downturn has reduced energy demand in the short-term, demand is expected to grow over time as the economy recovers. It is important that in making key energy decisions, policy makers and stakeholders be flexible enough to respond to future fluctuations in the economy in a way that enables the state to continue to develop and adopt energy policies and technologies that are critical for long-term reliability and economic growth. California’s Electricity Outlook Since the energy crisis of 2000–01, California has maintained a delicate balance between supply and demand, largely by relying on imported electricity from the North and Southwest and older, less efficient in-state power plants. With the demand in the North and Southwest growing, future imports are becoming more expensive and less available. Moreover, due to landmark legislation to cut the state’s greenhouse gas emissions (AB 32 and SB 1368), California is limited to what types of power plants may be used to serve the current and increases in load. Although conservation, energy efficiency standards and increased energy sources have helped keep supply greater than demand, continued population and economic growth edges the state closer to an imbalance of supply and demand. California’s population grows at a rate of more than 1 percent a year, according to the Legislative Analyst’s Office. According to the California Energy Commission (CEC), the state’s primary energy policy and planning agency, electricity consumption is projected to grow at a rate of 1.2 percent per year from 2010–2018, with peak demand growing at an average annual rate of 1.3 percent over the same period. The current forecast is lower than the CEC had estimated in a previous report, primarily due to lower-than-expected economic growth in both the near- and long-term, as well as increased expectations of savings from energy efficiency. According to the Energy Commission’s 2009 Integrated Energy Policy Report, more than 24,000 megawatts (MW) of new capacity has been licensed since 1998. Only 15,220 MW has come on line, however. The 2009 report states that the Energy Commission has a historic high level of more than 30 proposed projects under review, totaling more than 12,000 MW, many of which are large solar thermal power plants that present new and challenging environmental impacts that must be considered.

#### California key to US and global econ

**Navarro, ‘8** Professor of Economics and Public Policy at the Paul Merage School of Business, University of California, Irvine and holds a Ph.D. in Economics from Harvard University (Peter Navarro, SFGate, 15 August 2008, “California nightmare for the global economy?” http://www.sfgate.com/opinion/article/California-nightmare-for-the-global-economy-3273234.php)//CC

Will the California budget crisis tip the United States into recession? The California economy is certainly large enough to inflict such damage. It's the seventh-largest economy in the world and home to close to 38 million Americans. California's budget deficit is by any reasonable measure enormous. This budget deficit is estimated at $17.2 billion and represents more than 17 percent of the state's general fund expenditures (about $101 billion). In contrast, New York, which faces the second-worst budget gap in the nation for fiscal year 2009, has a gap of about $5 billion, which represents less than 10 percent of its budget. In closing its past budgetary gaps, California has acted more like the federal government rather than merely one of 50 states. Indeed, unlike the federal government (or sovereign nations), each state is required to balance its budget each year; and no state, at least in principle, has the authority to engage in the kind of discretionary deficit spending both the federal government and nations around the world routinely use to stimulate their economies. In the past, a profligate California has gotten around this balanced-budget requirement by using a technique that effectively allows the Golden State to administer its own fiscal stimulus. In particular, California - under both Democratic and Republican governors - has simply issued new bonds every time that it has spent far beyond its means. California's problem this time, however, is that its deficit is so big, its balance sheet is so bad, and world credit markets are so tight that issuing new bonds alone is no longer a viable option. Instead, California's politicians are inexorably being forced toward a solution that will prominently feature both a large tax increase and significant spending cuts. Indeed, this is not a partisan matter of choosing one's poison. The budget deficit is so large that it cannot be eliminated without raising taxes, anathema to the state's Republicans, and spending cuts, equally unpalatable to California Democrats. Of course, the faster the state Legislature accepts this harsh reality, the faster the deadlock can be broken. Viewed from a macroeconomic perspective, there is an even harsher reality. Increased taxes and reduced spending will send a very nasty contractionary shock through a California economy that is already reeling from a housing market meltdown and punishing gas prices. Should Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger's budgetary medicine - including firing many state employees - trigger a recession, this may well serve as a tipping point for a national recession and, in the worst case scenario, even a global recession. In considering these dangers, it is worth noting that California provides close to 13 percent of America's real GDP growth. In contrast, the second-largest contributor to U.S. gross domestic product is Texas, and it provides only half that stimulus. It also worth noting that California is an important destination for both U.S. manufactured goods and world imports, particularly from Asia. Already, California's unemployment rate is more than 6.8 percent and well above the national average of 5.7 percent. At least some economists believe California may already be experiencing negative growth. The economy is likely to get a lot worse before its gets better. If there is any one civics lesson to be learned from this fine mess, it is that the state's politicians must learn to resist overspending in good times so that the state won't face bankruptcy when bad times hit. It should be equally clear that any damn fool can issue bonds to balance a budget. However, it takes real political courage and economic foresight to put a state budget on an even keel through fiscally conservative tax-and-spend policies. At this juncture, California is nowhere close to that - and the rest of the country, and perhaps the world, may soon pay the Golden State's piper.

#### Global war

Harris and Burrows 9 Mathew, PhD European History @ Cambridge, counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer is a member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” <http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f_0016178_13952.pdf> Increased Potential for Global Conflict

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks\_and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions**.** It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

#### Strong Californian economy bolsters military-industrial innovation

**Gvosdev 3**—Editor at the National Interest

(Nikolas, “Recall Madness-- and Much Ado about Missiles”, <http://nationalinterest.org/article/recall-madness-and-much-ado-about-missiles-2406>, dml)

But the real issue is this: people "inside the Beltway" sometimes seem to forget that there is no "United States" apart from the fifty states (and associated territories and commonwealths). A fiscal and economic crisis in California has a direct impact on the power of the United States, since some 13 percent of the total U.S. output is produced by California. California on its own is the sixth largest economy in the world, worth some $1.309 trillion--yet this represents a decline of approximately 2.3 percent from 2000, when California's economy outperformed that of France. California represents a significant share of the country's technological base and of its human capital. The high-tech weaponry which led to a swift initial military victory in Iraq is in part a product of the technology and defense sectors of the California economy. A state budget crisis that significantly cuts back on everything from education (including higher education, where so many innovative breakthroughs have taken place) to health care has ramifications for how the United States projects its influence throughout the world. In previous issues of In the National Interest, other authors have pointed out the dangerous implications of continued deficit spending by the federal government to support overseas operations, and this problem can only increase if a continuing crisis in the principal engine of America's economy continues. And, of course, California is the bellweather for the nation as a whole. Twenty-nine states have either passed or are considering tax hikes to close budget deficits. Several states--including Hawaii, Georgia and North Carolina--will call special fall sessions of their legislatures to deal with the fact that collected taxes have fallen short of budget projections. Yet the attitude is that the recall in California is amusing political comedy, nothing more. There seems to be almost no recognition of the fact that whoever sits in the governor's chair after October 7 --whether Grey Davis survives or is "terminated" --must work quickly to solve the problems that have led California into its current quagmire. Few other countries in the world would be so blasé if political turmoil and economic collapse threatened the welfare of a key component of its national power. The California crisis reminds us that there is no neat line dividing "domestic" and "foreign" policy. Ensuring that California survives its current crisis is no less a priority than stabilizing Iraq or containing North Korea.

#### That’s key to deterrence and the de-escalation of conflict

**O’Hanlon et al 12** (Mackenzie Eaglen, American Enterprise Institute Rebecca Grant, IRIS Research Robert P. Haffa, Haffa Defense Consulting Michael O'Hanlon, The Brookings Institution Peter W. Singer, The Brookings Institution Martin Sullivan, Commonwealth Consulting Barry Watts, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments “The Arsenal of Democracy and How to Preserve It: Key Issues in Defense Industrial Policy January 2012,” pg online @ <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/1/26%20defense%20industrial%20base/0126_defense_industrial_base_ohanlon> //um-ef)

The current wave of defense cuts is also different than past defense budget reductions in their likely industrial impact, as **the U.S. defense industrial base is in a much different place than it was in the past**. Defense industrial issues are too often viewed through the lens of jobs and pet projects to protect in congressional districts. **But the overall health of the firms that supply the technologies our armed forces utilize does have national security resonance**. Qualitative superiority in weaponry and other key military technology has become an essential element of American military power in the modern era—**not only for winning wars but for deterring them**. **That requires world-class** scientific and **manufacturing capabilities—**which in turn can also generate civilian and military export opportunities for the United States in a globalized marketplace.

#### Multiple hotspots make defense manufacturing key --- these go nuclear

**Watts 8** (Barry D Watts, Senior Fellow, The Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, “The US Defense Industrial Base, Past, Present and Future,” CBA, <http://www.csbaonline.org/4Publications/PubLibrary/R.20081015._The_US_Defense_In/R.20081015._The_US_Defense_In.pdf>)

Since the 1950s, the US defense industrial base has been a source of long-term strategic advantage for the United States, just as it was during World War II. American defense companies provided the bombers and missiles on which nuclear deterrence rested and armed the US military with world-class weapons, including low-observable aircraft, wide-area surveillance and targeting sensors, and reliable guided munitions cheap enough to be employed in large numbers. They also contributed to the development of modern digital computers, successfully orbited the first reconnaissance satellites, put a man on the moon in less than a decade, and played a pivotal role in developing the worldwide web. Critics have long emphasized President Eisenhower’s warning in his farewell television address that the nation needed to “guard against the acquisition of undue influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex.” Usually forgotten or ignored has been an earlier, equally important, passage in Eisenhower’s January 1961 speech: A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that **no potential aggressor** may be **tempted to risk** his own destruction. Eisenhower’s warning about undue influence, rather than the need to maintain American military strength, tends to dominate contemporary discussions of the US defense industrial base. While the percentage of US gross domestic product going to national defense remains low compared to the 1950s and 1960s, there is a growing list of defense programs that have experienced problems with cost, schedule, and, in a few cases, weapon performance. In fairness, the federal government, including the Department of Defense and Congress, is at least as much to blame for many of these programmatic difficulties as US defense firms. Nevertheless, those critical of the defense industry tend to concentrate on these acquisition shortcomings. The main focus of this report is on a larger question. How prepared is the US defense industrial base to meet the needs of the US military Services in coming decades? The Cold War challenge of Soviet power has largely ebbed, but new challenges have emerged. There is the immediate threat of the violence stemming from SalafiTakfiri and Khomeinist terrorist groups and their state sponsors, that have consumed so much American blood and treasure in Iraq; the longer-term challenge of authoritarian capitalist regimes epitomized by the rise of China and a resurgent Russia; and, not least, the worsening problem of proliferation, particularly of **nuclear weapons.** In the face of these more complex and varied challenges, it would surely be premature to begin dismantling the US defense industry. From a competitive perspective, therefore, the vital question about the defense industrial base is whether it will be as much a source of long-term advantage in the decades ahead as it has been since the 1950s.

#### No defense --- collapse of the perception  leads to miscalculation and alliance shift

**Cooper 07** (Horace Cooper, Senior Fellow and deputy director of the Alliance for American Manufacturing, “Making it in America”, April 04, 2007, <http://www.americanmanufacturing.org/articles/making-it-america>)

But perhaps greater than the economic disruption in the lives of the workforce and their companies is the incalculable loss of a manufacturing base for our nation as a whole. There are those in Washington who fail to appreciate the attendant decline in our nation’s security and flexibility in foreign affairs that results from the collapse of this sector. The fall of the Berlin Wall and the unipolarity that resulted presents the United States far greater responsibilities and concerns than those that existed during the Cold War. Yet, our failure to sustain our domestic manufacturing base and instead pursuing a strategy of relying on other countries for military products and technologies isn’t just short-sided, it’s dangerous. This decline in our country’s **military readiness** is a **signal** to the rest of the world that we may not be capable of defending our interests or allies. And perhaps one of the greatest lessons of the 20th century is that **weakness at home is provocative.** Essentially, we provoke rogue nations into taking ill-advised actions that mustinevitably be countered by America’s military might. A policy that results in a diminished security for Americans, fewer jobs, a declining tax base for communities and states and that rejects our nation’s history is a policy that should be reassessed. Supporters of liberty and freedom recognize that American ingenuity and know-how is a core ingredient of our manufacturing sectorand has led to much of the high standard of living we Americans take for granted.

### 1ac plan

#### The United States federal government should amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make biogas an eligible source for renewable energy bonds to finance natural gas.

### 1ac solvency

#### IRS mechanism key to solvency

**Bilek 10**—2011 John J. McCloy Fellowship in Environmental Policy Energy Policy Specialist, Great Plains Institute

(Amanda, “SPOTLIGHT ON BIOGAS: POLICIES FOR UTILIZATION AND DEPLOYMENT IN THE MIDWEST”, <http://www.gpisd.net/vertical/Sites/%7B1510F0B9-E3E3-419B-AE3B-582B8097D492%7D/uploads/%7B6DEFD5AC-B930-4ED1-AB05-0AD7EB86EA6B%7D.PDF>, dml)

Tax credits are an attractive policy mechanism for biogas projects because they may provide an additional incentive for ownership and management models beyond individual farm ownership and also provide an incentive for industrial or municipal systems Tax credits will continue to be an important financing mechanism for biogas projects in the future as large-scale and industrial biogas projects are constructed The existing production incentives are geared toward electricity production and do not currently allow for advanced utilization options, such as renewable gas or thermal applications, to qualify for the incentives Expanding incentive program definitions to allow additional utilizations of biogas could spur additional project development The current policy environment at the state and federal level does not recognize the tremendous resource potential from biogas Without additional mechanisms and incentives geared towards diverse biogas utilizations and expanded ownership or management models, biogas development will struggle to grow and an opportunity will be missed to diversify our energy supply with a stable and versatile renewable resource 26Danny and Josie Kluthe’s neighbors were pleasantly surprised when the Kluthes were able to double the size of their hog operation while dramatically reducing the smell of the hog manure The Kluthes were able to achive this goal thanks to their anaerobic digester The complete mix digester system is an in-ground concrete tank with an insulated flexible cover that stores all the manure from the 8,000 head of swine on the Kluthe Farm near Dodge, Nebraska The Kluthe’s number one goal with the installation of the digester was to reduce the odor from their operation The Kluthes created Olean Energy to sell the electricity from their digester to the Nebraska Public Power District (NPPD) The farm produces and sells 549,000 kilowatt hours - enough to power 65 homes for one year -under a buy-all, sell-all contract Olean Energy sells the electricity produced to the power company at a wholesale rate and purchases it back off the grid at retail rates Nebraska’s first methane-powered electrical energy production project got off the ground with the financial support of a $200,000 grant from the Nebraska Environmental Trust and an $80,000 grant from USDA Rural Development Nebraska’s first methane-powered electrical generator has reduced greenhouse gas emissions by 4,878 metric tons of CO2 on an equivalent basis per year Besides the amazing environmental benefits, the Kluthe Farm digester has reduced odor, created nutrient-rich fertilizer, and provided consistent income amidst volatile hog market prices The Production Tax Credit (PTC) is one of the most popular renewable energy tax credits The PTC has been in operation since 1992 with intermittent periods of availability that depend upon Congressional action Renewable energy development ramps up when the credit is available and grinds to a halt when the credit expires The PTC is a ten-year per-kilowatt-hour tax credit for qualified renewable energy resources, including landfill gas, anaerobic digestion, and closed- and open-loop biomass facilities The 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) revised the PTC by extending the in-service deadline by three years for a majority of qualified renewable energy technologies and allows qualified facilities to take advantage of the Business Energy Investment Tax Credit (ITC) or take it alternatively as a cash grant from the U S Department of Treasury (DSIRE, 2010d) The Business Energy Investment Tax Credit (ITC) is similar to the PTC but has traditionally provided tax credits for solar power, fuel cells, small wind systems, geothermal energy, microturbines, and combined heat and power facilities Instead of providing a per-kilowatt-hour credit, a percentage tax credit based on qualifying costs has been available The 2009 ARRA changed the ITC to allow PTC eligible facilities, including closed- and open-loop biomass facilities, to qualify for a 30 percent tax credit through 2013 Prior to this change closed-and-open-loop biomass facilities were not eligible for the ITC New facilities take advantage of the ITC or a cash grant from the U S Department of Treasury (described below) if construction begins in 2010 This change to the ITC allows biogas projects, generally classified as open-loop biomass facilities, to use the ITC to help finance projects over the long-term A grant program (Section 1603) of the U S Department of Treasury was included as part of the 2009 ARRA and provides up to 30 percent of construction and installation costs for a depreciable or amortizable renewable energy facility in lieu of tax credits Facilities can take advantage of either the cash grant or the ITC This grant is available to facilities placed in service or beginning construction in 2009 or 2010 The current program excludes open-loop biomass facilities that have a nameplate capacity rating of 150 kilowatts or less A proposal by U S Senators Diane Feinstein (D-Calif ) and Jeff Merkley (D-Ore ) would extend the grant program until 2012 The bill needs Congressional action in order to extend the program and, at time of publication, no action has been taken The creation or extension of these production incentives or cash grant programs gives biogas project developers financing structure options for the project, but more choices can also create confusion The Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) conducted a quantitative analysis and considered qualitative factors of the PTC, ITC and the U S Treasury cash grant program Results were presented in the report, “PTC, ITC, or Cash Grant? An Analysis of the Choice Facing Renewable Energy Power Projects in the United States,” which concluded that, based on quantitative factors, open-loop biomass projects would receive more value from the ITC rather than the PTC Qualitative considerations, such as no performance risk, more immediate use of tax base, and no power sale requirement, gave the edge to closed-loop biomass projects utilization of the PTC Quantitative analysis alone could not conclusively determine if closed-loop biomass projects would fare better under the PTC or ITC Combining the qualitative and quantitative factors analyzed, open- and closed-loop biomass would receive a greater benefit utilizing the ITC (Bolinger et al , 2009) Although existing tax credits have provided some incentives for biogas projects, a federally dedicated production incentive for biogas does not currently exist In an effort to level the playing field among renewable energy incentives, Senator Ben Nelson of Nebraska introduced the Biogas Production Incentive Act of 2009 (S 306) The legislation, if passed, would provide a $4 27 tax credit for every million British thermal units (BTUs) of biogas produced Biogas is defined as gas derived from the processing of a qualified energy feedstock, such as livestock manure, or organic agricultural or food industry byproduct The legislation specifies the gas must contain at least 50% methane (Thomas, 2010a) The bill currently has 14 co-sponsors, including Democrats and Republicans from across the United States A companion bill (H R 1158) has also been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative Brian Higgins of New York The Higgins companion bill has 27 co-sponsors Both bills have been referred to the appropriate committees and no action has been taken to date H R 5581 was introduced by U S Representative Kind on June 23, 2010 This proposed legislation presents an opportunity to create a financial incentive for biogas projects producing biomethane to be used as a replacement for natural gas or compressed and used as a vehicle fuel to further diversify the utilization of biogas produced from agricultural livestock manure and processing byproducts The legislation proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code for a qualified biogas facility to use clean renewable energy bonds to finance a project. Eligible projects could receive a 30 percent credit Biogas produced from eligible facilities must be at least 52 percent methane Biogas projects producing electricity from biogas would not qualify (Thomas, 2010b) The bill also directs the NREL to conduct a biogas study that would examine biogas quality, methods for maximizing energy content, and recommendations for production expansion (Biomass Intel, 2010)

#### Methane digesters solve but federal government assurance is key to handle startup cost

**Setzer 7** (Emily, 17 September 2007, “Farmers Seek Slice of Cow Pie,” http://featured.matternetwork.com/2007/9/farmers-want-expand-energy-slice.cfm, RBatra)

The dairy farm industry can't stop talking about the potential of cow power. But high costs and low incentives are slowing biogas development in America, which trails Europe in developing energy from bovine waste. Digesters capture methane from cow manure and turn it into biogas, which can be used to generate electricity or converted into natural gas. Turning manure into an energy source can reduce emissions of methane and the environmental impact , by up to 70 percent. Methane is a greenhouse gas with a global warming potential 23 times higher than carbon dioxide., But digester equipment ranges from $300,000 to $2 million, making it a cost prohibitive investment for many farmers. Many digesters are built using steel and concrete – two products with rising costs due to transportation and fuel, so digesters probably won't get any cheaper. Experimental Farmers Some smaller dairy farms have gathered to build community digesters, like in the Port of Tillamook Bay in Oregon, which collects manure from seven farms totaling close to 4,000 cows. Meanwhile, larger farms have chosen to team up with big utility companies. "We're trying to make a community digester work," said George Devore, who operates the Port of Tillamook Bay's digester and heads research and development for the community facility. It's been a learning experience for the Tillamook farmers. Some of the digesters only lasted one year. He thinks the government should provide assistance to keep equipment in running order in addition to helping farmers with the initial startup costs. "We're losing money like mad here. Our government won't help the existing (digesters) to make them perfect. They help start them and that's the last you see of them," said Devore.

#### Other actors fail—federal government key to scale of leverage and tech viability

**Gloy 8** – works at the Department of Applied Economics and Management at Cornell (Brent A., 21 October 2008, “Biogas: what options for Slurry power in the US?,” http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2008/10/biogas-what-options-for-slurry-power-in-the-us-53901, RBatra)

Public policy can play an important role in the development of a biogas industry in the United States. Currently, most policy related to biogas production has been implemented by individual states and utilities. In contrast, national policies have focused on incentives for construction of biogas production facilities, such as grants for feasibility studies, waste management related construction grants, and loan guarantees. There has been little by way of US national policy directed toward developing markets for energy produced by biogas production systems. Such efforts would be likely to play a much larger role in industry development than do the current subsidies for the construction of farm level digester operations. National level policies might include the development of national quality standards for biogas inserted into gas pipelines. Such standards would make clear the requirements that must be met before biogas can be included in the existing and well-developed gas transmission network. Similarly, national rules on the pricing of electricity generated from biogas applications would ease the negotiation process required to sell electricity into the grid. Although some utilities provide financial incentives for the production of electricity produced from biogas, the site-specific nature of biogas production will limit the scale of the industry. **National, rather than regional-, state-, or utility-level incentives** for this type of energy are more likely to be effective in stimulating the industry. A per unit credit for electrical production from biogas would also speed the development of systems, as would incentives for fleets to adopt the use of natural gas and biogas transportation fuels. The process of monetizing the environmental benefits associated with biogas production is complex. National policy aimed at clarifying the magnitude of environmental benefits associated with the production of biogas would be a tremendous benefit to the industry. Additionally, national policy to assist in developing the markets for these benefits is likely to be necessary as no one producer has a strong enough incentive to organize the market.

#### The plan solves—gotta change the US tax structure

**GTI 11**—Gas Technology Institute, an independent not-for-profit organization

(“The Potential for Renewable Gas”, <http://www.gasfoundation.org/ResearchStudies/agf-renewable-gas-assessment-report-110901.pdf>, dml)

Renewable gas offers numerous potential benefits for the United States: • It is another source of domestically produced energy. Under the two practical long term scenarios that were considered for this study, the market potential of renewable gas is from 1.0 – 2.5 quadrillion Btu’s per year. The technical potential, representing complete utilization of all available feedstocks, is approximately 9.5 quadrillion Btu’s per year. • The job creation potential of renewable biogas gas projects is significant. Direct jobs created range up to 83,000 depending on the depth of the market penetration. Using an average multiplier of 3.12,3,4,5,6 for indirect and induced jobs, total jobs created ranges up to 257,000. • Depending on the model of deployment, renewable gas production could result in 146 million metric tons of CO2 removed from the air annually. This is the equivalent of taking 29 million cars off the road. 7 • The California Air Resources Board (CARB), in a 2009 report, has determined that renewable gas is the lowest carbon transportation fuel available today. 8 • Almost every state in the U.S. has the resources to participate in the production of renewable gas with the potential to create new green jobs. • Renewable gas from renewable sources including animal manure, forest residues, and agricultural wastes can be produced at efficiencies ranging from 60–70%, thus, using our renewable resources in a responsible and efficient manner.9 • All of the technology components to produce renewable gas from this variety of biomass sources exist today. • Renewable biogas production in digesters provides the agricultural sector additional environmental benefits by improving waste management, nutrient control, and dramatically reducing carbon emissions through the control of methane by placing manure in enclosed vessels instead of open lagoons. • Renewable gas is an interchangeable fuel that can be delivered to customers via the existing U.S. pipeline infrastructure and can provide a renewable energy option in the natural gas energy market, an energy market that overall represents 25% of U.S. energy use. • Renewable gas, in many instances, is the low-cost option among renewable products.10 Legislative and regulatory support for renewable fuels is understood to be crucial in realizing scale production for these resources. The same will be true for realizing the potential presented by renewable gas. Over the past several decades the U.S. Congress and the Executive Branch have endorsed a variety of incentives to further the advancement of renewable energy. Much of this effort has focused on creating incentives for the production of renewable electricity or renewable transportation fuels. These incentives have made a positive impact on the growth of renewable liquid transportation fuels produced from biomass resources and on renewable electricity produced from woody biomass, animal manure, and landfill gas. Currently, federal government policy gives disparate treatment to processes for producing renewable gas as compared to those which generate renewable electricity or transportation fuels. Renewable gas production does not receive similar tax credits compared to other renewable energy products. In many instances, as set out in this report, biomass and other renewable resources may be more effectively and efficiently used to produce renewable gas directly. This potential is hindered by the existing tax incentive structure on renewable energy which drives these resources towards production of renewable electricity or liquid transportation fuels. Importantly, renewable gas can be a supply source for all current users of natural gas. Prudent and well conceived changes in policy can expand its use across the country. These policy changes have to incorporate the following two principles: • Parity – renewable gas being valued and incentivized similarly to renewable electricity or liquid transportation fuel. • Accessibility and integration – the purchase and transfer of renewable gas through our nation’s pipeline infrastructure to meet local, state, or federal goals for renewable fuels.

#### Targeted, stable federal-level financial incentives are key to industry certainty and growth

**Greene et al 11**—O’Brien and Gere Chair of ABC

(Paul, with Norma McDonald, Rolfe Phillip, Melissa VanOrnum, Nora Goldstein, Amy Kessler, Shonodeep Modak, Patrick Serfass, and Freeman White, Testimony to the House Ways and Means Committee RE: Joint Hearing on Energy Tax Policy and Tax Reform, September 29, 2011, dml)

The argument that renewable energy tax incentives should be scrapped because such policies “pick winners and losers” implies that the government should not incentivize certain technologies even if their development and adoption lead to better national outcomes such as economic growth or energy security. Tax policy should reinforce our national objectives to increase use of sustainable, reliable forms of energy, both to create new industries that can lead the world, and enhance our energy independence. The Defense Department recognizes the need to reduce its dependence on vulnerable and volatile fossil fuel supplies and an increasingly outdated and exposed power grid— all of which is driving the military to explore deeply a full range of alternatives, including biogas. The Department of Defense’s 2010 Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan states that “heavy reliance on fossil fuels creates significant risks and costs at a tactical as well as a strategic level” which can result in “lost dollars, in reduced mission effectiveness, and in U.S. soldiers’ lives.” The Committee should embrace tax policies that encourage emerging technologies that meet these sustainability objectives. This investment in our future also spurs domestic economic growth and job creation. A July 2011 Brookings Institution study entitled “Sizing the Clean Economy: A National and Regional Green Jobs Assessment” recognized that while the clean economy can be difficult to adequately quantify, “newer ‘cleantech’ segments produced explosive job gains” between 2003 and 2010. The report concluded “that vigorous private sector-led growth needs to be co-promoted through complementary engagements by all levels of the nation’s federal system to ensure the existence of well-structured markets, a favorable investment climate, and a rich stock of cutting-edge technology.” Over the past decades, federal support has facilitated the emergence of many new industries. Federal support also allows innovative capital intensive energy projects with long-term economic benefits. For example, sizeable federal investments in hydroelectric dams made years ago continue to provide clean, affordable electricity for large portions of the country. Likewise, tax policies incentivizing biogas production will produce reliable, clean energy and economic benefits for years to come. While beneficial, the energy provisions in the tax code are far from perfect. Most of the favorable tax provisions to fossil fuels were written into the U.S. Tax Code as permanent provisions. By contrast, many renewable energy tax provisions were implemented through energy bills and contain expiration dates that limit their usefulness to the renewables industry. Moreover, even within the sphere of these short-term renewable energy credits, the value of tax credits for different technologies varies, as do the expiration dates. For instance, biogas producers can only take advantage of the §45 credit if they generate electricity, and this credit expires at the end of 2013, while other technologies have tax credits that extend to the end of 2016. Depending on the rate the utility will pay to buy excess power, a biogas producer may find it more economically feasible to forgo producing electricity and to use the biogas produced onsite for heating purposes. Or the producer may decide to use the biogas as a fuel, either to be used on site or to be cleaned up and sent into a pipeline or used as vehicle fuel. While using biogas as fuel saves energy, reduces methane emissions, and does not impact food prices, no comparable tax benefit exists for biogas production that is not used for electricity generation. As a 2010 Congressional Research Service report highlighted, “Recent legislation pertaining to agricultural sources of renewable energy has focused primarily on corn-based ethanol and cellulosic ethanol for liquid fuel purposes, and not biogas.” Consequently, we support past efforts by Rep. Kind and Sen. Nelson to provide parity for biogas production, no matter the final use. We also support efforts to extend the §45 open-loop biomass credit until December 31, 2016 so as to be in line with other §48 sunset dates. Despite the imperfections of the tax code, eliminating renewable energy focused tax provisions is inconsistent with national economic and security interests. Emerging and underutilized technologies like anaerobic digestion increase our energy independence and create domestic jobs. Increasing deployment of these renewable technologies drives down costs, reducing the need for future subsidies. In addition, the United States spends a great deal to ensure our national security. Devoting a small fraction of that amount to deploying clean energy technologies is a cost effective way to increase our energy security for the long term. To the extent that federal energy tax provisions pick “winners,” they attempt to make certain technologies competitive with traditional fossil fuel energy technologies that have received federal subsidies in a variety of forms over decades, many of which are permanent features of the Code. Consequently, extending renewable energy tax policy is crucial to ensuring a fair and a balanced approach that encompasses a variety of solutions. Allowing renewable tax provisions to lapse while ignoring the permanent provisions in the code for fossil energy would only undermine the Committee’s stated aims. 3) The tax code should subsidize energy technologies to the extent that those technologies improve our natural environment and strengthen our energy security The American Biogas Council agrees that tax provisions that create jobs and enhance energy security should continue. ABC disagrees with those who assert that the tax code should not subsidize renewable energy. While we would welcome a simplified tax code in theory, removing energy tax incentives in the absence of substantive federal non-tax policies such as feed in tariffs, a clean energy standard, or well-funded grant programs would decrease our energy independence. While the ABC is intrigued by the technology-neutral reverse auction concept proposed by Rep. Nunes, we remain concerned about shifting to an incentive structure where the trust fund is subject to appropriations. The annual appropriations process gives investors little certainty, and it would be a step backwards to eliminate existing tax incentives without an adequate replacement policy. It is also our understanding that the reverse auction would only apply to electricity production and so would not provide any incentive to the deployment of biogas as a fuel.

#### Recycling tech makes it cost competitive

**Thran 12**—Head of department Bioenergy Systems, DBFZ

(Daniela, “Focus on Biomethane”, <http://www.greengasgrids.eu/sites/default/files/files/fh_biomethane_engl_2.pdf>, dml)

In a project sponsored by the German Federal Ministry of the Environment, Alantum Europe GmbH together with the Fraunhofer Institutes for Ceramic Technologies and Systems (Institut für Keramische Technologien und Systeme – IKTS) and Manufacturing Technology and Advanced Materials (“Institut für Fertigungstechnik und Angewandte Materialforschung” – IFAM), and Lehmann Maschinenbau GmbH, is working on a regenerable filter system. The substrate used is porous metal alloy foam, which – like the previous used wood chippings and pellets – is coated with iron oxide. Due to the higher loads with the sorbent, the metal foam based filters can be designed to be smaller and yet have the same cleaning efficiency. In addition, due to the larger surface area compared to wood pellets, the operating period before regeneration is expected to be up to 4 times longer, as the loading with elementary sulphur takes a longer time. The elementary sulphur left on the foam surface by the regeneration reduces the active surface area. The required purity is no longer guaranteed above a critical sulphur load and the filter element must be replaced. In this case, the technologies used to date (activated carbon, zinc oxide and wood pellets) only provide for disposal of the filter elements on land fill sites. The aim is to remove this disadvantage using technology with which the sulphur is removed from the foam surface, either thermally or chemically, without having a negative effect on the filter system (in particular, causing deactivation of the sorbent or permanent damage to the foam). The removed sulphur is collected and, for example, is returned to the economic cycle as fertiliser. After use, the filter does not have to be disposed of on a landfill site, but instead its components are returned to the material cycle using existing recycling concepts (e.g. melting them down). These advantages reduce the costs per kilogram of sulphur removed from 16 to 20 euros to date to around 10 euros. This definitely contributes to reducing the price of biogas, until now relatively high compared to natural gas.

#### Federal incentives are key

**NYT 9**—the New York Times

(“Producers Optimistic About Biogas Bill Aimed at Farmers”, http://greeninc.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/01/30/farmers-optimistic-about-biogas-bill/, dml)

Experts say such fiscal enticements **from the** federal governmentare needed for biogas to become a commercially viable alternative to natural gas. As of 2008, there were 121 biogas recovery systems in the United States generating about 256,000 megawatt hours of power, according to AgSTAR. But the agency found that biogas systems were technically feasible at about 7,000 existing dairy and swine operations, with a potential of producing up to six million megawatt hours of energy annually (PDF). “Existing incentives for biogas have been very weak compared to other renewables,” observed Brent Gloy, an associate professor at Cornell University’s Department of Applied Economics and Management. Mr. Gloy said the proposed legislation was “a real step in the right direction that could really get the industry going.”

#### California has huge potential

**Krich et al 5**—Research Manager for ABC

(Ken, with Don Augenstein, JP Batmale, John Benemann, Brad Rutledge, and Dara Salour, “Biomethane from Dairy Waste”, <http://www.americanbiogascouncil.org/pdf/biomethaneFromDairyWaste.pdf>, dml)



Based on the information presented in Table 1-3, we estimate that California dairies have a methane production potential of about 40 million cubic feet per day (ft3 /d) or 14.6 billion cubic feet per year (ft3 /y). Using the early 2005 delivered price of natural gas (about $10.00 per thousand cubic feet), this is equivalent to over $146 million per year in energy costs.1 In terms of electricity output, this corresponds to over 1.2 million megawatt-hours (MWh) of energy or about 140 MW of electricity (MWe). As new technologies are tried and proven the methane yield and electrical production per cow is likely to increase.

# 2ac

### Zoonotic Disease

#### Failure to deal with manure on farms causes zoonotic diseases

**CDC 4**—the disease people

(“Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations”, <http://www.cdc.gov/cafos/about.html>, dml)

People who work with livestock may develop adverse health effects, including chronic and acute respiratory illnesses and musculoskeletal injuries, and may be exposed to infections that travel from animals to humans. Residents in areas surrounding CAFOs report nuisances, such as odor and flies. In studies of CAFOs, CDC has shown that chemical and infectious compounds from swine and poultry waste are able to migrate into soil and water near CAFOs. Scientists do not yet know whether or how the migration of these compounds affects human health. Pollutants possibly associated with manure-related discharges at CAFOs include: Antibiotics, which may contribute to the development of antibiotic-resistant pathogens Pathogens, such as parasites, bacteria, and viruses, which can cause disease in animals and humans Nutrients, such as ammonia, nitrogen, and phosphorus, which can reduce oxygen in surface waters, encourage the growth of harmful algal blooms, and contaminate drinking-water sources Pesticides and hormones, which researchers have associated with hormone-related changes in fish Solids, such as feed and feathers, which can limit the growth of desirable aquatic plants in surface waters and protect disease-causing microorganisms Trace elements, such as arsenic and copper, which can contaminate surface waters and possibly harm human health Researchers do not yet know whether or how these or other substances from CAFOs may affect human health. Therefore, CDC supports efforts to address these questions.

#### Extinction

**Morse 4** - Professor of Clinical Epidemiology @ Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University (Stephen S. Morse, “Factors and determinants of disease emergence,” <http://birdflubook.com/resources/Morse443.pdf>, JW)

As always, research, both basic and applied, will also be vital. There is still much to be learned about the natural ecology of infectious diseases and developing better prognostic epidemiology to predict the emergence and spread of these diseases. While some progress has been made in recent years in predicting disease spread (7, 18, 19), a great deal of work remains. For a variety of reasons, many zoonotic introductions fortunately do not succeed as human diseases (1). There is also a need to understand not only the driving factors of emergence, but also ways in which researchers can differentiate between successful and unsuccessful introductions, and better predict the risks of emergence and transmission. It is clear that infections will continue to emerge, and that many of these infections will be zoonotic. This emphasises the importance of close co-operation between the veterinary and human health communities, in working together and exchanging information on a regular basis. The World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) has long demonstrated leadership in surveillance and responding to threats to livestock and other animals. Agencies such as the OIE and WHO must continue their close collaboration in such worldwide efforts. While the task is large, it is essential to human survival.

### fertilizer

#### Plan creates a new fertilizer source for farms—Germany proves

**Farmers Guardian** **8** (5/9/08 [Farmers Guardian, “Euro 4m in grants and few barriers to entry in biogas production market, 5/9/08, pg. 12]

[Biogas is the gas produced by the breakdown of organic matter in the absence of oxygen, one type of which is produced by anaerobic digestion - the fermentation of biodegradable material such as manure and energy crops. The resulting biogas can be used as a fuel for heating or to generate electricity and the waste product, digestate, can be used as a fertiliser. Jeremy Eppel, deputy director of Defra's Farming for the Future programme, described anaerobic digestion as a `win, win, win' technology. It produces renewable energy in the form of biogas, it helps us mitigate methane emissions of agriculture, it helps convert other organic waste away from landfill and incineration and the treated material is then available as a bio-fertiliser," he said.] In Germany there are more than 3,500 plants providing around 5.4billion hours of electricity, which is in stark contrast to the UK where there are only a handful of farm-based plants and larger commercial units.

Solves the impact to peak gas—extinction

**Darley 4** (British Environmentalist, High Noon for Natural Gas, p. 8-9)

While natural gas is becoming ever more important for electrical power production, it is absolutely indispensable across the world for the production of industrial fertilizer. The explosive and highly problematic growth of the human population throughout the twentieth century and into the twenty-first is due in great part to the use of industrial fertilizer. One of the most vital, and presently irreplaceable, feedstocks of that fertilizer is natural gas, which makes natural gas possibly the single most critical ingredient in the diet of many human beings. For a few more years—no one can be sure how long—global natural gas production can increase, but in North America, where gas production has peaked and is declining, food production is already being affected, because of higher fertilizer prices; global oil peak will soon add to the problem. At the same time, water and soil problems are having a negative impact on global food production, especially in China. There is very little evidence that we can feed six billion or more people without petrochemicals. If water, soil, and climate problems haven't already begun to limit maximum global food production, which does now appear to be the case, once global oil then natural gas supplies become constrained, there will no longer be anyway of hiding from our disastrous population explosion. World population before the onslaught of industrial agriculture was around one and a half billion people. We may not even be able to support that number now, without oil and gas, because the very use of the chemicals derived from them has had so many damaging effects on the natural productive capacity of the soil and its related systems.

### Cal Econ UQ

#### Californias economy is sluggish -- no quick recovery -- tons of unemployment and high taxes

Walters, 3-24-13

[Dan, “Dan Walters: California's economic challenge in a nutshell,” http://www.sacbee.com/2013/03/24/5288075/dan-walters-californias-economic.html#storylink=cpy]

Coincidentally, three otherwise unrelated events last week framed California's somewhat clouded economic situation. One was a revelation that the state now is tied with Rhode Island for the nation's highest unemployment rate, 9.8 percent. Although employment surged in California last year, with about a quarter-million new jobs, and the jobless rate had dropped by more than two percentage points from its high-water mark, more than 1.8 million workers are still without jobs. And outside the immediate Bay Area the picture is especially grim, with jobless rates hitting nearly 30 percent in some rural counties. The second event was release of a study by researchers at the University of Southern California on the state's potentially huge deposits of shale oil that, they said, could spark an economic boom in the state, as it has in other states. Exploiting shale oil could create from a half-million to more than 2 million jobs, increase personal income sharply and spark a multi-billion-dollar surge in tax revenues, the study said. The third was release of the latest annual update of the Tax Foundation's state-by-state comparisons of tax burdens, indicating that Californians are bearing some of the nation's highest taxation loads. We were fourth highest at 11.2 percent of personal income in 2010 and since then, we've hiked sales and income taxes that would add nearly another half a point to that rate. Yet, despite those heavy taxes, state and local governments continue to struggle with chronic budget deficits and long-term obligations for pensions, retiree health care and bonded debt. And there it is. After three booms (defense, technology and housing) and three busts in the last three decades, California's economy continues to sputter. Two new economic forecasts, one from UCLA's Anderson School and another from California Lutheran University, see only incremental and slow recovery from what had been the worst recession since the Great Depression, with relatively high joblessness for years to come. Meanwhile, we're seeing a strong outflow of job-seeking Californians to other states, especially those whose economies are humming, such as Texas, thus reducing our stock of educated and high-skill workers. It's not a pretty picture, and while Gov. Jerry Brown dismisses those who question the state's prospects as "declinists," he and other Capitol politicians pay nothing more than lip service to making the state a more attractive venue for job- creating investment.

### Substantial 2AC

**Substantial means to large degree – not legal term of art**

Arkush 2 (David, JD Candidate – Harvard University, “Preserving "Catalyst" Attorneys' Fees Under the Freedom of Information Act in the Wake of Buckhannon Board and Care Home v. West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources”, Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review, Winter,
37 Harv. C.R.-C.L. L. Rev. 131)

Plaintiffs should argue that the term "substantially prevail" is not a term of art because if considered a term of art, resort to Black's 7th produces a definition of "prevail" that could be interpreted adversely to plaintiffs. [99](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1421887dc00d6c0b78bddb20857a69fa&docnum=16&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkAz&_md5=3f3ffe65eadff46b38ea49c40cb1037e&focBudTerms=definition%20of%20the%20term%21%20substantial%21%20or%20definition%20of%20the%20word%20substantial%21&focBudSel=all#n99) It is commonly accepted that words that are not legal terms of art should be accorded their ordinary, not their legal, meaning, [100](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1421887dc00d6c0b78bddb20857a69fa&docnum=16&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkAz&_md5=3f3ffe65eadff46b38ea49c40cb1037e&focBudTerms=definition%20of%20the%20term%21%20substantial%21%20or%20definition%20of%20the%20word%20substantial%21&focBudSel=all#n100) and ordinary-usage dictionaries provide FOIA fee claimants with helpful arguments. The Supreme Court has already found favorable, temporally relevant definitions of the word "substantially" in ordinary dictionaries: "Substantially" suggests "considerable" or "specified to a large degree." See Webster's Third New International Dictionary 2280 (1976) (defining "substantially" as "in a substantial manner" and "substantial" as "considerable in amount, value, or worth" and "being that specified to a large degree or in the main"); see also 17 Oxford English Dictionary 66-67 (2d ed. 1989) ("substantial": "relating to or proceeding from the essence of a thing; essential"; "of ample or considerable amount, quantity or dimensions"). [101](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1421887dc00d6c0b78bddb20857a69fa&docnum=16&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkAz&_md5=3f3ffe65eadff46b38ea49c40cb1037e&focBudTerms=definition%20of%20the%20term%21%20substantial%21%20or%20definition%20of%20the%20word%20substantial%21&focBudSel=all#n101)

**Counter-interpretation – disbursements of public funds for contingent commitments**

Webb, 93 – lecturer in the Faculty of Law at the University of Ottawa (Kernaghan, “Thumbs, Fingers, and Pushing on String: Legal Accountability in the Use of Federal Financial Incentives”, 31 Alta. L. Rev. 501 (1993) Hein Online)

In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean disbursements 18 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.19 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.20 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.21 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.22 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,23 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, thedefinition 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.

### AT: T Natural Gas

#### Renewable natural gas, biomethane and regular natural gas are the same thing

**Jensen 11**—Senior Bioenergy and Alternative Fuels Specialist at the Washington State University Extension Energy Program

(Jim, “Biomethane for Transportation”, <http://www.energy.wsu.edu/Documents/Biomethane_For_Transportation_WWCleanCities.pdf>, dml)

Biomethane refers to the gas produced by cleaning and upgrading biogas produced through anaerobic digestion of organic by-products, such as wastewater solids, livestock manure, food wastes, and yard debris. After removing carbon dioxide (CO2 ) and other gases, the remaining methane is essentially the same as natural gas and can be used in all the ways natural gas is used. For this reason, biomethane is also called renewable natural gas or green gas.

#### The text of the rez should be the primary determinant of how we view it

**Weaver, 7** (Aaron, PhD candidate in politics and society, “An Introduction to Original Intent.” Fall 2007 (Baylor University: J.M. Dawson Institute of Church-State Studies): 1-9. http://www.thebigdaddyweave.com/BDWFiles/originalism.pdf)

Discovering the “original intent” behind the religion clauses of the First Amendment is much more difficult than Edwin Meese, Antonin Scalia or any other 21 Ibid, originalist wants to admit. Contrary to the revisionist history being pushed by originalists who desire extensive government accommodation of religion, the founders did not always agree with one another. We simply can not determine with sufficient accuracy the collective intent of the Founding Fathers and the Framers of the Free Exercise Clause and the Establishment Clause

of the First Amendment. Those scholars in search of “original intent” have returned with strikingly inconsistent accounts of original intent. Thus, the originalism of Scalia, Meese, and Rehnquist is ambiguous at best and downright dishonest at worst.

We do not know nor can we be expected to accurately determine the intent or understanding of what the First Amendment meant to each person who cast their vote. After all, delegates to the Constitutional Convention were voting on the text of the First Amendment, not Madison’s writings or the private correspondence of the Framers. The text of the First Amendment reigns supreme. Authorial intent must take a backseat to the actual text. Justices should examine the text first and scour it for as much meaning as it will generate before turning to extrinsic evidence of intent. However, original intent is hardly irrelevant but simply subordinate to the text. Extrinsic evidence does not control the text. The text controls the text.

#### Counter-interp—energy production must come from substances chemically equivalent to topical categories—we meet that

**Boisen 8—**Chairman of the Board for NGVA Europe

(Peter, “NATURAL GAS AND BIOMETHANE CONTRIBUTIONS TO SUSTAINABILITY”, <http://www.eurogas.org/green/Position%20paper%20NGVA%20Europe.pdf>, dml)

Supplies of natural gas can be progressively substituted by biomethane produced from various biomass sources. Chemically there is no difference between biomethane and natural gas. Biomethane can be readily blended with natural gas - the engine will run equally well on pure biomethane, pure natural gas, or any mix of the two fuels. In Sweden biomethane already accounts for more than half of the gas used in a fleet of some 15,000 NGVS.

#### Prefer it—we still limit out affs like fusion or OTEC but allow for a wider breadth of discussion—that’s a better internal link to education

**Colander and McGoldrick, 9 (**David, Professor of Economics at Middlebury College, and KimMarie, , professor of economics in the University of Richmond, *Liberal Education*, Vol. 95, No. 2 “The Economics Major and Liberal Education,” Spring)

The success or failure of a liberal education, or an undergraduate major, depends far more on how the educational process influences students’ passion for learning than it does on what specifically they learn. A successful liberal education creates a lifelong learner, and classroom instruction is as much a catalyst for education as it is the education itself. Because passion for learning carries over to other fields and areas, the catalyst function of education does not depend on content. Academic departments tend to focus on both the need for depth in the field and the need for specialized training as a component of liberal education. The push for depth over breadth by disciplinary scholars is to be expected. Just as a Shakespeare scholar is unlikely to be passionate about teaching freshman composition, a scholar of classical game theory is unlikely to be passionate about teaching general economic principles within the context of an interdisciplinary consideration of broad themes. Because breadth is not usually associated with research passion by disciplinary specialists, and because a college is a collection of disciplinary specialists, breadth often gets shortchanged; it is interpreted as “superficial.” But in reality, breadth pertains to the nature of the questions asked. It involves asking questions that are unlikely to have definitive answers—“big-think” questions that challenge the foundations of disciplinary analysis. By contrast, depth involves asking smaller questions that can be answered—“little-think” questions that, too often, involve an uncritical acceptance of the assumptions upon which research is built. Questions and areas of study have two dimensions: a research dimension and a teaching dimension. The disciplinary nature of both graduate education and undergraduate college faculties leads to an emphasis on “research questions,” which tend to be narrow and in-depth, and a de-emphasis on “teaching questions,” which tend to involve greater breadth. Economics has its own distinctive set of teaching questions: Is capitalism preferable to socialism? What is the appropriate structure of an economy? Does the market alienate individuals from their true selves? Is consumer sovereignty acceptable? Do statistical significance tests appropriately measure significance? It is worthwhile to teach such “big-think” questions, but because they do not fit the disciplinary research focus of the profession, they tend not to be included in the economics major. This is regrettable, since struggling with “big-think” questions helps provoke a passion for learning in students and, hence, can be a catalyst for deeper student learning. It is similarly worthwhile to expose students to longstanding debates within the field. For example, Marx considered the alienation created by the market to be a central problem of western societies; Hayek argued that the market was necessary to preserve individual freedom; and Alfred Marshall argued that activities determine wants and, thus, wants cannot be considered as primitives in economic analysis. Such debates are highly relevant for students to consider as they study economics within the context of a liberal education. But these kinds of debates are not actively engaged as part of cutting-edge research, which instead tends to focus either on narrow questions that can be resolved through statistical analysis or on highly theoretical questions that exceed the level of undergraduate students.

#### Overlimiting bad—

#### a) Prevents holistic education

**Miller,** Professor of Philosophy**, 98** George D, Negotiating toward truth: the extinction of teachers and students, Google Book

Compartmentalization prevents students from seeing the whole. When students are given only a focalized view of reality, then they become more alienated . I would like to expand on this alienation. The alienation arises, on the one hand, from drawing solutions from this compartmentalized solutions that do not work. Education fails to develop holistic perspectives on issues. Secondly, compartmentalized education retards solidarity. We only see our neck of the woods. We don't see how our neck of the woods interacts with other necks of the woods and how the necks of the woods are similar. Compartmentalized learning narrows perspectives.

#### b) Critical thinking

**Miller,** Professor of Philosophy**, 98** George D, Negotiating toward truth: the extinction of teachers and students, Google Book

The fact that the oppressed cannot perceive themes does not mean that themes are absent. It only means that the themes are deeply suppressed by the oppressors. The banking concept of education allows for only a fragmented perspective on reality. Critical thinking grasps interconnections and the whole. We know by understanding the relationship between the whole and the parts. This understanding illuminates limit-situations.

#### c) placing limits first justifies counter-interps like only our aff is topical—incentivizes prioritizing the smallest topic over the best topic

### 2AC QER CP

#### No implementation

Barlas, ‘12

[Stephen, Financial Executive Magazine, Jan/Feb, “Does the U.S. Really Need An Energy Policy?” http://wa-dcwriter.blogspot.com/2012/01/does-us-really-need-energy-policy.html]

But it is highly unlikely that Obama's Blueprint will lead to a firmer footing for U.S. energy security than past Blueprints from other presidents, or, perhaps more importantly, whether a Blueprint is even necessary. Obama's Blueprint policy is a loosely knit set of policies which focus on producing more oil at home and reducing dependence on foreign oil by developing cleaner alternative fuels and greater efficiency. The Blueprint is not the result of any particular deep thinking or strategy. The President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) called for the development of such a strategy in its November 2010 Report to the President on Accelerating the Pace of Change in Energy Technologies Through an Integrated Federal Energy Policy. The PCAST called for a Quadrennial Technology Review (QTR) as the first step in preparing a Quadrennial Energy Review. The DOE completed the QTR in November 2011, six months after Obama published his Blueprint. Steven E. Koonin, Under Secretary for Science, DOE, says the QTR is limited in scope and all the DOE felt it could get done given budget and time. "Technology development absent an understanding and shaping of policy and market context in which it gets deployed is not a productive exercise," he states. At this point there is no indication that the DOE will even undertake the much more important QER, much less complete it any time soon. The larger reality is that any energy independence plan proposed by any U.S. President--whether based on a QER or not--has as much a chance of coming to fruition as Washington's hapless Redskins have of getting into the Super Bowl. In any case, the rhetoric of President after President aside, maybe the U.S. doesn't even need an energy independence or energy security policy. The biggest energy input for industrial and commercial business users is natural gas. Natural gas prices are incredibly important, both because the fuel is used directly to run industrial processes, heat facilities and commercial buildings, and make products such as fertilizers, pharmaceuticals, plastics and other advanced materials. Thanks to the Shale Revolution, the Energy Information Administration (EIA) forecasts natural gas prices will stay low for the foreseeable future, rising to $4.66 m/BTU in 2015 and $5.05 m/BTU in 2020. That is good news for the owners of 15,000 to 17,000 industrial boilers in this country, most of which use natural gas (and many of those who still use coal are switching to natural gas). In addition, companies such as Dow Chemical are restarting operations at facilities idled during the recession, Bayer is in talks with companies interested in building new ethane crackers at its two industrial parks in West Virginia, and Chevron Phillips Chemical and LyondellBasell, are considering expanding operations in the U.S. Fracking has also had a much less remarked-upon effect on petroleum prices, which are important to businesses with transportation fleets. New oil sources are spurting from the Bakken and Eagles Ford shale plays. U.S. oil prices have fallen from $133.88 a barrel of Texas intermediate crude in June 2008 to $86.07 today. The EIA predicts oil prices will rise to $94.58/bbl in 2015 and $108.10/bbl in 2020. Beyond the flood of natural gas washing over them, U.S. companies are also benefitting from three decades of investments--most of which made without federal subsidies or support--into facility energy efficiency. Ralph Cavanagh, Co-Director, Energy Program, Natural Resources Defense Council, member of Electricity Advisory Board at the DOE, says the most important single solution for U.S. businesses worried about energy prices and energy access is aggressive energy efficiency. "Energy independence is the wrong issue," he says. "It is reducing the cost of energy services and improving energy security. "U.S. business has done a tremendous job in energy efficiency over the past three decades," he states. "It takes less than one-half of a unit of energy to create $1 of economic value than it did in 1973. Industry has done that by upgrading the efficiency of process equipment and upgrading lighting." Others may well argue that the U.S. needs, and has always needed, an energy policy, but one narrowly targeted. Kenneth B Medlock III, PhD, Deputy Director, Energy Forum, James A Baker III Institute for Public Policy at Rice University, notes that the DOE and the Gas Research Institute helped develop, with federal funding, the horizontal drilling (i.e. fracking) technology that Mitchell Energy (now a part of Devon Energy) pioneered. "Government ought to be focused on research & development," he states. He also is a supporter of loan guarantees to promote investment activity in frontier technologies, and argues that as long as there are more good bets than bad bets in that kind of portfolio, the funds committed in total are a good investment. But spectacular failures like Solyndra and other less publicized busts such as Beacon Power's Chapter 11 filing kill the prospect of any additional congressional funding for energy loan guarantees of any kind. That is true even when legislation has bi-partisan support, which is the case for the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2011 (S. 1000) which would, among other things, provide grants for a revolving loan program designed to develop energy-saving technologies for industrial and commercial use. The bill passed the Senate Energy Committee by a vote of 18-3 in July. However, the Congressional Budget Office has pegged the cost of the bill's provisions at $1.2 billion over five years. That is a serious barrier to passage. And in any case, even if it did pass, the bill would simply authorize funding. Congressional appropriations committees would have to approve the money as part of the DOE's budget, which would be highly unlikely, Solyndra aside, since similar programs authorized by the 2005 and 2007 energy bills are still begging for appropriations.

#### Resolved government action key to certainty – counterplan isn’t a clear choice for investors

Deutch, ‘11

[John M., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, May, “An Energy Technology Corporation Will Improve the Federal Government’s Efforts to Accelerate Energy Innovation,” http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Research/Files/Papers/2011/5/energy%20corporation%20deutch/05\_energy\_corporation\_deutch\_paper.PDF]

IDEAL CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS There also are important conditions for realizing a successful technology demonstration program from a selected set of projects. I list the conditions that are desirable for a successful program and compare some of these conditions with the conditions that have existed in DOE’s past demonstration efforts. 1. A stable government energy policy—for example, a known greenhouse gas emissions charge—is needed. In the absence of stable policy, a demonstration program must be pursued either on the basis of existing policy or in anticipation of changed policy. In the latter case, the demonstration project is not commercially viable so government assistance is required. A national energy plan that sets a comprehensive framework also would be welcome. Certainty about tax provisions, subsidies, and regulation guide private investment decisions, and signal which technical advances will have and which will not have value in the future. The best example is the effect that the absence of a carbon emissions charge has on investment and technology development in low-carbon electricity generation: nuclear, solar, and coal with carbon capture and sequestration. Absent a carbon charge, there is little incentive for the private sector to make such investments. It might still be sensible for the DOE to finance a technology demonstration that is “out of the money” on a commercial basis, in the absence of a carbon policy, while providing information and realistic options to the private sector if and when the policy changes. 2. Clarity about the purpose of energy policy is also important. It is easy to have a single goal and complicated to have multiple goals, especially when the combination is intended to overwhelm any doubt about the virtue of the policy. Current energy policy seeks to advance several objectives: to encourage the transition from fossil to renewable energy sources, to reduce oil imports, to reduce carbon emissions, to create jobs, to improve U.S. international competitiveness for green technologies, and to lower the costs of energy for the consumer. Alternative policy goals will involve trade-offs. For example, a carbon charge will reduce emissions but also lift the cost of electricity for the consumer. Sound public policy requires clarity about the balance struck among the trade-offs resulting from different policy choices. Sound public policy also requires a comprehensive multiyear plan that describes how the interrelated energy policies will influence different energy sectors of the economy: transportation, power, industry/commercial, and residential. Such a plan will help guide private sector deployment and technology development investment decisions. Absent a stable plan, how should a utility decide whether to build a low-cost but high-carbon-emitting pulverized coal plant for electricity generation or a high-cost but largely carbon-free nuclear power plant? A disciplined and documented procedure is needed to select the portfolio of technology demonstration projects that are intended to provide options for private sector investment. There should be explicit criteria for selecting the projects—for example, prospects for reducing emissions, reducing oil imports, stimulating renewables, creating jobs, and improving competitiveness. To reiterate, a single objective—for example, reducing emissions—is simplest, but multiple objectives are the rule and require explicit weighting in the selection process. I believe the important criteria should be reducing external environmental cost, improving energy security, and lowering the cost of energy for the U.S. consumer. Job creation and competitiveness are broader economic objectives that are not unique to the energy sector.

#### Delay

PCAST, ‘10

[President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, 11-10, “REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT ON

ACCELERATING THE PACE OF CHANGE IN ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES THROUGH AN INTEGRATED FEDERAL ENERGY POLICY,” http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/pcast-energy-tech-report.pdf]

Our most important recommendation is that the Administration establish a new process that can forge a more coordinated and robust Federal energy policy, a major piece of which is advancing energy innovation. Many Executive Branch agencies and departments must be engaged, with leadership from the Executive Office of the President. This is needed because “energy policy” is an amalgam, and often derivative, of policies for environment, competitiveness, security, finance, land use, and more. The President should establish a Quadrennial Energy Review (QER) process that will provide a multiyear roadmap that lays out an integrated view of short-, intermediate-, and long-term energy objectives; outlines legislative proposals to Congress; puts forward anticipated Executive actions coordinated across multiple agencies; and identifies resource requirements for the development and implementation of energy technologies. The Secretary of Energy should provide the Executive Secretariat for the QER. While the QER will be a product of the Administration, substantial input from the Congress, the energy industry, academia, NGOs, and the public at large will be essential to the process. A staged process should be implemented now so as to provide some elements of a QER during each of the next four years. We recommend that the Secretary of Energy prepare and implement a DOE-Quadrennial Energy Review, focused on energy technology innovation, as a component of the full interagency QER on a shorter timescale. The DOE-QER should include roadmaps for key energy technologies, an integrated plan for the involvement of the national laboratories in energy programs, portfolio assessments that lay out the optimal deployment of resources, identification, and projections of demonstration projects, and identification of funding needs for each technology. This QER will also be prepared with strong input from many sources inside and outside of the Administration including industry, business, state and local governments, non-governmental organizations, and consumers. A complete and integrated QER will take longer to mature. While a good start should be made in 2011, the full government-wide QER should be targeted for delivery in early 2015. PCAST encourages Congress to use the QER as a basis for a 4-year authorization process that guides annual appropriations. The Federal investment in energy research, development, demonstration, and deployment (RDD&D) is incommensurate with the objective of leadership in energy technology innovation. We recommend a substantial increase – to $16 billion per year – in Federal support for energy RDD&D. Given the difficulty of increasing appropriated funds to this level and the importance of “front-loading” the required investment to jump start innovation, we recommend an alternative approach. The President should engage the private sector and Congress so as to generate about $10 billion per year of additional RDD&D funding through new revenue streams. This increase will provide the U.S. with the potential to leapfrog to development and deployment of the advanced energy technologies that will define a robust 21st century energy system.

#### THE CP devastates investor predictability – certain incentive scale up key

**Bramley et al 11**—Department of Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning, Tufts

(Julia, with Lum Fobi, Cammy Peterson, Lydia Rainville, Jeff Cheng-Hao Shih, Axum Teferra, and Rose Yuan Wang, “AGRICULTURAL BIOGAS IN THE UNITED STATES”, <http://ase.tufts.edu/uep/degrees/field_project_reports/2011/Team_6_Final_Report.pdf>, dml)

Creating stability and predictability through market and regulatory policies and incentives is paramount to achieving successful future development of the U.S. agricultural biogas market. The following recommendations, based on the research conducted for this report, if implemented by the relevant members of the biogas community, would remove a number of the economic, regulatory, and technical barriers to development, and increase the growth of agricultural AD across the U.S. 11.2.1 Stabilize Funding First and foremost, farmers must be guaranteed a stable source of long-term revenue for the electricity they generate. This is most successfully accomplished through implementing a FIT, because this measure mitigates merchant risk, and attracts investors and relatively low-cost financing by securing future revenue streams. Vermont created such a market through the Standard Offer Program, and institutionalized support for this program through CVPS Cow Power aided Vermont’s development of biogas facilities. To further encourage biogas production, uncertainty related to public financial incentives should be eliminated. Uncertainty currently exists, not only because generators are unsure if they can sell their electricity, but because many government subsidies are only enacted for a short period of time. Although they frequently get reauthorized, developers, lenders, and investors have no assurance of this, and therefore cannot trust that funding will be available when they need it. Further instability exists in government funding because grant funding is easily depleted. Because these programs quickly run out of money, there is no continuous momentum driving more farmers to enter the market – they simply do not trust that the grants will be available. This problem could be alleviated by ensuring greater appropriations or endowments of money to the grant programs, or by shifting the focus of AD funding to other mechanisms, such as a FIT or tax credits. When grant programs are funded, there should be certainty incorporated into the grant cycle timeline, which is not currently true of USDA’s Rural Development REAP grant. It is also important that the grants allow the farmer’s flexibility and avoid limiting development potential. As of now, after applying for a REAP grant a farmer cannot transfer the grant to an investor without re-applying for the grant. Allowing a grant recipient to be an equity contribution to a new investment would provide more flexibility from a financial standpoint. Another flexibility mechanism is to stop prioritizing projects based on whether or not they apply for the REAP loan guarantee, as not all financial institutions prefer this lending mechanism, so some farms may not apply for it. Finally, federal and state tax credits are a primary driver of renewable energy production for wind and solar energy – which are currently more successful industries than agricultural biogas. Currently, some tax credits apply only to wind and/or solar energy, but many also do include biogas. However, those pursuing biogas projects do not know that tax credits are available to them, or do not want to deal with the burden of navigating the tax code. To help biogas projects take advantage of these opportunities, it is important to ensure that incentives can actually be used for biogas development, and if so, that an explicit reference to biogas be included in the legislation or program. Additionally, AgSTAR or another consultant should make a concerted effort to inform candidate farms for AD development that they can, and should take advantage of these tax credits by exploring the possibility of funding projects through outside investors, and providing support services for helping farms understand the tax credit options in the tax codes.

**Uncertainty wrecks the biogas market – only stable long-term federal policies solve**

**KEY and SNEERINGER ’11** (Nigel and Stacy; United States Department of Agriculture – Economic Research Service, “Climate Change Policy and the Adoption of Methane Digesters on Livestock Operations,” Economic Research Report #111, February)

Obtaining financing for the large capital investment associated with most biogas systems can be a significant barrier, particularly for smaller scale operations (Gloy and Dressler, 2010). Digesters have little resale value, making their collateral value low. This problem could be addressed by loan guarantee programs such as USDA’s Rural Energy for America Program. The uncertainty surrounding digester systems’ benefits and costs is another barrier to financing and adoption. Investors who are uncertain about the returns to a project are likely to delay investment or require substantial compensation for the uncertainty (Stokes et al., 2010). Future climate change legislation could increase energy prices and raise carbon offset prices far above the current prices in regional carbon trading schemes. However, there is a great deal of uncertainty about the extent and timing of these price increases. Stable and long-term Government policies and programs can help reduce price uncertainty and encourage investment, for example, by providing long-term contracts for carbon offsets and/or electricity.

### 2AC Politics – Biogas

#### No impact

**O’Neill 4** O’Neill 8/19/2004 [Brendan, “Weapons of Minimum Destruction” http://www.spiked-online.com/Articles/0000000CA694.htm]

David C Rapoport*,* professor of political science at University of California, Los Angeles and editor of the Journal of Terrorism and Political Violence, has examined what he calls 'easily available evidence' relating to the historic use of chemical and biological weapons. He found something surprising - such weapons do not cause mass destruction. Indeed, whether used by states, terror groups or dispersed in industrial accidents, they tend to be far less destructive than conventional weapons. 'If we stopped speculating about things that might happen in the future and looked instead at what has happened in the past, we'd see that our fears about WMD are misplaced', he says. Yet such fears remain widespread. Post-9/11, American and British leaders have issued dire warnings about terrorists getting hold of WMD and causing mass murder and mayhem. President George W Bush has spoken of terrorists who, 'if they ever gained weapons of mass destruction', would 'kill hundreds of thousands, without hesitation and without mercy' (1). The British government has spent £28million on stockpiling millions of smallpox vaccines, even though there's no evidence that terrorists have got access to smallpox, which was eradicated as a natural disease in the 1970s and now exists only in two high-security labs in America and Russia (2). In 2002, British nurses became the first in the world to get training in how to deal with the victims of bioterrorism (3). The UK Home Office's 22-page pamphlet on how to survive a terror attack, published last month, included tips on what to do in the event of a 'chemical, biological or radiological attack' ('Move away from the immediate source of danger', it usefully advised). Spine-chilling books such as Plague Wars: A True Story of Biological Warfare, The New Face of Terrorism: Threats From Weapons of Mass Destruction and The Survival Guide: What to Do in a Biological, Chemical or Nuclear Emergency speculate over what kind of horrors WMD might wreak. TV docudramas, meanwhile, explore how Britain might cope with a smallpox assault and what would happen if London were 'dirty nuked' (4). The term 'weapons of mass destruction' refers to three types of weapons: nuclear, chemical and biological. A chemical weapon is any weapon that uses a manufactured chemical, such as sarin, mustard gas or hydrogen cyanide, to kill or injure. A biological weapon uses bacteria or viruses, such as smallpox or anthrax, to cause destruction - inducing sickness and disease as a means of undermining enemy forces or inflicting civilian casualties. We find such weapons repulsive, because of the horrible way in which the victims convulse and die - but they appear to be less 'destructive' than conventional weapons. 'We know that nukes are massively destructive, there is a lot of evidence for that', says Rapoport. But when it comes to chemical and biological weapons, 'the evidence suggests that we should call them "weapons of minimum destruction", not mass destruction', he says. Chemical weapons have most commonly been used by states, in military warfare. Rapoport explored various state uses of chemicals over the past hundred years: both sides used them in the First World War; Italy deployed chemicals against the Ethiopians in the 1930s; the Japanese used chemicals against the Chinese in the 1930s and again in the Second World War; Egypt and Libya used them in the Yemen and Chad in the postwar period; most recently, Saddam Hussein's Iraq used chemical weapons, first in the war against Iran (1980-1988) and then against its own Kurdish population at the tail-end of the Iran-Iraq war. In each instance, says Rapoport, chemical weapons were used more in desperation than from a position of strength or a desire to cause mass destruction. 'The evidence is that states rarely use them even when they have them', he has written. 'Only when a military stalemate has developed, which belligerents who have become desperate want to break, are they used.' (5) As to whether such use of chemicals was effective, Rapoport says that at best it blunted an offensive - but this very rarely, if ever, translated into a decisive strategic shift in the war, because the original stalemate continued after the chemical weapons had been deployed. He points to the example of Iraq. The Baathists used chemicals against Iran when that nasty trench-fought war had reached yet another stalemate. As Efraim Karsh argues in his paper 'The Iran-Iraq War: A Military Analysis': 'Iraq employed [chemical weapons] only in vital segments of the front and only when it saw no other way to check Iranian offensives. Chemical weapons had a negligible impact on the war, limited to tactical rather than strategic [effects].' (6) According to Rapoport, this 'negligible' impact of chemical weapons on the direction of a war is reflected in the disparity between the numbers of casualties caused by chemicals and the numbers caused by conventional weapons. It is estimated that the use of gas in the Iran-Iraq war killed 5,000 - but the Iranian side suffered around 600,000 dead in total, meaning that gas killed less than one per cent. The deadliest use of gas occurred in the First World War but, as Rapoport points out, it still only accounted for five per cent of casualties. Studying the amount of gas used by both sides from1914-1918 relative to the number of fatalities gas caused, Rapoport has written: 'It took a ton of gas in that war to achieve a single enemy fatality. Wind and sun regularly dissipated the lethality of the gases. Furthermore, those gassed were 10 to 12 times as likely to recover than those casualties produced by traditional weapons.' (7) Indeed, Rapoport discovered that some earlier documenters of the First World War had a vastly different assessment of chemical weapons than we have today - they considered the use of such weapons to be preferable to bombs and guns, because chemicals caused fewer fatalities. One wrote: 'Instead of being the most horrible form of warfare, it is the most humane, because it disables far more than it kills, ie, it has a low fatality ratio.' (8) 'Imagine that', says Rapoport, 'WMD being referred to as more humane'. He says that the contrast between such assessments and today's fears shows that actually looking at the evidence has benefits, allowing 'you to see things more rationally'. According to Rapoport, even Saddam's use of gas against the Kurds of Halabja in 1988 - the most recent use by a state of chemical weapons and the most commonly cited as evidence of the dangers of 'rogue states' getting their hands on WMD - does not show that unconventional weapons are more destructive than conventional ones. Of course the attack on Halabja was horrific, but he points out that the circumstances surrounding the assault remain unclear. 'The estimates of how many were killed vary greatly', he tells me. 'Some say 400, others say 5,000, others say more than 5,000. The fighter planes that attacked the civilians used conventional as well as unconventional weapons; I have seen no study which explores how many were killed by chemicals and how many were killed by firepower. We all find these attacks repulsive, but the death toll may actually have been greater if conventional bombs only were used. We know that conventional weapons can be more destructive.' Rapoport says that terrorist use of chemical and biological weapons is similar to state use - in that it is rare and, in terms of causing mass destruction, not very effective. He cites the work of journalist and author John Parachini, who says that over the past 25 years only four significant attempts by terrorists to use WMD have been recorded. The most effective WMD-attack by a non-state group, from a military perspective, was carried out by the Tamil Tigers of Sri Lanka in 1990. They used chlorine gas against Sri Lankan soldiers guarding a fort, injuring over 60 soldiers but killing none. The Tamil Tigers' use of chemicals angered their support base, when some of the chlorine drifted back into Tamil territory - confirming Rapoport's view that one problem with using unpredictable and unwieldy chemical and biological weapons over conventional weapons is that the cost can be as great 'to the attacker as to the attacked'. The Tigers have not used WMD since.

#### No chance

Financial Times February 6, 2013 “The US-EU trade announcement that never was” http://blogs.ft.com/the-world/2013/02/the-us-eu-trade-announcement-that-never-was/

As the FT reported this morning, the US has refused to give the Europeans the big, bold announcement on trade that they were desperately seeking.¶ The plan was that tomorrow’s US-EU summit would announce the beginning of negotiations to form a trade agreement between the US and Europe. But, for now, the Americans are refusing to play ball.¶ In Brussels, some may see this as a lamentable lack of vision. In fact, it is simply a welcome injection of some scepticism and realism.¶ Politicians love a big announcement. But the Americans are very reluctant to commit to a process that they suspect could absorb lots of time and energy – while eventually producing precisely nothing.¶ A big part of the problem is that any deal would have to be signed off by all 27 EU-member states. Some, like the Brits and the Germans, are keen. Others like the French are known to be sceptical. As one senior US diplomat puts it, semi-seriously – “The only question is whether the French shoot this down now, or wait a couple of years.”¶ The problem, of course, is agriculture. Any EU-US trade agreement would have to feature farm products. But that would mean essentially dismantling Europe’s protectionist Common Agricultural Policy – and the preservation of the CAP is a central goal of French foreign policy.¶ It has been suggested that, maybe, there could be a trade deal that exempted agriculture. But then there might be problems on the American side. Congress has not shown huge enthusiasm for any new trade deals, lately. The Americans think that eventual Congressional approval would depend on getting the farm lobby onside. But, if agriculture was not part of the deal, that would not happen.¶ And those are just the political obstacles. The technical obstacles, in terms of regulations and laws across a huge raft of economic areas, would also be formidable.¶ So while the idea of an US-EU trade deal remains exciting, particularly for politicians in search of a headline, the Americans’ cautious approach has something to be said for it.

#### Negotiations will fail – neither side has the diplomatic resources

Brummer and Kempe, 13 – Chris, C. Boyden Gray fellow on global finance and growth at the Atlantic Council and a professor of law at Georgetown and Frederick, chief executive officer of the Atlantic Council (“Hands Across the Atlantic,” Foreign Policy, 1/29/13, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/01/29/transatlantic\_free\_trade\_europe\_united\_states)Red

Despite the obvious benefits, there may not be enough institutional capacity on either side of the Atlantic to close a deal. Even as European leaders have vocalized support for trade talks with the United States, the continent's foreign economic policy has been cannibalized by the eurozone crisis and member state disputes on financial reform. Likewise, in the United States, resources to capitalize on the FTA opportunity are limited, despite the fact that domestic special interests have aligned in favor of a deal. The Obama administration has directed its diplomatic energy towards fast-growing Asia and the surging Pacific Rim, leaving Europe a relative backwater by comparison. Consequently, any proposed deal will not only have to be sufficiently rewarding to focus the attention of distracted political leaders, but it will also have to help bridge and engage an increasingly "post-Western" world of rising powers and states.

#### Obama won’t push TPA

**AP, 3/19/13** (“Budget cuts hurt trade policy, official says,” Lexis)**Red**

Hatch said a successful trade policy depended on Obama nominating a trade representative with strong leadership skills and the administration working with Congress to revive Trade Promotion Authority also known as fast track under which Congress gives the president the authority to negotiate trade deals that Congress can accept and reject but cannot amend. The last TPA law expired in 2007, making it more difficult to conclude trade talks because negotiating partners are reluctant to sign off on agreements that Congress can amend. With many Democrats suspicious of the benefits of trade deals that could disrupt American industries, the Obama administration has not actively sought a reopening of negotiations with Congress to establish the non-binding trade objectives that would act as the basis of new TPA legislation. "There's some concern," Baucus said, that "maybe the administration is a little lax, a little slow," in requesting a revival of TPA.

#### Negotiations literally can’t start for three months – thumpers o/w

AP, 3/20/13 (“US starts clock for beginning EU trade talks,” http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5go0dkDFLDNMcpXWeAwcz9-kxB1YA?docId=112ca0127b2b49a8bd85ec7684f8bddf)Red

WASHINGTON (AP) — The Obama administration is formally notifying Congress of its intention to negotiate a free trade deal with the European Union. The notification on Wednesday starts the clock on a 90-day waiting period required by law before the U.S. could launch the talks.

#### **Perez thumper**

John Terbush (writer for The Week) March 13, 2013 “Why conservatives are already fuming about Obama's next big Cabinet pick” http://theweek.com/article/index/241337/why-conservatives-are-already-fuming-about-obamas-next-big-cabinet-pick

"If you thought Chuck Hagel’s confirmation battle was rough, just wait for the blood on the floor if Thomas Perez is appointed to be secretary of labor," John Fund wrote, continuing that the IG report was damning evidence that Perez was unfit for the job.¶ In addition, critics contend that even if you believe that the division-wide problems can't be pinned on Perez, the guy is still terrible at his job because he's lost a number of cases for the government. Rubin calls him a "cruddy lawyer," while Quin Hillyer of the American Spectator blasted him as "one of the most loathsome figures in the thoroughly loathsome political ranks of Obama's Justice Department" — a man who "doesn’t even seem to be a very good lawyer at all."¶ Others have been critical not only of Perez's work, but his character, too. They argue that Perez is a partisan hack whose efforts at the DOJ reveal a radical agenda and a racial bias against whites.¶ Naturally, Perez's job description requires him to oversee cases involving race, most notable among them the department's opposition to voter ID laws — which progressives view as little more than modern Jim Crow laws — on behalf of the White House. On Perez's watch, the division has also sued Arizona's hardline anti-immigration Sheriff Joe Arpaio, and pursued banks for discriminating against minority homeowners, just two of many efforts that pleased liberals and rankled conservatives.¶ For those efforts, Hillyer calls Perez,"radical, race-baiting," and said he has "led the administration’s racial scaremongering against voter ID laws." Michelle Malkin similarly warned that Perez has had an "extremist left-wing 'social justice' career." But she went further into Perez's past to justify that argument, pointing to Perez's volunteer work with Casa de Maryland, an immigration amnesty group that received funding from two familiar conservative bogeymen: billionaire George Soros, and deceased Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez.¶ Perhaps the most simple explanation for the fervent backlash is that Perez is loved by progressives. Given that a Republican nominee like Chuck Hagel faced a mountain of criticism and a filibuster threat, it's hardly surprising that a liberal nominee would face at least equally tough scrutiny.¶ Republicans already tried to block Perez's nomination to the DOJ in 2009, in part because of (since-disproven) accusations that the department dropped a case against the New Black Panther Party for political reasons. (That case arose and was settled long before Perez was even in the division.)¶ Still, Republicans have found enough else to criticize about Perez's past that they're already sounding the alarm. If Obama does in fact nominate him, the drum beat of opposition will only grow louder.

#### **Energy thumper**

Ben Geman (writer for The Hill) March 18, 2013 “The week ahead: Budget battles, gas exports take center stage” http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/288671-the-week-ahead-budget-battles-gas-exports-take-center-stage

This week is likely to bring floor debate in the House and Senate over competing federal budget plans that offer starkly different priorities on energy.¶ The GOP-crafted House plan would mandate approval of the Keystone XL oil sands pipeline and expand federal lands available for oil-and-gas leasing.¶ Senate Democrats, in contrast, are touting their plans’ investments in green energy research and addressing climate change.¶ Watch The Hill’s E2-Wire updates during the week.¶ Energy will also take center stage at a slew of Capitol Hill hearings. Among them:¶ On Tuesday, a subpanel of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee will look at Energy Department (DOE) review of natural-gas exports.¶ DOE is weighing an array of industry applications to greatly expand natural-gas exports — proposals that have touched off a political battle in Washington.

#### **Guns thumper**

Murray 3-28 (Mark, “First Thoughts: Obama jumps back into the gun debate,” NBC News, <http://firstread.nbcnews.com/_news/2013/03/28/17501341-first-thoughts-obama-jumps-back-into-the-gun-debate?lite>)

Obama jumps back into the gun debate: With some GOP senators vowing to filibuster the legislation coming to the floor next month and with some analysts saying that reformers have already lost, President Obama today steps back into the gun debate with an event at the White House at 11:40 am ET. Per the White House, Obama will stand with mothers, law-enforcement officials, and Vice President Biden in urging Congress to take action on the upcoming Senate legislation, which includes universal background checks. As we have written before, those checks -- supported overwhelmingly in public opinion polls -- will ultimately define success or failure for gun-control advocates. Democrats, led by Sen. Chuck Schumer, are trying to get Republicans to back some type of compromise on background checks, given that the filibuster threat means 60 votes will be needed to even begin considering the legislation. That’s why Michael Bloomberg’s Mayors Against Illegal Guns is airing TV ads in key states to also apply pressure. Meanwhile, Politico reports that Sen. Chuck Grassley, the top GOP lawmaker on the Senate Judiciary Committee, is drafting his own Republican gun bill (without background checks), which “could further complicate what will already be a difficult lift for Democrats and the White House.” \*\*\* Obama, bipartisan group still optimistic on immigration reform: While Obama uses the bully pulpit today on guns, yesterday he used it on immigration by granting interviews to the top Spanish-language TV news outlets. “If we have a bill introduced at the beginning of next month -- as these senators indicate it will be -- then I'm confident that we can get it done certainly before the end of the summer,” Obama told Telemundo regarding the Senate bipartisan activity on immigration, per NBC’s Carrie Dann. “I'm optimistic,” he added. “I've always said that if I see a breakdown in the process, that I've got my own legislation. I'm prepared to step in. But I don't think that's going to be necessary. I think there's a commitment among this group of Democratic and Republican senators to get this done.” Speaking of that bipartisan group senators, four of them (Schumer, John McCain, Jeff Flake, and Michael Bennet) held a press conference yesterday in Arizona, where they also expressed optimism. “I’d say we are 90 percent there,” Schumer said, according to Roll Call. “We have a few little problems to work on; we’ve been on the phone all day talking to our other four colleagues who aren’t here. McCain chimed in: “Nobody is going to be totally happy with this legislation -- no one will be because we are having to make compromises, and that’s what makes for good legislation. It’s compromise that brings everybody together.”

#### Biogas is bipartisan

**Brown 9** (Sherrod, US. Senator for Ohio, 23 January 2009, “Brown Joins Bipartisan Group of Senators to Introduce Bill to Promote Biogas Production through Tax Credits,” http://brown.senate.gov/newsroom/press\_releases/release/?id=F351FB63-6C95-4AF5-B295-387886FAF1DF, RBatra)

Billions of gallons of fossil fuels could be reduced through renewable energy sources produced from animal waste with a little ingenuity and modest government support. U.S. Senator Sherrod Brown (D-OH) joined a bipartisan group of seven Senators this week to introduce groundbreaking legislation that promotes the development of biogas – a natural gas substitute created by the conversion of organic waste— such as the anaerobic digestion of animal waste—through tax incentives.

#### Ag lobby supports

**Taglia 10**—Staff Scientist, Clean Wisconsin

(Peter, “Biogas: Rethinking the Midwest’s Potential”, <http://www.ecw.org/MidwestBiogasPotential.pdf>, dml)

Even if the drivers of farm consolidation are completely unrelated to energy policy, the question remains: Will policies like biogas incentives encourage more consolidation? One way to examine this question is to view biogas incentives in the context of overall environmental policy. The societal demand for renewable energy and greenhouse gas reductions that provide the major force behind renewable energy policies, including biogas incentives, are also leading to changes in agricultural trends. Many of the proposed state and federal climate policies that would expand biogas also provide incentives for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture through nitrogen fertilizer emission reductions, agricultural cropping systems that store carbon (tillage, cover crops, organic farming), and the planting of perennial grasses on highly erodible or degraded farmland. In addition to their advantages in reducing climate change, these agricultural processes provide benefits for water quality, soil fertility, and wildlife habitat. Finally, many agricultural advocacy groups that support smaller-scale farming and sustainable agriculture in the United States also support comprehensive clean energy policies, such as proposed federal carbon cap and trade legislation, that would encourage biogas production and the beneficial agricultural practices described above.

#### Agriculture lobby key to the agenda

LA Times 09 (6/26, “The farm lobby vs. the global warming bill”, http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/la-ed-climate26-2009jun26,0,5647633.story)

Yet the nation's real power brokers are in plain sight, amid amber waves of grain: the farmers. The farm lobby demonstrates its awesome might every few years with the passage of a new farm bill, which invariably shovels billions in corporate welfare to agribusiness while damaging U.S. trade relationships and in many cases raising consumer prices for agricultural goods. But its power goes beyond the farm bill; it's hard to pass any legislation even tangentially related to farming without the support of a bipartisan bloc of lawmakers from Midwestern states. Which is why, when congressional Democrats bring their sweeping 1,200-page bill to fight climate change to the House floor today, the farm lobby's loamy thumbprints will be all over it. The American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009 from Reps. Henry A. Waxman (D-Beverly Hills) and Edward J. Markey (D-Mass.) is an ambitious effort to cut U.S. greenhouse gas emissions 17% below 2005 levels by 2020. It would do this by capping emissions and allowing polluters to trade carbon credits; regulating cleaner fuels; investing in clean energy development; and boosting energy efficiency and renewable power. What does that have to do with farming? Not a lot. Although agriculture plays a key role in global warming -- clearing forest land for farms eliminates trees that absorb carbon, and livestock generate hefty emissions of climate-altering methane -- the bill largely ignores such issues. That didn't stop Rep. Collin C. Peterson (D-Minn.), chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, from holding up the bill to wrestseed money for his constituents under the theory that heading off global catastrophe is only worthwhile if agribusiness can profit from it. Peterson got what he wanted.

#### Ag disputes destroy the deal

Butler and Melvin, 3/23/13 (“New US-EU talks threatened by agriculture spats,” AP, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5iZVV8rJyZEjQn7o7lSSMeOowzg5g?docId=f12bbdb95d474bff825b0f5248ec78ef)Red

WASHINGTON (AP) — President Barack Obama used Washington's grandest stage — the State of the Union speech — to announce negotiations with Europe aimed at creating the world's largest free trade agreement. Just weeks later, there are signs that old agriculture disputes could be deal-killers. European Union leaders don't want the negotiations to include discussions on their restrictions on genetically modified crops and other regulations that keep U.S. farm products out of Europe. But Obama says it's hard to imagine an agreement that doesn't address those issues. Powerful U.S. agricultural lobbies will do their best to make sure Congress rejects any pact that fails to address the restrictions. "Any free trade agreement that doesn't cover agriculture is in trouble," said Cathleen Enright, executive vice president at the Biotechnology Industry Organization, which promotes biotechnology, including genetically modified products. That would threaten the dream of a behemoth free trade deal between the world's two largest trading partners that together account for more than half of the world economy. It would lower tariffs and remove other trade barriers for most industries. Some analysts say the deal could boost each economy by more than a half-percentage point annually and significantly lower the cost of goods and services for consumers. Agricultural issues have long bedeviled attempts to expand free trade across the Atlantic and have led each side to file complaints against the other before the World Trade Organization, an arbitrator in trade disputes. While the U.S. protests EU restrictions, Europeans want the U.S. to reduce agricultural subsidies. Genetically modified organisms, or GMOs, have been a core part of the dispute. Agricultural scientists change the genetic makeup of agricultural products to improve their quality and boost production. In Europe, there is widespread public opposition to GMOs. The EU argues that the risks of altering the genetic pool are unknown. It has strict rules and imposes a heavy burden of proof before such crops can be grown or imported in the EU. U.S. companies say that genetically modified products have been proved safe by scientific studies and are being excluded based on irrational fears. They accuse Europe of trying to help their own farmers by keeping out American products. While they have little expectation that the EU would end the restrictions, they say it would be a victory if it clarified what it describes as opaque rules and also set timelines for considering products. Regulators now take what they call a precautionary approach, declining approval of products until they can be more certain of their safety. But any move to water down the regulations could provoke a backlash in Europe. "My reading of the mood in Europe around genetically modified crops is that it's extremely negative," said Paul DeGrauwe, a professor of economics at the London School of Economics. "It's going to be very difficult." Indeed, the top EU trade negotiator, Commissioner Karel De Gucht, seemed to rule out a compromise in remarks this month: "A future deal will not change the existing legislation. Let me repeat: no change." The U.S. and the EU have similarly intractable disagreements on what the two sides call sanitary issues in meats. U.S. poultry products are restricted in the EU because U.S. companies use chlorine to sanitize the meat. Pork is also restricted because U.S. farmers use a feed additive that makes pigs leaner. The two sides partially resolved disputes over U.S. beef after an agreement that U.S. farmers would restrict hormones in cows intended for the European market. Some European officials say the agricultural differences should be discussed after a major trade deal is completed. This month, French President Francois Hollande called for excluding sensitive issues, including the sanitary standards, from the talks. In the past, France has been among the most adamant of the European countries about protecting agricultural interests. Obama, in a talk with his export council this month, suggested this could be a deal-breaker. "There are certain countries whose agricultural sector is very strong, who tended to block at critical junctures the kinds of broad-based trade agreements that would make it a good deal for us," he said. "If one of the areas where we've got the greatest comparative advantage is cordoned off from an overall trade deal, it's very hard to get something going." Powerful U.S. agricultural groups could probably block a trade deal from winning approval in Congress. In interviews, representatives of many of these groups said they would oppose a deal that didn't address the regulatory differences. Robert Thompson, an academic at Johns Hopkins University and a former economist for the Agriculture Department, said that the agricultural issues could easily upend the talks. "I'm not expecting an agreement to emerge any time soon," he said. "I'm thinking years."

#### PC’s not real and thumpers disprove

Michael Hirsch (chief correspondent for National Journal, previously served as the senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek, based in its Washington bureau) February 7, 2013 “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207>

On Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President Obama will do what every president does this time of year. For about 60 minutes, he will lay out a sprawling and ambitious wish list highlighted by gun control and immigration reform, climate change and debt reduction. In response, the pundits will do what they always do this time of year: They will talk about how unrealistic most of the proposals are, discussions often informed by sagacious reckonings of how much “political capital” Obama possesses to push his program through.¶ Most of this talk will have no bearing on what actually happens over the next four years.¶ Consider this: Three months ago, just before the November election, if someone had talked seriously about Obama having enough political capital to oversee passage of both immigration reform and gun-control legislation at the beginning of his second term—even after winning the election by 4 percentage points and 5 million votes (the actual final tally)—this person would have been called crazy and stripped of his pundit’s license. (It doesn’t exist, but it ought to.) In his first term, in a starkly polarized country, the president had been so frustrated by GOP resistance that he finally issued a limited executive order last August permitting immigrants who entered the country illegally as children to work without fear of deportation for at least two years. Obama didn’t dare to even bring up gun control, a Democratic “third rail” that has cost the party elections and that actually might have been even less popular on the right than the president’s health care law. And yet, for reasons that have very little to do with Obama’s personal prestige or popularity—variously put in terms of a “mandate” or “political capital”—chances are fair that both will now happen.¶ What changed? In the case of gun control, of course, it wasn’t the election. It was the horror of the 20 first-graders who were slaughtered in Newtown, Conn., in mid-December. The sickening reality of little girls and boys riddled with bullets from a high-capacity assault weapon seemed to precipitate a sudden tipping point in the national conscience. One thing changed after another. Wayne LaPierre of the National Rifle Association marginalized himself with poorly chosen comments soon after the massacre. The pro-gun lobby, once a phalanx of opposition, began to fissure into reasonables and crazies. Former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., who was shot in the head two years ago and is still struggling to speak and walk, started a PAC with her husband to appeal to the moderate middle of gun owners. Then she gave riveting and poignant testimony to the Senate, challenging lawmakers: “Be bold.”¶ As a result, momentum has appeared to build around some kind of a plan to curtail sales of the most dangerous weapons and ammunition and the way people are permitted to buy them. It’s impossible to say now whether such a bill will pass and, if it does, whether it will make anything more than cosmetic changes to gun laws. But one thing is clear: The political tectonics have shifted dramatically in very little time. Whole new possibilities exist now that didn’t a few weeks ago.¶ Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all.¶ The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.”¶ The real problem is that the idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong. “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of political capital—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—is very rare. It almost never happens. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens. It is distortionary. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history.¶ Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits.

#### Winners win – momentum

Michael Hirsch (chief correspondent for National Journal, previously served as the senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek, based in its Washington bureau) February 7, 2013 “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207>

THE REAL LIMITS ON POWER¶ Presidents are limited in what they can do by time and attention span, of course, just as much as they are by electoral balances in the House and Senate. But this, too, has nothing to do with political capital. Another well-worn meme of recent years was that Obama used up too much political capital passing the health care law in his first term. But the real problem was that the plan was unpopular, the economy was bad, and the president didn’t realize that the national mood (yes, again, the national mood) was at a tipping point against big-government intervention, with the tea-party revolt about to burst on the scene. For Americans in 2009 and 2010—haunted by too many rounds of layoffs, appalled by the Wall Street bailout, aghast at the amount of federal spending that never seemed to find its way into their pockets—government-imposed health care coverage was simply an intervention too far. So was the idea of another economic stimulus. Cue the tea party and what ensued: two titanic fights over the debt ceiling. Obama, like Bush, had settled on pushing an issue that was out of sync with the country’s mood.¶ Unlike Bush, Obama did ultimately get his idea passed. But the bigger political problem with health care reform was that it distracted the government’s attention from other issues that people cared about more urgently, such as the need to jump-start the economy and financial reform. Various congressional staffers told me at the time that their bosses didn’t really have the time to understand how the Wall Street lobby was riddling the Dodd-Frank financial-reform legislation with loopholes. Health care was sucking all the oxygen out of the room, the aides said.¶ Weighing the imponderables of momentum, the often-mystical calculations about when the historic moment is ripe for an issue, will never be a science. It is mainly intuition, and its best practitioners have a long history in American politics. This is a tale told well in Steven Spielberg’s hit movie Lincoln. Daniel Day-Lewis’s Abraham Lincoln attempts a lot of behind-the-scenes vote-buying to win passage of the 13th Amendment, banning slavery, along with eloquent attempts to move people’s hearts and minds. He appears to be using the political capital of his reelection and the turning of the tide in the Civil War. But it’s clear that a surge of conscience, a sense of the changing times, has as much to do with the final vote as all the backroom horse-trading. “The reason I think the idea of political capital is kind of distorting is that it implies you have chits you can give out to people. It really oversimplifies why you elect politicians, or why they can do what Lincoln did,” says Tommy Bruce, a former political consultant in Washington.¶ Consider, as another example, the storied political career of President Franklin Roosevelt. Because the mood was ripe for dramatic change in the depths of the Great Depression, FDR was able to push an astonishing array of New Deal programs through a largely compliant Congress, assuming what some described as near-dictatorial powers. But in his second term, full of confidence because of a landslide victory in 1936 that brought in unprecedented Democratic majorities in the House and Senate, Roosevelt overreached with his infamous Court-packing proposal. All of a sudden, the political capital that experts thought was limitless disappeared. FDR’s plan to expand the Supreme Court by putting in his judicial allies abruptly created an unanticipated wall of opposition from newly reunited Republicans and conservative Southern Democrats. FDR thus inadvertently handed back to Congress, especially to the Senate, the power and influence he had seized in his first term. Sure, Roosevelt had loads of popularity and momentum in 1937. He seemed to have a bank vault full of political capital. But, once again, a president simply chose to take on the wrong issue at the wrong time; this time, instead of most of the political interests in the country aligning his way, they opposed him. Roosevelt didn’t fully recover until World War II, despite two more election victories.¶ In terms of Obama’s second-term agenda, what all these shifting tides of momentum and political calculation mean is this: Anything goes. Obama has no more elections to win, and he needs to worry only about the support he will have in the House and Senate after 2014. But if he picks issues that the country’s mood will support—such as, perhaps, immigration reform and gun control—there is no reason to think he can’t win far more victories than any of the careful calculators of political capital now believe is possible, including battles over tax reform and deficit reduction.¶ Amid today’s atmosphere of Republican self-doubt, a new, more mature Obama seems to be emerging, one who has his agenda clearly in mind and will ride the mood of the country more adroitly. If he can get some early wins—as he already has, apparently, on the fiscal cliff and the upper-income tax increase—that will create momentum, and one win may well lead to others. “Winning wins.”

### AT: States

#### States can’t amend the IRS tax code – that is exclusively under federal authority – that’s key to enhanced regulatory certainty and stable investment climates = that’s Bilek – the CP can’t cause scale up

**Bilek 12**—2011 John J. McCloy Fellowship in Environmental Policy Energy Policy Specialist, Great Plains Institute

(Amanda, “The German Biogas Experience: Opportunities and Key Experiences for Future US Deployment”, http://acgusa.org/files/The\_German\_Biogas\_Experience\_final\_report-NEW.pdf, dml)

Although a feed‐in tariff might not be the exact right policy mechanism for deployment in the US, what is clear from the German energy experience is the need for a consistent and clear public policy mechanism. If the US and individual states decide that there are broader societal benefits to be gained (which I believe there are) to the scale‐up of biogas energy systems, public policy must be implemented to support project development. Especially in the US where renewable energy resources must complete against low prices for fossil natural gas and fossil fuel energy incentives, parity for renewable energy policy must be achieved. Due to the different characteristics of biogas production a different incentive or public policy mechanism might need to be implemented compared to mechanisms for wind and solar. The need for clear and consistent renewable energy policy cannot be overstated in its importance to achieve renewable energy scale‐up.

#### Perm do both – solves the link

Overby 3 – A. Brooke, Professor of Law, Tulane University School of Law, “Our New Commercial Law Federalism.” Temple University of the Commonwealth System of Higher Education Temple Law Review, Summer, 2003 76 Temp. L. Rev. 297 Lexis

We held in New York that Congress cannot compel the States to enact or enforce a federal regulatory program. Today we hold that Congress cannot circumvent that prohibition by conscripting the States' officers directly. The Federal Government may neither issue directives requiring the States to address particular problems, nor command the States' officers, or those of their political subdivisions, to administer or enforce a federal regulatory program. It matters not whether policymaking is involved, and no case-by-case weighing of the burdens or benefits is necessary; such commands are fundamentally incompatible with our constitutional system of dual sovereignty.n65 The concerns articulated in New York and echoed again in Printz addressed the erosion of the lines of political accountability that could result from federal commandeering.n66 Federal authority to compel implementation of a national legislative agenda through the state legislatures or officers would blur or launder the federal provenance of the legislation and shift political consequences and costs thereof to the state legislators. Left unchecked, Congress could foist upon the states **expensive or** unpopular programs yet shield itself from accountability to citizens**.** While drawing the line between constitutionally permissible optional implementation and impermissible mandatory implementation does not erase these concerns with accountability, it does ameliorate them slightly.

#### Links to politics

Kiely 12 [[Eugene Kiely](http://www.factcheck.org/author/eugene-kiely/), Washington assignment editor USA today, February 17, 2012 Factcheck.org “Did Obama ‘Approve’ Bridge Work for Chinese Firms?” <http://www.factcheck.org/2012/02/did-obama-approve-bridge-work-for-chinese-firms/>]

Who’s to blame, if that’s the right word, if the project ends up using manufactured steel from China? The National Steel Bridge Alliance blames the state railroad agency. The Alliance for American Manufacturing says the federal Buy American laws have been “weakened with loopholes and various exemptions that make it easier for bureaucrats to purchase foreign-made goods instead of those made in American factories with American workers.” So, how did Obama get blamed for the decisions by state agencies and for state projects that, in at least one case, didn’t even use federal funds? The answer is a textbook lesson in how information gets distorted when emails go viral. We looked at the nearly 100 emails we received on this subject and found that Obama wasn’t mentioned at all in the first few emails. Typical of the emails we received shortly after the ABC News report aired was this one from Oct. 11, 2011: “I just got an email regarding Diane Sawyer on ABC TV stating that U. S. Bridges and roads are being built by Chinese firms when the jobs should have gone to Americans. Could this possible be true?” The answer: Yes, it’s true. End of story, right? Wrong. Days later, emails started to appear in our inbox that claimed ABC News reported that Chinese firm were receiving stimulus funds to build U.S. bridges — even though the broadcast news story didn’t mention stimulus funds at all. (The report did include a clip of Obama delivering a speech on the need to rebuild America’s bridges and put Americans to work, but said nothing about the president’s $830 billion stimulus bill.) Still, we received emails such as this one on Nov. 4, 2011, that included this erroneous claim language: “Stimulus money meant to create U.S. jobs went to Chinese firms. Unbelievable….” It didn’t take long for Obama to be blamed. That same day — Nov. 4, 2011 — we received an email that made this leap to Obama: “SOME CHINESE COMPANIES WHO ARE BUILDING ‘OUR’ BRIDGES. (3000 JOBS LOST TO THE CHINESE FIRM)…..AND NOW OBAMA WANTS ‘MORE STIMULUS MONEY’…..THIS IS NUTS ! ! ! If this doesn’t make you furious nothing will….” This year, Obama’s name started to surface in the subject line of such critical emails — raising the attack on the president to yet another level and perhaps ensuring the email will be even more widely circulated. Since Jan. 17, we have gotten more than a dozen emails with the subject line, “ABC News on Obama/USA Infrastructure,” often preceded with the word “SHOCKING” in all caps. The emails increasingly contain harsh language about the president. Since Jan. 11, 23 emails carried this added bit of Obama-bashing: “I pray all the unemployed see this and cast their votes accordingly in 2012!” One of those emails — a more recent one from Feb. 8 — contained this additional line: “Tell me again how Obama’s looking out for blue collar guys. He cancels pipelines, and lets Chinese contractors build our bridges…” And so it goes, on and on. **All from a news report that blamed state officials — not Obama — for spending taxpayer money** on Chinese firms to build U.S. bridges.

#### Private entities won’t get on board

**Bramley et al 11**—Department of Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning, Tufts

(Julia, with Lum Fobi, Cammy Peterson, Lydia Rainville, Jeff Cheng-Hao Shih, Axum Teferra, and Rose Yuan Wang, “AGRICULTURAL BIOGAS IN THE UNITED STATES”, <http://ase.tufts.edu/uep/degrees/field_project_reports/2011/Team_6_Final_Report.pdf>, dml)

FERC sets rates and implements regulations through independent system operators (ISOs) and regional transmission organizations (RTOs). An ISO coordinates, controls, and monitors the operation of the electrical power system, usually within a single state, or a small collection of states. An RTO generally performs the same function as an ISO, but over a larger region. At the state level, state public utility commissions (PUCs) set rates. Thus, much like the interconnection grid itself, interconnection regulations are comprised of regulations established by a network of regulators with varying, yet overlapping, jurisdictions that any connecting generator must learn to navigate. State policies vary greatly regarding interconnection options with utilities, retail electricity rates, and distributed power pricing (Lazarus, 2008). Utilities do not view relationships with smaller electricity generators enthusiastically since their operations are more efficient and profits more readily realized with utility-sized generators (Wright, 2004). Requirements for insurance and safeguards that the utility requires if the generator fails or is turned off further complicate that relationship. The AgSTAR Handbook explains that contractual agreements between farms with digesters and utilities typically fall into three categories of buy all-sell all, surplus sale, and net metering (Roos, Martin,Jr., and Moser, 2006). The Handbook outlines the information that a digester developer should have to initiate the utility contracting process.

**Now is the key time for New York campaign finance reform**

Karen **Rubin 3-28-**13 http://www.theislandnow.com/opinions/article\_4320853e-97df-11e2-88ed-001a4bcf887a.html

New York State has the **best chance in decades** of passing a Fair Elections Law and the **greatest urgency** since the U.S. Supreme Court unleashed the era of Citizens United. During the next 100 days until the New York State Legislature adjourns in June, advocates for campaign finance reform in New York State are marshaling **a massive push** for reforms that include a public financing mechanism (similar to what New York City already has in place), reducing contribution limits and tightening loopholes that corporate donors use to vastly exceed what individuals are allowed to contribute, tightening disclosure requirements, and putting teeth in enforcement which has been virtually nonexistent. There have been fair elections proposals for decades, but advocates are hoping the **“stars are aligned**” for passage this year: Governor Andrew Cuomo has stated he is in favor, the public has become aware and concerned that Citizens United has poisoned the political process; New Yorkers’ progressive mo-jo may have been reawakened by the state’s adoption of gay marriage and gun control. What is more, even the most idealistic elected representatives have become jaded when they realize that the intense need to appease big money interests conflicts with their dream of accomplishing great things for their communities. There are signs that even lobbyists and corporations have reached a tipping point because they are just tired of being shaken down for ever-higher donations, as the cost of mounting campaigns rises ever higher. The advantages of publicly financed elections are huge – by incentivizing candidates to seek small donations (under $250 which would be eligible for a match, perhaps $6 for every $1), they will actually go out to the people rather than spend all their time in big-donor fundraisers. And if individual voters feel they have a connection to a campaign, they will participate more fully.

Governors have limited capital- CP spends it

LARRY J. OBHOF J.D., Yale Law School, 2003; B.A., Ohio State University, 2000. Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy Spring 04

For their part, governors are accountable to the entire state and are therefore less likely to be constrained by local interests. Governors have a limited amount of political capital, however, and are generally reluctant to expend it on a single issue. [**19**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=37c002fdfd6b8c66349f420e2e283682&docnum=11&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlb-zSkAA&_md5=ee0c6f61a7de8b92a2b93b1e6e68cb11&focBudTerms=governors%20w/20%20political%20capital&focBudSel=all#n19) Like legislators, they must also be careful not to spend too much of a state's resources only on education. Thus, while governors are often more willing than legislators to support education reform, they are unlikely to do so without an outside catalyst such as pressure from the courts. [**20**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=37c002fdfd6b8c66349f420e2e283682&docnum=11&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlb-zSkAA&_md5=ee0c6f61a7de8b92a2b93b1e6e68cb11&focBudTerms=governors%20w/20%20political%20capital&focBudSel=all#n20)

#### Cuomo capital k2 publicly financed elections in new york

Jimmy Vielkind, Capitol bureau 3-26-13 http://blog.timesunion.com/capitol/archives/183215/obama-offshoot-joins-campfin-push/

Organizing for Action, the derivative group of President Barack Obama’s campaign organization, is joining the push for publicly financed elections in New York. (H/T Maggie Haberman) OFA has 744,000 members on its New York roster, and plans to ask members for money as well as prompt them to action. It joins a broad coalition of labor and progressive groups that have long been agitating for campaign finance reform, and expects to do more in coming months. Gov. Andrew Cuomo, a Democrat, supports the policy and has lent it some political capital — he addressed a conference call of activists and spoke on the issue at a luncheon in the New York Times building. OFA is planning another call for Wednesday night. Attorney General Eric Schneiderman, also a Democrat, is expected to participate.

#### New york election reform acts as a national model- Cuomo key

THOMAS KAPLAN 4-11-12 http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/12/nyregion/coalition-urges-public-financing-in-new-york-state-elections.html?pagewanted=print

ALBANY — An unusual and well-heeled coalition, trying to tap public anger over the flood of money into politics, is pushing to enact a public financing system for elections in New York State. The backers include media moguls — Barry Diller and Chris Hughes, a founder of Facebook — as well as investment bankers, unions, MoveOn.org, the restaurateur Danny Meyer and the philanthropist David Rockefeller Sr. They say New York, which they call a symbol of institutionalized corruption, could become a national model for the effort to free elections from the grip of big money. The campaign will start next week with mailings to the constituents of four state senators. For years, government watchdog groups have pressed unsuccessfully for public financing of elections. Leaders of the coalition say the Citizens United ruling and the role of “super PACs” in the presidential race have made campaign finance a more broadly understood and urgent issue. “Right now people are feeling a little bit helpless about super PACs and how to get money out of the system at the federal level,” said Sean Eldridge, Mr. Hughes’s fiancé, who runs an investment fund and is a leader of the effort. “An opportunity to pass campaign finance reform in New York is an opportunity for people to do something — to actually be able to pass a bill, to make progress.” The coalition, called New York Leadership for Accountable Government, is notable for its diversity and its well-known names: its roster includes Jonathan Soros, the son of the philanthropist George Soros; Jerome Kohlberg, a co-founder of Kohlberg Kravis Roberts & Company; and several former elected officials, including Mayor Edward I. Koch. The group is also supported by the Committee for Economic Development, a nonpartisan public-policy group backed by executives from dozens of Fortune 500 companies. The committee is holding meetings in New York this month to encourage business leaders to join the coalition. Many of the executives involved have given generously to candidates in the past. “With this effort, you have people who are big donors, who are involved with the campaign system, saying: ‘You know what, this doesn’t make sense. This isn’t what democracy is supposed to be about,’ ” said David L. Calone, a venture capitalist based on Long Island who has raised money for Democratic candidates. New York’s campaign finance system is among the least restrictive in the nation, with individuals permitted to give up to $60,800 to candidates running for statewide office. The median cap among states that limit contributions is $5,000 for candidates for governor, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures. The proposal the coalition is pushing would be modeled after the system that New York City adopted in 1988: in return for abiding by limits on their spending, city candidates can receive $6 in public funds for each of the first $175 city residents donate. The group sees the successful campaign to pass same-sex marriage in New York as a blueprint for its effort. Like same-sex marriage, public financing has been embraced in the past by the Democratic-led State Assembly, but blocked by the Republican State Senate. Gov. Andrew M. Cuomo’s response will be pivotal: Mr. Cuomo ran for governor on a platform that included enacting public financing, and in his State of the State address in January, he promised to push for it in the legislative session this year. But he has not pressed the issue since then, and he has raised prodigious amounts of money under the existing rules. Asked at a news conference last month if he still planned to pursue public financing, Mr. Cuomo responded, “Yes.” He did not elaborate, and a spokesman declined to comment on Wednesday. Coalition leaders said they were prepared to spend more than $1 million promoting public financing, but they acknowledged that it could take beyond this legislative session to persuade lawmakers to embrace their proposal. The issue could be sensitive for Mr. Cuomo. Some liberal leaders and government reform groups are unhappy that Mr. Cuomo broke his promise to veto redistricting maps drawn by incumbent lawmakers, and they are hoping that the governor will make campaign finance his next big cause. National groups are also getting involved. MoveOn.org, for instance, is planning to e-mail its members next week to rally them in support of the cause. “Our New York members will be watching to see if Governor Cuomo shows leadership on the issue,” said Justin Ruben, MoveOn’s executive director. The campaign will get under way as lawmakers return from a two-week recess next Tuesday. At the outset, the Public Campaign Action Fund, a group based in Washington that supports public financing, is paying for direct mail advertising to target four Republican senators who some advocates believe could be receptive to the proposal: Martin J. Golden of Brooklyn, Gregory R. Ball of Putnam County, Roy J. McDonald of Saratoga County and Mark J. Grisanti of Buffalo. Voters in each senator’s district will soon receive a mailer featuring a photograph of the State Capitol awash in $100 bills and declaring, “It’s time Albany put voters before big-monied corporate lobbyists.” Asked about the irony of wealthy donors pledging money to an effort to get big money out of elections, Mr. Eldridge responded: “Creating legislative reform is expensive, particularly on an issue like this where the resistance we’d get from special interest groups would be tremendous.” Educating the public and organizing voters, he said, “requires resources, and that requires money, and there’s no shame in that.” Advocates of public financing say the system frees politicians to spend more time focusing on the issues and interacting with constituents, rather than dialing for contributions from special interests. They also believe it encourages competition for electoral offices. “It’s a double victory,” said Frederick A. O. Schwarz Jr., chief counsel at the Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law. “You have lower amounts of money that can be given, and No. 2, ordinary people become engaged in political campaigns and candidates change their approach to campaigning.” Given the state’s shaky finances, however, anything that requires new spending of taxpayer dollars also tends to draw scrutiny. “The taxpayers have enough on their backs as it is,” said Michael R. Long, chairman of the state’s Conservative Party. “If Mike Long wants to run for office, why should the taxpayer have to pay for my campaign?” Mr. Long asked. “Let the taxpayers donate their own personal money to candidates they want to donate to.”

#### Publicly financed campaigns key to business confidence, small businesses economic growth, and democracy

David Levine is co-founder and CEO of the New York-based American Sustainable Business Council. Read more: http://www.timesunion.com/opinion/article/Publicly-financed-elections-good-business-4247596.php#ixzz2P0ArTWZ8 2-3-13

In 2012, corporations and businesses spent hundreds of millions of dollars to influence elections across America, thanks to new freedoms granted by the Supreme Court. Some businesses went even further, telling their employees directly how to vote. Given the advantages of this system, you would think most in the business community would support the status quo. But you would be wrong. Underneath the headlines, many business owners still believe that success should come from hard work, safe and quality products, and good customer service—not spending on elections. A poll commissioned by the American Sustainable Business Council and other business groups found 88 percent of small business leaders view the role money plays in politics negatively and 66 percent consider the Supreme Court's 2009 Citizens United decision bad for small business. Their opinion is clear: Unlimited corporate political spending in elections hurts the interests of small businesses, America's jobs engine. Another poll commissioned by the Committee for Economic Development found similar views among New York business leaders: 62 percent believe corporate donations are bad for the political process, while 72 percent support creating a public financing system that would match low-dollar contributions and give average citizens more incentive to contribute to campaigns, along the lines of reforms proposed by Gov. Andrew Cuomo. Businesses and their owners want to profit and thrive. But most of us also want to build a vibrant and sustainable economy that benefits our communities. An essential principle is that a strong economy requires a strong democracy. Transparency is another important business value. Decisions should be made in the open. Donations from corporations and the wealthy cannot be thinly veiled bribery that allows legislators to collect secret donations for which they then owe secret favors. "Pay to play" destroys the public's faith in government. The problem centers on which deep pockets will dominate the spending, and whether the ideas they will promote are good for our businesses and the state. The resulting policies often benefit those special interests at the expense of small and midsize businesses, our local economies and our communities. Campaign finance reform is a crucial step toward building a strong and fair economy. This is essential to create the economy we need. It's time to put the concerns of responsible business owners, our employees, and our customers back on the table so we can compete, create jobs, and support our local economies by putting our elections back in the hands of the electorate. That's why we and many other business leaders support a plan for public financing of our state elections.

### 2AC Security (short)

#### Rejection of securitization causes the state to become more interventionist—turns the K

Tara **McCormack, ’10**, is Lecturer in International Politics at the University of Leicester and has a PhD in International Relations from the University of Westminster. 2010, (Critique, Security and Power: The political limits to emancipatory approaches, page 127-129)

The following section will briefly raise some questions about the rejection of the old security framework as it has been taken up by the most powerful institutions and states. Here we can begin to see the political limits to critical and emancipatory frameworks. In an international system which is marked by great power inequalities between states, the rejection of the old narrow national interest-based security framework by major international institutions, and the adoption of ostensibly emancipatory policies and policy rhetoric, has the consequence of **problematising weak or unstable states** and allowing international institutions or major states a more interventionary role, yet without establishing mechanisms by which the citizens of states being intervened in might have any control over the agents or agencies of their emancipation. Whatever the problems associated with the pluralist security framework **there were at least formal and clear demarcations**. This has the consequence of **entrenching international power inequalities** and allowing for a shift towards a hierarchical international order in which the citizens in weak or unstable states may arguably have even less freedom or power than before. Radical critics of contemporary security policies, such as human security and humanitarian intervention, argue that we see an assertion of Western power and the creation of liberal subjectivities in the developing world. For example, see Mark Duffield’s important and insightful contribution to the ongoing debates about contemporary international security and development. Duffield attempts to provide a coherent empirical engagement with, and theoretical explanation of, these shifts. Whilst these shifts, away from a focus on state security, and the so-called merging of security and development are often portrayed as positive and progressive shifts that have come about because of the end of the Cold War, Duffield argues convincingly that these shifts are highly problematic and unprogressive. For example, the rejection of sovereignty as formal international equality and a presumption of nonintervention has eroded the division between the international and domestic spheres and led to an international environment in which Western NGOs and powerful states have a major role in the governance of third world states. Whilst for supporters of humanitarian intervention this is a good development, Duffield points out the depoliticising implications, drawing on examples in Mozambique and Afghanistan. Duffield also draws out the problems of the retreat from modernisation that is represented by sustainable development. The Western world has moved away from the development policies of the Cold War, which aimed to develop third world states industrially. Duffield describes this in terms of a new division of human life into uninsured and insured life. Whilst we in the West are ‘insured’ – that is we no longer have to be entirely self-reliant, we have welfare systems, a modern division of labour and so on – sustainable development aims to teach populations in poor states how to survive in the absence of any of this. Third world populations must be taught to be self-reliant, they will remain uninsured. Self-reliance of course means **the condemnation of millions to** **a barbarous life of inhuman bare survival**. Ironically, although sustainable development is celebrated by many on the left today, by leaving people to fend for themselves rather than developing a society wide system which can support people, sustainable development actually leads to a less human and humane system than that developed in modern capitalist states. Duffield also describes how many of these problematic shifts are embodied in the contemporary concept of human security. For Duffield, we can understand these shifts in terms of Foucauldian biopolitical framework, which can be understood as a regulatory power that seeks to support life through intervening in the biological, social and economic processes that constitute a human population (2007: 16). Sustainable development and human security are for Duffield technologies of security which aim to *create* self-managing and self-reliant subjectivities in the third world, which can then survive in a situation of serious underdevelopment (or being uninsured as Duffield terms it) without causing security problems for the developed world. For Duffield this is all driven by a neoliberal project which seeks to control and manage uninsured populations globally. Radical critic Costas Douzinas (2007) also criticises new forms of cosmopolitanism such as human rights and interventions for human rights as a triumph of American hegemony. Whilst we are in agreement with critics such as Douzinas and Duffield that these new security frameworks cannot be empowering, and ultimately lead to more power for powerful sta**tes**, we need to understand why these frameworks have the effect that they do. We can understand that these frameworks have political limitations without having to look for a specific plan on the part of current powerful states. In new security frameworks such as human security we can see the political limits of the framework proposed by critical and emancipatory theoretical approaches.

#### No lash out – institutional safeguards check

Buchanan 7 [Allen, Professor of Philosophy and Public Policy at Duke, 2007, Preemption: military action and moral justification, pg. 128]

The intuitively plausible idea behind the 'irresponsible act' argument is that, other things being equal, the higher the stakes in acting and in particular the greater the moral risk, the higher are the epistemic requirements for justified action. The decision to go to war is generally a high stakes decision par excellence and the moral risks are especially great, for two reasons. First, unless one is justified in going to war, one's deliberate killing of enemy combatants will he murder, indeed mass murder. Secondly, at least in large-scale modem war, it is a virtual certainty that one will kill innocent people even if one is justified in going to war and conducts the war in such a way as to try to minimize harm to innocents. Given these grave moral risks of going to war, quite apart from often substantial prudential concerns, some types of justifications for going to war may simply be too subject to abuse and error to make it justifiable to invoke them. The 'irresponsible act' objection is not a consequentialist objection in any interesting sense. It does not depend upon the assumption that every particular act of going to war preventively has unacceptably bad consequences (whether in itself or by virtue of contributing lo the general acceptance of a principle allowing preventive war); nor does it assume that it is always wrong lo rely on a justification which, if generally accepted, would produce unacceptable consequences. Instead, the "irresponsible act' objection is more accurately described as an agent-centered argument and more particularly an argument from moral epistemic responsibility. The 'irresponsible act' objection to preventive war is highly plausible if— but only if—one assumes that the agents who would invoke the preventive-war justification are, as it were, on their own in making the decision to go to war preventively. In other words, the objection is incomplete unless the context of decision-making is further specified. Whether the special risks of relying on the preventive-war justification are unacceptably high will depend, inter alia, upon whether the decision-making process includes effective provisions for redu­cing those special risks. Because the special risks are at least in significant part epistemic—due to the inherently speculative character of the preventive war-justification—the epistemic context of the decision is crucial. Because institutions can improve the epistemic performance of agents, it is critical to know what the institutional context of the preventive-war decision is, before we can regard the 'irresponsible agent' objection as conclusive. Like the 'bad practice' argument, this second objection to preventive war is inconclusive because it does not consider— and rule out—the possibility that well-designed institutions for decision-making could address the problems that would otherwise make it irresponsible for a leader to invoke the preventive-war justification.

#### Realism is true and inevitable – trying to shift away causes great power war

**Mearsheimer 1** [professor of political science at University of Chicago, The Tragedy of Great Power Politics, pg. 361]

The optimists' claim that security competition and war among the great powers has been burned out of the system is wrong. In fact, all of the major states around the globe still care deeply about the balance of power and are destined to compete for power among themselves for the foreseeable future. Consequently, realism will offer the most powerful explanations of international politics over the next century, and this will be true **even if the debates among academic** and policy **elites are dominated by non-realist theories**. In short, the real world remains a realist world. States still fear each other and seek to gain power at each other's expense, because international anarchy-the driving force behind greatpower behavior-did not change with the end of the Cold War, and there are few signs that such change is likely any time soon. States remain the principal actors in world politics and there is still no night watchman standing above them. For sure, the collapse of the Soviet Union caused a major shift in the global distribution of power. But it did not give rise to a change in the anarchic structure of the system, and without that kind of profound change, there is no reason to expect the great powers to behave much differently in the new century than they did in previous centuries.Indeed, considerable evidence from the 1990s indicates that power politics has not disappeared from Europe and Northeast Asia, the regions in which there are two or more great powers, as well as possible great powers such as Germany and Japan. There is no question, however, that the competition for power over the past decade has been low-key. Still, there is potential for intense security competion among the great powers that might lead to a major war. Probably the best evidence of that possibility is the fact that the United States maintains about one hundred thousand troops each in Europe and in Northeast Asia for the explicit purpose of keeping the major states in each region at peace.

#### Alt cedes the political – energy specific

**Kuzemko 12** [Caroline Kuzemko, CSGR University of Warwick, Security, the State and Political Agency: Putting ‘Politics’ back into UK Energy, <http://www.psa.ac.uk/journals/pdf/5/2012/381_61.pdf>]

Both Hay (2007) and Flinders and Buller (2006) suggest that there are other forms that depoliticisation can take, or in the terminology of Flinders and Buller ‘tactics’ which politicians can pursue in order to move a policy field to a more indirect governing relationship (Flinders and Buller 2006: 296). For the purposes of understanding the depoliticisation of UK energy policy, however, two of Colin Hay’s forms of depoliticisation are most useful: the ‘… offloading of areas of formal political responsibility to the market…’ and the passing of policymaking responsibility to quasipublic, or independent, authorities (Hay 2007: 82-3). 1 What each of these forms of depoliticisation has in common is the degree to which they can serve, over time, to reduce political capacity by removing processes of deliberation and contestation, thereby reducing the ability for informed agency and choice. In that politics can be understood as being inclusive of processes of deliberation, contestation, informed agency and collective choice the lack of deliberation and capacity for informed agency would result in sub-optimal politics (Hay 2007: 67; cf. Gamble 2000; Wood 2011; Jenkins 2011). There seems little doubt that, with regard to energy as a policy area, the principal of establishing a more indirect governing system had become accepted by UK political elites. One of the very few close observers of UK energy policy from the 1980s to early 2000s claims that both Conservative and New Labour politicians had actively sought to remove energy from politics, making it an ‘economic’ subject: From the early 1980s, British energy policy, and its associated regulatory regime, was designed to transform a state-owned and directed sector into a normal commodity market. Competition and 1 "These"forms"are"referred"to"elsewhere"by"the"author"as"‘marketised’"and"‘technocratic’"depoliticisation"(Kuzemko" 2012b:").liberalization would, its architects hoped, take energy out of the political arena… Labour shared this vision and hoped that energy would drop off the political agenda…. (Helm 2003: 386) 2 As already suggested this paper considers the intention to depoliticise energy to have been reasonably successful. By the early 2000s the Energy Ministry had been disbanded, there was little or no formal Parliamentary debate, energy was not represented at Cabinet level, responsibility for the supply of energy had been passed to the markets, it was regulated by an independent body, and the (cf. Kuzemko 2012b). Furthermore, the newly formed Energy Directorate within the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), which now had responsibility for energy policy, had no specific energy mandates but instead mandates regarding encouraging the right conditions for business with an emphasis on competition (Helm et al 1989: 55; cf. Kuzemko 2012b: 107). As feared by various analysts who write about depoliticisation as a sub-optimal form of politics, these processes of depoliticisation had arguably resulted in a lack of deliberation about energy and its governance outside of narrow technocratic elite circles. Within these circles energy systems were modelled, language was specific and often unintelligible to others, including generalist politicians or wider publics, and this did, indeed, further encourage a high degree of disengagement with the subject (cf. Kern 2010; Kuzemko 2012b; Stern 1987). Technical language and hiring practices that emphasised certain forms of economic education further isolated elite technocratic circles from political contestation and other forms of knowledge about energy. Arguably, by placing those actors who have been elected to represent the national collective interest at one remove from processes of energy governance the result was a lack of formal political capacity in this policy field. It is worth, briefly, at this point reiterating the paradoxical nature of depoliticisation. Whilst decisions to depoliticise are deeply political, political capacity to deliberate, contest and act in an issue area can be reduced through these processes. Depoliticisation has been an ongoing form of governing throughout the 20 th century it may (Burnham 2001: 464), however, be particularly powerful and more difficult to reverse when underpinned by increasingly dominant ideas about how best to govern. For example Hay, in looking for the domestic sources of depoliticisation in the 1980s and 1990s, suggests that these processes were firmly underpinned by neoliberal and public choice ideas not only about the role of the state but also about the ability for political actors to make sound decisions relating, in particular, to economic governance (Hay 2007: 95-99). Given the degree to which such ideas were held increasingly to be legitimate over this time period depoliticisation was, arguably, genuinely understood by many as a process that would result in better governance (Interviews 1, 2, 3, 15 cf. Hay 2007: 94; Kern 2010). This to a certain extent makes decisions to depoliticise appear both less instrumental but also harder to reverse given the degree to which such ideas become further entrenched via processes of depoliticisation (cf. Kuzemko 2012b: 61-66; Wood 2011: 7).

#### Turns the k

**McClean ‘1**

[David. Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy. “The Cultural Left and the Limits of Social Hope” [www.americanphilosophy.org/archives/2001%2520Conference/Discussion%2520papers/david\_mcclean.htm+foucault+habermas+slapped+cud&hl=en&gl=us&ct=clnk&cd=1](http://www.americanphilosophy.org/archives/2001%2520Conference/Discussion%2520papers/david_mcclean.htm%2Bfoucault%2Bhabermas%2Bslapped%2Bcud%26hl%3Den%26gl%3Dus%26ct%3Dclnk%26cd%3D1) 2001]

Yet for some reason, at least partially explicated in Richard Rorty's Achieving Our Country, a book that I think is long overdue, leftist critics continue to cite and refer to the eccentric and often a priori ruminations of people like those just mentioned, and a litany of others including Derrida, Deleuze, Lyotard, Jameson, and Lacan, who are to me hugely more irrelevant than Habermas in their narrative attempts to suggest policy prescriptions (when they actually do suggest them) aimed at curing the ills of homelessness, poverty, market greed, national belligerence and racism. I would like to suggest that it is time for American social critics who are enamored with this group, those who actually want to be relevant, to recognize that they have a disease, and a disease regarding which I myself must remember to stay faithful to my own twelve step program of recovery. The disease is the need for elaborate theoretical "remedies" wrapped in neological and multi-syllabic jargon. These elaborate theoretical remedies are more "interesting," to be sure, than the pragmatically settled questions about what shape democracy should take in various contexts, or whether private property should be protected by the state, or regarding our basic human nature (described, if not defined (heaven forbid!), in such statements as "We don't like to starve" and "We like to speak our minds without fear of death" and "We like to keep our children safe from poverty"). As Rorty puts it, "When one of today's academic leftists says that some topic has been 'inadequately theorized,' you can be pretty certain that he or she is going to drag in either philosophy of language, or Lacanian psychoanalysis, or some neo-Marxist version of economic determinism. . . . These futile attempts to philosophize one's way into political relevance are a symptom of what happens when a Left retreats from activism and adopts a spectatorial approach to the problems of its country. Disengagement from practice produces theoretical hallucinations"(italics mine).[(1)](file:///E%3A%5C%5CWINDOWS%5C%5CTemporary%20Internet%20Files%5C%5CContent.IE5%5C%5COTKXU3YH%5C%5Cthe%20city.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22N_1_) Or as John Dewey put it in his The Need for a Recovery of Philosophy, "I believe that philosophy in America will be lost between chewing a historical cud long since reduced to woody fiber, or an apologetics for lost causes, . . . . or a scholastic, schematic formalism, unless it can somehow bring to consciousness America's own needs and its own implicit principle of successful action." Those who suffer or have suffered from this disease Rorty refers to as the Cultural Left, which left is juxtaposed to the Political Left that Rorty prefers and prefers for good reason. Another attribute of the Cultural Left is that its members fancy themselves pure culture critics who view the successes of America and the West, rather than some of the barbarous methods for achieving those successes, as mostly evil, and who view anything like national pride as equally evil even when that pride is tempered with the knowledge and admission of the nation's shortcomings. In other words, the Cultural Left, in this country, too often dismiss American society as beyond reform and redemption. And Rorty correctly argues that this is a disastrous conclusion, i.e. disastrous for the Cultural Left. I think it may also be disastrous for our social hopes, as I will explain. Leftist American culture critics might put their considerable talents to better use if they bury some of their cynicism about America's social and political prospects and help forge public and political possibilities in a spirit of determination to, indeed, achieve our country - the country of Jefferson and King; the country of John Dewey and Malcom X; the country of Franklin Roosevelt and Bayard Rustin, and of the later George Wallace and the later Barry Goldwater. To invoke the words of King, and with reference to the American society, the time is always ripe to seize the opportunity to help create the "beloved community," one woven with the thread of agape into a conceptually single yet diverse tapestry that shoots for nothing less than a true intra-American cosmopolitan ethos, one wherein both same sex unions and faith-based initiatives will be able to be part of the same social reality, one wherein business interests and the university are not seen as belonging to two separate galaxies but as part of the same answer to the threat of social and ethical nihilism. We who fancy ourselves philosophers would do well to create from within ourselves and from within our ranks a new kind of public intellectual who has both a hungry theoretical mind and who is yet capable of seeing the need to move past high theory to other important questions that are less bedazzling and "interesting" but more important to the prospect of our flourishing - questions such as "How is it possible to develop a citizenry that cherishes a certain hexis, one which prizes the character of the Samaritan on the road to Jericho almost more than any other?" or "How can we square the political dogma that undergirds the fantasy of a missile defense system with the need to treat America as but one member in a community of nations under a "law of peoples?"The new public philosopher might seek to understand labor law and military and trade theory and doctrine as much as theories of surplus value; the logic of international markets and trade agreements as much as critiques of commodification, and the politics of complexity as much as the politics of power (all of which can still be done from our arm chairs.) This means going down deep into the guts of our quotidian social institutions, into the grimy pragmatic details where intellectuals are loathe to dwell but where the officers and bureaucrats of those institutions take difficult and often unpleasant, imperfect decisions that affect other peoples' lives, and it means making honest attempts to truly understand how those institutions actually function in the actual world before howling for their overthrow commences. This might help keep us from **being slapped down in debates by true policy pros who actually know what they are talking about** but who lack awareness of the dogmatic assumptions from which they proceed, and who have not yet found a good reason to listen to jargon-riddled lectures from philosophers and culture critics with their snobish disrespect for the so-called "managerial class."
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### T

#### They still get all their disad links—biomethane is refined biogas, just as natural gas is the refined product of what’s extracted from the wellhead

**DENA 9**—German Energy Agency [NOTE: no date available but the last date cited is 2009]

(“Biomethane—The Smart Solution for the Future”, <http://www.xebecinc.com/pdf/biogaspartner_Infobroschuere_engl.pdf>, dml)

One of the most auspicious applications of biomass is the generation of biogas. In the beginning or 2009 roughly 4,000 plants existed, in which biogas was created through the fermentation of biomass. There is currently technology available on the market, which allows biogas to be upgraded to the quality of natural gas – so-called “biomethane” or “bio-natural gas” – and to be injected into the grid. This process allows for the replacement of conventional natural gas in many areas, thus making an important contribution to climate protection. Currently, more than 14 plants feed biomethane into the natural gas grid. Several other projects are currently being planned or constructed. For a more detailed overview visit: [www.biogaspartner.com](http://www.biogaspartner.com).

#### Their interpretation excludes solar panels and creates a stagnant and hazy interpretation of energy production

**Batelle 80** [Batelle (the world’s largest nonprofit research and development organization, specializing in global science and technology) 1980 “An Analysis of Federal Incentives Used to Stimulate Energy Production” p 22 <http://www.scribd.com/doc/67538352/Federal-Incentives-for-Energy-Production-1980>]

Discussing governmental actions in a field that lacks consistent Policy is difficult, since boundaries defining energy actions are unclear. All governmental actions probably have at least some indirect relevance to energy. if a consistent Policy did exist, the discussion could focus on those actions that are part of the planned and consistent program. For this analysis, however, boundaries must be somewhat arbitrarily defined. First, this discussion will include only those actions taken by the Federal Government; relevant actions of state and local governments are not considered. Second, the discussion covers only those Federal Government actions In which major causes include to influence energy or major effects included some Influence on energy. Within those limits, the discussion considers actions related to both production arid consumption, although production receives the most emphasis. It also includes actions relating to both increases and decreases in energy consumption or production. Energy production is defined as the transformation of natural resources into commonly used forms of energy such as heat, light, and electricity. By this definition, the shining of the sun or the running of a river are not examples of energy production, but the installation of solar panels or the construction of a hydroelectric dam are. Energy consumption is defined is the use of one of these common, manufactured forms of energy. Under this definition sunbathing Is not energy consumption, but heating water by means of a solar panel is In both definitions, the crucial ingredient is the application of technology and resources to change a natural resource into a useful energy form.

#### Aff innovation outweighs limits (not read)

**Stockton College 82** Richard Stockton College of New Jersey, Mission Statement, http://intraweb.stockton.edu/eyos/page.cfm?siteID=124&pageID=36

At Stockton we seek to help our students develop the capacity for continuous learning and the ability to adapt to changing circumstances in a multicultural and interdependent world by insisting on breadth, as well as depth, in our curriculum. We believe that the breadth inherent in an interdisciplinary approach to liberal education both prepares students for inevitable career changes, and enriches their lives. We insist on excellence in teaching and dedication to learning. These, indeed, are the guiding principles of our mission. Moreover, we recognized a responsibility not only to transmit received ideas to our students but to participate in the development of new ideas. Accordingly, we encourage continuous research, learning, and professional development for our faculty and staff. Quality academic programs are best created, developed, and maintained by a high degree of faculty and student responsibility for, and participation in, the educational process. For that reason, the College is committed to faculty-wide involvement in general education and in teaching such academic skills as writing, quantitative analysis, and logical reasoning. Breadth, then, is not only a desirable outcome for our students, but a requisite for the faculty who teach these students. To teach beyond the traditional bounds of one’s area of formal expertise, across disciplinary lines, and to interrelate the traditional disciplines, requires and extraordinary effort from faculty. It is imperative that the executive administration and the trustees provide the resources and the atmosphere, which will make such exceptional effort both possible and appreciated. Our insistence upon breadth of education for all students does not preclude an emphasis on depth of study in the major disciplines but rather, supplements it. Our academic programs must offer students a real understanding of the ideas and methods of their disciplines, including those most recently developed. Exposure to many disciplines and intensive investigation of one discipline should prepare graduates to move into appropriate fields of employment, or to continue with graduate academic or professional study. At Stockton we believe that co-curricular activities complement the academic curriculum and, along with classroom education, help students develop the capacity for making intelligent choices. While we offer students assistance in and out of the classroom, we emphasize and encourage student initiative in their co-curricular life, and responsibility for their education. We value diversity and the differing perspectives it brings. Accordingly, we are unequivocally committed to implementing the principles of affirmative action in the composition of our student body, faculty, and staff. Just as students must receive an education that is sufficiently broad to permit flexible response to changes in society, so too the College must be able to change and adapt to differing circumstances and needs in our society. In order to best fulfill our mission, we must all recognize the limitations of our resources, and respond by a prudent and flexible allocation of those resources.

### Bioterror Defense

#### No bioterror.

**Galamasa 11** [Francisco, Social Sciences Institute, Lisbon University, Lisbon, Portugal Profiling Bioterrorism: Present and Potential Threats Published in: journal Comparative Strategy, Volume 30, Issue 1 January 2011 , pages 79 – 93]

Restrictions in Terrorist Use of Biological Weapons Even with these strategic advantages, cases where terrorists have used biological weapons are rare. What are the reasons behind the absence of bioterrorist attacks? It is possible to divide these reasons between those of technical nature and those of non-technical nature. Technical Nature When planning a bioterrorist attack, the terrorists must first acquire or possess a virulent strain of a pathogen or a toxin in significant quantities. Second, specific equipment and technical knowledge of how to produce and process the biological agent efficiently are required. Third, for the pathogen or toxin to reach its target with maximum harm, it must be disseminated with an effective delivery mechanism.17 Bioterrorism skeptics base their assumptions on these main reasons. Other technical hurdles include the unpredictability present in biological weapons use due to factors such as the weather conditions and the impossibility of controlling aerosol particles containing biological agents. Although this is not a technical obstacle directly concerning biological weapons, it is possible to consider capabilities—or lack thereof—to resist detection and infiltration by governmental intelligence and secret services as another reason why we have not witnessed many bioterrorism attacks in recent years.18 Nontechnical Nature Development and dissemination of biological weapons involves a substantial amount of money. This sometimes leads to the need of bioterrorists to rely on state sponsorship in order to gain access to biological weapons. But this link may prove to be a major restriction for bioterrorists, since the state may do the utmost to avoid the use of these weapons in order to avoid retaliation from the bioterrorism victim state. Another nontechnical restriction is the fact that the incubation period takes away the reward that some terrorist groups find in the immediate casualties provided by conventional explosives. As was noted earlier, after dissemination it is impossible to control the biological weapons aerosol. This implies that pathogens may infect the targeted population as well as the terrorists' supporters. Therefore, the fear of losing local or international supporters and donors is yet another restriction in terrorist use of biological weapons.19

### Accidental Launch Defense

#### No accidental war

**Mueller** **10** - Woody Hayes chair of national security studies at Ohio State University (John, Atomic Obsession, p. 100-101)

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

### Politics UQ

#### No serious push – Obama won’t commit to specifics or a timeline

**Inside US Trade, 3/22/13** (“MARANTIS SAYS ADMINISTRATION READY TO WORK WITH CONGRESS ON FAST TRACK,” ProQuest)**Red**

Acting U.S. Trade Representative Demetrios Marantis on March 19 told the Senate Finance Committee that the administration is ready to begin work with Congress on issues related to developing a new fast-track law, also known as Trade Promotion Authority (TPA). This will include discussing potential trade negotiating objectives and the extent to which they need to address emerging challenges such as forced localization and placing disciplines on state-owned enterprises, Marantis said at a hearing on the president's trade agenda. But he did not given any indication on which objectives the administration is now considering for labor, environmental and intellectual property provisions, **despite repeated efforts by senators to pin him down.** For example, Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-MT) asked Marantis to what extent a new fast-track law should reflect the standards of the so-called May 10, 2007, agreement between Congress and the Bush administration. The agreement spells out labor, environmental and intellectual property protection standards for free trade agreements the U.S. negotiates. Baucus implied that he wants to change the terms of the agreement by saying the "world's changed a lot since 2007." He also said some members want to weaken the terms of the 2007 agreement while others want to strengthen it. "There is a diversity of interests on this committee and ... elsewhere on what our trade negotiating objectives under TPA should look like," Marantis responded. "It's a conversation that ... we need to have together, and we're ready to begin having that conversation with you now." **Marantis offered nothing but a general commitment to work on fast-track issues.** "We've heard your calls on this issue loud and clear, and we're ready to begin our work," Marantis said. "It is in our mutual interest to use TPA as a tool to support a job-focused agenda." He stuck with this answer despite repeated requests from various senators that he provide specifics on **substance or timelines.** He said once the administration was ready to begin work "now." Rhetorically, Marantis' statements to the committee seemed more emphatic than the statements in President Obama's Trade Policy Agenda issued on March 1. "To facilitate the conclusion, approval, and implementation of market-opening negotiating efforts, we will also work with Congress on Trade Promotion Authority," the report said. "Such authority will guide current and future negotiations, and will thus support a jobs-focused trade agenda moving forward." Sen. Rob Portman (R-OH) noted that the same commitment reflected in the agenda was previously made by then-USTR Ron Kirk **without any followup**, despite Finance Committee outreach. "So I am assuring all my staff that this time you're sincere," Portman said. Sen. Sherrod Brown (D-OH) questioned Marantis about how the fast-track law will address the current U.S. trade balance that he said is a "drag" on U.S. economic growth. He said the focus on U.S. exports without examining imports over the past two decades by administrations of both parties has led to a record trade deficit. In response, Marantis offered to work with him and the committee, and reiterated that the administration is enforcing trade laws and rights under trade agreements by, for example, challenging prohibited subsidies in the World Trade Organization. Brown asked Marantis why the administration does not apply its calculation that $1 billion in exports creates 5,200 jobs to imports, saying that $1 billion in imports loses 5,200 jobs. Marantis responded that the "picture with imports" is not as clear cut as it is with exports because more than 50 percent of the imports that come into the U.S. are re-exported. "So there is not that same one-to-one correlation" between jobs and imports as there is with exports, he said. To illustrate his point, Brown said that on the anniversary of the U.S.-Korea FTA, the administration noted the increase in car exports but neglected to state that imports of Korean cars are up by almost $2 billion from the year before. He said that is the reason for the caution with which he and Sen. Debbie Stabenow (D-MI) approach the fact that Japan will join the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) talks. In his opening statement, Baucus highlighted the need for a renewal of the fast-track law in light of the ambitious negotiating agenda the administration has laid out. "TPA is a key negotiating tool that will help bring these trade agreements to a successful conclusion," Baucus said. But he clearly **linked fast-track to the renewal of the Trade Adjustment Assistance** (TAA) program, which will expire this year. "TPA and TAA are two sides of the same coin, making trade work," he said. "We need to renew and extend both of them this year." TAA is a program that retrains workers that have lost their jobs due to trade. **But Marantis did not expressly endorse the renewal of TAA** and talked more generally about providing Americans impacted by trade and others with employment services.

#### Democrats and labor groups oppose

**Abrams, 3/11/13** (Jim, “Congress wants role as Obama pushes trade agenda,” Mercury News, http://www.mercurynews.com/breaking-news/ci\_22763343/congress-wants-role-obama-pushes-trade-agenda)**Red**

Members of Obama's **Democratic Party tend to oppose TPA**, arguing that trade pacts negotiated by past administrations have resulted in job losses in America and given short shrift to environmental and labor and human rights issues. The last TPA law was passed in 2002 by the slimmest of margins, with House votes of 215-214 and 215-212. More than 300 labor and environmental groups, in a letter last week opposing the Trans-Pacific talks, **said no TPA legislation should be considered** without a thorough assessment of how a trade deal will affect job creation, environmental and labor rights, food sovereignty, access to medicine and other issues.

### Thumpers

#### Perez fights are huge and spillover into Obama’s agenda

Franco Ordonez (writer for McClatchy Newspapers) March 18, 2013 “Confirmation fight looms for Labor Secretary nominee Thomas Perez” http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2013/03/18/186226/confirmation-fight-looms-for-labor.html

The road to confirmation will likely be long and difficult for the first Latino picked to serve in President Barack Obama’s Cabinet during his second term.¶ The Obama administration on Monday tapped Thomas Perez, the assistant attorney general for civil rights at the Justice Department, to lead the Department of Labor.¶ Seen as an unabashed advocate for immigrant rights and other liberal causes, Perez is expected to play a leading role in Obama’s efforts to overhaul immigration laws and raise the minimum wage.¶ Opponents are planning to block his nomination by painting him as a poster boy for big government who pushes an intrusive agenda, and they already have a bill of particulars prepared: that he blocked laws in Texas and South Carolina that require photo IDs at the polls and that a recent critical report by the Justice Department inspector general found that his division suffered from “deep ideological polarization.”¶ “This is an unfortunate and needlessly divisive nomination,” said Sen. Jeff Sessions, R-Ala., a senior member of the Senate Judiciary committee, which overseas the Justice Department. “The top priority of the secretary of labor should be to create jobs and higher wages for American workers. But Mr. Perez has aggressively sought ways to allow the hiring of more illegal workers.”¶ Speaking from the East Room of the White House, Obama described the Harvard University-trained lawyer born to immigrant parents from the Dominican Republic as a dedicated public servant whose upbringing and success “reminds us of this country’s promise.”¶ “If you’re willing to work hard, it doesn’t matter who you are, where you come from, what your last name is, you can make it if you try,” the president said. “And Tom has made protecting that promise, for everybody, the cause of his life.”¶ Before becoming the nation’s civil rights enforcer, Perez served as Maryland’s labor secretary for two years. He also served in the Health and Human Services Department’s civil rights office under President Bill Clinton and was an aide to the late Sen. Edward Kennedy, D-Mass.¶ If he’s confirmed, Perez will replace another Latino, outgoing Secretary Hilda Solis, who resigned after Obama’s first term. Latino groups concerned about a lack of diversity in the Cabinet praised Perez’s selection. Labor groups see him as an ally.¶ Cathy Ruckelshaus, legal co-director at the National Employment Law Project who worked with Perez in Maryland, said he knew how to balance the needs of unions and employers.¶ “He’s pretty unique,” Ruckelshaus said. “He’s balanced and fair, but also has a lot of passion for laws he’s called upon to enforce.”¶ His confirmation is no sure thing, foreshadowing another possibly nasty fight for an administration that’s had to battle – and even retreat from the field – for some of its recent nominees. Obama withdrew U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice’s name for secretary of state after she became embroiled in a controversy surrounding the fatal Libyan consulate attack last September. Former Republican Sen. Chuck Hagel endured a bruising Senate hearing before being confirmed as secretary of defense.¶ “Detractors are likely to claim he’s an aggressive advocate of race-conscious civil rights policies and that he’s also not sufficiently protective of the rights of American citizen workers,” said Rogers Smith, a political science professor at the University of Pennsylvania.¶ Some Republicans already are planning to block his nomination. Sen. David Vitter, R-La., plans to hold it hostage until the Department of Justice responds to his 2011 letter about what he said was spotty enforcement of the National Voter Registration Act in Louisiana.¶ “Perez was greatly involved in the DOJ’s partisan full-court press to pressure Louisiana’s secretary of state to only enforce one side of the law – the side that specifically benefits the politics of the president and his administration, at the expense of identity security of each and every Louisianan on the voter rolls,” Vitter said in a statement.¶ If Perez makes it to the confirmation process, he’ll be asked about his opposition to voter ID laws in South Carolina – which the courts upheld, but only with certain changes – and in Texas, which the court blocked, saying the law would hurt minority voting and place a burden on the poor. Republicans, who have argued that the laws are needed to prevent fraud, saw the move as political.¶ Perez very likely will be asked about his earlier work as the president of the board of Casa de Maryland, an immigration advocacy group, which Sessions described as a “fringe advocacy group.”¶ Perez’s division also sued popular pro-immigration enforcement sheriffs such as Joe Arpaio of Arizona’s Maricopa County and Terry Johnson of North Carolina’s Alamance County, accusing them of racially profiling Latinos.¶ The nomination process will be further complicated by a recent inspector general report that criticized Perez’s division for “deep ideological polarization” and a “lack of professionalism,” including leaks and harassment.¶

### Politics Links

#### Ag disputes destroy the deal

Butler and Melvin, 3/23/13 (“New US-EU talks threatened by agriculture spats,” AP, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5iZVV8rJyZEjQn7o7lSSMeOowzg5g?docId=f12bbdb95d474bff825b0f5248ec78ef)Red

WASHINGTON (AP) — President Barack Obama used Washington's grandest stage — the State of the Union speech — to announce negotiations with Europe aimed at creating the world's largest free trade agreement. Just weeks later, there are signs that old agriculture disputes could be deal-killers. European Union leaders don't want the negotiations to include discussions on their restrictions on genetically modified crops and other regulations that keep U.S. farm products out of Europe. But Obama says it's hard to imagine an agreement that doesn't address those issues. Powerful U.S. agricultural lobbies will do their best to make sure Congress rejects any pact that fails to address the restrictions. "Any free trade agreement that doesn't cover agriculture is in trouble," said Cathleen Enright, executive vice president at the Biotechnology Industry Organization, which promotes biotechnology, including genetically modified products. That would threaten the dream of a behemoth free trade deal between the world's two largest trading partners that together account for more than half of the world economy. It would lower tariffs and remove other trade barriers for most industries. Some analysts say the deal could boost each economy by more than a half-percentage point annually and significantly lower the cost of goods and services for consumers. Agricultural issues have long bedeviled attempts to expand free trade across the Atlantic and have led each side to file complaints against the other before the World Trade Organization, an arbitrator in trade disputes. While the U.S. protests EU restrictions, Europeans want the U.S. to reduce agricultural subsidies. Genetically modified organisms, or GMOs, have been a core part of the dispute. Agricultural scientists change the genetic makeup of agricultural products to improve their quality and boost production. In Europe, there is widespread public opposition to GMOs. The EU argues that the risks of altering the genetic pool are unknown. It has strict rules and imposes a heavy burden of proof before such crops can be grown or imported in the EU. U.S. companies say that genetically modified products have been proved safe by scientific studies and are being excluded based on irrational fears. They accuse Europe of trying to help their own farmers by keeping out American products. While they have little expectation that the EU would end the restrictions, they say it would be a victory if it clarified what it describes as opaque rules and also set timelines for considering products. Regulators now take what they call a precautionary approach, declining approval of products until they can be more certain of their safety. But any move to water down the regulations could provoke a backlash in Europe. "My reading of the mood in Europe around genetically modified crops is that it's extremely negative," said Paul DeGrauwe, a professor of economics at the London School of Economics. "It's going to be very difficult." Indeed, the top EU trade negotiator, Commissioner Karel De Gucht, seemed to rule out a compromise in remarks this month: "A future deal will not change the existing legislation. Let me repeat: no change." The U.S. and the EU have similarly intractable disagreements on what the two sides call sanitary issues in meats. U.S. poultry products are restricted in the EU because U.S. companies use chlorine to sanitize the meat. Pork is also restricted because U.S. farmers use a feed additive that makes pigs leaner. The two sides partially resolved disputes over U.S. beef after an agreement that U.S. farmers would restrict hormones in cows intended for the European market. Some European officials say the agricultural differences should be discussed after a major trade deal is completed. This month, French President Francois Hollande called for excluding sensitive issues, including the sanitary standards, from the talks. In the past, France has been among the most adamant of the European countries about protecting agricultural interests. Obama, in a talk with his export council this month, suggested this could be a deal-breaker. "There are certain countries whose agricultural sector is very strong, who tended to block at critical junctures the kinds of broad-based trade agreements that would make it a good deal for us," he said. "If one of the areas where we've got the greatest comparative advantage is cordoned off from an overall trade deal, it's very hard to get something going." Powerful U.S. agricultural groups could probably block a trade deal from winning approval in Congress. In interviews, representatives of many of these groups said they would oppose a deal that didn't address the regulatory differences. Robert Thompson, an academic at Johns Hopkins University and a former economist for the Agriculture Department, said that the agricultural issues could easily upend the talks. "I'm not expecting an agreement to emerge any time soon," he said. "I'm thinking years."

#### Farm lobby key to the agenda.

**Washington Post 8-2**. (Washington Post, “Prodding the Liberal Agenda with a Pitchfork” http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/07/24/AR2009072402092.html 8-2-09)

Climate change legislation was moving along in the House in June when it ran into a tractorcade. Dozens of farm-state lawmakers, led by the blunt-talking Minnesotan who chairs the House Agriculture Committee, blocked the way.

Only after Democratic leaders agreed to a raft of changes drawn up by Rep. Collin Peterson (D-Minn.) did the bill squeak through the House, 219 to 212.

It was a striking demonstration of agricultural interests stamping their imprint on key parts of the Democratic program. That may come as a surprise to those who thought the "farm bloc" disappeared sometime around the end of the Eisenhower administration. In fact, its clout has been reshaping -- and in some cases halting -- the ambitious agenda of President Obama and Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.).

A bloc of moderate-to-conservative rural Democrats in both houses now holds the fate of health-care legislation in its hands. Meanwhile, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the nation's largest farm organization, has vowed to kill the climate change bill in the Senate. And last week, farm groups forced significant changes in food safety legislation by limiting the Food and Drug Administration's role in tracing suspected pathogens back to farms.

You might call these newly empowered farm-state lawmakers the Agracrats. They're Democrats, all right. In the House, many of them are newcomers who defeated Republicans in 2006 or 2008. In the Senate, Democrats have 12 of the 18 seats in the central farm belt and northern Great Plains.

And while their influence is hardly new -- over the years the farm bloc has fought off efforts to reduce farm subsidies and, in the 1990s, to raise gasoline mileage requirements for cars and trucks -- this latest rise of the Agracrats poses a dilemma for the Democratic Party. Rebuilding the urban-rural coalition that enabled Democrats to control Congress for most of the final two-thirds of the last century has been a major achievement. Last year, 49 House Democrats were elected in districts carried by the Republican presidential candidate, Sen. John McCain (Ariz.). But Agracrats are putting the needs of farmers, ranchers and rural communities ahead of party loyalty, often to the chagrin of more liberal lawmakers.

### States

#### State biogas incentives lead to a race to the bottom—federal incentives are key

**Hay and Forage 5** (No author, 1 September 2005, “Biogas power faces hurdles,” http://hayandforage.com/mag/farming\_biogas\_power\_faces\_2/, RBatra)

Some say legislation is the only way to force cooperation and reasonable pricing. That's what New York did in 2002 after the governor championed a law favoring farm-based biogas generation. New York's “net metering” law could provide a good working model for other states. Tom Fiesenger, research and development specialist with the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, says the law provides a specific process for hooking into the system, payment rates, and the many other details. At press time, California was forging similar legislation, though without some beneficial components of the New York law. At last viewing, California's proposed legislation didn't provide retail price or fee elimination. It also had less rigorous requirements on the electrical companies. On the other hand, the mere presence of such a law in a state, or of net metering agreements enumerated by power companies, doesn't mean a farm-based biogas generator can be run profitably. A net metering law won't force fair or favorable treatment unless written specifically to do so. Many states have such laws that apply to wind power, solar power and even fuel cells, but not biomass or anaerobic digestion. The biogas energy industry needs federal subsidies/incentives to compete with all the other subsidized energy segments, says Ken Krich, project manager for Sustainable Conservation's dairy methane digester energy program. New York's net metering law does that by providing farm-based biogas generators a retail price for the electricity they produce above their own needs, and by eliminating obstructive fees. Any legislation that effectively fosters biogas electrical generation must do all these things, say biogas industry supporters. Such laws will only come, however, if farmers push for them.

#### Specificity to biogas is key—impossible to make market predictions otherwise

**Bramley et al 11**—Department of Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning, Tufts

(Julia, with Lum Fobi, Cammy Peterson, Lydia Rainville, Jeff Cheng-Hao Shih, Axum Teferra, and Rose Yuan Wang, “AGRICULTURAL BIOGAS IN THE UNITED STATES”, <http://ase.tufts.edu/uep/degrees/field_project_reports/2011/Team_6_Final_Report.pdf>, dml)

The background, technology, permitting, utility interconnection, and financing areas were comprehensively examined. They appear here in the report to provide a coherent and thorough context from which to understand the paths to market, the entry barriers, the market operations, and the reality on the ground for farmers, vendors, and policymakers in the four selected foci states. Neither the market research nor the data and anecdotal evidence collected from stakeholders would be meaningful without understanding the regulations, utility requirements, and funding hoops with which one is presented when developing an AD facility. All of these factors greatly affect the current market in each state.

#### Federal oversight’s critical

**NDRC 11**—Natural Resources Defense Council

(“RENEWABLE ENERGY FOR AMERICA”, <http://www.nrdc.org/energy/renewables/biogas.asp>, dml)

A single CAFO can generate as much waste as a small to midsized city, and can affect the water supply and air quality of an area that extends far beyond the operation itself. There is very little government oversight of these operations -- the EPA does not have a definitive national list -- and they pose very real risks to air and water quality. By capturing manure, biogas recovery systems can drastically reduce or eliminate untreated waste runoff from CAFOs, but in the end, strong environmental protections and government oversight of CAFOs are needed to ensure that the risks of polluted runoff are mitigated.

#### State policies will conflict which kills commercialization—empirically proven—national policy is key

-from an independent government-sponsored study

**NREL 12**—national laboratory of the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy

(“Biogas and Fuel Cells Workshop Summary Report”, Proceedings from the Biogas and Fuel Cells Workshop Golden, Colorado June 11–13, 2012, dml)

Participants agreed that policies and incentives should enable loans to be structured to allow for payback of project capital over longer periods of time than conventional technologies. In addition, while qualification of biomethane under RPS is beneficial, more incentives that help to offset biogas fuel cell project costs are needed until full commercialization is realized. Few states offer specific incentives or requirements for source separation or collection of organic waste. State policies and incentives vary and often conflict, in terms of their definition of “renewable” (e.g., landfill gas is frequently excluded from RPS) and in terms of options for biomethane transport (i.e., what quality standards must be met in order for it to be injected into the natural gas pipeline). National standards are needed to help clarify these definitions. Policies for utility interconnection, net metering, and wheeling also vary from state to state, and can affect a project’s viability.