### Elections

#### Obama is winning but it will be close and it’s reversible – popularity is key

**Brownstein, 9/21/12** - a two-time finalist for the Pulitzer Prize for his coverage of presidential campaigns, is National Journal Group's Editorial Director, in charge of long-term editorial strategy.(Ronald, National Journal, “Heartland Monitor Poll: Obama Leads 50 Percent to 43 Percent” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/2012-presidential-campaign/heartland-monitor-poll-obama-leads-50-percent-to-43-percent-20120921?page=1>)

President Obama has opened a solid lead over Mitt Romney by largely reassembling the “coalition of the ascendant” that powered the Democrat to his landmark 2008 victory, the latest Allstate/National Journal Heartland Monitor Poll has found.¶ The survey found Obama leading Romney by 50 percent to 43 percent among likely voters, with key groups in the president’s coalition such as minorities, young people, and upscale white women providing him support comparable to their levels in 2008.¶ The survey, conducted by Ed Reilly and Jeremy Ruch of FTI Communications, a communications and strategic consulting firm, surveyed 1,055 likely voters by landline and cell phone from Sept. 15-19. It has a margin of error of plus or minus 3 percentage points. Full results from the survey, including a detailed look at Americans’ attitudes about opportunity and upward mobility, will be released in the Sept. 22 National Journal.¶ The Heartland Monitor’s results are in line with most other national surveys in recent days showing Obama establishing a measurable lead, including this week’s new Pew Research Center and NBC/Wall Street Journal polls. The saving grace for Republicans is that even as these surveys show Obama opening a consistent advantage, the president has not been able to push his support much past the critical 50 percent level, even after several difficult weeks for Romney that began with a poorly reviewed GOP convention. That suggests the president faces continued skepticism from many voters that could allow Romney to draw a second wind if he can stabilize his tempest-tossed campaign.¶ The poll found Obama benefiting from a small increase in optimism about the country’s direction. Among likely voters, 37 percent said the country was moving in the right direction. Even looking at all adults, the "right track" number now stands at 35 percent, its best showing since the April 2010 Heartland Monitor.¶ Obama’s approval rating in the new survey also ticked up to 50 percent, with 46 percent disapproving. That’s a slight improvement from May, when the survey of all adults found 47 percent approving and 48 percent disapproving. Among all adults, Obama’s rating improved to 49 percent approving and 45 percent disapproving, also one of his best showings since January 2010.¶ Those gains are critical, because as always with an incumbent president, attitudes toward Obama’s performance powerfully shape the race. Among likely voters who approve of Obama’s job performance, he leads Romney in the ballot test by 93 percent to 3 percent; those who disapprove prefer Romney by 87 percent to 5 percent.

#### Obama is promoting an “all of the above” energy strategy – this allows him to distance himself from prior renewables scandals. The plan makes Obama a target and will cost him the election

**Farnam, 12** (T.W., Washington Post, 6/27, “Energy ads flood TV in swing states,”

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/energy-ads/2012/06/27/gJQAD5MR7V_story.html>

Energy issues don’t spark much excitement among voters, ranking below health care, education and the federal budget deficit — not to mention jobs and the economy.

And yet those same voters are being flooded this year with campaign ads on energy policy. **Particularly in presidential swing states**, the airwaves are laden with messages boosting oil drilling and natural gas and hammering President Obama **for his support of green energy**. The Cleveland area alone has heard $2.7 million in energy-related ads.

The disconnect between what voters say they care about and what they’re seeing on TV lies in the money behind the ads, much of it coming from oil and gas interests. Those funders get the double benefit of attacking Obama at the same time they are promoting their industry.

Democrats also have spent millions on the subject, defending the president’s record and tying Republican candidate Mitt Romney to “Big Oil.”

Overall, more than $41 million, about one in four of the dollars spent on broadcast advertising in the presidential campaign, has gone to ads mentioning energy, more than a host of other subjects and just as much as health care, according to ad-tracking firm Kantar Media/Cmag.

In an election focused heavily on jobs and the economy, all of this attention to energy seems a bit off topic. But the stakes are high for energy producers and environmentalists, who are squared off over how much the government should regulate the industry. And attention has been heightened by a recent boom in production using new technologies such as fracking and horizontal drilling, as well as a spike in gas prices this spring just as the general election got underway.

When asked whether energy is important, more than half of voters say yes, according to recent polls. But asked to rank their top issues, fewer than 1 percent mention energy.

Still, so much spending focused on a topic low on the public agenda should not be a surprise, given the interest of the ad sponsors, said Bob Biersack, a senior fellow at the nonpartisan Center for Responsive Politics.

“It’s always been true that people’s financial involvement in politics tends to reinforce their self-interest,” he said.

The policy debate coincides with a flurry of criticism of the Obama administration’s loan guarantee for Solyndra, a bankrupt solar-power company that defaulted on more than $500 million. Among the company’s investors was the family foundation of a major donor to Obama.

“Half a billion in taxpayer money gone, and Obama said this was a model of growth,” says an ad from the conservative group Americans for Prosperity. “Tell President Obama that workers aren’t pawns in your political games.”

Obama spokesman Ben LaBolt said the campaign welcomed the fight over the administration’s energy policies, saying the president can win on the merits.

“This debate has offered us the chance to highlight the success of the president’s all-of-the-above energy strategy – domestic oil production at a 12-year high and our dependence on foreign oil at a 16-year low, domestic natural gas production at an all-time high and doubling our renewable energy production,” LaBolt said.

Republicans are also attacking Obama for rejecting permits for the proposed Keystone XL pipeline, which would carry oil from tar sands in Canada to refineries on the Gulf Coast. Romney opened the general election with an ad prominently featuring the Keystone issue, with the candidate saying he would reverse Obama and approve the pipeline on his first day in office.

Americans for Prosperity, one of the major funders of the ads, has sponsored five television spots against Obama, two of them focused on Solyndra and another critical of government spending on clean energy.

The organization, which has promoted tea party candidates, has devoted more than 90 percent of its ad spending to energy-related commercials, according to Kantar.

The Obama campaign and other Democrats have been critical of the group, saying, among other things, that its billionaire backers, brothers Charles and David Koch, are using it to promote the interests of the chemical conglomerate they own. David Koch is a founder and chairman of the organization. A Koch spokesman declined to comment.

Obama answered Americans for Prosperity’s message in his first ad of the campaign.

“Secretive oil billionaires attacking president Obama with ads fact checkers say are not tethered to the facts,” a narrator says in the spot.

Tim Phillips, president of Americans for Prosperity, said the group focused on Solyndra because the firm’s federal loan guarantee exemplifies cronyism and big government, with bureaucrats choosing economic winners and losers in the way they dole out public money.

“To us, Solyndra encapsulates everything that’s wrong with the economic policies of President Obama,” Phillips said. “It’s not just the energy, although the energy is important.”

The group also ran millions of dollars of advertising in 2009 and 2010 opposing the president’s health-care plan, Phillips said.

All of these messages could very well do what their funders have in mind and shape public opinion, tarring renewable energy as a government boondoggle, said Kathleen Hall Jamieson, director of the Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania.

“Ads can create an agenda-setting effect and frame an issue,” she said. “If renewable energy comes to be seen as Solyndra, that’s a problem for that sector, not simply for future government investment in that sector.”

#### Romney causes massive foreign backlash and nuclear wars around the globe

Doug Bandow 5-15-2012; Doug Bandow is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute and former special assistant to President Ronald Reagan. “Mitt Romney: The Foreign Policy of Know-Nothingism” http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/mitt-romney-foreign-policy-knownothingism

Romney’s overall theme is American exceptionalism and greatness, slogans that win public applause but offer no guidance for a bankrupt superpower that has squandered its international credibility. “This century must be an American century,” Romney proclaimed. “In an American century, America leads the free world and the free world leads the entire world.” He has chosen a mix of advisers, including the usual neocons and uber-hawks — Robert Kagan, Eliot Cohen, Jim Talent, Walid Phares, Kim Holmes, and Daniel Senor, for instance — that gives little reason for comfort. Their involvement suggests Romney’s general commitment to an imperial foreign policy and force structure. Romney is no fool, but he has never demonstrated much interest in international affairs. He brings to mind George W. Bush, who appeared to be largely ignorant of the nations he was invading. Romney may be temperamentally less likely to combine recklessness with hubris, but he would have just as strong an incentive to use foreign aggression to win conservative acquiescence to domestic compromise. This tactic worked well for Bush, whose spendthrift policies received surprisingly little criticism on the right from activists busy defending his war-happy foreign policy. The former Massachusetts governor has criticized President Obama for “a naked political calculation or simply sheer ineptitude” in following George W. Bush’s withdrawal timetable in Iraq and for not overriding the decision of a government whose independence Washington claims to respect. But why would any American policymaker want to keep troops in a nation that is becoming ever more authoritarian, corrupt, and sectarian? It is precisely the sort of place U.S. forces should not be tied down. In contrast, Romney has effectively taken no position on Afghanistan. At times he appears to support the Obama timetable for reducing troop levels, but he has also proclaimed that “Withdrawal of U.S. forces from Afghanistan under a Romney administration will be based on conditions on the ground as assessed by our military commanders.” Indeed, he insisted: “To defeat the insurgency in Afghanistan, the United States will need the cooperation of both the Afghan and Pakistani governments — we will only persuade Afghanistan and Pakistan to be resolute if they are convinced that the United States will itself be resolute,” and added, “We should not negotiate with the Taliban. We should defeat the Taliban.” Yet it’s the job of the president, not the military, to decide the basic policy question: why is the U.S. spending blood and treasure trying to create a Western-style nation state in Central Asia a decade after 9/11? And how long is he prepared to stay — forever? On my two trips to Afghanistan I found little support among Afghans for their own government, which is characterized by gross incompetence and corruption. Even if the Western allies succeed in creating a large local security force, will it fight for the thieves in Kabul? Pakistan is already resolute — in opposing U.S. policy on the ground. Afghans forthrightly view Islamabad as an enemy. Unfortunately, continuing the war probably is the most effective way to destabilize nuclear-armed Pakistan. What will Romney do if the U.S. military tells him that American combat forces must remain in Afghanistan for another decade or two in order to “win”? The ongoing AfPak conflict is not enough; Romney appears to desire war with Iran as well. No one wants a nuclear Iran, but Persian nuclear ambitiions began under America’s ally the Shah, and there is no reason to believe that the U.S. (and Israel) cannot deter Tehran. True, Richard Grenell, who briefly served as Romney’s foreign-policy spokesman, once made the astonishing claim that the Iranians “will surely use” nuclear weapons. Alas, he never shared his apparently secret intelligence about the leadership in Tehran’s suicidal tendencies. The Iranian government’s behavior has been rational even if brutal, and officials busy maneuvering for power and wealth do not seem eager to enter the great beyond. Washington uneasily but effectively deterred Joseph Stalin and Mao Zedong, the two most prolific mass murderers in history. Iran is no substitute for them. Romney has engaged in almost infantile ridicule of the Obama administration’s attempt to engage Tehran. Yet the U.S. had diplomatic relations with Hitler’s Germany and Stalin’s Russia. Washington came to regret not having similar contact with Mao’s China. Even the Bush administration eventually decided that ignoring Kim Jong-Il’s North Korea only encouraged it to build more nuclear weapons faster. Regarding Iran, Romney asserted, “a military option to deal with their nuclear program remains on the table.” Building up U.S. military forces “will send an unequivocal signal to Iran that the United States, acting in concert with allies, will never permit Iran to obtain nuclear weapons... Only when the ayatollahs no longer have doubts about America’s resolve will they abandon their nuclear ambitions.” Indeed, “if all else fails... then of course you take military action,” even though, American and Iranian military analysts warn, such strikes might only delay development of nuclear weapons. “Elect me as the next president,” he declared, and Iran “will not have a nuclear weapon.” Actually, if Tehran becomes convinced that an attack and attempted regime change are likely, it will have no choice but to develop nuclear weapons. How else to defend itself? The misguided war in Libya, which Romney supported, sent a clear signal to both North Korea and Iran never to trust the West. Iran’s fears likely are exacerbated by Romney’s promise to subcontract Middle East policy to Israel. The ties between the U.S. and Israel are many, but their interests often diverge. The current Israeli government wants Washington to attack Iran irrespective of the cost to America. Moreover, successive Israeli governments have decided to effectively colonize the West Bank, turning injustice into state policy and making a separate Palestinian state practically impossible. Perceived American support for this creates enormous hostility toward the U.S. across the Arab and Muslim worlds. Yet Romney promises that his first foreign trip would be to Israel “to show the world that we care about that country and that region” — as if anyone anywhere, least of all Israel’s neighbors, doesn’t realize that. He asserted that “you don’t allow an inch of space to exist between you and your friends and allies,” notably Israel. The U.S. should “let the entire world know that we will stay with them and that we will support them and defend them.” Indeed, Romney has known Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu for nearly four decades and has said that he would request Netanyahu’s approval for U.S. policies: “I’d get on the phone to my friend Bibi Netanyahu and say, ‘Would it help if I say this? What would you like me to do?’” Americans would be better served by a president committed to making policy in the interests of the U.S. instead. Romney’s myopic vision is just as evident when he looks elsewhere. For instance, he offered the singular judgment that Russia is “our number one geopolitical foe.” Romney complained that “across the board, it has been a thorn in our side on questions vital to America’s national security.” The Cold War ended more than two decades ago. Apparently Romney is locked in a time warp. Moscow manifestly does not threaten vital U.S. interests. Romney claimed that Vladimir “Putin dreams of ‘rebuilding the Russian empire’.” Even if Putin has such dreams, they don’t animate Russian foreign policy. No longer an ideologically aggressive power active around the world, Moscow has retreated to the status of a pre-1914 great power, concerned about border security and international respect. Russia has no interest in conflict with America and is not even much involved in most regions where the U.S. is active: Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America. Moscow has been helpful in Afghanistan, refused to provide advanced air defense weapons to Iran, supported some sanctions against Tehran, used its limited influence in North Korea to encourage nuclear disarmament, and opposes jihadist terrorism. This is curious behavior for America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” Romney’s website explains that he will “implement a strategy that will seek to discourage aggressive or expansionist behavior on the part of Russia,” but other than Georgia where is it so acting? And even if Georgia fell into a Russian trap, Tbilisi started the shooting in 2008. In any event, absent an American security guarantee, which would be madness, the U.S. cannot stop Moscow from acting to protect what it sees as vital interests in a region of historic influence. Where else is Russia threatening America? Moscow does oppose NATO expansion, which actually is foolish from a U.S. standpoint as well, adding strategic liabilities rather than military strengths. Russia strongly opposes missile defense bases in Central and Eastern Europe, but why should Washington subsidize the security of others? Moscow opposes an attack on Iran, and so should Americans. Russia backs the Assad regime in Syria, but the U.S. government once declared the same government to be “reformist.” Violent misadventures in Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya demonstrate that America has little to gain and much to lose from another attempt at social engineering through war. If anything, the Putin government has done Washington a favor keeping the U.S. out of Syria. This doesn’t mean America should not confront Moscow when important differences arise. But treating Russia as an adversary risks encouraging it to act like one. Doing so especially will make Moscow more suspicious of America’s relationships with former members of the Warsaw Pact and republics of the Soviet Union. Naturally, Romney wants to “encourage democratic political and economic reform” in Russia — a fine idea in theory, but meddling in another country’s politics rarely works in practice. Just look at the Arab Spring. Not content with attempting to start a mini-Cold War, Mitt Romney dropped his nominal free-market stance to demonize Chinese currency practices. He complained about currency manipulation and forced technology transfers: “China seeks advantage through systematic exploitation of other economies.” On day one as president he promises to designate “China as the currency manipulator it is.” Moreover, he added, he would “take a holistic approach to addressing all of China’s abuses. That includes unilateral actions such as increased enforcement of U.S. trade laws, punitive measures targeting products and industries that rely on misappropriations of our intellectual property, reciprocity in government procurement, and countervailing duties against currency manipulation. It also includes multilateral actions to block technology transfers into China and to create a trading bloc open only for nations genuinely committed to free trade.” Romney’s apparent belief that Washington is “genuinely committed to free trade” is charming nonsense. The U.S. has practiced a weak dollar policy to increase exports. Washington long has subsidized American exports: the Export-Import Bank is known as “Boeing’s Bank” and U.S. agricultural export subsidies helped torpedo the Doha round of trade liberalization through the World Trade Organization. Of course, Beijing still does much to offend Washington. However, the U.S. must accommodate the rising power across the Pacific. Trying to keep China out of a new Asia-Pacific trade pact isn’t likely to work. America’s Asian allies want us to protect them — no surprise! — but are not interested in offending their nearby neighbor with a long memory. The best hope for moderating Chinese behavior is to tie it into a web of international institutions that provide substantial economic, political, and security benefits. Beijing already has good reason to be paranoid of the superpower which patrols bordering waters, engages in a policy that looks like containment, and talks of the possibility of war. Trying to isolate China economically would be taken as a direct challenge. Romney would prove Henry Kissinger’s dictum that even paranoids have enemies. Naturally, Romney also wants to “maintain appropriate military capabilities to discourage any aggressive or coercive behavior by China against its neighbors.” However, 67 years after the end of World War II, it is time for Beijing’s neighbors to arm themselves and cooperate with each other. Japan long had the second largest economy on earth. India is another rising power with reason to constrain China. South Korea has become a major power. Australia has initiated a significant military build-up. Many Southeast Asian nations are constructing submarines to help deter Chinese adventurism. Even Russia has much to fear from China, given the paucity of population in its vast eastern territory. But America’s foreign-defense dole discourages independence and self-help. The U.S. should step back as an off-shore balancer, encouraging its friends to do more and work together. It is not America’s job to risk Los Angeles for Tokyo, Seoul, or Taipei. Romney similarly insists on keeping the U.S. on the front lines against North Korea, even though all of its neighbors have far more at stake in a peaceful peninsula and are able to contain that impoverished wreck of a country. The Romney campaign proclaims: “Mitt Romney will commit to eliminating North Korea’s nuclear weapons and its nuclear-weapons infrastructure.” Alas, everything he proposes has been tried before, from tougher sanctions to tighter interdiction and pressure on China to isolate the North. What does he plan on doing when Pyongyang continues to develop nuclear weapons as it has done for the last 20 years? The American military should come home from Korea. Romney complained that the North’s nuclear capability “poses a direct threat to U.S. forces on the Korean Peninsula and elsewhere in East Asia.” Then withdraw them. Manpower-rich South Korea doesn’t need U.S. conventional support, and ground units do nothing to contain North Korea’s nuclear ambitions. Pull out American troops and eliminate North Korea’s primary threat to the U.S. Then support continuing non-proliferation efforts led by those nations with the most to fear from the North. That strategy, more than lobbying by Washington, is likely to bring China around. Romney confuses dreams with reality when criticizing President Obama over the administration’s response to the Arab Spring. “We’re facing an Arab Spring which is out of control in some respects,” he said, “because the president was not as strong as he needed to be in encouraging our friends to move toward representative forms of government.” Romney asked: “How can we try and improve the odds so what happens in Libya and what happens in Egypt and what happens in other places where the Arab Spring is in full bloom so that the developments are toward democracy, modernity and more representative forms of government? This we simply don’t know.” True, the president doesn’t know. But neither does Mitt Romney. The latter suffers from the delusion that bright Washington policymakers can remake the world. Invade another country, turn it into a Western-style democracy allied with America, and everyone will live happily every after. But George W. Bush, a member of Mitt Romney’s own party, failed miserably trying to do that in both Afghanistan and Iraq. The Arab Spring did not happen because of Washington policy but in spite of Washington policy. And Arabs demanding political freedom — which, unfortunately, is not the same as a liberal society — have not the slightest interest in what Barack Obama or Mitt Romney thinks. Yet the latter wants “convene a summit that brings together world leaders, donor organizations, and young leaders of groups that espouse” all the wonderful things that Americans do. Alas, does he really believe that such a gathering will stop, say, jihadist radicals from slaughtering Coptic Christians? Iraq’s large Christian community was destroyed even as the U.S. military occupied that country. His summit isn’t likely to be any more effective. Not everything in the world is about Washington. Which is why Romney’s demand to do something in Syria is so foolish. Until recently he wanted to work with the UN, call on the Syrian military to be nice, impose more sanctions, and “increase the possibility that the ruling minority Alawites will be able to reconcile with the majority Sunni population in a post-Assad Syria.” Snapping his fingers would be no less effective. Most recently he advocated arming the rebels. But he should be more cautious before advocating American intervention in another conflict in another land. Such efforts rarely have desirable results. Iraq was a catastrophe. Afghanistan looks to be a disaster once American troops come home. After more than a decade Bosnia and Kosovo are failures, still under allied supervision. Libya is looking bad. Even without U.S. “help,” a full-blown civil war already threatens in Syria. We only look through the glass darkly, observed the Apostle Paul. It might be best for Washington not to intervene in another Muslim land with so many others aflame. Despite his support for restoring America’s economic health, Romney wants to increase dramatically Washington’s already outsize military spending. Rather than make a case on what the U.S. needs, he has taken the typical liberal approach of setting an arbitrary number: 4 percent of GDP. It’s a dumb idea, since America already accounts for roughly half the globe’s military spending — far more if you include Washington’s wealthy allies — and spends more in real terms than at any time during the Cold War, Korean War, or Vietnam War, and real outlays have nearly doubled since 2000. By any normal measure, the U.S. possesses far more military resources than it needs to confront genuine threats. What Romney clearly wants is a military to fight multiple wars and garrison endless occupations, irrespective of cost. My Cato colleague Chris Preble figured that Romney's 4 percent gimmick would result in taxpayers spending more than twice as much on the Pentagon as in 2000 (111 percent higher, to be precise) and 45 percent more than in 1985, the height of the Reagan buildup. Over the next ten years, Romney's annual spending (in constant dollars) for the Pentagon would average 64 percent higher than annual post-Cold War budgets (1990-2012), and 42 percent more than the average during the Reagan era (1981-1989). If Mitt Romney really believes that the world today is so much more dangerous than during the Cold War, he should spell out the threat. He calls Islamic fundamentalism, the Arab Spring, the impact of failed states, the anti-American regimes of Cuba, Iran, North Korea, and Venezuela, rising China, and resurgent Russia “powerful forces.” It’s actually a pitiful list — Islamic terrorists have been weakened and don’t pose an existential threat, the Arab Spring threatens instability with little impact on America, it is easier to strike terrorists in failed states than in nominal allies like Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, one nuclear-armed submarine could vaporize all four hostile states, and Russia’s modest “resurgence” may threaten Georgia but not Europe or America. Only China deserves to be called “powerful,” but it remains a developing country surrounded by potential enemies with a military far behind that of the U.S. In fact, the greatest danger to America is the blowback that results from **promiscuous intervention** in conflicts not our own. Romney imagines a massive bootstrap operation: he wants a big military to engage in social engineering abroad which would require an even larger military to handle the violence and chaos that would result from his failed attempts at social engineering. Better not to start this vicious cycle. America faces international challenges but nevertheless enjoys unparalleled dominance. U.S. power is buttressed by the fact that Washington is allied with every industrialized nation except China and Russia. America shares significant interests with India, the second major emerging power; is seen as a counterweight by a gaggle of Asian states worried about Chinese expansion; remains the dominant player in Latin America; and is closely linked to most of the Middle East’s most important countries, such as Israel, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, and Iraq. If Mitt Romney really believes that America is at greater risk today than during the Cold War, he **is not qualified to be president**. In this world the U.S. need not confront every threat, subsidize every ally, rebuild every failed state, and resolve every problem. Being a superpower means having many interests but few vital ones warranting war. Being a bankrupt superpower means exhibiting judgment and exercising discretion. President Barack Obama has been a disappointment, amounting in foreign policy to George W. Bush-lite. But Mitt Romney sounds even worse. His rhetoric suggests a return to the worst of the Bush administration. The 2012 election likely will be decided on economics, but foreign policy will prove to be equally important in the long-term. America can ill afford another know-nothing president.

### Oil

#### Oil prices will stabilize at breakeven levels

Irina Rogovaya August 2012; writer for Oil and Gas Eurasia, Oil Price Changes: Everyone Wants Stability <http://www.oilandgaseurasia.com/articles/p/164/article/1875/>

According to the current base forecast for the Eurozone prepared by Oxford Economics, within the next two years oil prices will continue to drift lower, but not beyond the bounds of the “green” corridor for the world economy – $80-100 per barrel. This forecast coincides with the expectations of the World Bank (see Fig. 4). Meanwhile, S&P analysts presented three scenarios for the energy market in June. In the base scenario, oil will remain at $100 per barrel. S&P calculates that the likelihood of a stressful scenario in which the price of oil drops below $60 per barrel (the bottom in 2009) is 1:3. Analysts believe that given today’s state of economic and geopolitical affairs, strong political will would be needed to force the price of oil below $70-80 (the current level of effective production). So far, that will is nowhere to be seen. Recent events have shown that nobody is interested in the Eurozone breaking apart. And nobody wants a war in the Persian Gulf. Furthermore, nobody today intends to force the production of less valuable oil. At least that is what OPEC leaders promised during the recent summit. “Stability on the market should be at the center of our attention,” General Secretary Abdalla El-Badri said. Even Saudi Arabia, which consistently violates OPEC discipline in over-producing its quotas, announced at the beginning of July that it would review its margins to determine a higher price for Saudi supplies ordered on August contracts. Analysts noted that the average price of oil supplied to Europe and Asia had jumped (by $0.85 and $0.66 per barrel respectively), a fact which could be seen as proof that the collective members of the cartel will not let prices fall under $100 per barrel.

#### Wind power expansion would shift natural gas to transportation and massively reduce oil demand

TGCO 2010; Texas Gulf Coast Online, Wind Power Plan Could Solve Oil Crisis http://www.texasgulfcoastonline.com/News/tabid/86/ctl/ArticleView/mid/466/articleId/106/Wind-Power-Plan-Could-Solve-Oil-Crisis.aspx

If the United States takes advantage of the so-called "wind corridor," stretching from the Canadian border to West Texas, energy from wind turbines built there could supply 20 percent or more of the nation's power. Power from thousands of wind turbines that would line the corridor could be distributed throughout the country via electric power transmission lines and could fuel power plants in large population hubs. Fueling these plants with wind power would then free up the natural gas historically used to power them, and would mean that natural gas could replace foreign oil as fuel for motor vehicles. Using natural gas for transportation needs could replace one-third of the United States' imported oil and would save more than $230 billion a year. As imports grow and world prices rise, the amount of money we send to foreign nations every year is soaring. At current oil prices, we will send $700 billion dollars out of the country this year alone. Projected over the next 10 years the cost will be $10 trillion. America uses a lot of oil, every day 85 million barrels of oil are produced around the world and 21 million of those are used here in the United States. That's 25% of the world's oil demand used by just 4% of the world's population. World oil production peaked in 2005. Despite growing demand and an unprecedented increase in prices, oil production has fallen over the last three years. Oil is getting more expensive to produce, harder to find and there just isn't enough of it to keep up with demand. The simple truth is that cheap and easy oil is gone. A 2005 Stanford University study found that there is enough wind power worldwide to satisfy global demand 7 times over, even if only 20% of wind power could be captured. Building wind facilities in the corridor that stretches from the Texas panhandle to North Dakota could produce 20% of the electricity for the United States at a cost of $1 trillion. It would take another $200 billion to build the capacity to transmit that energy to cities and towns. It's a one-time cost and compared to the $700 billion we spend on foreign oil every year, it's a bargain. Building new wind generation facilities and better utilizing our natural gas resources can replace more than one-third of our foreign oil imports in 10 years. The benefits for the Texas economy and real estate values on the coast are enormous - and the entire country will benefit from lower gas prices.

#### The Saudis will fight to the death for market share – massive production increase would tank the Russian economy and turns the case

Matthew Hulbert 7-9-2012; specialises in energy security and political risk and is a regular contributor to European Energy Review “The political perils of low oil prices” <http://www.europeanenergyreview.eu/site/pagina.php?id=3796>

But it's the 'selfish' motives that are far more compelling for Saudi Arabia. Riyadh netted over $155 billion in the first half of 2012, and is believed to have built up $500 billion in cash reserves to alleviate domestic pressures. The al-Saud can afford a sustained period of prices around $75-80/b without being worried. What Riyadh can't make on price, **it can easily make up for on volume** given it will continue to pump over 9.5 mb/d. That will win Saudi Arabia considerable plaudits across consumer states, but also leaves them with total control over the remaining producer states. For all the bluster of OPEC hawks, none of them would be willing to make cuts, and all of them would continue to cheat on quotas wherever possible. It's free-riding 101, and entirely at Saudi expense. The Kingdom isn't going to let the 'free-lunch' brigade enjoy that luxury. It's more than happy to see Iran squirm under the weight of US sanctions to re-think its nuclear posture. It also makes no bones about wresting back political influence in Lebanon, Iraq and the Gaza strip from the Persian Gulf to the Levant, not to mention clipping Shia influence in Sunni political strongholds. Internecine wars are being fought with Arab Nationalist Republics accordingly. Further afield, nobody is too bothered about a bullish Venezuela talking up its reserves, but Riyadh considers Russia to be another petro-state that needs putting in its place. Moscow has been a real thorn in Saudi Arabia's Middle East side, by offering diplomatic support to Iran and military hardware to Syria. Given Russia's serious depletion problems, it's entirely possible that Moscow will retort by trying to strike bilateral agreements with OPEC members outside of formal cartel meetings as it did in 2008. A lower price range is **doubly concerning** for President Putin. It not only leaves the Kremlin with a serious financing gap, it also makes new Arctic plays **increasingly difficult** to invest in to stave off production falls. That's the final string to Saudi Arabia's 'pricing bow' - lower prices aren't just about showing fellow petro-states who's boss, but about fighting Riyadh's bigger battle over the next decade: retaining 40% of **OPEC market** share in the midst of supposedly huge non-OPEC unconventional supply growth. At $100/b prices, unconventional plays ranging from Russian extremes, to US shale oil, Canadian tar, Australian coal seams, and Brazilian pre-salt all looked highly attractive prospects. Once prices are back to $90/b the profits look thin - at $80/b marginal, at $75/b, few investors would be willing to go near that kind of risk over long and arduous project cycles. US shale becomes too dirty, Canadian tar distinctly sticky, Brazilian pre-salt horribly deep, Russian Arctic plays simply impossible. Even conventional developments could see investments eased. Hence, the al-Saud's more intricate price point is one that gives the global economy some breathing space, Riyadh the upper geopolitical hand over all petro-states, **and scrubs unconventional plays off global balance sheets.** This policy might be good for OPEC's long term health, but it's a bitter (some might say **lethal) pill** for some members of the cartel to currently swallow. Expect them to fight tooth and nail (within and beyond) the cartel to try and get Saudi Arabia to budge and drive prices up through 'tough talking' and political bluster. Dragging Saudi Arabia back for emergency meetings in Vienna will be the first prelude to a full scale price war with the al-Saud. Iran has already tabled exactly that proposition.

#### The impact is Russian growth and stability

Michael Schuman 7-5-2012 ; writes about Asia and global economic issues as a correspondent for TIME in Hong Kong. B.A. in Asian history and political science from the University of Pennsylvania and a master of international affairs from Columbia; “Why Vladimir Putin Needs Higher Oil Prices” http://business.time.com/2012/07/05/why-vladimir-putin-needs-higher-oil-prices/

But Vladimir Putin is not one of them. The economy that the Russian President has built not only runs on oil, but runs on oil priced extremely high. Falling oil prices means rising problems for Russia – both for the strength of its economic performance, and possibly, the strength of Putin himself. Despite the fact that Russia has been labeled one of the world’s most promising emerging markets, often mentioned in the same breath as China and India, the Russian economy is actually quite different from the others. While India gains growth benefits from an expanding population, Russia, like much of Europe, is aging; while economists fret over China’s excessive dependence on investment, Russia badly needs more of it. Most of all, Russia is little more than an oil state in disguise. The country is the largest producer of oil in the world (yes, bigger even than Saudi Arabia), and Russia’s dependence on crude has been increasing. About a decade ago, oil and gas accounted for less than half of Russia’s exports; in recent years, that share has risen to two-thirds. Most of all, oil provides more than half of the federal government’s revenues. What’s more, the economic model Putin has designed in Russia relies heavily not just on oil, but high oil prices. Oil lubricates the Russian economy by making possible the increases in government largesse that have fueled Russian consumption. Budget spending reached 23.6% of GDP in the first quarter of 2012, up from 15.2% four years earlier. What that means is Putin requires a higher oil price to meet his spending requirements today than he did just a few years ago. Research firm Capital Economics figures that the government budget balanced at an oil price of $55 a barrel in 2008, but that now it balances at close to $120. Oil prices today have fallen far below that, with Brent near $100 and U.S. crude less than $90. The farther oil prices fall, the more pressure is placed on Putin’s budget, and the harder it is for him to keep spreading oil wealth to the greater population through the government. With a large swath of the populace angered by his re-election to the nation’s presidency in March, and protests erupting on the streets of Moscow, Putin can ill-afford a significant blow to the economy, or his ability to use government resources to firm up his popularity. That’s why Putin hasn’t been scaling back even as oil prices fall. His government is earmarking $40 billion to support the economy, if necessary, over the next two years. He does have financial wiggle room, even with oil prices falling. Moscow has wisely stashed away petrodollars into a rainy day fund it can tap to fill its budget needs. But Putin doesn’t have the flexibility he used to have. The fund has shrunk, from almost 8% of GDP in 2008 to a touch more than 3% today. The package, says Capital Economics, simply highlights the weaknesses of Russia’s economy: This cuts to the heart of a problem we have highlighted before – namely that Russia is now much more dependent on high and rising oil prices than in the past… The fact that the share of ‘permanent’ spending (e.g. on salaries and pensions) has increased…creates additional problems should oil prices drop back (and is also a concern from the perspective of medium-term growth)…The present growth model looks unsustainable unless oil prices remain at or above $120pb.

#### Russian economic collapse causes global nuclear war

Steven David, January/February 1999;Professor of International Relations and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs at the Johns Hopkins University, FOREIGN AFFAIRS, **,** http://www.foreignaffairs.org/19990101faessay955/steven-r-david/saving-america-from-the-coming-civilwars.html

If internal war does strike Russia, economic deterioration will be a prime cause. From 1989 to the present, the GDP has fallen by 50 percent. In a society where, ten years ago, unemployment scarcely existed, it reached 9.5 percent in 1997 with many economists declaring the true figure to be much higher. Twenty-two percent of Russians live below the official poverty line (earning less than $ 70 a month). Modern Russia can neither collect taxes (it gathers only half the revenue it is due) nor significantly cut spending. Reformers tout privatization as the country's cure-all, but in a land without well-defined property rights or contract law and where subsidies remain a way of life, the prospects for transition to an American-style capitalist economy look remote at best. As the massive devaluation of the ruble and the current political crisis show, Russia's condition is even worse than most analysts feared. If conditions get worse, even the stoic Russian people will soon run out of patience.  A future conflict would quickly draw in Russia's military. In the Soviet days civilian rule kept the powerful armed forces in check. But with the Communist Party out of office, what little civilian control remains relies on an exceedingly fragile foundation -- personal friendships between government leaders and military commanders. Meanwhile, the morale of Russian soldiers has fallen to a dangerous low. Drastic cuts in spending mean inadequate pay, housing, and medical care. A new emphasis on domestic missions has created an ideological split between the old and new guard in the military leadership, increasing the risk that disgruntled generals may enter the political fray and feeding the resentment of soldiers who dislike being used as a national police force. Newly enhanced ties between military units and local authorities pose another danger. Soldiers grow ever more dependent on local governments for housing, food, and wages. Draftees serve closer to home, and new laws have increased local control over the armed forces. Were a conflict to emerge between a regional power and Moscow, it is not at all clear which side the military would support.  Divining the military's allegiance is crucial, however, since the structure of the Russian Federation makes it virtually certain that regional conflicts will continue to erupt. Russia's 89 republics, krais, and oblasts grow ever more independent in a system that does little to keep them together. As the central government finds itself unable to force its will beyond Moscow (if even that far), power devolves to the periphery. With the economy collapsing, republics feel less and less incentive to pay taxes to Moscow when they receive so little in return. Three-quarters of them already have their own constitutions, nearly all of which make some claim to sovereignty. Strong ethnic bonds promoted by shortsighted Soviet policies may motivate non-Russians to secede from the Federation. Chechnya's successful revolt against Russian control inspired similar movements for autonomy and independence throughout the country. If these rebellions spread and Moscow responds with force, **civil war is likely**.  Should Russia succumb to internal war, the consequences for the United States and Europe will be severe. **A major power** like Russia -- even though in decline -- **does not suffer civil war quietly or alone**. An embattled Russian Federation might provoke **opportunistic attacks from enemies such as China.** Massive flows of refugees would pour into central and western Europe. Armed struggles in Russia could easily spill into its neighbors. Damage from the fighting, particularly attacks on nuclear plants, would poison the environment of much of Europe and Asia. Within Russia, the consequences would be even worse. Just as the sheer brutality of the last Russian civil war laid the basis for the privations of Soviet communism, a second civil war might produce another horrific regime.

### Coercion

**Plan’s coercive**

**Rothbard, no date** (Murray Rothbard, former teacher, Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, New Liberty – Involuntary Servitude, no date, p. <http://www.mises.org/rothbard/newliberty4a.asp>)

In a sense, the entire system of taxation is a form of involuntary servitude. Take, in particular, the income tax. The high levels of income tax mean that all of us work a large part of the year? several months? for nothing for Uncle Sam before being allowed to enjoy our incomes on the market. Part of the essence of slavery, after all, is forced work for someone at little or no pay. But the income tax means that we sweat and earn income, only to see the government extract a large chunk of it by coercion for its own purposes. What is this but forced labor at no pay? The withholding feature of the income tax is a still more clear-cut instance of involuntary servitude. For as the intrepid Connecticut indus­trialist Vivien Kellems argued years ago, the employer is forced to expend time, labor, and money in the business of deducting and transmit­ting his employees' taxes to the federal and state governments, yet the employer is not recompensed for this expenditure. What moral principle justifies the government's forcing employers to act as its unpaid tax collectors?

**Decision rule**

**Petro**, **74** (Sylvester, Professor of Law at Wake Forest University, University of Toledo Law Review, p.480)

However, one may still insist, echoing Ernest Hemingway – “I believe in only one thing: liberty.” And it is always well to bear in mind David Hume’s observation: “It is seldom that liberty of any kind is lost all at once.” Thus, it is unacceptable to say that the invasion of one aspect of freedom is of no import because there have been invasions of so many other aspects. That road leads to chaos, tyranny, despotism, and the end of all human aspiration. Ask Solzhenitsyn. Ask Milovan Djilas. In sum, if one believes in freedom as a supreme value and the proper ordering principle for any society aiming to maximize spiritual and material welfare, then every invasion of freedom must be emphatically identified and resisted with undying spirit.

### Efficiency

#### COUNTERPLAN: The fifty state governments should substantially increase Energy Efficiency Resource Standard programs.

#### Fifty state EERS policy solves efficiency across the board – solves environmental leadership

**Glatt and Schwentker 2010** – \* Technology Delivery Team Member, Office of Industrial Technologies Program, DOE, \*\*Research Associate at BCS Incorporated (July, Sandy and Beth, DOE, “State Energy Efficiency Resource Standards Analysis”, http://www1.eere.energy.gov/manufacturing/states/pdfs/eers\_web\_final.pdf, WEA)

The effect of state energy policies in supporting energy efficiency in the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors is clear—states with strong energy efficiency policies save energy. Utilities’ citing these policies as the primary impetus for offering energy efficiency and other demand-side management programs prove the impact strong policies have. One tool in the energy efficiency policy toolbox, the state-implemented Energy Efficiency Resource Standard (EERS) program, has been instrumental in encouraging energy efficiency across the nation. EERS policies are adopted by state legislatures and implemented and managed by utilities. They require that electric and natural gas utilities offer programs and incentives to encourage their customers to reduce energy use by a specified amount each year, based on a percentage of total energy sales.

EERS policy programs typically start with modest targets that increase over time. Typical savings goals can range from the relatively modest 0.25% savings annually to the more aggressive end of the scale such as 1.25% annually, with the most successful states setting even more ambitious targets. Terms of performance standard goals can vary—some are annual while others are cumulative, but an EERS is a long-term strategy to achieve energy savings and realize the financial and environmental benefits of those savings over time. EERS programs typically offer utilities the flexibility to utilize a market-based trading system to reach their set targets, and they provide support and incentives for utilities to successfully manage their own and their customers’ energy use.

Utilities can work towards these goals by improving their own processes and distribution systems, implementing new efficiency standards in equipment and infrastructure, and encouraging their end-use customers to participate in energy-saving programs. In addition, they can purchase energy credits from over-performing utilities that have exceeded the set goals. 1

**EERS is a tested policy measure that has successfully reduced energy use in multiple states.** Texas was the first state to adopt an EERS in 1999. As of April 2010, 24 states had some form of EERS in place, with three others strongly considering it. Having a state EERS policy in place ensures uniform energy efficiency goals across the state. It also provides a mechanism to create support programs that lead to reduced energy use. As increasing attention is focused on cutting energy consumption and the accompanying benefits of lower energy costs and less environmental pollution, it behooves states to have the ability to track performance against goals.

**If all states were to adopt their own EERS, the United States could significantly lower energy costs, reduce air pollution, mitigate climate change, and improve energy reliability**. These policies also lead to job creation as utilities implement new efficiency programs and monitoring systems. Despite these benefits and successes in individual states, no federal EERS mandate or Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard (EEPS), as they are also known, currently exists.

### States

**The 50 state governments and relevant subnational actors should establish energy financing banks to substantially increase financial incentives for energy production on lands defined by 18 United States Code section 1151 for wind power and solar power.**

#### States should establish energy finance banks to do the plan – solves all the case and doesn’t require new spending

**Muro and Berlin, 9/12**/12 – \*senior fellow and policy director of the Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings AND \*\* Senior Vice President for Policy and Planning, and General Counsel at the Coalition for Green Capital (Mark and Ken, “State Clean Energy Finance Banks: New Investment Facilities for Clean Energy Deployment”, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/9/12%20state%20energy%20investment%20muro/12%20state%20energy%20investment%20muro>)

Given these challenges, states that want to realize the benefits of clean energy deployment should consider a new approach to funding clean energy programs. Specifically, they should investigate the possibility of developing state clean energy finance banks that use limited public dollars and leverage private capital to provide a combination of low-interest rate funding that makes clean energy projects competitive and low-cost 100-percent up-front loans for energy efficiency projects.¶ Such an approach would address the deployment and diffusion challenges faced by clean energy ¶ technologies while recognizing that federal and state appropriations, tax credits, and other incentives ¶ and subsidies will be sharply diminished in the years ahead because of the budget crisis at all levels of ¶ government. Likewise, the development of such finance entities would address the need for states to ¶ develop a new paradigm for financing strong clean energy and energy efficiency projects as part of a ¶ push to develop strong regional industries.¶ So-called “clean energy finance banks” or “green banks” are ideally suited to solve the present ¶ problems because they offer a practical way for states to make available leveraged, low-cost financing ¶ for project developers in their states. First, they can be developed out of existing state programs while ¶ bringing into the enterprise the equivalent of substantial new resources given their ability to leverage ¶ funds. Likewise, because the banks would provide debt financing, they would be repaid on their loans, ¶ putting them in the position to borrow funds and to establish revolving loan funds that would provide ¶ funds that could be reinvested without new sources of financing. Furthermore, clean energy finance ¶ banks, if established as independent institutions, would be able to issue revenue bonds without the full ¶ faith and credit of the state and without the restrictions facing states, which have limited borrowing ¶ capacity. Finally, clean energy finance banks could efficiently seek large investors with patient, longterm capital who are seeking a long-term, conservative rate of return, such as pension fund investors.

#### It’s legitimate and politics is a net benefit

**Harvard Law Review, 6** – the author isn’t named but the qualifications are: John M. Olin Fellow in Law, Economics, and Business at Harvard Law School (119 Harv. L. Rev. 1855, “STATE COLLECTIVE ACTION\*”, April, lexis)

Consider now the reasons why states may act collectively. In the simplest terms, collective action may be more desirable than individual state action because it opens a panoply of otherwise unavailable policy choices and may be more desirable than federal action because it allocates power to a better-positioned actor. n12 These advantages may exist **[\*1859]** because regional organizations have better information, are better positioned to act on that information, or avoid duplicative costs or coordination problems. n13 Also, collective action may be desirable politically because it may make certain programs either more or less politically salient. n14 Similarly, political actors may want to act collectively because doing so spreads or diversifies political risk. n15 Lastly, collective action may provide opportunities for economies of scale or rent-seeking behavior that states cannot achieve independently. n16

Some brief examples of how states may act collectively illustrate the importance of the topic. n17 As in the stylized examples, states may act collectively to reduce pollution. Groups of states also could develop plans to use common reserves of natural resources, including oil fields or aquifers that cross state lines, or plans to allocate the use of rivers, lakes, forests, or other natural resources. They may also regulate wildlife that lives in multiple states, either to protect that wildlife or to use it for commercial purposes. States may take similar action to regulate or allocate energy or to develop interstate transit infrastructure, such as highways, rail lines, or regional airports. States may regulate the production or distribution of goods or create economic development organizations organized either geographically or by some other trait, such as agricultural or oil and gas production. They also may wish to regulate certain industries or set labor standards in common ways or may wish to regulate products commonly by adopting similar production standards or tort rules. As a final example - although one can imagine many other motivations for state collective action - states may collectivize to provide better social welfare or governmental insurance programs.

### Adv 1

**No impact to the environment**

**Boucher 98** (Doug, "Not with a Bang but a Whimper," Science and Society, Fall, http://www.driftline.org/cgi-bin/archive/archive\_msg.cgi?file=spoon-archives/marxism-international.archive/marxism-international\_1998/marxism-international.9802&msgnum=379&start=32091&end=32412)

The political danger of catastrophism is matched by the weakness of its scientific foundation. Given the prevalence of the idea that the entire biosphere will soon collapse, it is remarkable how few good examples ecology can provide of this happening m even on the scale of an ecosystem, let alone a continent or the whole planet. Hundreds of ecological transformations, due to introductions of alien species, pollution, overexploitation, climate change and even collisions with asteroids, have been documented. They often change the functioning of ecosystems, and the abundance and diversity of their animals and plants, in dramatic ways. The effects on human society can be far-reaching, and often extremely negative for the majority of the population. But one feature has been a constant, nearly everywhere on earth: life goes on. Humans have been able to drive thousands of species to extinction, severely impoverish the soil, alter weather patterns, dramatically lower the biodiversity of natural communities, and incidentally cause great suffering for their posterity. They have not generally been able to prevent nature from growing back. As ecosystems are transformed, species are eliminated -- but opportunities are created for new ones. The natural world is changed, but never totally destroyed. Levins and Lewontin put it well: "The warning not to destroy the environment is empty: environment, like matter, cannot be created or destroyed. What we can do is replace environments we value by those we do not like" (Levins and Lewontin, 1994). Indeed, from a human point of view the most impressive feature of recorded history is that human societies have continued to grow and develop, despite all the terrible things they have done to the earth. Examples of the collapse of civilizations due to their over- exploitation of nature are few and far between. Most tend to be well in the past and poorly documented, and further investigation often shows that the reasons for collapse were fundamentally political.

**Tech solves --- their evidence is media alarmism**

**Stossel,** Journalist, winner of the Peabody Award, anchors ABC News, **07** [John, “Environmental Alarmists Have It Backwards”,

http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2007/04/how\_about\_economic\_progress\_da.html]

Watching the media coverage, you'd think that the earth was in imminent danger -- that human life itself was **on the verge of extinction**. Technology is fingered as the perp. Nothing could be further from the truth. John Semmens of Arizona's Laissez Faire Institute points out that Earth Day misses an important point. In the April issue of The Freeman magazine, Semmens says the environmental movement overlooks how hospitable the earth has become -- thanks to technology. "The environmental alarmists have it backwards. If anything imperils the earth it is ignorant obstruction of science and progress. ... That technology provides the best option for serving human wants and conserving the environment should be evident in the progress made in environmental improvement in the United States. Virtually every measure shows that pollution is headed downward and that nature is making a comeback." (Carbon dioxide excepted, *if* it is really a pollutant.) Semmens describes his visit to historic Lexington and Concord in Massachusetts, an area "lush with trees and greenery." It wasn't always that way. In 1775, the land was cleared so it could be farmed. Today, technology makes farmers so efficient that only a fraction of the land is needed to produce much more food. As a result, "Massachusetts farmland has been allowed to revert back to forest." Human ingenuity and technology not only raised living standards, but also restored environmental amenities. How about a day to celebrate that? Yet, Semmens writes, the environmental movement is skeptical about technology and is attracted to three dubious principles: sustainable development, the precautionary principle, and stakeholder participation. The point of sustainable development, Semmens says, "is to minimize the use of nonrenewable natural resources so there will be more left for future generations." Sounds sensible -- who is for "unsustainable" development? But as the great economist Julian Simon often pointed out, resources are manmade, not natural. Jed Clampett cheered when he found oil on his land because it made him rich enough to move to Beverly Hills. But his great-grandfather would have cursed the disgusting black gunk because Canadian geologist Abraham Gesner hadn't yet discovered that kerosene could be distilled from it. President Bush chides us for our "addiction to oil." But under current conditions, using oil makes perfect sense. Someday, if we let the free market operate, someone will find an energy source that works better than oil. Then richer future generations won't need oil. So why deprive ourselves and make ourselves poorer with needless regulation now? Anyway, it's not as if we're running out of oil. That's one of the myths I expose in my new book, "Myths, Lies and Downright Stupidity". If the price of a barrel of oil stays high, entrepreneurs will find better ways to suck oil out of the ground. At $50 a barrel, it's even profitable to recover oil that's stuck in the tar sands in Alberta, Canada. Those tar sands alone contain enough oil to meet our needs for a *hundred* years. The precautionary principle, popular in Europe, is the idea that no new thing should be permitted until it has been proved harmless. Sounds good, except as Ron Bailey of Reason writes, it basically means, "Don't ever do anything for the first time." Stakeholder participation means that busybodies would be permitted to intrude on private transactions. Semmens's example is DDT, which for years would have saved children from deadly malaria, except that "'stakeholders' from the environmental quarter have prevailed on governments to ban the trade in this product." The first victims of these principles are the poor. We rich Westerners can withstand a lot of policy foolishness. But people in the developing world live on the edge, so anything that retards economic progress -- including measures to arrest global warming -- will bring incredible hardship to the most vulnerable on the planet. If we care about human life, we should celebrate Economic Progress Day.

**Environment impacts are exaggerated**

**Gordon 95** – professor of mineral economics at Pennsylvania State University[Gordon, Richard, “Ecorealism Exposed,” Regulation, 1995, http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regv18n3/reg18n3-readings.html

Easterbrook's argument is that although environmental problems deserve attention, the environmental movement has exaggerated the threats and ignored evidence of improvement. His discontent causes him to adopt and incessantly employ the pejoratively intended (and irritating) shorthand "enviros" to describe the leading environmental organizations and their admirers. He proposes-and overuses-an equally infelicitous alternative phrase, "ecorealism," that seems to mean that most environmental initiatives can be justifited by more moderate arguments. Given the mass, range, and defects of the book, any review of reasonable length must be selective. Easterbrook's critique begins with an overview of environmentalism from a global perspective. He then turns to a much longer (almost 500- page) survey of many specific environmental issues. The overview section is a shorter, more devastating criticism, but it is also more speculative than the survey of specific issues. In essence, the overview argument is that human impacts on the environment are minor, easily correctable influences on a world affected by far more powerful forces. That is a more penetrating criticism than typically appears in works expressing skepticism about environmentalism. Easterbrook notes that mankind's effects on nature long predate industrialization or the white colonization of America, but still have had only minor impacts*.* We are then reminded of the vast, often highly destructive changes that occur naturally and the recuperative power of natural systems.

**Soft power is necessary not sufficient—everything turns it**

**Quinn, 11** – Lecturer in International Studies at the University of Birmingham, having previously worked at the University of Leicester and the University of Westminster alongside his graduate studies at the LSE. His chief area of interest is the role of national history and ideology in shaping US grand strategy (Adam, “The art of declining politely: Obama’s prudent presidency and the waning of American power”, International Affairs 87:4 (2011) 803–824 http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/87\_4quinn.pdf

Nevertheless, this qualification demands two further qualifications of its own. The first is that if we consider ‘soft power’ as a national attribute then it is difficult to separate it with confidence from the economic and military dimensions of power. Is it really likely that America’s ideological and cultural influence will endure undiminished in the absence of the platform of military and economic primacy upon which it has been constructed? It may be overstatement to suggest that, borrowing Marxist terminology, hard power represents the ‘base’ and soft power mere ‘superstructure’. But one could plausibly argue that even America’s non-coercive power and political appeal are inextricably entwined with the status conferred upon it by possession of a preponderance of material resources. While vestigial soft power may delay or mitigate the consequences of relative material decline, it is surely unrealistic to expect it to override them such as to allow the US to continue to exercise the same influence in a multipolar or non-polar world as it did in a unipolar one.

**Hegemony is a structural cap on soft power**

Christopher **Layne**, Associate Professor in the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University, **2007** “American Empire: A Debate” p 68

Doubtless, American primacy has its dimension of benevolence, but a state as powerful as the United States can never be benevolent enough to offset the fear that other states have of its unchecked power. In international politics, benevolent hegemons are like unicorns-there is no such animal. Hegemons love themselves, but others mistrust and fear them-and for good reason. In today's world, others dread both the overconcentration of geopolitical weight in America's favor and the purposes for which it may be used. After all, "No great power has a monopoly on virtue and, although some may have a great deal more virtue than others, virtue imposed on others is not seen as such by them. All great powers are capable of exercising a measure of self-restraint, but they are tempted not to and the choice to practice restraint is made easier by the existence of countervailing power and the possibility of it being exercised."\*" While Washington's self-proclaimed benevolence is inherently ephemeral, the hard fist of American power is tangible. Others must worry constantly that if U.S. intentions change, bad things may happen to them. In a one-superpower world, the overconcentration of power in America's hands is an omnipresent challenge to other states' security, and Washington's ability to reassure others of its benevolence is limited by the very enormity of its power.

**Soft power fails**

**Rachman 9** [Gideon Rachman is the Economist's bureau chief in Brussels, June 1 http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/e608b556-4ee0-11de-8c10-00144feabdc0.html]

Barack Obama is a soft power president. But the world keeps asking him hard power questions.

From North Korea to Guantánamo Bay, from Iran to Afghanistan, Mr Obama is confronting a range of vexing issues that cannot be charmed out of existence.

The problem is epitomised by the US president’s trip to the Middle East this week. Its focal point will be a much-trailed speech in Cairo on Thursday June 4, in which he will directly address the Muslim world.

The Cairo speech is central to Mr Obama’s efforts to rebuild America’s global popularity and its ability to persuade – otherwise known as soft power. The president has been trying out potential themes for the speech on aides and advisers for months. He is likely to emphasise his respect for Islamic culture and history, and his personal links to the Muslim world. He will suggest to his audience that both the US and the Islamic world have, at times, misjudged and mistreated each other – and he will appeal for a new beginning.

George W. Bush launched a military offensive in the Middle East. Mr Obama is launching a charm offensive.

There is plenty to be said for this approach. Mr Bush embroiled America in a bloody war in Iraq that strengthened Iran and acted as a recruiting sergeant for America’s enemies. Mr Obama’s alternative strategy is based on diplomacy, engagement and empathy.

Mr Bush had a shoe thrown at him in his last appearance in the Middle East. So if Mr Obama receives his customary standing ovation in Cairo, that will send a powerful symbolic message. But the president should not let the applause go to his head. Even if his speech is a success, the same foreign-policy problems will be sitting in his in-tray when he gets back to the Oval Office – and they will be just as dangerous as before.

In particular, there is chatter in official Washington that the Israelis may be gearing up to attack Iran’s nuclear facilities before the end of the year. The Obama administration is against any such move and it is normally assumed that Israel would not dare to pull the trigger without the go-ahead from Washington – not least because the Israelis would have to fly across US-controlled airspace to get to their targets. But the Americans do not have a complete veto over Israel’s actions. One senior US official asks rhetorically: “What are we going to do? Shoot down their planes?”

A conflict between Israel and Iran would scatter the Obama administration’s carefully laid plans for Middle East peace to the winds. It would also make talk of improving American soft power around the world seem beside the point. The immediate task would be to prevent a wider regional war.

In the meantime, the US will press on with the effort to achieve peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians. But even that goal is unlikely to be advanced much by Mr Obama’s trip to the Middle East. Many in the audience in Cairo and in the wider Islamic world will want and even expect the new president to lay out a complete vision for a peace settlement and to apply unambiguous pressure on Israel. For reasons of domestic politics, diplomacy and timing, Mr Obama is highly unlikely to do this.

Yet while his Arab audience may be disappointed by what he has to say about the Middle East peace process, Mr Obama is already facing an increasingly tense relationship with the new Israeli government. The administration has now clashed openly with the Israelis over the Netanyahu government’s tolerance of expanded settlements in occupied Palestinian land.

Mr Obama is also running up against the limits of soft power elsewhere. Closing the prison camp at Guantánamo was meant to be the ultimate tribute to soft power over hard power. The Obama team argued consistently that the damage that Guantánamo did to America’s image in the world outweighed any security gains from holding al-Qaeda prisoners there. Yet, faced with the backlash against releasing the remaining 240 prisoners or imprisoning them in the US, the Obama administration has back-tracked. It is not clear whether Guantánamo will be closed on schedule or what will happen to the riskier-sounding prisoners, who may still be held indefinitely. The much-criticised military trials are likely to be revived.

In Afghanistan, Mr Obama is trying a mixture of hard and soft power. There will be a military surge – but also a “civilian surge”, designed to build up civil society and governance in Afghanistan. Old hands in Washington are beginning to shake their heads and mutter about Vietnam.

Mr Obama’s preferred tools of diplomacy, engagement and charm do not seem to be of much use with Kim Jong-il of North Korea, either. The North Koreans have just tested a nuclear weapon – leaving the Obama administration scratching its head about what to do.

The president’s charisma and rhetorical skill are real diplomatic assets. If Mr Obama can deploy them to improve America’s image and influence around the world, that is all to the good. There is nothing wrong with trying to re-build American “soft power”.

The danger is more subtle. It is that President Yes-we-can has raised exaggerated hopes about the pay-off from engagement and diplomacy. In the coming months it will become increasingly obvious that soft power also has its limits.

**Soft power is high enough despite their uniqueness claims**

Hallams, 2011 (Ellen is a Lecturer in Defence Studies, King's College, London,  From Crusader to Exemplar: Bush, Obama and the Reinvigoration of America’s Soft Power, European journal of American studies, June 28, 2011, http://ejas.revues.org/9157)

At heart then, Obama is a pragmatic realist, deeply ambitious and determined to reconfigure America’s role in the world yet imbued with an astute awareness that the world in which he operates will sometimes require uncomfortable choices. It is not only the war in Afghanistan that has exposed the dilemmas Obama faces. On a range of issues, from climate change to the Israeli-Palestinian peace process, and the challenges posed by Iran and North Korea, Obama has often found himself having to compromise. Obama’s Cairo speech was a clear attempt to rebuild America’s soft power in the Middle East, but continuing support for the corrupt regime of Hamid Karzai in Afghanistan despite the fraudulent elections – viewed as a necessary evil in Washington – and the failure to close Guantanamo Bay remain points of contention for many in the Arab world. The killing of Osama Bin Laden in May 2011, although a huge boost for the president domestically, was regarded by Pakistan as a unacceptable violation of Pakistani sovereignty, while even in the West questions have been raised as to why the President ‘executed’ Bin Laden, instead of bringing him to trial.55 Despite seeming to demonstrate a commitment to a more even-handed approach to the Israeli-Palestinian problem, the early resistance of Benyamin Netanyahu to Obama’s demands for an end to the construction of illegal Israeli settlements in East Jerusalem left Obama looking powerless – and subject to criticism that he had failed to exert sufficient pressure on Netanyahu, and done little to help alleviate the humanitarian situation in Gaza.”56 Moreover, although Obama has engaged with the peace process from the very start of his presidency, based upon the premise that progress on the Israeli-Palestinian front is linked to securing Arab support on the equally challenging question of Iran, the release of the ‘Palestine Papers’ in January 2011 only served to expose the degree of disappointment with Obama felt by many Palestinians. The papers reveal the dismay at Obama’s ‘capitulation’ on the settlement issue, continuing perceptions of the US position as ‘pro-Israeli’ and the administration’s rejection of its predecessors commitment to using the 1967 borders as a baseline for negotiations.57 In a speech in Washington in May 2011 Obama sought to reclaim the initiative by stating that Israeli and Palestinian borders should be based on the 1967 lines, a move met with hostility from the visiting Netanyahu, at the same time as he urged the Palestinians not to got to the UN to seek recognition for the West Bank, Gaza and Jerusalem as an independent state.58 Like his predecessors, Obama remains constrained by a powerful domestic Jewish lobby and America’s historic links with Israel, but his sustained effort to maintain the pressure on Netanyahu suggests a president determined to chart a more balanced path. On Iran, although Obama has demonstrated a more principled commitment to ‘constructive engagement,’ the political turmoil surrounding the Iranian elections exposed, again, the limits of Obama’s soft power approach. On the one hand, Obama needed to grasp the opportunity presented by the groundswell of anti-Ahmedinijad sentiment and the reformist movement, but his response was notably cautious, reluctant to be seen as “meddling” in Iran’s political affairs given the desire to engage the regime on nuclear proliferation. Obama’s response was further evidence of his instinctive pragmatism and the administration’s commitment to ‘smart’ power, a willingness to take each case on its merits and consider the appropriate mix of hard and soft power. Elsewhere, Obama’s efforts to forge a new relationship with China have succumbed to the usual pressures, with disputes over Taiwan, exchange rates, human rights and internet censorship, the Chinese going so far as to accuse the Americans of “information imperialism.”59 Despite being accused of “soft-peddling” the Chinese on human rights, Obama has opted for a strategy of quiet engagement, with human rights talks taking place behind closed doors, as he attempts to balance criticism of China’s human rights record with the desire for a cooperative relationship on key global issues like climate change. US-Sino relations will likely remain a difficult challenge in balancing competing tensions. As one analyst has noted such challenges “cannot be charmed out of existence.”60 To suggest that Obama thought he could “charm” such issues out of existence is, however, missing the point. By putting soft power at the centre rather than the margins of US foreign policy, Obama has gone a long way towards reconfiguring America’s image in the world – in a remarkably short space of time. As Zbigniew Bzrezinski argued in early 2010: Obama has undertaken a truly ambitious effort to redefine the United States” view of the world and to reconnect the United States with the emerging historical context of the twenty-first century. He has done this remarkably well. In less than a year, he has comprehensively reconceptualized U.S. foreign policy.**61**33Signs are also beginning to emerge that Obama’s softer touches are beginning to pay dividends, particularly as Obama benefits from the momentum generated by domestic successes, notably healthcare reform, allowing him to focus on key foreign policy issues that have often seemed to take a back-seat to domestic concerns. Climate change was one such issue, but even despite the pressing domestic challenges Obama faced, he played a crucial role in helping facilitate negotiations with the Chinese and Indians behind the scenes at Copenhagen. Although those negotiations delivered a non-binding agreement that fell far short of what many had hoped for, the challenges of getting a comprehensive, binding agreement were always going to exceed the persuasive powers of one individual.34More notably, a year on from his landmark speech in Prague, Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev signed the START III agreement committing both countries to reducing their nuclear arsenals by a third, and affirming a shared determination to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Obama generated leverage with Russia in abandoning Bush-era plans for a missile defence shield in Poland and the Czech Republic that had led to a deep rift in relations, and developing a new plan focused on the threat of short-range missiles from Iran. Crucially, the improved relationship with Russia is now beginning to facilitate cooperation on Iran, with the Russians supporting tough new UN sanctions.  The renewed emphasis on diplomacy and the “reset” of US-Russian relations has generated real and tangible gains, representing a notable shift away from the often inflammatory rhetoric and terse exchanges that characterised the relationship during the Bush-era.

**Soft power resilient**

**Nye 6** – IR Professor, Harvard (Joseph, 6/25, Why Do They Hate Us?, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/06/22/AR2006062200972\_pf.html)

Fortunately, even when the U.S. government's foreign policies are unattractive to others, our culture and our open political processes can produce a "meta" form of soft power -- winning grudging admiration for our freedoms at the same time that our policies are unpopular. After all, anti-American protests were rampant around the world during the Vietnam War, but the protesters did not sing "The Internationale"; they sang the American civil rights anthem "We Shall Overcome." Today, the fact that America remains democratic and self-critical, that its free press exposes governmental flaws and that the legislative and judicial branches can act against the executive, means that anti-American critics of U.S. foreign policies can still feel a residual attraction to our society. As Sweig puts it, "The best antidote to Anti-America may well come not from how we fight (or prevent) the next war but from the degree to which we keep intact the social contract and international appeal of American society." She also urges Washington to adopt a changed foreign policy style that develops empathy for foreign cultures, practices better manners and pays more attention to rules and fairness. Anti-Americanism will not go away, but it need not dominate the 21st century if Americans follow the advice of this well-reasoned book.

### Culture

**No impact to cultural survival**

**Coates 2009** – former adjunct professor at George Washington University, President of the Kanawha Institute for the Study of the Future and was President of the International Association for Impact Assessment and was President of the Association for Science, Technology and Innovation, M.S., Hon D., FWAAS, FAAAS, (Joseph F., Futures 41, 694-705, "Risks and threats to civilization, humankind, and the earth”, ScienceDirect, WEA)

The first category of significant dreadful outcomes: the death of cultures, raises definitional questions of what is a culture, and how to define the boundaries on it and what it means for it to disappear. Obviously, most of the cultures that would be at risk today are small, involving thousands, tens of thousands, or surely well under a million people. Cultures larger than that are becoming increasingly globalized, westernized, and part of an expanding international advanced-nation culture, with local flavors in different parts of the world. When we turn to the smaller cultures, there is not even a good guess as to how many there are, but an excellent surrogate for that is the number of languages that there are. Each culture insofar as it is isolated has created its own language. The linguists tell us that languages are dying in great numbers.

Another side of the question is, whether the death of cultures is good or bad. There are, worldwide, people who deplore the loss of any culture. (We are not thinking about people, but about the culture of a people.) Unfortunately, they would like to see functional groups of the people at cultural risk preserved to become parts of a living museum. That is unfair and, to say the least, undemocratic. Consider the case of the people who manage and harvest the reindeer in Finland, the Lapps. Their culture is in large part framed around a great annual cycle. The animals are collected together and moved much like the situation so common in our western movies of taking the herds of cattle from Texas to the Midwest slaughter houses and railroad yards. The snowmobile was introduced into Lapp society and has been rapidly changing their customs. Some outsiders, as noted, deplore this. But remember, no one forced the snowmobile on the Lapps; it is their free choice and it is outrageous to think that we would deprive them of free choice to adopt what they see will enhance the quality of their lives. On net, I see the loss of cultures as, in some romantic sense, regrettable and undesirable, but in terms of the overall benefits to humankind, the integration of the minor cultures into a global culture carries far more benefit for them and for the world than local survival does.

#### Multiple jurisdictional barriers overwhelm the plan

Sullivan, 10 – JD, University of Arizona (Bethany, “Changing Winds: Reconfiguring the Legal Framework for Renewable-Energy Development in Indian Country,” 52 Ariz. L. Rev. 823, Fall, lexis)

Unfortunately, the IEED's TERA program has produced unsatisfactory results. Not a single tribe, as of present, has successfully attained a TERA. n54 This may partially be a consequence of the multi-step TERA application requirements, including: submission of documentation demonstrating a tribe's financial and personnel capacity to administer energy agreements and programs, establishment of a tribal environmental review process, and consultative meetings with the Director of the Indian Energy and Economic Development Office. n55 Perhaps more problematic are conflicting sentiments within tribes over distancing tribal energy development from federal government protection, an issue strongly debated among Indian law practitioners and scholars. n56 So, although tribes could arguably benefit [\*832] from the decreased federal oversight that TERAs would provide, it appears that this mechanism, on its own, is insufficient to truly stimulate renewable development.

In summary, the Act has provided for federal programs that encourage the development of tribal renewable resources, yet its policy goals of tribal economic and energy development and tribal self-determination have not yet been met. In part, this may be a function of inadequate appropriations for the Act's provisions. n57 An alternative explanation, however, is that the Act fails to address substantial obstacles to tribal renewable-energy development. The most significant obstacles can be generally divided into two categories: (1) tribal inability to take advantage of federal tax incentives in the renewable-energy industry and (2) unfavorable case law concerning tribal civil jurisdiction.

#### BIA obstructionism blocks the plan

Unger, 9 – JD, Loyola (Kathleen, “CHANGE IS IN THE WIND: SELF-DETERMINATION AND WIND POWER THROUGH TRIBAL ENERGY RESOURCE AGREEMENTS,” 43 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 329, Fall, lexis)

 [\*343] Second, as regulatory activities are transferred from the federal government to tribes, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) bureaucracy may resist relinquishing control because of self-interested concerns over losing jobs and power. n90 This tendency is illustrated in the congressional attempt to shift control of programs to tribes under the ISDEAA. n91 This Act allowed tribes to contract with the BIA to manage programs previously managed by the BIA. n92 But the BIA often denied contracting requests, n93 and even when the BIA issued a contract, it dictated the form of program administration and required the tribe to obtain BIA concurrence in decision making. n94 In this way, the BIA retained significant control over tribal programs, and the federal bureaucracy thus greatly limited tribal self-determination. n95 Similarly, when these conflicts arise in federal laws and regulations governing tribal resource development, they hamper the ability of tribes to truly take control of development in a self-determined way. n96

The principle of self-determination informs federal American Indian policy in general and policy for tribal resource development in particular. However, the contrary impulse for the government to assert its power over tribes can be an obstacle to tribal self-determination even when the government affirms its commitment to that principle and to increasing tribes' control over the course of development on their lands.

#### The AFF’s get rich quick way of economic development of tribes ultimately fails and recreates the Status Quo

Joseph Kalt and Stephen **Cornell, 2005,** Professor of International Political Economy at Harvard and professor of sociology and of public administration at University of Arizona, “Two Approaches to Economic Development on American Indian”, ([http://jopna.net/pubs/jopna\_ 2005-02\_Approaches.pdf](http://jopna.net/pubs/jopna_2005-02_Approaches.pdf) )

Native nations operating with the standard approach tend to pursue development by focusing only on the last two of these steps—choosing projects and launching them—or sometimes on asserting sovereignty as well, ignoring the need for effective institutions, strategies, and policies. The development conversation tends to be not about growing an economy but instead about projects, and the goal is just to get something going. But without the other steps—building capable institutions, figuring out where you want to go, and putting in place the policies that can get you there—things are **unlikely to last**. This is one of the places where leadership’s role is critical in development. It takes visionary and effective leadership to re-orient the development conversation and change the development process so that the community embraces all six steps in the nation-building approach. Leadership can help refocus the nation’s energy on building societies that work—economically, socially, culturally, politically.

**Cultural survival is impossible and there’s no impact anyway.**

**Blake 2000** (Michael Blake, Professor of political philosophy and philosophy at Harvard University, August/September 2000, Civilization, p. 51-53)

One frequently hears that endangered cultural groups have a right to preservation, and indeed to outside aid and legal sanctions toward that end. Anthropologists and activists have made such claims on the grounds that the survival of these groups has inherent value. Some advocacy groups have even gone so far as to equate the absence of such special rights with genocide. There is no great moral distinction, such rhetoric seems to suggest, between allowing a culture to assimilate into the wider surrounding society and actually going out and killing its members en masse. This vague moral equation has turned up of late in the discussion of issues as varied as affirmative action, Southern regionalism, Quebecois nationalism, and the moral status of such culturally overwhelming institutions as Wal-Mart and McDonald’s. If we take these arguments at face value, cultural survival is something very close to a moral absolute; to refuse to endorse it is to sign up on the side of cultural atrocity and numbing global conformity This is a shame, because it is surprisingly difficult to figure out exactly what is morally relevant about cultural survival in itself. The first challenge is pinning down just what the term might mean. It cannot simply mean the continued existence of the individuals comprising the endangered culture, since their survival is entirely compatible with their complete assimilation and hence with the destruction of their culture. Nor however, can it mean the preservation of all existing aspects of a culture, for some degree of cultural change and adaptation is normal, indeed inevitable. Cultural stasis is not a plausible ideal, let alone a worthy guide to policy. The messy reality of cultural survival, then, lies somewhere between disintegration and the deep freeze. The most plausible meaning of the slogan as a political goal might be simply the preservation of difference: the desire that whatever cultures now exist not lose their distinctiveness and blend into surrounding society; and that they continue to serve as means by which some people make sense of their place in the world, however much the content of their cultures may change over time. The key idea here is that the number of cultures now present not be reduced, however much the lifeways and customs comprising each individual culture might change over time. But what reason have we, then, to think that cultural survival is valuable in itself? One argument draws an analogy between cultures and other threatened aspects of the social and natural world: We ought to preserve cultures because to do otherwise is to allow something unique and irreplaceable to leave the world. Refusing to act against assimilation might thus be thought roughly akin to, say; shooting the last of a particularly beautiful species of condor. This argument, though, claims too much, for we feel an equivalent sense of loss when we face not the destruction of a culture but merely its reworking from the inside—and, thereby the destruction of specific elements within it. For example, during Quebec’s Quiet Revolution— the tumultuous postwar period during which French Canada cast off clerical authority and conservatism and fashioned itself into a modem secular society—much of the culture was completely remade and many traditional norms and practices abandoned. We might easily sympathize with the feeling that there was a loss to the world in what was thereby abandoned. We do have reason to regret the fact that current ways by which the world is understood— our own ways included—will eventually disappear. But our justifiable sadness does not give us good reason to declare that what is now endangered ought to be preserved forever, or to forbid ourselves from altering inherited cultural norms—abandoning some, amending others, and embracing foreign ways and customs as our own. One could even say that this sadness is the inevitable price we pay for freedom: If we had no choice about what norms to adopt, and knew that our children would live as our ancestors lived before us, the world would lose one source of woe but gain many more. This approach to defending cultural survival, then, has some serious defects. Another line of argument harnesses the value of cultural survival to the more kindred value of cultural diversity gaining support from the undoubted attractiveness of the latter. On reflection, however, the ideal of cultural diversity seems scarcely less mysterious and ambiguous than the notion of cultural survival itself. The ambiguity in valuing diversity lies, on one level, in whether it means valuing people of distinct backgrounds or valuing the diversity of backgrounds itself. The first notion—that people ought to be respected as equals regardless of their ethnicity race, gender, and other distinguishing traits—is today a part of any plausible political philosophy But it hardly follows that we must value and preserve diversity itself, in the abstract; we have, I think, no reason to regret that the world does not contain twice as many cultures as it does. We might try to defend cultural diversity in the abstract by pointing out how much we benefit by its concrete existence. But this raises in turn another deep ambiguity—that between diversity of cultures and diversity within cultures. Exposure to a wide variety of lifeways is clearly of great moral value; it enables people to flourish in ways that conformity and sameness instead suppress. But there is no necessary link between the desirability of diversity within cultures and the demand that there be a wide variety of cultures themselves. More to the point, the latter demand can actually work against diversity. Political measures designed to foster a culture’s survival must perforce ascribe a negative value to assimilation; they therefore end up penalizing those individuals within it who seek, for example, to borrow or adapt from other cultures. In so doing, advocates of cultural survival often provoke a stilling insistence on cultural purity and conformity; one need only think of the recurrent French crusades for linguistic purity to realize how quickly a drive for cultural preservation can begin to resemble a paternalistic—and, if imposed from outside, patronizing—intolerance. It is one of the sharpest ironies of the cultural survival movement that defending a diversity of cultures tends to repress the possibilities for diversity within cultures.

#### Brain drain alt cause

Joseph **Kalt** and Stephen **Cornell, 2005,** Professor of International Political Economy at Harvard and professor of sociology and of public administration at University of Arizona, “Two Approaches to Economic Development on American Indian”, ([http://jopna.net/pubs/jopna\_ 2005-02\_Approaches.pdf](http://jopna.net/pubs/jopna_2005-02_Approaches.pdf) )

There’s a brain drain as a lot of the people with good ideas—particularly younger tribal members—leave home for somewhere else, desperate to support their families and discouraged by political favoritism, bureaucratic hassles, and the inability of tribal government to deal with the basic problems. Patterns of failure, mismanagement, and corruption encourage outside perceptions of Indian incompetence and reservation chaos that make it even harder to defend tribal sovereignty. **The ultimate economic result is continued poverty**. In short, the standard approach doesn’t work.