#### State action avoids national controversy

**Rabe 4** (Barry, Statehouse and Greenhouse, p 22)

But this is not what occurred in the states examined in this study. Instead, a much quieter process of policy formation has emerged, even during more recent years, when the pace of innovation has accelerated and the intent of many policies has been more far-reaching. This is not to suggest that climate-related episodes have been irrelevant or that leading environmental groups have played no role in state policy development. Contrary to the kinds of political brawls so common in debates about climate change policy at national and international venues, however, state-based policymaking has been far less visible and contentious, often cutting across traditional partisan and interest group fissures. It has, moreover, been far more productive in terms of generating actual policies with the potential to reduce greenhouse gas releases.

### Overview

#### Romney will gut federal support for renewable energy

**Wood, 9/6**/12 – AOL Energy (Elisa, “Renewable Energy: More, Less or the Same under Obama or Romney?,”

<http://energy.aol.com/2012/09/06/renewable-energy-more-less-or-the-same-under-obama-or-romney/>)

For renewable energy, the 2012 presidential race reveals the downside of being championed.

President Barack Obama channeled a historic amount of money into green energy in his first term and made it a centerpiece of his jobs platform. As a result, renewable energy is big target for those taking aim at Obama.

"Because the Obama White House has made renewable energy an important part of the focus, it has become important for the other side to beat it up," said Arno Harris, CEO of Recurrent Energy and board chairman of the Solar Energy Industries Association.

The brawl is at times colorful with quips from both sides about powering cars with windmills – or maybe dogs – on their roofs. Romney's jabbed that Obama thinks he can turn back the rising oceans. And 'Solyndra' has become the 'Halliburton' of this election: a single company name that one party uses to try to encapsulate all they see wrong with the other.

Jokes and hyperbole aside, how far apart are Romney and Obama on renewables?

"There is a real difference in policy," said Andrew Holland, senior fellow for energy and climate at the American Security Project. "Romney, and now Paul Ryan [Romney's vice presidential running mate], **are quite anti-renewable energy."**

Romney hasn't abandoned renewable energy. But he's also not pursuing it with the same "purposefulness," according to Dan Berwick, director of policy and business development at Borrego Solar.

To Incentivize or not to Incentivize?

In his nomination acceptance at the Republican National Convention, Romney included renewables in the list of energy resources North America must take "full advantage of" to reach energy independence. However, Romney promotes few of the market incentives the industry now enjoys. He describes a more narrow federal role, one where funding goes to basic research.

#### Obama key to environmental leadership

Walter and Nan Simpson, 4-22-2012; Walter, University Energy Officer for 26 years and was director of the UB Green Office at the University at Buffalo (SUNY Buffalo); Buffalo News

 http://www.buffalonews.com/editorial-page/viewpoints/article822432.ece

Let’s not reverse progress While Obama has not yet delivered on some environmental priorities, his environmental record is solid in many areas. He appears to be committed to addressing environmental problems in a meaningful way within the constraints of what he views as politically possible. Obama’s re-election offers the promise of continuing his pro-environment programs and the hope he will do more in his second term. Cleaner air, water and energy mean tens of thousands of green jobs with improved public health outcomes that reduce health care costs. The president understands this win-win. Additionally, Obama is likely to do more on climate change in a second term if re-elected with a Democratic Congress and an increasingly informed public demanding action on this life-and-death issue. None of this will happen if Romney is elected our next president. Worse, given the GOP’s radical turn, a Republican victory would take us in reverse — undermining and eliminating laws and regulations that now protect our environment and public health. The critically important environmental vote goes to Obama.

#### Romney election causes Middle East instability and escalatory war

Brooklyn Dame 8-1-2012; Mitt Romney: A Foreign Policy of Incoherence

http://www.zimbio.com/Governor+W.+Mitt+Romney/articles/6GkfmpjrRzU/Mitt+Romney+Foreign+Policy+Incoherence

If his views are to be taken seriously (and some doubt if they should) Romney politics in the Middle East line up pretty strongly with the Israeli Likud party. From this we know three things: Romney would allow Israel relative free ride on its policies, right or wrong, that the former Massachusetts Governor would take a hawkish approach to Iran (risking war and instability in the Middle East), and that a President Romney would not be very friendly towards the new regimes of Egypt or Tunisia. Part of me thinks Romney is too smart to actually believe this tripe. While Bush was a “think-with-your-gut,” “shoot-first-ask-questions-later” kind of guy, with nary a bone of pragmatism in his body, Romney appears at least removed in his behavior, and he appears to consider the pros and cons of every action (which explains his “flip-flopping” behavior in politics). So, again, part of me leans towards believing that as president, Romney would merely be a high-defense-spending, moderate, realist in the mold of Ronald Reagan or George H.W. Bush. It’s hard to realistically picture him as one truly in the camp of Paul Wolfowitz or Bill Kristol whose panacea for foreign policy comes down to “bomb! bomb! invade! invade!” That being said, we must take the candidates at their word. To dismiss their words would be folly. And Romney’s words in foreign policy arena **border on disastrous**. We cannot risk electing someone who — in a time of democratization and revolution in the Middle East, a trend that can easily be reversed or hijacked by illiberal forces — would turn a blind eye to pernicious Israeli policies in the region, encourage military action against Iran, and spurn the newly emergent regimes of Egypt and Tunisia for their exaggerated Islamist nature. Furthermore, as can be seen in Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and Bahrain, the cold war between Sunni Saudi Arabia and Shia Iran is at threat of **heating up across the region** if not properly mediated by the international community. Why would Romney want to risk derailing the progress of the Arab Spring through unintentionally encouraging an escalation of Sunni-Shia tensions across the region with the added wild card of an unrestrained, frenetic Israel in the mix?

#### Nuclear war

Russell2009 – Editor of Strategic Insights, Senior Lecturer Department of National Security Affairs (James, Spring, “Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East” Security Studies Center Proliferation Papers, http://www.ifri.org/downloads/PP26\_Russell\_2009.pdf)

Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors: (1) asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors; (2) the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists; (3) incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable; (4) perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack; (5) the prospect that Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States; (6) the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants.

These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of miscalculation or the pressures of wartime circumstance. Given these factors, it is disturbingly easy to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons.

It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the context of an unstable strategic framework. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent such an outcome, which would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with substantial risk for the entire world.

### A2 u ow link

#### It’s not over – Romney can still recover

**Thrush and Tau, 9/18/12 -** covers the White House for Politico.(Glenn and Byron, “Romney RIP — not so fast” Politico, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0912/81369.html?hp=t1_3>)

Caution is not the message emanating from the Washington echo chamber or from giddy Democrats — and depressed Republicans — who are drafting Romney’s political obituary with nearly 50 news cycles before Election Day.

But Romney, however humbled, has nearly 50 more chances to change the narrative. Despite his stunning missteps, his failure to articulate an attractive rationale for his candidacy, a growing GOP pessimism and tales of corrosive internal dissent, he remains within easy striking distance of Obama in most polls and is showing no signs of imminent collapse.

His support isn’t likely to dip much below 45 percent to 47 percent largely because nine in 10 Republicans are backing him.

“President Obama may make major strategic decisions in response to two tough days in the fishbowl — but that’s not how Crossroads rolls,” said Jonathan Collegio, spokesman for the Rove-linked groups American Crossroads and Crossroads GPS. “Every state where Romney needs to win is tight — we know this; our donors know this; and we’re continuing with our plan to end this train wreck of a presidency that has been Obama’s last four years.”

There aren’t a lot of raging optimists in Obama’s inner circle anyway, and now, they are being very careful, in private, to moderate their glee with a realism.

“Democrats should just remember Florida 2000 before they get cocky,” veteran Democratic strategist Karen Finney said. “It’s the stuff you don’t see that goes under the radar — the robocalls … flyers and mailings. … That’s the kind of stuff you can’t detect. Karl Rove knows how to win,” she said.

#### It will be close and Romney can recover if Obama’s approval rating slips

**Usher, September, 12** – PhD, director of Purple Insights, a polling firm (Doug, September 2012 edition Purple Poll, <http://www.purplestrategies.com/wp-content/uploads/PurplePoll-9.21.12.pdf?utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=PurplePoll+Sept+2012-+from+Doug&utm_content=PurplePoll+Sept+2012-+from+Doug+CID_3d908eaa034685f378af8d464ed685de&utm_source=Email%20marketing%20software&utm_term=For%20much%20more%20read%20the%20full%20poll%20and%20our%20analysis%20here>)

Six weeks is a lifetime in politics, particularly in an election as closely monitored as this year’s presidential race. While Obama has gained momentum, there is a small but significant window of opportunity for Romney. First, the President’s approval rating and vote level indicate that voters remain hesitant

to re-elect him. Second, the Romney campaign has had a string of difficult events (some self-inflicted), and as the campaign rights its ship the polls may tighten again. Finally, the upcoming debates provide a level of exposure (and risk) for both candidates. A strong showing by Governor Romney could turn the race around once more.

### Link u

#### Renewables will collapse in the US – financial incentives are rolling back

Justin Jacobs 5-25-2012; Petroleum Economist June 2012, Is the boom-time over for US renewables, Lexis

Justin Jacobs, LONDON: The clean energy sector has been a rare bright spot for the ailing US economy since the financial crisis took hold. Strong political support from the Obama administration and generous stimulus spending has fuelled a golden age for wind and solar technologies and led to a resurgence in the moribund nuclear industry. Non-hydro renewable electricity generation in the US, including nuclear power, doubled from 2006 to 2011, even if it still accounts for less than a tenth of electricity produced. But the good times could soon come to an end, though, as stimulus funds run dry and a host of subsidy programmes expire over coming years, potentially creating a **ruinous "funding cliff**", a report from three think tanks has warned. The report, Beyond Boom and Bust: Putting Clean Tech on a Path to Subsidy Independence, was written by authors from the Breakthrough Institute, the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program and the World Resources Institute. It points to 2012 as a make-or-break year for the sector. Federal funding for clean energy - wind, solar and nuclear primarily - is expected to fall by nearly half this year, from $30.7 billion in 2011 to around $16 billion. That is down from a peak of $44.3 billion dollars in 2009. And spending is projected to continue its precipitous decline. By 2014 federal spending on clean energy technologies is projected to fall to $11 billion, a decline of 75% from 2009, the report's author's claim. Last year, for example, a crucial grant programme known as Section 1603, which BP took advantage of to approve an $800 million wind farm in Kansas, was allowed to expire. That led to an increase of some 50%-130% in the cost of financing new wind projects, according to the report. Dozens of similar subsidy programmes, representing 70% of all clean energy support measures, are scheduled to expire by 2014. "In the first quarter of 2012, global clean energy investment dropped to its lowest level since 2008. Good news stories are being replaced with headlines about closing factories, bankruptcies, and cancelled projects. Clean tech appears to be at a crucial inflection point," says Letha Tawney, a co-author of the report and senior associate at the World Resources Institute.

### 2nc links

#### Renewables are massively unpopular –Budgetary concerns

**Von Schirach, 12 -** International Economic Development Consultant

(Paolo, International Affairs Commentator and Writer, May 11, “[Renewable Energy In The US – Subsidies Politically Unpopular – Natural Gas A Much Cheaper Alternative – USG Should Focus On R&D](http://schirachreport.com/index.php/2012/05/11/grim-prospects-for-renewable-energy-in-the-us-subsidies-politically-unpopular-natural-gas-a-much-cheaper-alternative-usg-should-focus-on-rd/),”

<http://schirachreport.com/index.php/2012/05/11/grim-prospects-for-renewable-energy-in-the-us-subsidies-politically-unpopular-natural-gas-a-much-cheaper-alternative-usg-should-focus-on-rd/>, d/a 7-20-12

American enthusiasm for renewable energy, not too deep [to begin](http://schirachreport.com/index.php/2012/05/11/grim-prospects-for-renewable-energy-in-the-us-subsidies-politically-unpopular-natural-gas-a-much-cheaper-alternative-usg-should-focus-on-rd/)with, **has gone away**. In part this has to do with loss of interest in “climate change” and its dire consequences. Unfortunately, climate change has been and is mostly an issue of political belief, **rather than upholding science**. And as the intensity of the political fervor somehow waned, in large part replaced by more immediate economic fears, so did political support for all the renewable energy technologies that were supposed to create, relatively quickly it was thought, workable alternatives to carbon based energy. An additional reason for waning support is that keeping renewable energy alive means also **subsidizing it** for a few more years. And this is less and less politically palatable at a time of budgetary constraints at every level. Paying more for electricity simply because this kind is clean looks like an unaffordable luxury, **whatever the consequences** of burning more (cheaper) fossil fuels may be.

#### Wind power unpopular

AEA 8/17/12 (American Energy Alliance, “In the Pipeline: 8/17/12,” http://www.americanenergyalliance.org/2012/08/in-the-pipeline-81712/)

 Basically, Dan Simmons ran the show, even though it’s not actually named after him. The Diane Rehm Show (8/16/12) reports: “The role of subsidies for wind energy has become a **hot-button issue** in the presidential campaign. Governor Romney opposes extending tax credits for the wind industry. President Obama has re-doubled his commitment to them. In a rare show of bipartisanship last week, the Senate Finance Committee voted to extend the credits for another year. The debate over their fate will likely surface again in the fall. Supporters of the extension argue all major sources of energy have received federal help. Opponents say it’s time to let the free market take over. Diane her guests discuss the politics the future of wind energy in the U.S.”

### 2nc states solve

#### Tribal-state agreements over taxation are historically successful

**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)

In order to reduce the problem of double taxation, many tribes have entered into special agreements with states called tax compacts. n199 Although the content of these compacts differ, they often involve a tribe and state agreeing to implement a single tax over an activity, the revenue of which they allocate between themselves. n200 The benefit of this approach is that it clarifies each sovereign's rights, making litigation unnecessary. Additionally, it prevents non-Indian actors on the reservation from being taxed twice for the same activity, decreasing the deterrent effect on investors. But states generally have much greater political and economic power than tribes and are able to leverage agreements in their own favor. n201 As a result, tribes ultimately give away substantial chunks of their tax revenue to the state to avoid conflict and litigation. n202

#### Solves wind and solar – spurs massive new investment and decreases costs to spur commercialization and ends the need for subsidies and tax breaks

**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>)

Clean energy finance banks, in this regard, hold great promise for financing both energy efficiency projects and the deployment of clean energy projects with low technology risks, including projects using existing wind and solar technologies. Such clean energy projects, because of their low technology risk and low financing risk (particularly when they have entered into long-term power purchase agreements for the purchase of their output) should be able to attract bond purchasers interested in long-term, safe returns and thus willing to accept rates of return at a conservative level. By providing standby purchase agreements or total return swaps, the clean energy finance bank could even increase the potential pool of tax equity investors by lowering the risk profile of such investments. At the same time, state clean energy finance banks could also be expanded to cover innovative, riskier new technologies and manufacturing facilities, although each of these propositions presents its own risk factors and would require a different funding “window” within the bank. Along these lines, state-organized clean energy finance banks offer a practical way for states to make available low-cost financing for project developers in their regions and keep the clean energy economy growing. Currently, a significant amount of relatively low-cost credit is available for at least large energy project developers. Studies that the Coalition for Green Capital (CGC) has conducted, however, show that lowering the cost of clean energy loans by 225 basis points and providing longterm loans to all developers would lower the cost for a clean energy project by 15 to 20 percent (See Figure 3).21CGC thinks that state clean energy finance banks could provide loans at this rate differential. A clean energy finance bank would establish loan loss reserves through credit subsidy fees or using bank capital that is replenished by credit subsidy fees.22 This would be an important gain. A 15 to 20 percent reduction in the cost of a wind or solar project would make many projects cost-competitive with conventional generation. For other projects, clean energy finance banks’ offer of a low-interest rate tranche, rather than the full cost of the project, might be enough for the project to proceed. In yet other cases, the banks’ financing would not replace all of the tax credits and incentives that are likely to be withdrawn for budget reasons but it would substantially reduce the need for such supports. The need for financing of energy efficiency projects is different. When faced with a choice of spending scarce dollars on energy efficiency rather than other uses, most homeowners and small businessmen, and even many large businesses, choose projects other than energy efficiency. As a result, to ensure adequate demand for energy efficiency projects, most energy programs subsidize the cost of energy efficiency projects, and many experts believe that 100 percent subsidies or financing of the up-front costs of energy efficiency projects is needed,23 with repayment limited to an estimate of the expected amount of the energy savings.24 The latter limitation becomes difficult if the cost of the project is too high since the cost of repayment at high interest rates would eventually exceed the estimated value of the energy savings. Currently there are low-cost financing programs but often the interest rates are held down by interest rate buy-downs. These types of programs will be very hard to bring to scale in an austere budget environment and in many places it is difficult to obtain 100-percent up-front financing. A clean energy finance bank should be able to provide financing at low enough rates after a loan loss reserve is established to avoid the need for interest rate buy-downs and help bring energy efficiency projects to scale. In any event, the low-cost lending through state clean energy finance banks should be able to substantially reduce the cost of clean energy projects and so make many of them cost-competitive with traditional power generation while reducing their reliance on subsidies.

### modeling

#### States solve international modeling and perception arguments

**Northrop and Sassoon, 08** - Program Director for Sustainable Development at the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and administrator of SolveClimate.com (Michael David, Yale Environment 360, 6-3, <http://e360.yale.edu/content/feature.msp?id=2015>)

Individually, the size of many of these state economies rivals those of most countries. State climate policy initiatives — though not yet implemented on a national scale — are collectively among the most advanced anywhere in the world. They provide a profound but largely unrecognized platform for national action, and for a potential reassertion of global environmental leadership by the United States. Indeed, state climate initiatives have provided hope to those in the global community who have waited patiently for the United States to engage meaningfully in international climate efforts.

#### States solve all their international warrants—other countries perceive state-level leadership and it sets a model for other countries

**Kate 8** – member, Clingendael International Energy Programme (Warner ten, May, A Green Light for the American Climate Discussion?, http://www.clingendael.nl/publications/2008/20080500\_ciep\_briefingpaper\_kate.pdf)

Kevin Conrad, together with the rest of the conference, accused the United States of lacking the leadership it had promised to show in the run-up to Bali. The US, as the largest consumer of energy in the world, and as de facto leader of the industrialized nations, is indispensable in setting a good example, and in such to convince the large developing economies such as China and India to contribute in mitigating climate change. Although on the international level the leadership of Washington has been sorely missed for several years, an increasingly vocal call for more leadership is originating from the national level. The autonomous governments of the American states are developing a number of climate initiatives, which they seek to couple with international initiatives, particularly the European Emission Trading Scheme (ETS). In the run-up to the international climate conference in Bali, the International Carbon Action Partnership (ICAP) was launched on October 29, 2007. Apart from several member states of the European Union, together with Norway, New Zealand, and Canadian Provinces, sixteen individual states from the United States joined the partnership.2 ICAP provides a platform for the exchange of expertise in the field of emission trading systems which would, in the long term, enable these systems to be coupled. ICAP thus wants to contribute to the Bali-road map, in order to facilitate the creation of a global emission trading system.3 The Dutch minister of European Affairs, Frans Timmermans, called the signing of ICAP a milestone: “For the first time we have been able to establish sounds commitments across the Atlantic. You don’t need ‘Washington’ to make substantial agreements with the American States.”4

### AT: 50 state fiat bad

Solvency advocate checks – our 1nc Harvard Law Review evidence says that collective state action is superior to federal action, prefer a literature – based interpretation of theory –it’s in the context of energy policy and it describes collective state action

a. Real world policy experts consider the counterplan, it’s in the literature, its arbitrary and unpredictable to exclude it from the negative arsenal

#### b.Literature supports 50 state uniformity

**Northrop and Sassoon, 08** - Program Director for Sustainable Development at the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and administrator of SolveClimate.com (Michael David, Yale Environment 360, 6-3, <http://e360.yale.edu/content/feature.msp?id=2015>)

But the states have far more to offer. They also have approved a host of energy-efficiency measures affecting all sectors of the economy. For example, one set of policies provides both emissions reductions and substantial economic savings from the building sector through improved building codes, insulation and weatherization programs, and lighting retrofits. From the waste management sector, waste reduction and recycling programs yield similar two-pronged benefits.

These policies go hand-in-hand with others mandating that an increasing percentage of a state’s energy come from renewable sources, such as solar and wind power. Many states — chief among them California — have shown similar national leadership by significantly toughening auto emissions standards, leading Congress to increase national vehicle standards last December and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to challenge the states in court.

The fact that so many states are acting with a similar impetus begs an important question: What would happen if you aggregated these policies and applied them on a national scale?

One study conducted by the Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) — a non-partisan group that has worked on climate policymaking and analysis with many of these states — indicates that the adoption of a comprehensive, nationwide climate and energy policy would have substantial economic benefits. Using data from 12 states that are leaders in the field of climate change and energy, CSS calculated that were all 50 states to adopt similar rules and legislation, the aggregate economic savings would be $25 billion. The nation could achieve a 33% reduction in projected greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 — a common interim target — and save money doing so.

**Advocacy Skills- Forcing the aff to defend federal key warrants encourages the development of better researched and planned policies and is vital to being a competent energy policy advocate because ideas aren’t enough in congress, that’s key to social change and avoiding the lack of planning that caused poor policies like Iraq**

**Info Processing- Forcing the aff to research every intricacy of the plan encourages more holistic processing of information that encourages better research practices and critical thinking and causes more precise plan writing**

**Relevant Policy Choice – State Lawmakers must compare and choose in the absence of Federal Action – means our cp provides a real-world policy option**

**Biering 8 –** former Executive Fellow in the California Resources Agency (Brian, 23 J. Envtl. L. & Litig. 35)

Federalism issues aside, the fundamental question policymakers need to resolve is whether it is more appropriate for the states to act now in the area of climate change, or whether the field should be simply left to the federal government to address in its own time.

**-Neg ground—checks tiny affs with no federal defense, otherwise there will be a huge topic explosion**

**-Reciprocal—they fiat each Congressperson votes for the plan and that local agencies enforce it**

**-Aff ground—they can read disad to states or impact turn**

**-No infinite regress—“in the US” in the topic means there’s only a few domestic government actors**

#### 50 state fiat isn’t unprecedented

**Mountjoy 4,** (John J., Director of National Center for Interstate Compacts and Associate Director for National Policy Coordination, The Council of State Governments, “Solutions for States: Interstate Compacts as a Tool,” http://www.csg.org/programs/ncic/documents/SolutionsForStates.pdf)

Interstate compacts are contracts between states and carry with them the force and effect of statutory law. While most interstate compacts are rudimentary in function (regulating boundaries and water rights) and have signatories numbering below fifteen, several interstate compacts maintain membership of all 50 states (or close to it) and have administrative/regulatory agencies that oversee the functionality of the compact between states. The Drivers’ License Compact and its American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators regulate and allow states to recognize drivers’ licenses issued in other states. The Interstate Compact for Education and its Education Commission of the States maintain close cooperation and understanding among executive, legislative, professional, educational leadership on a nationwide basis at the State and local levels.

### 2NC Impact Overview

#### Russian collapse escalates all conflicts

Patrick, Speice 2006 J.D. Candidate 2006, Marshall-Wythe School of Law, College of William and Mary, “NEGLIGENCE AND NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION: ELIMINATING THE CURRENT LIABILITY BARRIER TO BILATERAL U.S.-RUSSIAN NONPROLIFERATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS,” William & Mary Law Review, Lexis

The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be devastating in terms of immediate human and economic losses. (49) Moreover, there would be immense political pressure in the United States to discover the perpetrators and retaliate with nuclear weapons, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict. (50) In addition to the threat posed by terrorists, leakage of nuclear knowledge and material from Russia will reduce the barriers that states with nuclear ambitions face and may trigger widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons. (51) This proliferation will **increase the risk of nuclear attacks** against the United States or its allies by hostile states, (52) as well as increase the likelihood that **regional conflicts will draw in the United States and escalate to the use of nuclear weapons**. (53)

#### US-Russia nuclear war causes extinction and outweighs

Nick Bostrum March 2002 faculty of philosophy at Oxford and winner of the esteemed Eugene Gannon Award, <http://marukuwato.multiply.com/journal/item/157>

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

#### Even if Russia doesn’t collapse, opportunistic aggression by China would escalate – causes extinction

AlexanderSharavin2001 Director of the Institute for Military and Political Analysis, What the Papers Say, Oct 3)

Now, a few words about the third type of war. A real military threat to Russia from China has not merely been ignored; it has been denied by Russia's leaders and nearly all of the political forces. Let's see some statistic figures at first. The territory of Siberia and the Russian Far East comprises 12,765,900 square kilometers (75% of Russia's entire area), with a population of 40,553,900 people (28% of Russia's population). The territory of China is 9,597,000 square kilometers and its population is 1.265 billion (which is 29 times greater than the population of Siberia and the Russian Far East). China's economy is among the fastest-growing economies in the world. It remains socialistic in many aspects, i.e. extensive and highly expensive, demanding more and more natural resources. China's natural resources are rather limited, whereas the depths of Siberia and the Russian Far East are almost inexhaustible. Chinese propaganda has constantly been showing us skyscrapers in free trade zones in southeastern China. It should not be forgotten, however, that some 250 to 300 million people live there, i.e. at most a quarter of China's population. A billion Chinese people are still living in misery. For them, even the living standards of a backwater Russian town remain inaccessibly high. They have absolutely nothing to lose. There is every prerequisite for "the final throw to the north." The strength of the Chinese People's Liberation Army (CPLA) has been growing quicker than the Chinese economy. A decade ago the CPLA was equipped with inferior copies of Russian arms from late 1950s to the early 1960s. However, through its own efforts Russia has nearly managed to liquidate its most significant technological advantage. Thanks to our zeal, from antique MiG-21 fighters of the earliest modifications and S-75 air defense missile systems the Chinese antiaircraft defense forces have adopted Su-27 fighters and S-300 air defense missile systems. China's air defense forces have received Tor systems instead of anti-aircraft guns which could have been used during World War II. The shock air force of our "eastern brethren" will in the near future replace antique Tu-16 and Il-28 airplanes with Su-30 fighters, which are not yet available to the Russian Armed Forces! Russia may face the "wonderful" prospect of combating the Chinese army, which, if full mobilization is called, is comparable in size with Russia's entire population, which also has nuclear weapons (even tactical weapons become strategic if states have common borders) and would be absolutely insensitive to losses (even a loss of a few million of the servicemen would be acceptable for China). Such a war would be more horrible than the World War II. It would require from our state maximal tension, universal mobilization and complete accumulation of the army military hardware, up to the last tank or a plane, in a single direction (we would have to forget such "trifles" like Talebs and Basaev, but this does not guarantee success either). Massive nuclear strikes on basic military forces and cities of China would finally **be the only way out**, what would exhaust Russia's armament completely. We have not got another set of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-based missiles, whereas the general forces would be extremely exhausted in the border combats. In the long run, even if the aggression would be stopped after the majority of the Chinese are killed, our country would be absolutely unprotected against the "Chechen" and the "Balkan" variants both, and even against the first frost of a possible nuclear winter.

#### Russian economic collapse would cause an airborne Ebola pandemic

ScienceDaily, 1998 (Science Daily, 9-16-98, http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/1998/09/980916074355.htm)

Drug-senstive TB is curable through proper drug therapy. MDR-TB is potentially much more dangerous, especially because TB spreads through the air and can move from patient to patient in its deadly drug-resistant form. MDR-TB has been dubbed "Ebola with wings." Current levels of MDR-TB in Russia are alarming. The looming economic crisis will exacerbate the problem. It is only a matter of time before MDR-TB of Russian origin becomes a daily reality in other countries worldwide. The current Russian economic crisis will further deplete already strained resources of public medicine. The resulting shortage of anti-TB drugs will inevitably lead to the massive practice of substandard antibiotic treatment of patients with TB, which is the principal cause of MDR-TB. Standard treatment of regular TB consists of a daily regimen of four different antibiotics for six months. When this treatment is incomplete or interrupted, a patient can easily develop MDR-TB and then spread this potentially lethal form of TB to other people. We are particularly concerned about the dire situation in Russian prisons, where systematic underfunding combined with epidemic-prone conditions already has resulted in the generation of nearly 20,000 MDR-TB cases. The number of cases is expected to rise because, under the current conditions, about 100,000 inmates with regular TB are subjected to inappropriate, MDR-causing treatment protocols. Among the civilian population, TB patients undergoing treatment often are required to pay for their own drugs, even in state run hospitals. In the worsening economic situation, this burden on patients will translate into inadequate treatment and, consequently, thousands of new MDR-TB cases because most people will discontinue prescribed treatment as soon as symptoms subside.

#### Russia is key to the global economy

#### --anchor for growth during recessions

Martin Gilman, 1-16-2008; Former senior representative of the IMF in Russia and professor at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow. “Well-Placed to Weather an Economic Storm,” Moscow Times, <http://www.moscowtimes.ru/stories/2008/01/16/008.html>

Faced with this gloomy global outlook, Russia is well placed to weather the storm. In fact, not only is the Russian economy **likely to decouple largely from a sagging U**nited **S**tates and even Europe, but its continuing boom -- mostly but not solely **fueled by high energy revenues** -- **is** sucking in both consumer and investment goods, and so **acting as a motor of world growth**. And the planned $1 trillion public investment program over the next decade should ensure that the country remains decoupled for years to come.

#### Russian stability is key to balance China – prevents heg collapse

Zeyno Baran et al, Summer 2007. Senior Fellow and Director Center for Eurasian Studies, Hudson Institute. “U.S. – RUSSIAN RELATIONS : IS CONFLICT INEVITABLE?” Hudson Institute Symposium on US-Russian Relations, www.hudson.org/files/pdf\_upload/Russia-Web%20(2).pdf

The West needs a stable Russia in order to maintain the global balance of power against China. In the event of Russia’s disintegration, her resources will go to China, not the West. The West cannot stop Russia’s slide into a systemic cri- sis, and can only help get out of it once it has begun. This is a challenge for the future. Currently, the West needs a “Cold War” only with Russia’s new masters, not with the Russian people. Russians are protesting against the politics of the Russian bureaucracy, and their protest should not be re-directed at the bureaucracy’s strategic partners in the West. If the West understands and accepts this, it needs to learn to acknowledge Russians’ rights to patriotism and to a normal level of freedom—not as a religious symbol, but as the only path to prosperity and justice. Russian “democrats” and “liberals” have forgotten these demands and rights, and therefore the terms “dem - o crat” and “liberal” are cursed in Russia. Official propa- ganda uses this to divert Russian citizens from asserting their interests and rights to fighting the West. The West needs to explain to Russia that these rights have been destroyed not by rivalry with the West, but solely by the avarice of the new Russian leaders. It is true that in the future, the issue of global competition will arise. Currently, however, there is only one key prob- lem—corruption (including, of course, corruption in the interests of the West) and a lack of bureaucratic integrity. After Russia experiences a systemic crisis the West must be able to say to Russians; “You see? We are for democracy, but not for “democrats,” for law, but not for lawyers, for prosperity, but not for prospering oligarchs.” All of these are things that the West could not say after the 1990s. Russia will be useful to the West if the West can side with Russia against China and global Islam in foreign policy and with the Russian people against the Russian bureaucracy in domestic policy. If the West attempts to transform Russia according to its own conceptualization of the correct societal order, or simply to seize Russian raw materials, intellect, and money, it will destroy Russia and pay dearly for the rela- tively small gain. **As a consequence** of doing so, **the West will experience large-scale, global systemic problems**.

### A2 mltry link u

#### No production increase or sustained investment – not cost competitive

Aaron Menenburg 9-6-2012; graduate student in international relations at The Maxwell School of Syracuse University. “Let’s Get Real: Energy Independence is an Unrealistic and Misleading Myth” http://www.economonitor.com/policiesofscale/2012/09/06/lets-get-real-energy-independence-is-a-unrealistic-and-misleading-myth/

By 2030, the world is expected to consume over 100 million barrels of oil per day, and it is far from conclusive that the impact of the additional 10% of supply achieved by producing North America’s near-full capacity would have any meaningful effect on oil prices given the continued rise in demand up to and beyond 2035 expected by every projection, especially when US proven oil reserves are only the twelfth largest in the world.[17] Getting every little bit of additional supply from domestic reserves will require increasingly elaborate operations, many of which may be prohibitively expensive if proper environmental safeguards are factored in and if world prices sag, **as they have repeatedly** in the past 15 years. In a global market, it is hard to see how such projects could compete with various foreign sources where production costs are much lower. Most of the oil extracted by OPEC countries costs less than $5 per barrel to produce[18] with total upstream costs of Middle Eastern crude at $16.93 per barrel.[19] Conversely, the Department of Energy reports US average upstream costs of $74.20 per barrel between 2006 and 2008, which is a good reference point for current production costs given recent dynamics in global oil production costs.[20] Even if all government regulations on oil production and refining were removed, the cost of domestic production would be **more expensive** than OPEC production **by multiples**.

#### Current renewables in the military won’t be adopted – nowhere near cost competitive

Reuters 6-19-2012; Renewables no fix for US military fuel woes –study <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/19/usa-defense-energy-idUSL1E8HIH6M20120619>

WASHINGTON, June 19 (Reuters) - Renewable fuels for U.S. military ships and jets are likely to remain "far more expensive" than petroleum products absent a technological breakthrough, a study for the U.S. Air Force found on Tuesday, questioning a Pentagon push for alternative energy. The study by the RAND Corporation think tank said that while the U.S. Defense Department is a huge consumer of fuel at about 340,000 barrels per day, that figure is a tiny fraction of the 87 million barrels per day of global demand, too small to influence price significantly. Efforts to make fuel from seed or algae oils are not producing at the scale or price necessary to meet the military's demand at a reasonable cost, said James Bartis, the RAND researcher who authored a volume of the report. "Pending a major technical breakthrough, renewable jet fuel and marine fuels will continue to be far more expensive than petroleum-based fuels," he said. That assessment is likely to stoke the current confrontation in Washington over the Pentagon's efforts to promote alternative fuels. U.S. Navy Secretary Ray Mabus has angered members of Congress by pushing development of biofuels for use in ships and aircraft. Lawmakers in both houses of Congress have proposed a measure that would bar military spending on biofuels unless they are competitively priced with petroleum. The move came after the Navy spent $12 million on 450,000 gallons of biofuel to power an exhibition next month of Mabus's Great Green Fleet, which will use nuclear energy in its aircraft carrier and submarines and a blend of biofuels and petroleum in its cruisers, destroyers and jet aircraft. Mabus says the U.S. can create a market for alternative fuels that is large enough to drive down prices to the point where they would be competitive with petroleum. SKEPTICISM IN CONGRESS Lawmakers are skeptical of that view, saying Mabus and the Pentagon have not produced the analysis needed to back up his arguments. Representative Randy Forbes, one of his leading critics, said on Monday that Mabus needed to explain how he came to the conclusion that renewable fuels can achieve price competitiveness with petroleum. "We are absolutely opposed to the secretary trying to spend taxpayer money to create alternative markets just because he wants those alternative markets without any analysis to substantiate what it's going to take to successfully do that," he said. In his report, Bartis said price fluctuations in the oil market would at times force the U.S. military to spend heavily on fuel, but "alternative liquid fuels do not offer DoD (the Defense Department) a way to appreciably reduce fuel costs."

**Those projects don’t trigger the link – the military isn’t the one demonstrating or developing the project, it’s just buying some electricity from local utility companies**

Joao Peixe; 8-12-2012 writer for Oilprice.com; The US Army has $7 Billion to Spend on Renewable Energy <http://oilprice.com/Latest-Energy-News/World-News/The-US-Army-has-7-Billion-to-Spend-on-Renewable-Energy.html>

In order to achieve the Department of Defence’s initiative to generate 25 percent of all energy demanded on its bases from renewable energy sources by 2025, the US Army has announced that it will invest $7 billion in new renewable energy projects. The Army won’t actually fund the projects, but rather will sign contracts to buy the electricity produced by any solar, wind, geothermal, or biomass installations for up to 30 years. The renewable energy companies must finance, install and operate the installations. So rather than paying utility companies for the electricity, they will pay renewable energy companies such as SolarCity or Sungevity. “It is the intent of the government only to purchase the energy that is produced and not to acquire any generation assets. The contractor shall develop, finance, design, build, operate, own and maintain the energy plant.”