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#### Multiple alt causes like uranium mining on native land

#### Prefer util

Cumminsky 90 – Professor of Philosophy, Bates (David, Kantian Consequentialism, Ethics 100.3, p 601-2, p 606, jstor)

We must not obscure the issue by characterizing this type of case as the sacrifice of individuals for some abstract "social entity." It is not a question of some persons having to bear the cost for some elusive "overall social good." Instead, the question is whether some persons must bear the inescapable cost for the sake of other persons. Nozick, for example, argues that "to use a person in this way does not sufficiently respect and take account of the fact that he is a separate person, that his is the only life he has."30 Why, however, is this not equally true of all those that we do not save through our failure to act? By emphasizing solely the one who must bear the cost if we act, one fails to sufficiently respect and take account of the many other separate persons, each with only one life, who will bear the cost of our inaction. In such a situation, what would a conscientious Kantian agent, an agent motivated by the unconditional value of rational beings, choose? We have a duty to promote the conditions necessary for the existence of rational beings, but both choosing to act and choosing not to act will cost the life of a rational being. Since the basis of Kant's principle is "rational nature exists as an end-in-itself' (GMM, p. 429), the reasonable solution to such a dilemma involves promoting, insofar as one can, the conditions necessary for rational beings. If I sacrifice some for the sake of other rational beings, I do not use them arbitrarily and I do not deny the unconditional value of rational beings. **Persons** may **have "dignity**, an unconditional and incomparable value" that transcends any market value (GMM, p. 436), **but**, as rational beings, persons **also** have **a fundamental equality which dictates that some must** sometimes **give way for the sake of others.** The formula of the end-in-itself thus does not support the view that we may never force another to bear some cost in order to benefit others. If one focuses on the equal value of all rational beings, then equal consideration dictates that one sacrifice some to save many. [continues] According to Kant, the objective end of moral action is the existence of rational beings. Respect for rational beings requires that, in deciding what to do, one give appropriate practical consideration to the unconditional value of rational beings and to the conditional value of happiness. Since agent-centered constraints require a non-value-based rationale, the most natural interpretation of the demand that one give equal respect to all rational beings lead to a consequentialist normative theory. We have seen that there is no sound Kantian reason for abandoning this natural consequentialist interpretation. In particular, a consequentialist interpretation does not require sacrifices which a Kantian ought to consider unreasonable, and it does not involve doing evil so that good may come of it. It simply requires an uncompromising commitment to the equal value and equal claims of all rational beings and a recognition that, in the moral consideration of conduct, one's own subjective concerns do not have overriding importance.

**Regulatory confusion and jurisdictional overlap prevents solvency**

**Tanana and Ruple, 12** - \* Fellow with the University of Utah's Institute for Clean and Secure Energy AND \*\* Fellow with the University of Utah's Wallace Stegner Center for Land, Resources & the Environment (Heather and John, “Energy Development in Indian Country: Working within the Realm of Indian Law and Moving towards Collaboration,” 32 Utah Envtl. L. Rev. 1, lexis)

B. Moving Towards Collaboration

A collaborative approach in and around Indian country is needed to ensure efficient energy development. Land and resource ownership is highly fragmented, and Indian country jurisdiction remains a complicated and often misunderstood concept. Agency personnel may not understand the geographic extent of Indian country or why Indian country is not synonymous with current reservation boundaries. Formal agreements and maps of the geographic extent of Indian country and associated state regulatory jurisdictional limits are rare. n309 As a result, federal, state, and tribal officials must rely on informal understandings and ad-hoc [\*44] decision-making processes. The lack of clarity can create uncertainty for those potentially subject to regulation, as they legitimately question who will regulate their development and fear that a project extending across jurisdictional boundaries could be subject to multiple and conflicting requirements or worse, a jurisdictional battle between governments or agencies. Moreover, energy developers may be forced to configure proposals to address regulatory rather than resource constraint, which may in turn lead to inefficient development, redundant infrastructure, and a greater overall level of environmental impact.

Where jurisdiction is unclear, the risk of inconsistent regulation increases, uncoordinated cumulative effects assessments become more likely, and inadequate protection of transient resources, such as migrating wildlife and air quality related values, is more likely to occur. Energy resources within Indian country hold tremendous promise to reduce dependence on foreign oil and spur economic development. However, in order to prevent haphazard development, federal, state, and tribal governments must work together. Failure to coordinate plans among federal agencies, tribal governments, state governments, and the general public can lead to program duplication and inefficient accomplishment of governmental programs. n310 It is essential to bring all the relevant players into the land use planning process "so that they will have a voice in decisions that affect their interests." n311

Presently, energy resources are managed by different parties under different requirements, advancing different interests. Fragmented ownership, combined with divergent management objectives, threatens to either impede development or result in development that neither maximizes efficiencies nor minimizes environmental degradation. In order to prevent such outcomes, it is critical that federal, state, and tribal leaders coordinate their efforts to create synergies rather than conflicts.
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#### Zero impact d on strikes – escalates faster and is more probable – Romney has made definitive statements

#### 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.

#### Strikes cause terrorism, CBW attacks, and oil shocks that destroy the economy

Michael Moran, 8-20-2010; Foreign Affairs columnist for GlobalPost, covering global economics, politics and U.S. foreign policy from New York; Moran ran CFR.org, the website of the Council on Foreign Relations, Opinion: The war over war with Iran http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/middle-east/100820/iran-war-nuclear-proliferation-israel

Yet U.S. military planners concluded long ago that Iran’s nuclear program has already developed beyond the point where air strikes could destroy it. At best, air strikes push back the day when Iran attains nuclear capability (whether it actually “tests” a warhead is another question). During the early days of the Iraq war in 2003, perhaps, such a mission might have successfully set back Iran’s nuclear weapons program a few years (though destroying it, frankly, would always have required an invasion and a sustained UNSCOM-style inspections regime). Right now, the frustrating UN sanctions route appears the best of a bad set of options. Few claim the air strikes would do long-term damage to Iran’s program. A recent assessment by James Phillips, a senior defense analyst from the conservative Heritage Foundation, concluded that Israeli air strikes could only “buy a little time” at this point. Phillips goes on to argue that it would be better for Israel to buy some time now than fight a nuclear war with Iran later – as if these are the only two options on the table. But Phillips, like other analysts of various political leanings, also lays out a series of harrowing consequences from such an attack, including possible chemical and biological counterstrikes by Iranian missiles on Israel, the unleashing of Hezbollah and Hamas against Israeli and U.S. interests, the activation of Iranian agents in Iraq to foil the American withdrawal and, in the darkest scenario, the closing of the Straits of Hormuz and attacks on Saudi oil facilities – in effect, precipitation of a global oil crisis like none ever seen. The fact is, in every year subsequent to our misguided Iraq invasion, both the expansion and “hardening” of Iran’s program, plus the political atmosphere in the Middle East, has lessened the potential for a successful preemptive air strike against Iranian nuclear facilities. The United States, left to its own devices right now, certainly would not take this route. The stakes in Iraq and the global economy simply are too high. For the United States, the best-case scenario would be for the conflict to ossify into a standoff reliant on Israeli and U.S. nuclear deterrence. Sanctions would continue to give incentives for Iran to stay away from taking the final, fateful step – testing a weapon.

#### Extinction

**Singer 1** - professor of nuclear engineering and director of the Program in Arms Control, Disarmament, and International Security at the University of Illinois at Urbana (Clifford, Swords and Ploughshares, Volume XIII, Spring, http://www.acdis.uiuc.edu/Research/S&Ps/2001-Sp/S&P\_Sp-2001.html)

There are, however, two technologies currently under development that may pose a more serious threat to human survival. The first and most immediate is biological warfare combined with genetic engineering. Smallpox is the most fearsome of natural biological warfare agents in existence. By the end of the next decade, global immunity to smallpox will likely be at a low unprecedented since the emergence of this disease in the distant past, while the opportunity for it to spread rapidly across the globe will be at an all time high. In the absence of other complications such as nuclear war near the peak of an epidemic, developed countries may respond with quarantine and vaccination to limit the damage. Otherwise mortality there may match the rate of 30 percent or more expected in unprepared developing countries. With respect to genetic engineering using currently available knowledge and technology, the simple expedient of spreading an ample mixture of coat protein variants could render a vaccination response largely ineffective, but this would otherwise not be expected to substantially increase overall mortality rates. With development of new biological technology, however, there is a possibility that a variety of infectious agents may be engineered for combinations of greater than natural virulence and mortality, rather than just to overwhelm currently available antibiotics or vaccines. There is no a priori known upper limit to the power of this type of technology base, and thus the survival of a globally connected human family may be in question when and if this is achieved.

# 1nr at: swing state polls

#### Romney gains are a temporary bounce – his overall chance of winning is still only 15%

**Silver, 10/5/**12 – Nate, “Oct. 5: Day After Debate, Strong Swing State Polls for Romney,” <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/>)

Polling trends can sometimes be odd in reaction to news events. One factor is that supporters of a particular candidate may be more enthusiastic, and more inclined to respond to surveys, after he gets a favorable development in the news cycle. The methodology that a pollster applies, particularly its likely voter model, may amplify or mitigate these effects.

The We Ask America polls, for instance, had a lot of voters who identified as Republican in their samples. I don’t think there’s necessarily anything wrong with that — I’d rather that pollsters give the most honest snapshot of what they were finding in the field on the day that they conducted their interviews. Part of the reason that critiques about “oversampling” Democrats or Republicans are misguided is because the party identification breakouts themselves provide interesting information. It’s logical to conclude, for instance, that Republicans may have been especially likely to respond to pollsters after Mr. Romney’s strong debate performance. That would also explain why Mr. Romney’s bounce was more modest in the Rasmussen Reports polls, as they weight their samples by party identification (a poor methodological choice, in my view), which may dampen the enthusiasm effect.

There is another type of polling bias, however, which is potentially more relevant when there is polling after a major development in the news cycle. Namely, polls are very probably biased toward high-information voters who take more interest in the news and are more likely to respond to political surveys. This issue may be more profound in automated polls, which have especially low response rates — often only 3 or 4 percent of the people they call respond to them.

So it’s hard to distinguish a genuine shift toward Mr. Romney, from a real but potentially temporary shift based on changes in voter enthusiasm, from an artificial change caused by a bias toward heavy news consumers.

But now there’s another complication: the government reported a strong jobs report on Friday, which changed the tone of the news cycle. To the extent that the polls reflected people’s reaction to the news coverage of the debate as much as the debate itself, the jobs report could blunt some of Mr. Romney’s momentum if the tenor of news coverage changes.

The FiveThirtyEight forecast did show a clear shift toward Mr. Romney on Friday, giving him a 15.1 percent chance of winning the Electoral College — up from 12.9 percent on Thursday.

#### Strong methodology problems with these newest polls

**Blumenthal, 10/5**/12 – editor of Pollster.com (Mark, “Obama-Romney Polls Start To See Romney Debate Bounce,” Huffington Post,

<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/10/05/obama-romney-polls-debate_n_1943786.html>

Within the swing states, the only fresh data come from one-day, automated, recorded-voice polls conducted by both Rasmussen and We Ask America (a subsidiary of the Illinois Manufacturers Association) in Florida, Ohio and Virginia. Generally, pollsters prefer to call over several nights in order to make multiple attempts to interview voters who might not be at home or otherwise available on any one night. So these Rasmussen and We Ask America results should be interpreted with caution.

Five of the six one-night polls show single-digit shifts to Romney. The change on the Rasmussen surveys is relatively modest, averaging a roughly two-point gain for Romney on the margin. The We Ask America surveys show much bigger shifts. The more subtle changes are to be expected on the Rasmussen polls, since the pollster weights its samples to match party identification targets.

Another reason for caution: The one-night, automated surveys either miss voters in cell-phone-only households entirely (We Ask America) or rely on a small number of cell-phone-only interviews conducted with a non-random Internet panel (Rasmussen). Roughly one-third of U.S. adults now live in cell-phone-only households.

The new state polls have helped narrow the Obama-Romney margin on the HuffPost Pollster tracking model of the national popular vote. As of this writing, the HuffPost model, which is based on all available surveys both national and statewide, gives Obama a roughly three-point lead (48.3 to 45.2 percent), though it will continue to update as new polls become available.

Over the next week, new polls will be released using more rigorous methods, including national surveys that are usually more accurate than statewide surveys. The polls still to come will reach voters with more distance from their immediate reactions to Wednesday night's debate and will also begin to reflect any response to Friday's jobs report (showing the unemployment level declining to 7.8 percent).

#### Post-debate polls are nonsense and most show no change

**Blumenthal, 10/5**/12 – editor of Pollster.com (Mark, “Obama-Romney Polls Start To See Romney Debate Bounce,” Huffington Post,

<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/10/05/obama-romney-polls-debate_n_1943786.html>

WASHINGTON -- Political junkies have been watching for any signs that the perceptions of a lackluster performance by President Barack Obama in Wednesday night's debate have translated into polling gains for Republican nominee Mitt Romney.

For the moment, the only evidence of a Romney bump comes from a handful of one-night, automated, recorded-voice surveys released Friday whose methods and timing may exaggerate the change. At the national level, the daily tracking surveys are still based on interviews conducted mostly before the Denver debate.

Friday's update of the Gallup Daily tracking poll shows Obama leading by five percentage points (50 to 45 percent), one point better for the president than the previous day's release. But Gallup reports numbers on a seven-day rolling average, so the post-debate interviews account for just one out of every seven interviews in its latest release.

The daily Rasmussen Reports automated phone survey reports results based on a three-day rolling average. Although a third of the interviews in its Friday release were conducted after the debate, Rasmussen shows no change. Obama leads 49 to 47 percent, the same two-point margin as the day before and a point better than earlier in the week.

# 1nr at: econ uq

#### The newest jobs report boosted Obama

**Kowalski, 10/5/**12 (Alex, Bloomberg, U.S. Jobless Rate Declines to 7.8%; 114,000 Jobs Added,

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-10-05/u-s-jobless-rate-unexpectedly-falls-to-7-8-114-000-jobs-added.html>

The unemployment rate in the U.S. unexpectedly fell to 7.8 percent in September, the lowest since President Barack Obama took office in January 2009, as employers took on more part-time workers.

The economy added 114,000 workers last month after a revised 142,000 gain in August that was more than initially estimated, Labor Department figures showed today in Washington. The jobless rate dropped from 8.1 percent, and hourly earnings climbed more than forecast.

“We’re seeing some firming in the labor market,” said Dean Maki, New York-based chief U.S. economist at Barclays Plc. “It’s still not booming or extraordinarily robust, but it is a labor market that we expect to continue to be firm enough to push the unemployment rate lower.”

Today’s report, the penultimate before the November presidential election, may give Obama a boost after he stumbled in this week’s debate against Republican challenger Mitt Romney. Stocks advanced, returning the Standard & Poor’s 500 Index above its highest close since 2007, as investors bet better job prospects will give workers the wherewithal to boost spending, helping cushion the economy from a global slowdown.

The S&P 500 Index rose 0.4 percent to 1,466.97 at 1:10 p.m. in New York. The yield on the benchmark 10-year Treasury note climbed to 1.72 percent from 1.67 percent late yesterday.

Obama used today’s report to press home his message that the economy is on the mend after the worst recession since the Great Depression.

Led to Crisis

“We’ve made too much progress to return to the policies that led to the crisis in the first place,” Obama said at a campaign rally in Fairfax, Virginia, a suburb of Washington.

Unemployment had been higher than 8 percent since February 2009, the longest stretch since monthly jobless figures were first compiled in 1948. The 7.8 percent matches the January 2009 figure.

The decline in the unemployment rate is “good news for Obama,” said Alan Abramowitz, a political scientist at Emory University in Atlanta. The drop below 8 percent is “symbolically important” to voters, he said.

#### Historically this means Obama is likely to win

**Silver, 10/5**/12 (Nate, “Jobs News Makes Obama’s Case Easier”

<http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/05/jobs-news-makes-obamas-case-easier/?gwh=93714D03872E6AAC10EE9E847E5F7B41#more-35589>

Historically, there has been no relationship at all between the unemployment rate on Election Day and the incumbent’s performance.

However, there has been a relationship between the change in the unemployment rate in the months leading up to the election and how well the incumbent does. The decline in unemployment under Mr. Obama this year since December is the largest in an election year since Ronald Reagan’s re-election bid, when it declined to 7.3 percent in Sept. 1984 from 8.3 percent in Dec. 1983.

The drop in unemployment alone is no guarantee of re-election — there was also a considerable drop in unemployment in 1976, and Gerald Ford lost.

However, the FiveThirtyEight economic index, which accounts for the payrolls numbers along with six other economic data series, would project a narrow re-election for Mr. Obama by about 3 percentage points — similar to Mr. Bush’s margin over John Kerry in 2004. Especially with the Friday jobs report, the economic numbers now seem just strong enough to make the incumbent a favorite for re-election, based on the way the public has evaluated their presidents historically.

I’m less inclined to predict what immediate effect the numbers will have on the polls — whether Friday’s news outweighs, for instance, Mr. Obama’s poor performance in Wednesday night’s debate. Mr. Obama did not win the election on Friday any more than he lost it on Wednesday.

But for the first time in a long while, Mr. Obama should be happy if the discussion turns toward the economy.

# 1nr at: debates

#### The debate doesn’t help Romney much and it’s only a short bounce

**Cohn, 10/5**/12 (Nate, “Size of Romney Bounce Remains Unclear” The New Republic,

<http://www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/108246/size-romney-bounce-remains-unclear>

It’s still too soon to judge whether Romney received a debate bounce. The initial signs point toward movement in Romney’s direction, but not necessarily decisive movement. On average, Romney gained 2.2 points in today’s polls compared to pre-debate polls, although it is worth emphasizing that nearly half of those surveys included samples conducted prior to the debates.

Four points:

1) If Obama performed poorly in Rasmussen or Gallup’s samples yesterday, the results weren’t worse than the day dropped by the trackers. In Gallup’s case, Obama actually did better yesterday than he did in the sample from seven days ago. Similarly, Obama actually gained ground in the RAND American Life Panel. The only tracking poll to show clear movement to Romney is Reuters/Ipsos, and it certainly showed clear movement, with Romney now gaining a net-four points since Wednesday’s release.

2) It’s worth comparing the relative stability of the trackers with the clear movement in Obama’s direction following the DNC. Obama probably held a 7 or 8 point edge in the first few nights of post-DNC tracking and even the slow moving seven-day Gallup tracker lurched immediately in his direction. It’s hard to say whether the post-debate polls should behave like post-convention bounce pols, especially since the first day of post-convention polling reflects multiple days of convention coverage, not just one day of debates. And there is reason to believe that the post-debate media coverage can be just as important as the impressions of the debate itself. But there is at least a case that yesterday should have been Romney’s best day, and it doesn’t necessarily look like he got a spectacular bounce.

3) On the other hand, the We Ask America polls showed an abrupt 6-point swing in Romney’s direction in both Virginia and Florida. Now, WAA is perhaps the only poll showing evidence of such clear movement in Romney’s direction, so it would be wise to wait for confirmation from other pollsters before asserting that Romney has made particularly large gains. That’s especially true since Rasmussen polled two of the same states and found Romney gaining just three points and making no gains in the critical state of Ohio. Of course, the balance of these polls was indisputably good for Romney, if confirmed by other pollsters.

4) So far, a relatively small and unrepresentative selection of pollsters have provided post-debate results. Rasmussen and WAA's battleground state polls were one day samples by automated firms, and their results have not always mirrored of the broader universe of pollsters. Most pollsters began to survey today or yesterday and the post-debate landscape won't be clear until early next week, when the broader set of pollsters relying on more conventional multi-day or live interview samples are able to weigh-in. By then, the tracking polls will more fully reflect the post-debate landscape, as well.

#### Jobs report erases any movement Romney had from the debate

**Lee, 10/5**/12 (Don, Los Angeles Times, “Unemployment rate drops to 7.8% in September,” [http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-jobs-report-20121006,0,3135294.story](http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-jobs-report-20121006%2C0%2C3135294.story))

Stock investors reacted cautiously to the employment news. The White House cheered Friday's report, coming just two days after Obama's first debate with Republican challenger Mitt Romney.

"Given the dearth of positive news, it's still a welcomed report," said Harry Holzer, a professor of public policy at Georgetown University. For Obama, he added, "the timing of this may cut short any strong movement to Romney because of the bad debate."

The jobs report, the next-to-last one before the Nov. 6 election, takes away one of Romney's talking points — that, under Obama's watch, the economy has struggled with more than 8% unemployment for 40-plus consecutive months.

#### Jobs report reversed Romney’s debate momentum

**White, 10/5/12** (Ben, Politico, “Jobs report buoys bruised Obama,” <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1012/82083.html?hp=l1>)

He got a big one on Friday with the drop in the unemployment rate below the politically deadly level of 8 percent.

Republicans seized on the fact that the decline was based in large measure on part-time workers who may vanish from the labor rolls in subsequent months. And they noted that manufacturing employment actually declined by 16,000 and that employers said they added a total of just 114,000 jobs for the month of September.

But the bottom line — and the dominant headline — is that the jobless rate is now at 7.8 percent, its lowest level since Obama took office in January 2009. And that will help shift a media narrative dominated this week by Republican nominee Mitt Romney’s strong debate performance and resurgence in some swing state and national polls.

The impact of the good news on candidate Obama was immediately apparent Friday at a campaign stop at George Mason University in Fairfax, Va., where he seemed far more energized than during his listless and widely panned debate performance in Denver on Wednesday night.

“After losing about 800,000 a month when I took office, our businesses have now added 5.2 million new jobs over the past two and a half years,” Obama said. “This morning, we found out that unemployment has fallen to its lowest level since I took office. More Americans entered the workforce, more people are getting jobs.”

Obama also took a shot at Republicans for criticizing the jobs report after being on the defensive for so many of the Fridays in recent months when the jobs report did not go his way.

“Every month reminds us that we have too many of our friends and neighbors looking for work,” he said. “But today’s news is certainly not an excuse to try and talk down the economy to score a few political points. It’s a reminder that this country has come too far to turn back now.”

But Romney and other Republicans stayed on the offensive, saying the jobs report was nowhere near good enough.

“There were fewer jobs created this month than last month,” Romney said at a rally at Carter Machinery in Abingdon, Va., referring to the revised August figure. “The unemployment rate has come down very, very slowly but it has come down nonetheless. And the reason it has come down this year is that more and more people have just stopped looking for work.”

That attack line, reliable in the past, felt a bit flat Friday.

The size of the labor force actually went up in September after having declined in other recent months.

This could be because of discouraged workers leaving the labor force. Or it could be people retiring or deciding not to work for other reasons. It is an imprecise figure but a useful political tool for Republicans.

Despite the GOP rebuttals, the report, at least for a day, took some edge off Romney’s core argument that Obama has completely failed to get the economy moving and that the GOP nominee’s plans for lower corporate and individual tax rates, deeper spending cuts and fewer regulations would unleash faster growth.

 “This report obviously overstates the case and a big chunk of it was an increase in people working part-time for economic reasons,” said Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody’s Analytics. “But this is still a very Obama-friendly report. There is no way to spin it otherwise. The fact that we got below 8 percent is the key for Obama.”

# 1nr energy key

#### Energy policy will determine the election

**Gardett, 8/23/12** (Peter, “As Voters Focus on Energy, API Chief Begs: 'Turn Us Loose',” <http://energy.aol.com/2012/08/23/as-voters-focus-on-energy-api-chief-begs-turn-us-loose/>)

The US oil and natural gas business has been an unusual bright spot for the American economy over the past four years, and that success has helped highlight energy issues as a major factor in the 2012 election cycle.

Energy has not traditionally been a focus of electoral politics beyond prices at the gasoline pump, but this year the broader focus on the economy and the government's role in directing it have brought to light the successes, the potential and the risks of energy development in the US.

"We're only in the early stages of a very robust debate on energy issues," American Petroleum Institute (API) CEO Jack Gerard told AOL Energy in a recent interview.

API has played its part in surfacing energy and the sector's role as an economic engine in a large awareness building campaign called Vote4Energy, revealed in Washington, DC to great fanfare at the beginning of this year. Unlike many industry group-led campaigns, API has implemented a long-term and fully committed strategy across the year as part of the campaign, and will be present at the upcoming Presidential nominating conventions planned for Tampa, Florida and Charlotte, North Carolina over the coming weeks.

The campaign will intensify over the remaining months of 2012 with particularly robust outreach planned for voters in five key states, including Virgina, Ohio, Florida, Colorado and North Carolina.

"We've broken through to a new means of engaging with the public," Gerard said, adding that he thinks the Vote4Energy campaign has been "wildly successful" so far. A recent poll conducted by API demonstrates what it says is broad-based and bipartisan support for the economic issues that in turn underpin the group's pro-energy development agenda.

#### Energy will be the deciding factor in the election

**Belogolova 12 –** reports on energy and environment policy for National Journal and manages the bi-monthly Energy and Environment Insiders Poll, holds bachelor’s degrees in Journalism and European Studies from Boston University. She studied abroad at Oxford University, was one of 10 American journalism students selected for a press trip to Jordan. (Olga, May 17th, “Insiders: Outreach to Oil Industry Won’t Help Obama” http://www.nationaljournal.com/energy/insiders-outreach-to-oil-industry-won-t-help-obama-20120517) Jacome

 “It may be harder now for Republicans to land punches related to oil and gas, because the administration has called off the dogs, but many voters still think the president would like to thwart production and consumption of fossil fuels,” said one Insider. “Every time the president singles out the oil and gas industry for unfavorable tax treatment, voters are reminded of the White House's true goals."

Insiders said that energy issues will continue to be a sticking point in this election — to the very end.

“Energy is one of the president's biggest vulnerabilities. From Solyndra to 'cap and tax,' the administration has pursued one energy flop after another. The president's campaign team must agree, since their first ad was a defensive spot on their energy record, and the follow-up was a campaign swing through the country's energy heartland,” said another Insider. “Republicans are going to continue to pound away on the president's energy record to make sure he doesn't get away with trying to mask it.”

#### Energy policy will determine the election

**Handley, 8/21/12 -** business reporter for U.S. News & World Report (Meg, “3 Energy Issues No One's Talking About,” <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2012/08/21/3-energy-issues-no-ones-talking-about>)

If recent campaign events by both the Democratic and Republican presidential candidates are any indication, energy policy is going to be a major political chip in the race for the White House.

President Obama and Mitt Romney have diametrically opposed views on energy security, efficiency, and innovation. That brings seemingly minute issues such as a wind tax energy credit (crucial to Iowans, coincidentally) to the forefront as well as more philosophical issues such as whether the government should subsidize companies researching and producing renewable energy sources.

# 1nr forecasting fails

#### Election models pick the winner 85% of the time

**Sides 3/29**/12 (John Sides. Associate Professor of Political Science. Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley. “In Defense of Presidential Forecasting Models,” http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/03/29/in-defense-of-presidential-forecasting-models/)

Second, as Nate acknowledges but doesn’t fully explore (at least not in this post), the models vary in their accuracy. The average error in predicting the two-party vote is 4.6 points for Ray Fair’s model, but only 1.72 points for Alan Abramowitz’s model. In other words, some appear better than others — and we should be careful not to condemn the entire enterprise because some models are more inaccurate. Third, if we look at the models in a different way, they arguably do a good enough job. Say that you just want to know who is going to win the presidential election, not whether this candidate will get 51 percent or 52 percent of the vote. Of the 58 separate predictions that Nate tabulates, **85 percent of them correctly identified the winner** — even though most forecasts were made two months or more before the election and even though few of these forecasts actually incorporated trial heat polls from the campaign.

# 1nr links

#### 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.”

#### 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.

# 1nr weed

#### Stupid – this is not in the news, their evidence describes the efforts of stoner advocacy groups trying to make it an issue, not that it will be visible or that anyone will cover it

#### The balance of our polls prove this is factored in – it doesn’t affect the polls because no one credible is making the argument for legalization

#### At best this effects ONE state - Colorado – our uniqueness evidence shows that Obama is winning the balance of all other swing states

#### No one cares

**Morgan, 10/2**/12 (Deborah, Marijuana law reform largely ignored during election cycle , The Examiner, <http://www.examiner.com/article/marijuana-law-reform-largely-ignored-during-election-cycle>)

Last night, CNN's Erin Burnett ran a news story highlighting the impact of marijuana legalization on the 2012 presidential election. "Out Front" - Burnett's prime time news program - studied the implications of Colorado's marijuana legalization ballot initiative on the strength of the mile-high position as a swing state.

Both President Obama and GOP candidate Mitt Romney need to secure Colorado to win the November 6 election. But neither one will speak clearly on the issue of marijuana law reform.

At best, Romney admonishes reporters who bring up the issue, instead trying to re-focus the interview to GOP platform talking points.

Obama prefers to remain silent, possibly to avoid answering questions of his blatant hypocrisy regarding states' rights under the Tenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. His administration has continuously raided hundreds of medical marijuana dispensaries in the seventeen states which boast state medical marijuana laws. And voters are none-too-happy.

#### Obama will avoid it, the attempt to make it an election issue is dumb

**Flock, 9/21/12** (Elizabeth, Current, Former Cops Make Push to Legalize Marijuana Ahead of Election,

<http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/washington-whispers/2012/09/21/current-former-cops-make-push-to-legalize-marijuana-ahead-of-election>

Less than 50 days before Election Day, a group of current and former police officers are ramping up their efforts to push for the legalization of marijuana in the United States.

On Thursday, Law Enforcement Against Prohibition, which is based in Medford, Mass., announced it would support get-out-the-vote efforts for Amendment 64, a Colorado ballot initiative to essentially legalize marijuana.

Tony Ryan, who spent 36 years on Denver's police force and now serves on LEAP's board, is pushing for Amendment 64. "I'd been thinking about this much of my career," Ryan tells Whispers. "I saw that marijuana wasn't the cause of disturbances, crimes, or homicides—something like alcohol was."

Ryan says he often noticed police officers spending several hours processing a person found with only a small amount of marijuana. "That perturbed me," he says. "It detracts from the police officer's job in my mind."

Though LEAP is a 501(c)(3) group and therefore unable to legally oppose or endorse candidates, it has been outspoken about its frustration with President Obama's drug policies.

In August, the Obama campaign released an ad featuring the actors who portrayed stoners in the Harold & Kumar movies, which some perceived as a nod to marijuana users. But LEAP Executive Director Neill Franklin wrote on the group's Facebook page that the ad was"not being honest" as President Obama "has been avoiding answering questions" on marijuana legalization.

"Obama has been disappointing," LEAP spokesman Tom Angell says. "His words have not matched his policies."

While LEAP and others had hoped Obama would allow states to decide on marijuana legalization, the Office of National Drug Control Policy says it has made other "revolutionary" strides to reform drug policy. The office cites the signing of a fair sentencing act into law under Obama, and the release of the first-ever national drug prevention strategy.