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#### "Financial incentives for energy production" involve the exchange of money for production.

Book 11 [Managing Director, ClearView Energy Partners, LLC]

Kevin, Testimony before U.S. HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

SUBCOMMITTEES ON SELECT REVENUE MEASURES AND OVERSIGHT, SEPTEMBER 22, http://waysandmeans.house.gov/UploadedFiles/Booktestimony922.pdf

Incentive cost ratios, implied abatement costs and implied displacement costs offer three possible ways to measure the performance of **federal financial incentives for energy production** and consumption. Metrics of this sort could be used to prioritize spending – dynamically, perhaps through a reverse auction – or through legislated formulas **that balance incentives for high-yield, low-cost sources with high-potential, emerging sources.** Fuels or technologies that consistently fall short of established benchmarks may require a different type of government financial intervention (e**.g. manufacturing assistance or pre-competitive R&D** in place of production **tax credits**) or a different mode of financial support (e.g. loan guaranteesinstead of tax credits **or deductions)**.

#### For is a term of exclusion – requiring direct action upon

US CUSTOMS COURT 39 AMERICAN COLORTYPE CO. v. UNITED STATES C. D. 107, Protest 912094-G against the decision of the collector of customs at the port of New York UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT, THIRD DIVISION 2 Cust. Ct. 132; 1939 Cust. Ct. LEXIS 35

The same reasons used by the appellate court may be adopted in construing the language of the statute herein involved. If the words "for industrial use" mean no more than the words "articles of utility," there could be no reason for inserting the additional words "for industrial use" in the paragraph. Therefore, it must be held that the [\*135] new language "for industrial use" was intended to have a different meaning from the words "articles of utility," as construed in the case of Progressive Fine Arts Co. v. United States, [\*\*8] supra. Webster's New International Dictionary defines the word "industrial" as follows: Industrial. 1. Relating to industry or labor as an economic factor, or to a branch or the branches of industry; of the nature of, or constituting, an industry or industries \* \* \* . The transferring of the scenes on an oil painting to a printed copy is a branch of industry under the definition above quoted. Some of the meanings of the preposition "for" signify intent, as shown by the following definition in the same dictionary: For. 2. Indicating the end with reference to which anything is, acts, serves, or is done; as: a. As a preparation for; with the object of; in order to be, become, or act as; conducive to. \* \* \*. d. Intending, or in order, to go to or in the direction of. Therefore, the words "articles for industrial use" in paragraph 1807 imply that Congress intended to exclude from that provision articles either purchased or imported with the intention to use the same in industry for manufacturing purposes.

#### Energy Production distinct from material production, transport & waste treatment

Is Cumulative Fossil Energy Demand a Useful Indicator for the Environmental Performance of Products? M A R K A . J . HUIJBREGTS , \* , † L I N D A J . A . R O M B O U T S , † S T E F A N I E H E L L W E G , ‡ R O L F F R I S C H K N E C H T , § A . J A N H E N D R I K S , † D I K V A N D E M E E N T , † , | A D M . J . R A G A S , † L U C A S R E I J N D E R S , ⊥ A N D J A A P S T R U I J S | Department of Environmental Science, Institute for Wetland and Water Research, Faculty of Science, Radboud University Nijmegen, P.O. Box 9010, NL-6500 GL Nijmegen, The Netherlands, Institute for Chemical- and Bioengineering, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zu¨rich, CH-8093 Zu¨rich, Switzerland, Ecoinvent Centre, Ueberlandstrasse 129, CH-8600 Duebendorf, Switzerland, Laboratory for Ecological Risk Assessment, National Institute of Public Health and the Environment, P.O. Box 1, NL-3720 BA, Bilthoven, The Netherlands, and Institute for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Dynamics, University of Amsterdam, Nieuwe Achtergracht 166, NL-1018 WV, Amsterdam, The Netherlands 2006 American Chemical Society VOL. 40, NO. 3, 2006 / ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY 9 641 http://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/es051689g

The appropriateness of the fossil Cumulative Energy Demand (CED) as an indicator for the environmental performance of products and processes is explored with a regression analysis between the environmental life-cycle impacts and fossil CEDs of 1218 products, divided into the product categories “energy production”, “material production”, “transport”, and “waste treatment”. Our results show that, for all product groups but waste treatment, the fossil CED correlates well with most impact categories, such as global warming, resource depletion, acidification, eutrophication, tropospheric ozone formation, ozone depletion, and human toxicity (explained variance between 46% and 100%). We conclude that the use of fossil fuels is an important driver of several environmental impacts and thereby indicative for many environmental problems. It may therefore serve as a screening indicator for environmental performance. However, the usefulness of fossil CED as a stand-alone indicator for environmental impact is limited by the large uncertainty in the product-specific fossil CEDbased impact scores (larger than a factor of 10 for the majority of the impact categories; 95% confidence interval). A major reason for this high uncertainty is nonfossil energy related emissions and land use, such as landfill leachates, radionuclide emissions, and land use in agriculture and forestry.

#### Vote Negative

#### Limits- there are infinite financial incentives that can be tied to things external to energy production- limiting the incentives part of the topic to directly involving production is key to limits because of the difficulty of defining what a restriction on energy production is

#### Our limit is the only non- arbitrary one because it is the most grammatically correct- financial incentives for energy production is an adjectival phrase- even if their aff is a financial incentive- it is not DIRECTLY for energy production

### Off

The United States Congress should immediately establish a government-wide staged-process Quadrennial Energy Review to recommend goals, priorities and actions for implementation of a national energy policy, immediately establish a deadline for completion of each stage by April 1st of each year, with a deadline for completion of the entire review by April 1st, 2014, and every subsequent four years and immediately provide all necessary support for expedited build up of relevant analytic capabilities.

The Executive Secretariat of the review should immediately establish a policy determination to provide full support for making a recommendation to

establish a matching funds program to develop and build a Liquid Fluoride Thorium Nuclear Reactor in United States labs a top priority of the first stage of the review.

#### CP competes – it tests the word “resolved” which means “to make a firm decision about”, the word “should” which is “used to imply obligation or duty”

[American Heritage Dictionary at dictionary.com]

#### The CP is a distinct option from the plan and overcomes agency conflict- also avoids politics and provides greater certainty

Moniz 12 [Ernest Moniz, Cecil and Ida Green Professor of Physics and Engineering Systems and Director of the Energy Initiative at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Former Clinton Administration Under Secretary of the Department of Energy and as Associate Director for Science in the Office of Science and Technology Policy ; serves on the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, Spring 2012, Stimulating Energy Technology Innovation, Daedalus, Vol. 141, No. 2, Pages 81-93]

It should come as no surprise that I do not have the answers for how the government should intersect the latter stages of the innovation process in a general sense. However, PCAST recommended a pragmatic approach to an integrated federal energy policy that would employ all the tools available to the government in a coherent way. Termed **the** Quadrennial Energy Review (**QER**), the process is necessarily complex, but **history suggests** that **anything short of a full multiagency effort is unlikely to provide a robust plan that accounts for the many threads of an energy policy**. Furthermore, a degree of analysis is required that has not been present in previous efforts.¶ Energy policy is derivative of many policies: environment, technology and competitiveness, diplomacy and security, natural resources, and land and food, among many others. Indeed, multiple agencies that are not labeled “energy” have major equities and long-held perspectives on key elements of energy policy. Often, the preferred policies for different agencies’ agendas conflict. Further, states and local governments play a strong role, for example with building codes, and their approaches can vary dramatically in different parts of the country; certainly, California’s energy policies have influenced the national market. The tools available to support innovation are also diverse, ranging from direct support of RD&D to a variety of economic incentives, regulation, standards, and federal procurement, among other instruments. Congress is equally fragmented: in the House of Representatives and Senate, many committees beyond those tasked with energy policy have equities that mirror those of the different executive agencies. **To overcome this fragmentation** of responsibilities and perspectives, and **especially if the goal is a plan that has staying power in advancing adoption and diffusion, PCAST recommended a QER process** to provide a multiyear roadmap that:¶• lays out an integrated view of short-, intermediate-, and long-term objectives for Federal energy policy in the context of economic, environmental, and security priorities;¶ • outlines **legislative proposals** to Congress;¶ • puts forward anticipated Executive actions (programmatic, regulatory, fiscal, and so on) coordinated across multiple agencies;¶ • **identifies resource requirements** for the RD&D programs **and** for innovation **incentive programs**; and, most important,¶ • provides a strong analytical base.14¶ This is a tall order intellectually and organizationally. Several process elements are essential to fostering a chance for success. First, the Executive Office of the President (eop) must use its convening power to ensure effective cooperation among the myriad relevant agencies. However, the capacity to carry out such an exercise and to sustain it does not (and should not) reside in the eop. The doe is the logical home for a substantial Executive Secretariat supporting the eop interagency process that would present decision recommendations to the president. However, the scope of the analytical capability needed does not currently reside at the doe or any other agency. The doe needs to build this capability, presumably supplemented by contractor support to gather data, develop and run models, and carry out analysis, such as independent energy-system engineering and economic analysis. Market trends and prices would be part of the analysis, including international markets and robust analyses of uncertainty. The Energy Information Administration can help with some data gathering and models, but its independence from the policy function needs to be preserved. The national laboratories also lack this range of functions, and tasking them with providing the analytical support to the policy process would be regarded as a conflict of interest; their focus is best directed at research, invention, and technology transfer. Building this analysis capacity is a large job that will take time.¶ For the QER to succeed, the government must seek substantial input from many quarters in a transparent way; certainly, ongoing dialogue with Congress and the energy industry are essential. The good news is that members of Congress have supported the development of the QER as a way to present a coherent **starting point for congressional action across many committees.** A hope is that **Congress could then use the QER as a basis for** a four or five-year **authorization that would provide the private sector with the increased confidence needed to make sound clean energy investment decisions**.¶ Given the magnitude of the task, PCAST recommended in 2011 that the doe carry out a Quadrennial Technology Review (qtr)–a first step centered in a single department and focused on technology. The qtr resulted in a rebalancing of the R&D portfolio toward the oil dependence challenge through advanced vehicle development, particularly transportation electrification. The key now will be to extend the processes developed for the qtr to the multiagency QER, involving the eop in a leadership role. Taking the next steps in 2012 will maintain momentum and establish the capabilities needed for the QER by early 2015, the time frame recommended by PCAST.¶ While some may view 2015 as a frustratingly long time away, the alternative is to rely on wishes rather than analysis while failing to gain multiple perspectives in a fair and open manner. **Rushing the process will result in a poorly done job that will not accomplish** any of the **key** QER **goals**. Certainly, **it will not bring together succeeding administrations and Congresses around a** reasonably **shared vision** and set of objectives **that can accelerate innovation in service of national competitiveness and environmental and security goals. Continuing with fragmented** and economically inefficient **policies, technologies “du jour,” and frequent shifts will complicate private-sector decisions rather than facilitate innovation**. The government unavoidably plays a strong role in the innovation process, even when this is unacknowledged in policy and political debates. The issue now is to present both a set of principles and fact-based analyses supporting coordinated government-wide actions that earn decent buy-in from major stakeholders.

#### The CP solves better- agency coordination

SEPI 2012 [Strategic Energy Policy Initiative November 2012 Bipartisan Policy Center “The Executive Branch ¶ and National Energy ¶ Policy: Time for ¶ Renewal” http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/BPC\_Governance\_Report\_0.pdf]

To address the problems of focus, coordination, and execution that have hampered past ¶ efforts to develop and implement effective national energy policy, the Strategic Energy ¶ Policy Initiative recommends a new approach. The initiative’s proposal combines a highlevel National Energy Strategy with a companion Quadrennial Energy Review, as described ¶ in more detail below. This process is intended to mirror the approach currently used to ¶ develop U.S. national security policy, wherein the executive branch prepares a high-level ¶ National Security Strategy (NSS) outlining major security concerns confronting the nation ¶ and plans for addressing them. The NSS document is purposefully short (the latest version ¶ was 128 pages), to the point, and general in content. The implementation details are ¶ provided separately in supporting documents, including notably the Quadrennial Defense ¶ Review (QDR), which is prepared by the Department of Defense.¶ 21¶ ¶ Similarly, the Strategic Energy Policy Initiative recommends that administrations rely on the ¶ expertise of existing federal agencies and on the leadership and coordination capacities that ¶ exist within the EOP. Given the complexities of the energy ecosystem; the diffuse roles and ¶ responsibilities for decision making that exist within the federal government, the Congress, ¶ and the broader economy; and the international dimensions of most important energy ¶ challenges, this effort will require high-level leadership (e.g., Senate-confirmed Cabinet ¶ members or heads of agencies), extensive technical expertise, effective cross-agency ¶ coordination, and broad consultation with states and energy stakeholders.

### Off

#### Obama using PC to avoid debate on the debt ceiling- he will succeed

Klein 1-2 [Ezra Klein 1-2-2013 Washington Post “Calm down, liberals. The White House won” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/01/02/calm-down-liberals-the-white-house-got-a-good-deal-on-the-fiscal-cliff/]

Fourth, I don’t think the White House has a shred of credibility when they say they won’t negotiate over the debt ceiling. They may not call what they’re about to do negotiating over the debt ceiling, but that’ll be what they’re doing. That said, I’m quite convinced that they don’t intend to be held hostage over the debt ceiling. As a former constitutional law professor, the president sees himself as a steward of the executive branch and is deeply hostile to setting the precedent that congressional minorities can hold presidents hostage through the debt ceiling. At some point in the coming talks, Boehner or McConnell or both are going to realize that the White House really, seriously will not accept a bargain in which what they “got” was an increase in the debt limit, and so they’re going to have to decide at that point whether to crash the global economy.¶ Fifth, the constellation of economic interest groups that converge on Washington understands the debt ceiling better than they did in 2011, are becoming more and more tired of congress’s tendency to negotiate by threatening to trigger economic catastrophes, and is getting better at knowing who to blame. It’s not a meaningless sign that John Engler, the former Republican Governor of Michigan who now leads the Business Roundtable, called for a five-year solution to the debt ceiling. ¶ It’s worth keeping this in perspective: All it means is that the White House can potentially demand a perfectly reasonable compromise of one dollar in revenue-generating tax reform for every dollar in spending cuts. When you add in the fiscal cliff deal, and the 2011 Budget Control Act, that’ll still mean that the total deficit reduction enacted over the last few years tilts heavily towards spending, particularly once you account for reduced war costs. ¶ But that is, arguably, another reason that the White House isn’t in such a bad position here: They’ve set up a definition of success that will sound reasonable to most people — a dollar in tax reform for a dollar in spending cuts — while the Republicans have a very unreasonable sounding definition, in which they get huge cuts to Medicare or they force the United States into default. So while it’s possible that the White House will crumble, rendering itself impotent in negotiations going forward, and while it’s possible that the we’ll breach the debt ceiling, both possibilities seem less likely than Republicans agreeing to a deal that pairs revenue-generating tax reform with spending cuts.

#### LFTR funding is controversial – seen as pumping money into wasteful endeavor – benefits of the tech have empirically been smokescreens.

The Guardian, 2011 Don't believe the spin on thorium being a greener nuclear option http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/jun/23/thorium-nuclear-uranium

Without exception, [thorium reactors] have never been commercially viable, nor do any of the intended new designs even remotely seem to be viable. Like all nuclear power production they rely on extensive taxpayer subsidies; the only difference is that with thorium and other breeder reactors these are of an order of magnitude greater, which is why no government has ever continued their funding.'¶ China's development will persist until it experiences the ongoing major technical hurdles the rest of the nuclear club have discovered, he says.¶ Others see thorium as a smokescreen to perpetuate the status quo: the world's only operating thorium reactor – India's Kakrapar-1 – is actually a converted PWR, for example. 'This could be seen to excuse the continued use of PWRs until thorium is [widely] available,' points out Peter Rowberry of No Money for Nuclear (NM4N) and Communities Against Nuclear Expansion (CANE).¶ In his reading, thorium is merely a way of deflecting attention and criticism from the dangers of the uranium fuel cycle and excusing the pumping of more money into the industry.

#### Obama PC is key - failure collapses the global economy

Maass 1-2 [Harold Maass 1-2-2013 The Week “The looming debt-ceiling fight: Worse than the fiscal cliff?” http://theweek.com/article/index/238312/the-looming-debt-ceiling-fight-worse-than-the-fiscal-cliff]

Since the agreement heading for Obama's desk doesn't raise the debt ceiling, which we've already hit, says Zachary A. Goldfarb at The Washington Post, it leaves "the Treasury to use what it calls 'extraordinary measures' as long as it can to pay the government's bills." When the bean counters run out of tricks, we could face a "catastrophic default" if Congress doesn't act fast.¶ In many ways, the threat of default in two months is a more serious risk than the Jan. 1 fiscal cliff deadline. If Congress does not increase the debt ceiling, the government will quickly run out of ways to pay the nation's bills and make interest payments on the nation’s outstanding debt. Any failure by the government to meet its financial obligations could be seen as a default, shaking world financial markets, given the special role that U.S. government bonds play in the global economy.¶ Obama is still smarting from the 2011 debt-ceiling dispute, says Neil Munro at The Daily Caller. In that fight, "the GOP eventually pressured him to accept spending curbs in exchange for an increase to the debt limit up to $16.4 trillion." Obama has been complaining about that defeat ever since, and he's vowing not to let it happen again. But the GOP-led House is adamant about using "its authority over the nation's debt ceiling to pressure Obama to shrink future spending."

#### Economic decline causes nuclear conflict

Mathew J. Burrows (counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC), PhD in European History from Cambridge University) and Jennifer Harris (a member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit) April 2009 “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” http://www.twq.com/09april/docs/09apr\_Burrows.pdf

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

### Off

#### Electricity prices are dropping and will stay low

Dallas Burtraw, one of the nation’s foremost experts on environmental regulation in the electricity sector, and studies electricity restructuring, competition, and economic deregulation, “Falling Emissions and Falling Prices: Expectations for the Domestic Natural Gas Boom,” Common Resources, August 21, 2012, <http://common-resources.org/2012/falling-emissions-and-falling-prices-expectations-for-the-domestic-natural-gas-boom/>, accessed 10-25-2012.

Moreover, the boom in domestic natural gas production could have even more immediate affects for U.S. electricity consumers. The increased supply of gas is expected to lower natural gas prices and retail electricity prices over the next 20 years, according to a [new RFF Issue Brief](http://www.rff.org/Publications/Pages/PublicationDetails.aspx?PublicationID=22019). These price decreases are expected to be even larger if demand for electricity continues on a slow-growth trajectory brought on by the economic downturn and the increased use of energy efficiency. For example, RFF analysis found that delivered natural gas prices would have been almost 35% higher in 2020 if natural gas supply projections had matched the lower estimates released by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) in 2009. Instead, with an increased gas supply, consumers can expect to pay $4.9 per MMBtu for delivered natural gas in 2020 instead of $6.6 per MMBtu. These trends are even more exaggerated if demand for electricity were to increase to levels projected by the EIA just three years ago, in 2009.This decrease in natural gas prices is expected to translate into a decrease in retail electricity prices for most electricity customers in most years out to 2020. Compared to the world with the lower gas supply projections, average national electricity prices are expected to be almost 6% lower, falling from 9.25 cents to 8.75 cents per kilowatt-hour in 2020. Residential, commercial, and industrial customers are all expected to see a price decrease, with the largest price changes occurring in parts of the country that have competitive electricity markets. All of these prices decreases translate into real savings for most electricity customers. The savings are largest for commercial customers, who stand to save $33.9 Billion (real $2009) under the new gas supply projections in 2020. Residential customers also stand to save big, with estimates of $25.8 Billion (real $2009) in savings projected for 2020.

#### New nuclear reactors drive up electricity prices

Mark Cooper, SENIOR FELLOW FOR ECONOMIC ANALYSIS INSTITUTE FOR ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT¶ VERMONT LAW SCHOOL, "THE ECONOMICS OF NUCLEAR REACTORS: RENAISSANCE OR RELAPSE?," 2009, http://www.vermontlaw.edu/Documents/Cooper%20Report%20on%20Nuclear%20Economics%20FINAL%5B1%5D.pdf

Within the past year, estimates of the cost of nuclear power from a new generation of ¶ reactors have ranged from a low of 8.4 cents per kilowatt hour (kWh) to a high of 30 cents. This ¶ paper tackles the debate over the cost of building new nuclear reactors, with the key findings as ¶ follows: ¶ • The initial cost projections put out early in today’s so-called “nuclear renaissance” were about ¶ one-third of what one would have expected, based on the nuclear reactors completed in the ¶ 1990s. ¶ • The most recent cost projections for new nuclear reactors are, on average, over four times as high as the initial “nuclear renaissance” projections. ¶ • There are numerous options available to meet the need for electricity in a carbon-constrained ¶ environment that are superior to building nuclear reactors. Indeed, nuclear reactors are the worst option from the point of view of the consumer and society. ¶ • The low carbon sources that are less costly than nuclear include efficiency, cogeneration, ¶ biomass, geothermal, wind, solar thermal and natural gas. Solar photovoltaics that are presently ¶ more costly than nuclear reactors are projected to decline dramatically in price in the next ¶ decade. Fossil fuels with carbon capture and storage, which are not presently available, are ¶ projected to be somewhat more costly than nuclear reactors. ¶ • Numerous studies by Wall Street and independent energy analysts estimate efficiency and ¶ renewable costs at an average of 6 cents per kilowatt hour, while the cost of electricity from ¶ nuclear reactors is estimated in the range of 12 to 20 cents per kWh. ¶ • The additional cost of building 100 new nuclear reactors, instead of pursuing a least cost ¶ efficiency-renewable strategy, would be in the range of $1.9-$4.4 trillion over the life the ¶ reactors. ¶ Whether the burden falls on ratepayers (in electricity bills) or taxpayers (in large subsidies), ¶ incurring excess costs of that magnitude would be a substantial burden on the national economy and ¶ add immensely to the cost of electricity and the cost of reducing carbon emissions.

#### High energy prices jack up food prices – means drastic cuts in food aid

Tom Capehart, Specialist in Agricultural Policy¶ Resources, Science and Industry Division, and ¶ Joe Richardson¶ Specialist in Domestic Social Policy¶ Domestic Social Policy Division, “Food Price Inflation: Causes and Impacts,” Congressional Research Service, April 10, 2008, <http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/RS22859_20080410.pdf>, accessed 10-25-2012.

Higher commodity and food prices reduce our ability to provide food aid to other¶ countries without additional appropriations. Food aid usually takes the form of basic food¶ grains such as wheat, sorghum, and corn, and vegetable oil — commodities critical to¶ developing-country diets. Since there is very little value added for these commodities,¶ shifts in prices translate directly into higher prices for food-insecure countries or reduced¶ food aid contributions per dollar spent. Also, higher energy costs have increased shipping¶ costs for both food purchases and food aid. Unlike some domestic nutrition programs,¶ foreign food aid is not adjusted to account for changing costs. After a long period of¶ declining food costs, developing countries are facing increased food import bills — for¶ some countries as high as 25% in 2007.¶ 13¶ The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has indicated that rising¶ food and fuel prices would result in a significant reduction in emergency food aid.¶ According to press reports in March 2008, USAID expects a $200 million shortfall in¶ funding to meet emergency food aid needs. For FY2008, Congress appropriated $1.2¶ billion for P.L. 480 food aid, the same as FY2007. For FY2009, the President’s budget¶ again requested $1.2 billion. In six out of ten years since 1999, supplemental funding for¶ P.L. 480 Title II food aid has been appropriated.¶ Last year, the U.N. World Food Program (WFP) estimated it would need $2.9 billion¶ to cover 2008 food aid needs. Recent commodity, energy, and food cost increases have¶ boosted this estimate to $3.4 billion. According to the WFP, the current price increases¶ force the world’s poorest people to spend a larger proportion of their income on food.

#### Food price spikes cause insecurity that causes global resource wars that escalate to nuclear war

Michael Klare (professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College in Amherst, Mass) March 11, 2006 “The Coming Resource Wars” http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Oil\_watch/ComingResourceWars.html

It's official: the era of resource wars is upon us. In a major London address, British Defense Secretary John Reid warned that global climate change and dwindling natural resources are combining to increase the likelihood of violent conflict over land, water and energy. Climate change, he indicated, "will make scarce resources, clean water, viable agricultural land even scarcer" -- and this will "make the emergence of violent conflict more rather than less likely." Although not unprecedented, Reid's prediction of an upsurge in resource conflict is significant both because of his senior rank and the vehemence of his remarks. "The blunt truth is that the lack of water and agricultural land is a significant contributory factor to the tragic conflict we see unfolding in Darfur," he declared. "We should see this as a warning sign." Resource conflicts of this type are most likely to arise in the developing world, Reid indicated, but the more advanced and affluent countries are not likely to be spared the damaging and destabilizing effects of global climate change. With sea levels rising, water and energy becoming increasingly scarce and prime agricultural lands turning into deserts, internecine warfare over access to vital resources will become a global phenomenon. Reid's speech, delivered at the prestigious Chatham House in London (Britain's equivalent of the Council on Foreign Relations), is but the most recent expression of a growing trend in strategic circles to view environmental and resource effects -- rather than political orientation and ideology -- as the most potent source of armed conflict in the decades to come. With the world population rising, global consumption rates soaring, energy supplies rapidly disappearing and climate change eradicating valuable farmland, the stage is being set for persistent and worldwide struggles over vital resources. Religious and political strife will not disappear in this scenario, but rather will be channeled into contests over valuable sources of water, food and energy. Prior to Reid's address, the most significant expression of this outlook was a report prepared for the U.S. Department of Defense by a California-based consulting firm in October 2003. Entitled "An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and Its Implications for United States National Security," the report warned that global climate change is more likely to result in sudden, cataclysmic environmental events than a gradual (and therefore manageable) rise in average temperatures. Such events could include a substantial increase in global sea levels, intense storms and hurricanes and continent-wide "dust bowl" effects. This would trigger pitched battles between the survivors of these effects for access to food, water, habitable land and energy supplies. "Violence and disruption stemming from the stresses created by abrupt changes in the climate pose a different type of threat to national security than we are accustomed to today," the 2003 report noted. "Military confrontation may be triggered by a desperate need for natural resources such as energy, food and water rather than by conflicts over ideology, religion or national honor." Until now, this mode of analysis has failed to command the attention of top American and British policymakers. For the most part, they insist that ideological and religious differences -- notably, the clash between values of tolerance and democracy on one hand and extremist forms of Islam on the other -- remain the main drivers of international conflict. But Reid's speech at Chatham House suggests that a major shift in strategic thinking may be under way. Environmental perils may soon dominate the world security agenda. This shift is due in part to the growing weight of evidence pointing to a significant human role in altering the planet's basic climate systems. Recent studies showing the rapid shrinkage of the polar ice caps, the accelerated melting of North American glaciers, the increased frequency of severe hurricanes and a number of other such effects all suggest that dramatic and potentially harmful changes to the global climate have begun to occur. More importantly, they conclude that human behavior -- most importantly, the burning of fossil fuels in factories, power plants, and motor vehicles -- is the most likely cause of these changes. This assessment may not have yet penetrated the White House and other bastions of head-in-the-sand thinking, but it is clearly gaining ground among scientists and thoughtful analysts around the world. For the most part, public discussion of global climate change has tended to describe its effects as an environmental problem -- as a threat to safe water, arable soil, temperate forests, certain species and so on. And, of course, climate change is a potent threat to the environment; in fact, the greatest threat imaginable. But viewing climate change as an environmental problem fails to do justice to the magnitude of the peril it poses. As Reid's speech and the 2003 Pentagon study make clear, the greatest danger posed by global climate change is not the degradation of ecosystems per se, but rather the disintegration of entire human societies, producing wholesale starvation, mass migrations and recurring conflict over resources. "As famine, disease, and weather-related disasters strike due to abrupt climate change," the Pentagon report notes, "many countries' needs will exceed their carrying capacity" -- that is, their ability to provide the minimum requirements for human survival. This "will create a sense of desperation, which is likely to lead to offensive aggression" against countries with a greater stock of vital resources. "Imagine eastern European countries, struggling to feed their populations with a falling supply of food, water, and energy, eyeing Russia, whose population is already in decline, for access to its grain, minerals, and energy supply." Similar scenarios will be replicated all across the planet, as those without the means to survival invade or migrate to those with greater abundance -- producing endless struggles between resource "haves" and "have-nots." It is this prospect, more than anything, that worries John Reid. In particular, he expressed concern over the inadequate capacity of poor and unstable countries to cope with the effects of climate change, and the resulting risk of state collapse, civil war and mass migration. "More than 300 million people in Africa currently lack access to safe water," he observed, and "climate change will worsen this dire situation" -- provoking more wars like Darfur. And even if these social disasters will occur primarily in the developing world, the wealthier countries will also be caught up in them, whether by participating in peacekeeping and humanitarian aid operations, by fending off unwanted migrants or by fighting for access to overseas supplies of food, oil, and minerals. When reading of these nightmarish scenarios, it is easy to conjure up images of desperate, starving people killing one another with knives, staves and clubs -- as was certainly often the case in the past, and could easily prove to be so again. But these scenarios also envision the use of more deadly weapons. "In this world of warring states," the 2003 Pentagon report predicted, "nuclear arms proliferation is inevitable." As oil and natural gas disappears, more and more countries will rely on nuclear power to meet their energy needs -- and this "will accelerate nuclear proliferation as countries develop enrichment and reprocessing capabilities to ensure their national security." Although speculative, these reports make one thing clear: when thinking about the calamitous effects of global climate change, we must emphasize its social and political consequences as much as its purely environmental effects. Drought, flooding and storms can kill us, and surely will -- but so will wars among the survivors of these catastrophes over what remains of food, water and shelter. As Reid's comments indicate, no society, however affluent, will escape involvement in these forms of conflict. We can respond to these predictions in one of two ways: by relying on fortifications and military force to provide some degree of advantage in the global struggle over resources, or by taking meaningful steps to reduce the risk of cataclysmic climate change. No doubt there will be many politicians and pundits -- especially in this country -- who will tout the superiority of the military option, emphasizing America's preponderance of strength. By fortifying our borders and sea-shores to keep out unwanted migrants and by fighting around the world for needed oil supplies, it will be argued, we can maintain our privileged standard of living for longer than other countries that are less well endowed with instruments of power. Maybe so. But the grueling, inconclusive war in Iraq and the failed national response to Hurricane Katrina show just how ineffectual such instruments can be when confronted with the harsh realities of an unforgiving world. And as the 2003 Pentagon report reminds us, "constant battles over diminishing resources" will "further reduce [resources] even beyond the climatic effects." Military superiority may provide an illusion of advantage in the coming struggles over vital resources, but it cannot protect us against the ravages of global climate change. Although we may be somewhat better off than the people in Haiti and Mexico, we, too, will suffer from storms, drought and flooding. As our overseas trading partners descend into chaos, our vital imports of food, raw materials and energy will disappear as well. True, we could establish military outposts in some of these places to ensure the continued flow of critical materials -- but the ever-increasing price in blood and treasure required to pay for this will eventually exceed our means and destroy us. Ultimately, our only hope of a safe and secure future lies in substantially reducing our emissions of greenhouse gases and working with the rest of the world to slow the pace of global climate change

### Off

#### The affirmative props up the distinction between licit and illicit nuclear markets that is used to erase difference

Hecht 2010 [Gabrielle is associate professor of history at the University of Michigan, January Technology and Culture¶ Volume 51, Number 1, Project Muse]

The distinction between licit and illicit market activities depended on one's place in the geography of nuclear things. From the late 1970s onward, Namibian yellowcake played a central role in the (cold war, capitalist) uranium market. Its presence and its price helped keep conversion and enrichment plants in business; it fueled power reactors as well as bombs. When the liberation struggles in southern Africa threatened to render its uranium illicit, producers recruited these allies and their technopolitical mechanisms in an increasingly desperate (and ultimately successful) effort to remain in business. In this instance provenance, rather than nuclearity or markets, became reconfigured. The technopolitics of provenance not only served to materially intertwine licit trade and black markets; they also enacted a profound symbolic erasure of African things from Western nuclear systems.

#### Exceptionalism leads to extinction- produces a denial of death that demands constant causalities

Peterson ‘7 (Christopher, Lecturer @ University of Western Sidney, Kindred Specters: Death, Mourning, and American Affinity, pgs. 3-8)

While this study accords with the claim that American culture disavows mortality, 1 do not argue for any simple reversal of this interdiction with an aim toward affirming finitude per se. If death is beyond our experience (as Heidegger among others has observed), if I am ultimately absent from "my" own death, then strictly speaking there is nothing for me to recognize or avow. Yet dying is something that I do every day. Indeed, it might be more accurate to say that American culture disavows dying, understood as a process that extends from our birth to our biological demise." Even with such an amended formulation, however, it is not entirely clear whether dying can ever be fully affirmed or avowed. That "we live as if we were not going to die," as Zygmunt Bauman observes, "is a remarkable achievement," especially given the ease with which we disavow dying on a daily basis." Some degree of disavowal would seem both unavoidable and necessary for our survival. Any effort to prolong one's life, from simply eating well and exercising to taking medications to prevent or treat illness, evidences this disavowal. For Bauman, however, the disavowal of dying often has violent political and social consequences. Noting the wartime imperative "to limit our casualties" for instance, Bauman remarks that "the price of that limiting is multiplying the dead on the other side of the battleline" (34). Drawing from Freud's claim that, "at bottom no one believes in his own death," Bauman argues that death is "socially managed" by securing the "immortality" of the few through the mortalization of others (35, his emphasis).8 The belief in my self-presence, which is also always a belief in my immortality, is thus dialectically conditioned by the nonpresence of others. Scholars in race and sexuality studies have done much to bring our attention to the ways in which American culture represents racial and sexual minorities as dead - both figuratively and literally. Indeed, this gesture both accompanies and reinforces the larger cultural dissimulation of mortality by making racial and sexual others stand in for the death that haunts every life. The history of American slavery tells a familiar story of how American consciousness disavows and projects mortality onto its "others." Orlando Patterson has described the institution of slavery in terms of a process of kinship delegitimation that constructs slaves as "socially dead."? For Patterson, slavery - across its various historical forms - emerges as a substitute for death a forced bargain by which the slave retains his/her life only to enter into the liminal existence of the socially dead. As a substitution for death slavery does not "absolve or erase the prospect of death," for the specter of material death looms over the slave's existence as an irreducible remainder (5). This primary stage in the construction of the socially dead person is followed by what Patterson refers to as the slave's "natal alienation," his/her alienation from all rights or claims of birth: in short, a severing of all genealogical ties and claims both to the slave's living blood relatives, and to his/her remote ancestors and future descendants. Although Patterson does not approach the problem of social death through a psychoanalytic vocabulary of disavowal and projection, one might say that the presumptive ontology of slave-owning, legally recognized kinship, was dependent on a deontologization of slave kinship that worked to deny the death that each life bears within itself. Building on Patterson's argument, Toni Morrison observes in Playing in the Dark that, "for a people who made much of their 'newness' - their potential, freedom, and innocence - it is striking how dour, how troubled, how frightened and haunted our early and founding literature truly is." For Morrison, African-American slaves came to shoulder the burden of the darkness (both moral and racial) against which America defined itself. The shadow of a racialized blackness did not so much threaten the ostensible "newness" of American life as it conditioned the latter's appearance as new and free. Hence "freedom," she writes, "has no meaning ... without the specter of enslavement" (56). Echoing Morrison, Russ Castronovo asserts in Necro Citizenship that nineteenth-century American politics constructed the citizen in relation to a morbid fascination with ghosts, seances, spirit rappings, and mesmerism. Taking his point of departure from Patrick Henry's in-famous assertion, "give me liberty or give me death," Castronovo explores how admission into the domain of citizenship required a certain depoliticization and pacification of the subject: "The afterlife emancipates souls from passionate debates, everyday engagements, and earthly affairs that animate the political field."!' From Lincoln's rumored dabbling in spiritualism, to attempts by mediums to contact the departed souls of famous Americans, to a senator's introduction of a petition in 1854 asking Congress to investigate communications with the "other side" so numerous are Castronovo's examples of what he calls" spectral politics" that we would have a difficult time contesting his diagnosis that nineteenth-century American political discourse worked to produce politically and historically dead citizens. That these citizens were constructed in tandem with the production of large slave populations- noncitizens who were urged by slavery proponents and abolitionists alike to believe that emancipation existed in a promised afterlife - would lend still more credence to the argument that nineteenth-century America propagated a dematerialized politics. One wonders, however, how Castronovo's argument sits in relation to Aries's contention that American life tends toward an interdiction of death, and if Castronovo's rejection of necropolitics, moreover, is not finally symptomatic of this very disavowal. Castronovo maintains that, "for cultures that fear death ... necrophilia promotes fascination with and helps tame an unknowable terror:' (5). American necrophilia, according to Castronovo, responds to an overwhelming fear and denial of death. Castronovo thus aims 'to turn us away from such preoccupation with ghosts, spirits, and the afterlife toward "specific forms of corporeality," such as the laboring body, the slave body, and the mesmerized body, in order to avoid "reinscrib[ing] patterns of abstraction" (17). Yet, this move away from general to specific forms of embodiment still retains the notion of "the body," and therefore of a self-contained, sell-present entity. If nineteenth-century politics required that the citizen be disembodied and dematerialized, it does not follow that a move toward embodiment remedies such a spiritualized politics. Although Castronovo cautions that recourse to the body" does not automatically guarantee resistance," the overall tenor of his project pathologizes the spectral (18). Indeed, one has the sense that Castronovo would like to untether politics from death altogether - as if political life is not always haunted by finitude. Reversing the terms of political necrophilia, he offers something like a political necrophobia that sees every intrusion of the spectral as synonymous with depoliticization. If nineteenth-century spiritualism infused American political life with a familiar set of distinctions between spirit/matter, soul/body, that says nothing about how these binaries might be displaced rather than merely reversed. A binaristic approach to the subject of mortality is also legible in Sharon Holland's Raising the Dead, which asserts that "bringing back the dead (or saving the living from the shadow of death) is the ultimate queer act."11Drawing from the activist slogan "silence = death" from the early years of the AIDS epidemic, and extending this activist imperative to address the social death of sexual and racial minorities more generally, Holland observes that the deaths of queer and racial subjects serve "to ward off a nation's collective dread of the inevitable" (38). Yet, as in Castronovo's critique of necropolitics, this imperative to "raise the dead" reverses rather than displaces the logic through which dominant, white, heterosexual culture disavows and projects mortality onto racial and sexual minorities. While we must address the particular effects that social death has on racial and sexual minorities, this social reality must also be thought in relation to a more generalizable principle of mourning. For the "shadow of death" haunts all lives, not just queer ones. The "ultimate queer act," pace Holland, would be to deconstruct rather than reinscribe the binary between life and death, to resist the racist and heterosexist disavowal of finitude. That Americanist literary criticism on the subject of mortality remains implicated in the larger cultural disavowal of dying suggests that we ought to reassess our critical energies, particularly as these powers are enlisted to address how American political ideology produces the "death" of racial and sexual others. Indeed, I would argue that such criticism remains invested - despite all claims to the contrary - in an American exceptionalist project. American exceptionalism names, in part, a fetishization of novelty and futurity that initially defined America against an ostensibly decaying and moribund Europe. As David Noble has argued, the doctrine of exceptionalism excluded America from "the human experience of birth, death, and rebirth" by figuring Europe in terms of time and America in terms of timeless space." If, as George Berkeley put it, America is "time's noblest offspring," history gives birth to its final progeny in order that the latter might escape time altogether. America thus becomes eternally present while "Europe breeds in her decay." If the "new world" qua new must deny mortality, then reanimating the excluded from within the terms of a dialectical reversal renews rather than dismantles the American exceptionalist project. Challenging the ideology of American exceptionalism is particularly crucial for a post-9/11 politics that aims to resist the transformation of American exposure to injury and death into a newly reconsolidated sense of innocence and immortality. As Donald Pease has argued, 9/11 transformed "virgin land" into "ground zero," effecting an ideological shift from a "secured innocent nation to a wounded, insecure emergency state."16 Drawing from the work of Giorgio Agamben. Pease describes the emergency state as a nation that - by exempting itself from its own democratic rules of free speech, due process, and above all, the rules of war - marks a division between those whom the state protects from injury and those whom the state is free to injure and kill with impunity (13). The reduction of the Arab other to that which cannot be killed because it is already dead works to cover over the wound that ground zero opens up under the surface of virgin land. The emergency state (or what Agamben calls the "state of exception") thus also names a nation that attempts to except itself from the universal condition of mortality. As Bauman notes, "if mortality and transience are the norm among humans, durability may be attained only as an exception" (67, his emphasis).

#### The alternative is to reject the Affirmative-Questioning American exceptionalism is key to understanding our place in the world- rejection is key to more productive politics

Walt 2011[Stephen M. Walt, an FP contributing editor, is Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international affairs at Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government NOVEMBER 2011, Foreign Policy, “The Myth of American Exceptionalism” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/10/11/the\_myth\_of\_american\_exceptionalism]

Most statements of "American exceptionalism" presume that America's values, political system, and history are unique and worthy of universal admiration. They also imply that the United States is both destined and entitled to play a distinct and positive role on the world stage.¶ The only thing wrong with this self-congratulatory portrait of America's global role is that it is mostly a myth. Although the United States possesses certain unique qualities -- from high levels of religiosity to a political culture that privileges individual freedom -- the conduct of U.S. foreign policy has been determined primarily by its relative power and by the inherently competitive nature of international politics. By focusing on their supposedly exceptional qualities, Americans blind themselves to the ways that they are a lot like everyone else.¶ This unchallenged faith in American exceptionalism makes it harder for Americans to understand why others are less enthusiastic about U.S. dominance, often alarmed by U.S. policies, and frequently irritated by what they see as U.S. hypocrisy, whether the subject is possession of nuclear weapons, conformity with international law, or America's tendency to condemn the conduct of others while ignoring its own failings. Ironically, U.S. foreign policy would probably be more effective if Americans were less convinced of their own unique virtues and less eager to proclaim them.¶ What we need, in short, is a more realistic and critical assessment of America's true character and contributions. In that spirit, I offer here the Top 5 Myths about American Exceptionalism.

### Prolif

#### No nuclear rensaissance – fukishima

Cooper 11 (NUCLEAR SAFETY AND NUCLEAR ECONOMICS: HISTORICALLY, ACCIDENTS DIM THE PROSPECTS FOR NUCLEAR REACTOR CONSTRUCTION; FUKUSHIMA WILL HAVE A MAJOR IMPACT MARK COOPER, PHD Senior Fellow for Economic Analysis Institute for Energy and the Environment, Vermont Law School December 2011, <http://www.nirs.org/neconomics/Nuclear-Safety-and-Nuclear-Economics-Post-Fukushima.pdf>) JD

The increase in risk associated with the post-accident reviews and the history of cost escalation, before and after accidents will make investors and governments look less favorably on nuclear power. This inclination is compounded by the fact that the cost of new nuclear reactors was highly uncertain before Fukushima (as shown in Exhibit 5). Since the first estimates were put forward by nuclear "Enthusiasts" in an effort to create the impression of a “nuclear renaissance,” cost estimates have increased dramatically and the numbers that were originally hyped to kick off the “renaissance” proved to be far too low. Although the Enthusiasts have since raised their cost projections somewhat, Wall Street analysts still use construction cost projections that are at least 50 percent higher Fukushima will magnify the economic problems that the “nuclear renaissance” faced, which are the very problems that that have plagued nuclear power throughout its history. Nuclear power has always suffered from high cost and continuous cost escalation, high risk and uncertainty. With long lead-times and large sunk costs, nuclear is a very risky investment in an environment filled with ambiguities and competitive alternatives. Thus, new reactors are the antithesis of prudent investment. That is the reason that the “nuclear renaissance” never materialized. Hype and speculation of dozens of projects quickly gave way to a handful that became increasingly dependent on massive public subsidies to move forward. Before Fukushima, the Energy Information Administration, which had been one of the early Enthusiasts, had already conceded that only four reactors would be built over the next two decades. After Fukushima, even that number is in doubt.

#### We are already the prolif leader

Bigongiari 12 (U.S. assumes leadership of G8′s non-proliferation bodies Published on [January 25, 2012](http://www.bioprepwatch.com/us_bioterror_policy/u-s-assumes-leadership-of-g8s-non-proliferation-bodies/322874/) by [Jeffrey Bigongiari](http://www.bioprepwatch.com/author/jeffrey_bigongiari/) <http://www.bioprepwatch.com/us_bioterror_policy/u-s-assumes-leadership-of-g8s-non-proliferation-bodies/322874/>) JD

As the head of the G8 in 2012, the United States has assumed leadership of the organization’s three **non-proliferation bodies. The U**nited States now chairs the Non-proliferation Directors Group, the Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction, and the Nuclear Safety and Security Group, which will meet throughout the year to develop international nonproliferation objectives among the group’s members. The GP, which was launched at the Kananaskis Summit in 2002, was created initially as a 10 year, $20 billion initiative to support non-proliferation projects in Russia and the former Soviet Union. It has since expanded into additional regions around the world and has extended its mission beyond 2012. It now includes projects aimed at enhancing biological and radiological security, scientific engagement and U.N. nonproliferation efforts.

#### No cascade of proliferation – its all alarmist rhetoric

Muthia Alagappa, pub. date: 2008, Distinguished Senior Fellow, East-West Center, “The Long Shadow: Nuclear Weapons and Security in 21st Century Asia,” accesed: 1-6-09, p. 521-2, Google Books

It will be useful at this juncture to address more directly the set of instability arguments advanced by certain policy makers and scholars: the domino effect of new nuclear weapon states, the probability of preventative action against new nuclear weapon states, and the compulsion of these states to use their small arsenals early for fear of losing them in a preventive or preemptive strike by a stronger nuclear adversary. On the domino effect, India’s and Pakistan’s nuclear weapon programs have not fueled new programs in South Asia or beyond. Iran’s quest for nuclear weapons is not a reaction to the Indian or Pakistani programs. It is grounded in that country’s security concerns about the U ntiedStates and Tehran’s regional aspirations. The North Korean test has evoked mixed reactions in Northeast Asia. Tokyo is certainly concerned; its reaction, though, has not been to initiate its own nuclear weapon program but to reaffirm and strengthen the American extended deterrence commitment to Japan. Even if the U.S.-Japan security treaty were to weaken, it is not certain that Japan would embark on a nuclear weapon program. Likewise, South Korea has sought reaffirmation of the American extended deterrence commitment, but has firmly held to its nonnuclear posture. Without dramatic change in it’s political, economic, and security circumstances, South Korea is highly unlikely to embark on a covert (or overt) nuclear weapon program as it did in the 1970s. South Korea could still become a nuclear weapon state by inheriting the nuclear weapons of North Korea should the Kim Jong Il regime collapse. Whether it retains or gives up that capability will hinge on the security circumstances of a unified Korea. The North Korean nuclear test has not spurred Taiwan or Mongolia to develop nuclear weapon capability. The point is that each country’s decision to embark on and sustain nuclear weapon programs is contingent on its particular security and other circumstances. Through appealing, the domino theory is not predictive; often it is employed to justify policy on the basis of alarmist predictions. The loss of South Vietnam, for example, did not lead to the predicted domino effect in Southeast Asia and brought about a fundamental transformation in that sub region (Lord 1993, 1996). In the nuclear arena, the nuclear programs of China, India, and Pakistan were part of a security chain reaction, not mechanically falling dominos. However, as observed earlier the Indian, Pakistani, and North Korean nuclear tests have thus far not had the domino effect predicted by alarmist analysts and policy makers. Great caution should be exercised in accepting at face value the sensational predictions of individuals who have a vested interest in accentuating the dangers of nuclear proliferation. Such analysts are now focused on the dangers of a nuclear Iran. A nuclear Iran may or may not have destabilizing effects. Such claims must be assessed on the basis of an objective reading of the drivers of national and regional security in Iran and the Middle East.

#### Robust statistical studies prove prolif decreases war and escalation

Victor Asal and Kyle Beardsley, pub. date: 2007, Assistant Prof. Pol. Sci. – SUNY Albany, and Kyle Beardsley, Asst. Prof. Pol. Sci. – Emory Univ., Journal of Peace Research, “Proliferation and International Crisis Behavior,” accessed: 12-18-09, http://jpr.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/44/2/139

The literature on international conflict is divided on the impact of nuclear proliferation on state conflict. The optimists’ argument contends that nuclear weapons raise the stakes so high that states are unlikely to go to war when nuclear weapons enter the equation. The pessimists rebut this argument, contending that new proliferators are not necessarily rational and that having nuclear weapons does not discourage war but rather makes war more dangerous. Focusing on one observable implication from this debate, this article examines the relationship between the severity of violence in crises and the number of involved states with nuclear weapons. The study contends that actors will show more restraint in crises involving more participants with nuclear weapons. Using data from the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) project, the results demonstrate that crises involving nuclear actors are more likely to end without violence and, as the number of nuclear actors involved increases, the likelihood of war continues to fall. The results are robust even when controlling for a number of factors including non-nuclear capability. In confirming that nuclear weapons tend to increase restraint in crises, the effect of nuclear weapons on strategic behavior is clarified. But the findings do not suggest that increasing the number of nuclear actors in a crisis can prevent war, and they cannot speak to other proliferation risks

#### Not an existential threat – no overreaction

John Mueller (Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies, Mershon Center, and is professor of Political Science, at Ohio State University) 2010 “Atomic Obsession: Nuclear Alarmism from Hiroshima to Al Qaeda” p. 232

From this perspective, then, rhetorical declamations insisting that terrorism poses an existential threat are profoundly misguided. And so self-destructive overreactions (like the war in Iraq) which are also encouraging to the terrorists. As Osama bin Laden crowed in 2004: It is easy for us to provoke and bait .... All that we have to do is to send two mujahidin ... to raise a piece of cloth on which is wtitten al-Qaeda in order to make the generals race there to cause America to suffer human, economic, and political losses. Our policy is one -...... of bleeding America to the point of bankruptcy. The terrorist attacks cost al-Qaeda $500,000 while the attack and its aftermath .. inflicted a cost of more than $500 billion on the United States. .... Or perhaps, it is even worse. To the extent that we "portray the terrorist nuclear threat as the thing we fear most," notes Susan Martin, "we ow--. ture the idea that this is what terrorists must do if they want to be taka. ; seriously:'48 Existential bombast can be useful for scoring political points, selling. newspapers, or securing funding for pet projects or bureaucratic expansion. However, it does so by essentially suggesting that, if the terrorists really want to destroy us, all they have to do is hit us with a terrific punch, particularly a nuclear one. Although the attack may not in itself be remotely" enough to cause the nation to cease to exist, purveyors of bombast assure the terrorists that the target country will respond by obligingly destroying itself in anguished overreaction. The suggestion, then, is that it is not ' only the most feared terrorists who are suicidal. As Sageman points out, the United States hardly faces a threat to its existence, because even a nuclear strike by terrorists "will not destroy the nation:' As things stand now, he.. adds, "only the United States could obliterate the United States:'49 Atomic terrorism may indeed be the single most serious threat to the national security of the United States. Assessed in an appropriate context, however, the likelihood that such a calamity will come about seems breathtakingly small. Sensible, cost-effective policies designed to make that probability even lower may be justified, given the damage that can be inflicted by an atomic explosion. But unjustified, obsessive alarmism about the likelihood and imminence of atomic terrorism has had policy consequences that have been costly and unnecessary. Among them are the war in Iraq and the focus on WMD that seduced federal agencies away from due preparation 5o for disasters that have actually happened, such as Hurricane Katrina. Arch-demon Zawahiri once noted that the group only became aware of biological weapons "when the enemy drew our attention to them by repeatedly expressing concerns that they can be produced simply with easily available materials;'5! By constantly suggesting that the United States will destroy itself in response to an atomic explosion, the existential bombast about a terrorist bomb that follows so naturally from decades of atomic obsession encourages the most diabolical and murderous terrorists to investigate the possibility of obtaining one. Fortunately, however, would-be atomic terrorists are exceedingly unlikely to be successful in such a quest, however intense the inspiration and encouragement they receive from the unintentional cheerleaders among their distant enemies.

#### No motive - your evidence is alarmism

John Mueller (Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies, Mershon Center, and is professor of Political Science, at Ohio State University) 2010 “Atomic Obsession: Nuclear Alarmism from Hiroshima to Al Qaeda” p. 163

If there has been a "failure of imagination" over all these decades, however, perhaps it has been in the inability or unwillingness to consider the difficulties confronting the atomic terrorist. Thus far, terrorist groups seem to have exhibited only limited desire and even less progress in going atomic. This may be because, after brief exploration of the possible routes to go atomic, they, unlike generations of alarmed pundits, have discovered that the tremendous effort required is scarcely likely to be successful.

#### Thorium causes prolif

Arjun Makhijani, an electrical and nuclear engineer who is President of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research. Makhijani has written many books and reports analyzing the safety, economics, and efficiency of various energy sources. He has testified before Congress and has served as an expert witness in Nuclear Regulatory Commission proceedings, and Michele Boyd, former director of the Safe Energy Program at Physicians for Social Responsibility, “Thorium Fuel: No Panacea for Nuclear Power,” Physicians for Social Responsibility, July 2009, <http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/thorium2009factsheet.pdf>, accessed 10-1-2012.

Thorium is not actually a “fuel” because it is not fissile and therefore cannot be used to start ¶ or sustain a nuclear chain reaction. A fissile material, such as uranium-235 (U-235) or ¶ plutonium-239 (which is made in reactors from uranium-238), is required to kick-start the ¶ reaction. The enriched uranium fuel or plutonium fuel also maintains the chain reaction ¶ until enough of the thorium target material has been converted into fissile uranium-233 (U-¶ 233) to take over much or most of the job. An advantage of thorium is that it absorbs slow ¶ neutrons relatively efficiently (compared to uranium-238) to produce fissile uranium-233.¶ The use of enriched uranium or plutonium in thorium fuel has proliferation implications. ¶ Although U-235 is found in nature, it is only 0.7 percent of natural uranium, so the ¶ proportion of U-235 must be industrially increased to make “enriched uranium” for use in ¶ reactors. Highly enriched uranium and separated plutonium are nuclear weapons ¶ materials.

### Warming

#### No catastrophic warming and its not human caused- past temperatures were hotter and we didn’t cause them nor die from them

Idso, Carter and Singer 2011 [Craig D. Ph.D Chairman for the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Robert M. Ph.D Adjunct Research Fellow James Cook University, S. Fred Ph.D President of Science and Environmental Policy Project, Climate Change Reconsidered 2011 Interim Report” Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change http://nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/2011NIPCCinterimreport.pdf

Evidence of a Medieval Warm Period (MWP) approximately 1,000 years ago, when there was about 28 percent less CO2 in the atmosphere than there is currently, would show there is nothing unusual, unnatural, or unprecedented about recent temperatures. Such evidence is now overwhelming.  New evidence not reported in NIPCC-1 finds the Medieval Warm Period occurred in North America, Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, Antarctica, and the Northern Hemisphere. Despite this evidence, Mann et al. (2009) continue to understate the true level of warming during the MWP by cherry-picking proxy and instrumental records.  Research from locations around the world reveals a significant period of elevated air temperatures that immediately preceded the Little Ice Age, during a time that has come to be known as the Little Medieval Warm Period.  Recent reconstructions of climate history find the human influence does not stand out relative to other, natural causes of climate change. While global warming theory and models predict polar areas would warm most rapidly, the warming of Greenland was 33 percent greater in magnitude in 1919–1932 than it was in 1994–2007, and Antarctica cooled during the second half of the twentieth century.  Perlwitz et al. (2009) reported ―a decade-long decline (1998–2007) in globally averaged temperatures from the record heat of 1998‖ and noted U.S. temperatures in 2008 ―not only declined from near-record warmth of prior years, but were in fact colder than the official 30-year reference climatology … and further were the coldest since at least 1996.‖  New research disputes IPCC‘s claim that it has ferreted out all significant influences of the world‘s many and diverse urban heat islands from the temperature databases they use to portray the supposedly unprecedented warming of the past few decades.

#### Thorium reactors have no design plan in R&D for commercialization – no electricity produced, granular cracking, and moderator distortion means it’s unsafe.

Dylan Ryan, 2011, Masters in Mechanical Engineering, specialization in technical aided engineering & materials, and a PhD in engineering energy systems from Stanford University, 15 years’ experience in natural convection and heat transfer, daryanenergyblog , “The Molten Salt Reactor concept,” <http://daryanenergyblog.wordpress.com/ca/part-8-msr-lftr/>

Firstly, there is a view that the LFTR concept has been “proven” already via the Molten-Salt Reactor Experiment (MSRE) project in the 1960’s. While it is certainly true that such a reactor ran successfully for 4 years and that this project proved that some of the ideas behind the MSR have merit, there are a couple of key things it didn’t do. Notably, it never generated a single watt of electricity. As I’ve mentioned previously the turbo generator systems for high temperature reactors is technically challenging, especially for the LFTR as the molten salt presents a number of design challenges. That said, the goal of the MSR experiment was to prove the reactor concept, not develop turbo machinery kit, which would have been a serious (and costly) distraction. The molten salts at the MSRE were passed through a cooling loop and fans used to blow the pipe work cool again. Stories of said pipe work glowing red (see below) are worrying, as it indicates they were operating well within the thermal creep zone. At the time very little was known about thermal creep, in particular the delirious effects of neutron bombardment on exacerbating the problem. Consequently, it’s unlikely one could utilize the same design spec today for a commercial plant. Indeed, reports of distortions in the graphite moderator after just a few years exposure and worse inter-granular cracking (a corrosion related failure phenomenon usually caused by excessively high temperatures) of some metal components exposed to the molten salt, suggest it was operating well outside the limits of what would count as a reasonable safe technical envelope (at least for a commercial reactor with a long operating life). As I will detail later this has significant design implications. The reactor also spent a good deal of its time down for maintenance. The cooling circuit of the MSRE glows red hot due to its high operating temperature Also, the MSRE never included the trickier Chemical Processing Plant. One was designed by ORNL but never installed. Aside from using a chemical spray technique to separate out the nastier neutron “poisons”, such as Xenon-135, much of the remaining “chemical plant” functions of this reactor design have never been tested. While the MSRE did run once on U-233, this was generated off site, not by the reactor itself. Finally, as I hinted earlier, 40 years is a long time. Very little of the technical side of building this reactor would be relevant today given how much technology, especially material science has changed. Many of the scientists who worked on it are either dead or retired. While one won’t be starting off with a blank sheet of paper, you probably won’t find yourself far removed from that.

#### Extra steps in thorium make it cost-prohibitive

Arjun Makhijani, n electrical and nuclear engineer who is President of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research. Makhijani has written many books and reports analyzing the safety, economics, and efficiency of various energy sources. He has testified before Congress and has served as an expert witness in Nuclear Regulatory Commission proceedings, and Michele Boyd, former director of the Safe Energy Program at Physicians for Social Responsibility, “Thorium Fuel: No Panacea for Nuclear Power,” Physicians for Social Responsibility, July 2009, <http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/thorium2009factsheet.pdf>, accessed 10-1-2012.

Thorium may be abundant and possess certain technical advantages, but it does not mean ¶ that it is economical. Compared to uranium, the thorium fuel cycle is likely to be even more ¶ costly. In a once-through mode, it will need both uranium enrichment (or plutonium ¶ separation) and thorium target rod production. In a breeder configuration, it will need ¶ reprocessing, which is costly. In addition, as noted, inhalation of thorium-232 produces a ¶ higher dose than the same amount of uranium-238 (either by radioactivity or by weight). ¶ Reprocessed thorium creates even more risks due to the highly radioactive U-232 created ¶ in the reactor. This makes worker protection more difficult and expensive for a given level ¶ of annual dose.

#### Doesn’t solve warming- electricity generation is only a quarter of emissions

Green 2009¶ [Jim B.Med.Sci. (Hons.), PhD, honors degree in public health and was awarded a PhD in science and technology studies for his analysis of the Lucas Heights research reactor debates, studies and speaks extensively on nuclear power, national nuclear campaigner, “Nuclear Weapons and 'Generation 4' Reactors,” Friends of Earth Australia, July 2009, http://www.foe.org.au/anti-nuclear/issues/nfc/power-weapons/g4nw/]

Others are less circumspect, with one advocate of integral fast reactors promoting them as the "holy grail" in the fight against global warming. There are two main problems with these arguments. Firstly, nuclear power could at most make a modest contribution to climate change abatement, mainly because it is used almost exclusively for electricity generation which accounts for about one-quarter of global greenhouse emissions. Doubling global nuclear power output (at the expense of coal) would reduce greenhouse emissions by about 5%. Building six nuclear power reactors in Australia (at the expense of coal) would reduce Australia's emissions by just 4%.

#### CO2 doesn’t cause warming

Jaworowski 2010 [Zbigniew, Ph. D., M.D., D.Sc., has researched the atmospheric pollution of glaciers and CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere for many years, and is the author of numerous publications on climate change. He serves as the Polish representative in the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, and is a member of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC) January 15, “‘Global Warming’: A Lie Aimed At Destroying Civilization” EIR Science and Technology http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles\_2010/Jaworowski\_interview.pdf]

As you can see, there is no connection between CO2 , which has been under such fierce attack, and climate change. Indeed, more than 500 million years ago, according to the geological record, CO2 was present at 23 times the levels we now have in the atmosphere, and yet, half a billion years ago, the land was covered by glaciers. Climate change depends on many factors, and now we are fighting against only one factor, CO2 , which happens to be negligible.

#### Experts don’t actually think the climate debate is over- their authors manipulate data too

Bast, Karnick and Bast 2011 [Joseph L. President of the Heartland Institute, S.T. Research Director The Heartland Institute, Diane Carol, Executive Editor The Heartland Institute, “Climate Change Reconsidered 2011 Interim Report: Foreward” Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change http://nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/2011NIPCCinterimreport.pdf

Just months after Hulme‘s book was released, a large cache of emails was leaked by someone at the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia. ―Climategate,‖ as it has come to be known, revealed deliberate efforts by leading scientific supporters of the IPCC, and of climate alarmism more generally, to hide flaws in their evidence and analysis, keep ―skeptics‖ from appearing in peer-reviewed journals, and avoid sharing their data with colleagues seeking to replicate their results (Bell, 2011; Sussman, 2010; Montford, 2010). The emails reveal that important data underlying climate policy are missing or have been manipulated. In February 2010, the BBC‘s environment analyst Roger Harrabin posed a series of written questions to Philip D. Jones, director of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia and the person responsible for maintaining the IPCC‘s all important climate temperature records (BBC, 2010). Jones appeared to back away from many of the foundational positions of the IPCC, admitting for example:  The rates of global warming from 1860–1880, 1910–1940 and 1975–1998, and 1975–2009 ―are similar and not statistically significantly different from each other.‖

## 2NC

## T

### 2NC Limits Overview

#### Literally doubles the educational benefit

**Arrington 2009** (Rebecca, UVA Today, “Study Finds That Students Benefit From Depth, Rather Than Breadth, in High School Science Courses” March 4)

A recent study reports that high school students who study fewer science topics, but study them in greater depth, have an advantage in college science classes over their peers who study more topics and spend less time on each. Robert Tai, associate professor at the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education, worked with Marc S. Schwartz of the University of Texas at Arlington and Philip M. Sadler and Gerhard Sonnert of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics to conduct the study and produce the report. "Depth Versus Breadth: How Content Coverage in High School Courses Relates to Later Success in College Science Coursework" relates the amount of content covered on a particular topic in high school classes with students' performance in college-level science classes. The study will appear in the July 2009 print edition of Science Education and is currently available as an online pre-print from the journal. "As a former high school teacher, I always worried about whether it was better to teach less in greater depth or more with no real depth. This study offers evidence that teaching fewer topics in greater depth is a better way to prepare students for success in college science," Tai said. "These results are based on the performance of thousands of college science students from across the United States." The 8,310 students in the study were enrolled in introductory biology, chemistry or physics in randomly selected four-year colleges and universities. Those who spent one month or more studying one major topic in-depth in high school earned higher grades in college science than their peers who studied more topics in the same period of time. The study revealed that students in courses that focused on mastering a particular topic were impacted twice as much as those in courses that touched on every major topic

### 2NC A2: For Definition

#### For is a limiting term- has to be exclusive

Clegg, 95 - J.D., 1981 Yale Law School; the author is vice president and general counsel of the National Legal Center for the Public Interest. (Roger, “Reclaiming The Text of The Takings Clause,” 46 S.C. L. Rev. 531, Summer, lexis)

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

## QER CP

### Perm do the CP

#### Our interpretation is the most predictable.

**Random House Dictionary, 2010** (Random House, Inc., online)

Rules similar to those for choosing between shall and will have long been advanced for should and would, but again the rules have had little effect on usage. In most constructions, would is the auxiliary chosen regardless of the person of the subject: If our allies would support the move, we would abandon any claim to sovereignty. You would be surprised at the complexity of the directions. Because the main function of should in modern American English is to express duty, necessity, etc. (You should get your flu shot before winter comes), its use for other purposes, as to form a subjunctive, can produce ambiguity, at least initially: I should get my flu shot if I were you. Furthermore, should seems an affectation to many Americans when used in certain constructions quite common in British English: Had I been informed, I should (American would) have called immediately. I should (American would) really prefer a different arrangement. As with shall and will, most educated native speakers of American English do not follow the textbook rule in making a choice between should and would. See also shall.

#### The CP is part of the debate on options to increase energy production- process is a key debate in the lit

Pryor 2011 [Hon. Mark L. Pryor, U.S. Senator From Arkansason s. 1703 HEARING¶ before the¶ COMMITTEE ON¶ ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES¶ UNITED STATES SENATE¶ ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS¶ FIRST SESSION¶ TO¶ RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S QUADRENNIAL TECHNOLOGY ¶ REVIEW (QTR) AND TWO BILLS PENDING BEFORE THE COMMITTEE: S. 1703--¶ QUADRENNIAL ENERGY REVIEW ACT OF 2011, AND S. 1807--ENERGY RESEARCH AND ¶ DEVELOPMENT COORDINATION ACT OF 2011 NOVEMBER 15, 2011 http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-112shrg72188/html/CHRG-112shrg72188.htm]

Secretary of Energy Steven Chu recognizes this challenge. In 2009, ¶ he tasked the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology ¶ (PCAST) with identifying and recommending ways to accelerate the ¶ transformation of energy production, delivery, and use. Led by Dr. ¶ Moniz, one of PCAST's most important recommendations was for the ¶ Administration to establish a new process that can forge a more ¶ coordinated and robust Federal energy policy, a major piece of which is ¶ advancing energy innovation. The report recommends:¶ ``The President should establish a Quadrennial Energy Review ¶ process that will provide a multiyear roadmap that lays out an ¶ integrated view of short-, intermediate-, and long-term energy ¶ objectives; outlines legislative proposals to Congress; puts forward ¶ anticipated Executive actions coordinated across multiple agencies; and ¶ identifies resource requirements for the development and implementation ¶ of energy technologies.''

#### And the education net benefit outweighs their offense

#### implementation is the KEY ISSUE in energy policy

**Nolan, 11** - Associate Professor of Law and Dispute Resolution Program Director, Vermont Law School (Seth, “Negotiating the Wind: A Framework to Engage Citizens in Siting Wind Turbines” Negotiating the Wind: A Framework to Engage Citizens in Siting Wind Turbines, SSRN)

Despite demonstrated need and available technology, the promise of wind energy has yet to live up to its potential. As a society, we see the benefits of renewable sources of energy but struggle to implement our vision through siting of new facilities. In some instances, this gap results from opposition caused by applicants’ and regulators’ emphasis (read: overemphasis) on the substance rather than the process of decision-making. Applicants often enter an approval process expecting that doling out concessions will adequately address citizen opposition. The resulting opposition is often as much a product of what was proposed as how it was proposed.210 Attending to procedural needs as well as substantive needs can offer some solace to weary and suspicious citizens and provide the substrate on which a satisfactory solution can be reached.

### 2NC Solvency Generic

#### Empirically processes that create broad energy policy are implemented

Energy Washington Week, 12 (1/25, lexis)

The Department of Energy's forthcoming "straw man" vision of what is needed to achieve "a new paradigm for the electricity industry" targets 80 percent clean energy by 2035 through a system that allows 100 percent "customer participation and choice" using distributed generation, demand-side management, transportation electrification and other elements, according to a draft report DOE developed last year and will circulate broadly for public comment.DOE has been working over the past year on this document to "continue the dialogue towards a national publicprivate vision of the future grid" and will present its draft vision at the Feb. 8-9 National Electricity Forum that runs back-to-back with the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners' (NARUC) winter meeting Feb. 5-8 in Washington, DC.According to former senior DOE officials, while the department's vision initiative will be limited by its lack of authority for setting national energy policy and by election year politics that will inhibit any major policy actions that might upset constituents, the effort could lay the foundation for significant policy developments, including eventual legislation. The national energy strategy task force of 1990-1991 and the highly controversial national energy plan released in 2001 by President George W. Bush and Vice President Dick Cheney resulted, respectively, in 1992 energy legislation and the Energy Policy Act of 2005, says one former official.A DOE-wide "Grid Tech Team" under the leadership of Lauren Azar, senior adviser to Energy Secretary Steven Chu, developed the document and held a workshop Nov.

#### More analytic capabilities solves this

Moniz, 11 Ernest J. Moniz, Cecil and Ida Green, Professor of Physics and Engineering Systems, Director, MIT Energy Initiative, 11/15, http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-112shrg72188/html/CHRG-112shrg72188.htm)

¶ As recognized in the QTR, there is much to do for further iteration ¶ of the QTR and for building up capacity to support a full QER. The most ¶ striking need is to build up substantial government strength in energy ¶ engineering-economic analysis as a core competence. The DOE (and its ¶ labs) have little strength in this area in comparison to the private ¶ sector, but such skills are essential for going to the next meaningful ¶ stage of the QTR. The ability to integrate technical, economic and ¶ policy analysis is in turn essential for the QER Executive Secretariat ¶ function. I urge that the Congress support buildup of this capability ¶ within the DOE. This function could be placed in an expanded Office of ¶ Policy supporting the Secretary; the PCAST report recommends ¶ establishment of a policy office separate from the international ¶ affairs function. In my view, the first QTR should be followed in 2012 ¶ by a renewed effort to build on the first edition, incorporating more ¶ analytical functions, engaging more agencies, and building momentum ¶ towards a QER that will presumably be launched more aggressively in ¶ early 2013.¶

### Solves Nuclear Affs

#### QER is key to nuclear decisions- key to the long term nature of the technology

NMNP, 12 [ABOUT THE NEW MILLENIUM NUCLEAR PARTNERSHIP The New Millennium Nuclear Energy Summit was held on December 7, 2010, in Washington, D.C. Senior leaders from government, industry and non-government organizations actively participated in defining the most important and substantive issues that confront the nuclear energy industry—an essential part of the United States’ energy production portfolio. Upon the success of the summit, four working groups comprised of summit participants were established to provide the recommendations found in this consolidated report. ABOUT THIRD WAY Third Way is a think tank that answers America’s challenges with modern ideas aimed at the center. We advocate for private-sector economic growth, a tough and smart centrist security strategy, a clean energy revolution, and progress on divisive social issues, all through a moderate-led U.S. politics, June http://content.thirdway.org/publications/540/Third\_Way\_Report\_-\_A\_Strategy\_for\_the\_Future\_of\_Nuclear\_Energy.pdf]

The QER should establish priorities for government-sponsored research¶ into new nuclear technology. The development time for new nuclear ¶ technologies typically exceeds the time frame of the federal appropriation ¶ process. Too often, projects authorized in one Congress and implemented by ¶ an Administration are cut off before they bear fruit. The consequent shift in ¶ priorities results in development that has not adequately matured to support ¶ technology transfer to the private sector for commercialization. The QER ¶ provides the opportunity to insert rigor in the change control processes and ¶ restrain the “technology of the moment” shift in governmental priorities.

### 2NC Agency Coordination UQ

#### Massive lack of coordination in energy policy now- takes out solvency

SEPI 2012 [Strategic Energy Policy Initiative November 2012 Bipartisan Policy Center “The Executive Branch ¶ and National Energy ¶ Policy: Time for ¶ Renewal” http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/BPC\_Governance\_Report\_0.pdf]

Unfortunately, the executive branch of the federal government is currently not well equipped to develop and effectively implement a national energy policy that meets the ¶ criteria outlined above. As mentioned previously, one part of the problem is that energy related responsibilities in the executive branch have proliferated and spread over the last 50 ¶ years to at least 20 distinct federal agencies and departments. As a result, no single entity¶ is in a position to implement, coordinate, and assess all of the federal government’s energyrelated activities and initiatives. Of course, DOE has a large role and is at the center of ¶ many of the government’s energy-related science and R&D programs. And yet, the majority ¶ of DOE’s budget is devoted to programs that maintain the nation’s stockpile of nuclear ¶ materials and manage the cleanup of Cold War weapons-production facilities.¶ 20¶ Meanwhile, ¶ the sheer multiplicity and fragmentation of other federal agencies and congressional ¶ committees involved to a greater or lesser extent in energy-related policies or programs ¶ inevitably increases the potential for failure in coordination, incompatible agendas, ¶ duplication, and inconsistency across the federal complex.

## Prolif

#### Any move for retaliation is posturing – Obama wont follow through

Michael Crowley (Senior Editor the New Republic) January 2010 “Obama and Nuclear Deterrence”, http://www.tnr.com/node/72263

The Los Angeles Times ran an important story yesterday about the Obama administration's Nuclear Posture Review, which evaluates U.S. policy towards the use of nuclear weapons. Apparently there's a debate inside the administration--one that is splitting the civilians from the generals--not just about the size of our nuclear stockpile but also how we conceive of possible first-strike and retaliatory policies. A core issue under debate, officials said, is whether the United States should shed its long-standing ambiguity about whether it would use nuclear weapons in certain circumstances, in hopes that greater specificity would give foreign governments more confidence to make their own decisions on nuclear arms. Some in the U.S. argue that the administration should assure foreign governments that it won't use nuclear weapons in reaction to a biological, chemical or conventional attack, but only in a nuclear exchange. Others argue that the United States should promise that it would never use nuclear weapons first, but only in response to a nuclear attack. As the story notes, some experts don't place much weight on how our publicly-stated doctrine emerges because they don't expect foreign nations to take it literally. And the reality is that any decisions about using nukes will certainly be case-by-case. But I'd still like to see some wider discussion of the underlying questions, which are among the most consequential that policymakers can consider. The questions are particularly vexing when it comes to terrorist groups and rogue states. Would we, for instance, actually nuke Pyongyang if it sold a weapon to terrorists who used it in America? That implied threat seems to exist, but I actually doubt that a President Obama--or any president, for that matter--would go through with it.

## Warming

### No Solvency

#### Very long timeframe even with optimal market conditions – an increase in incentives for thorium still won’t get fuel vendors on board.

UK NNL (National Nuclear Laboratory), August 2010, “The Thorium Fuel Cycle,” <http://ripassetseu.s3.amazonaws.com/www.nnl.co.uk/_files/documents/aug_11/NNL__1314092891_Thorium_Cycle_Position_Paper.pdf>

ThorEnergy advocates using plutonium as the initial “seed” material (the fissile material used to generate the neutrons to enable breeding to take place in the fertile thorium) for LWRs, prior to U-233 becoming available at a later stage. The plutonium would be incorporated in Th-Pu MOX fuel. They argue that Th-Pu MOX is fundamentally very similar to U-Pu MOX fuel and therefore that the R&D requirements would be much less onerous than would be necessary for a more radical design change. Nevertheless, ThorEnergy recognize that the large R&D investment will still be required and the timescale to commercial readiness will be long. There have been many other international thorium fuel studies, including several demonstration programs in the Shipping port prototype Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) and High Temperature Reactors (HTRs). However, these were not subsequently progressed to full commercial deployment. The main reason has been that thorium is competing with the uranium/plutonium fuel cycle which is already very mature. To progress to commercial deployment would demand major investments from fuel vendors and utilities. Such investment has yet to be justified by market conditions and there is no immediate prospect of change in the next ten years. Beyond that, however, the conditions may favor thorium if uranium ore prices increase and/or uranium reserves become more scarce. In the event of thorium fuel cycles being adopted commercially in existing LWRs, the technology can be considered to be well understood, but not fully demonstrated. The historic experience in the Shipping port PWR cannot now be considered adequate to cover modern operating regimes and discharge burnups. Demonstration of thorium/U-233 fuels in commercial LWRs will therefore demand small scale testing in research reactors, followed by large scale tests in commercial reactors. Based on NNL’s knowledge and experience of introducing new fuels into modern reactors, it is estimated that this is likely to take 10 to 15 years even with a concerted R&D effort and investment before the thorium fuel cycle could be established in current reactors and much longer for any future reactor systems. Therefore it is not envisaged that thorium fuel in LWRs will be established in the next decade, but could be feasible in the following ten years if the market conditions are conducive.

### Warming 2NC Impact D

#### No proof of tipping points – we’ve recovered from worse temp increases

Thomas Fuller July 6, 2010. “Global warming, uncertainty, tipping points and the precautionary principle” Environmental Policy Examiner. http://www.examiner.com/environmental-policy-in-national/global-warming-uncertainty-tipping-points-and-the-precautionary-principle

Others are more optimistic, and say that if we act right now, but really right now, we can avoid crossing the line and making permanent changes. They say that because we don't know where the tipping point really is and because we do not know the extent of damage that could be caused by a permanently warmer planet, the Precautionary Principle more or less compels us to take drastic action to fight climate change. There are opposing arguments to this. One of the best arguments against the Precautionary Principle is the error it led us into the last time it was used. Then Vice President Dick Cheney argued that if there was even a 1% chance that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, then it was important to us to invade Iraq, find the weapons and institute regime change. What's important to understand about that is that Cheney was wrong, not because Hussein didn't have WMD. He was wrong in his application of logic. The first step in dealing with this type of situation is reducing the uncertainty in your calculations. For Cheney, this would have meant first, quantifying the type and amounts of WMD Hussein might realistically possess, Hussein's realistic delivery options for WMD, and his propensity to use them. Second, in a Strangelovian way, Cheney would have used existing Pentagon scenarios to calculate the damage to life and the political framework of the Middle East if Husseing used these weapons and compared it very cold-bloodedly to the losses certain to result from our intervention. The problem is Cheney didn't do any of the math. He merely pronounced that Hussein's possible possession of WMD meant that a Tipping Point had already been reached, and that the Precautionary Principle mandated our intervention. But pronouncing it doesn't make it so. There are solid philosophical arguments against both the Tipping Point and the Precautionary Principle, and well-educated and intelligent people on both sides of the fence. And this argument extends to the application of both concepts to climate change. One argument from skeptics is that the Earth has warmed before without reaching a Tipping Point. It may have been warmer than today during Medieval Times, and it certainly has been warmer for most of the period since the end of the last Ice Age. And yet temperatures did eventually decline. In the more remote past, temperatures were dramatically warmer during several periods, but again, temperatures declined. Another argument is that if we rigorously applied the Precautionary Principle to poorly understood phenomena, we would halt all technological progress and innovation. If our society is paralysed by fear of the unknown, we may reject the next invention that might dramatically improve our lives.What disturbs me is that we are willing to discuss in endless detail with incredible amounts of name-calling the causes and effects of global warming, without discussing the validity of using Tipping Points and the Precautionary Principle as guiding lights for how we should react. From what I have seen in the popular media, the use of those terms is very Cheney-esque. People mention the existence of Tipping Points and the Precautionary Principle and assume that that closes the conversation.

## 1NR

### Impact

#### Double-dip now causes depression - overwhelms their D

Isidore 11 (Financial Correspondent-CNN Money, 8/10, http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/10/news/economy/double\_dip\_recession\_economy/index.htm

Another recession could be even worse than the last one for a few reasons. For starters, the economy is more vulnerable than it was in 2007 when the Great Recession began. In fact, the economy would enter the new recession much weaker than the start of any other downturn since the end of World War II. Unemployment currently stands at 9.1%. In November 2007, the month before the start of the Great Recession, it was just 4.7%. And the large number of Americans who have stopped looking for work in the last few years has left the percentage of the population with a job at a 28-year low. Various parts of the economy also have yet to recover from the last recession and would be at serious risk of lasting damage in a new downturn. Home values continue to lose ground and are projected to continue their fall. While manufacturing has had a nice rebound in the last two years, industrial production is still 18% below pre-recession levels. There are nearly 900 banks on the FDIC's list of troubled institutions, the highest number since 1993. Only 76 banks were at risk as the Great Recession took hold. But what has economists particularly worried is that the tools generally used to try to jumpstart an economy teetering on the edge of recession aren't available this time around. "The reason we didn't go into a depression three years ago is the policy response by Congress and the Fed," said Dan Seiver, a finance professor at San Diego State University. "We won't see that this time." Three times between 2008 and 2010, Congress approved massive spending or temporary tax cuts to try to stimulate the economy. But fresh from the bruising debt ceiling battle and credit rating downgrade, and with elections looming, the federal government has shown little inclination to move in that direction. So this new recession would likely have virtually no policy effort to counteract it.

#### Economic bounceback now- failure to get a deal on debt ceiling and sequester causes collapse

Brown 1-2 [Abram Brown 1-2-2013 Forbes “Fiscal Cliff: Two Monster Problems Loom Ahead. Here's What Happens Next” http://www.forbes.com/sites/abrambrown/2013/01/02/u-s-faces-uphill-climb-after-fiscal-cliff-deal-heres-what-happes-next/]

To monitor how investors feel about the progress, look at key bellwether stocks, businesses like Apple and FedEx, that can report tremors in economic conditions throughout the globe. Also, track how risk-off stocks fare: These are large, cash-generative companies like Procter & Gamble and Coca-Cola that investors buy during tiring times.¶ Optimism is already apparent from gains in U.S. and overseas markets. The Dow Jones industrial average climbed 1.4% to 13,286.18—a triple-digit gain of 182 points. The Nasdaq composite rose 2.6% to 3,086.46, and the S&P 500 added 1.9% to 1,452.81.¶ Abroad, the Euro Stoxx 50 climbed by 2.6% to 2,704.61. The FTSE 100 added 2.3% to 6,035.90. Asian markets told a similar story. The Shanghai composite went up 1.3% to 2,269.13, and the Hang Sheng index increased 2.9% to 23,311.98.¶ The length of the rally should seem very much in doubt. “The bare bones agreement to limit the scope of tax increases in 2013 removes for now the threat of immediate, severe fiscal tightening,” says Citi economist Steven Wieting. “However, the incomplete agreement leaves both short-term and long-term spending decisions to the new Congress in just the next couple of months. A two-month delay in sequestration roughly coincides with needed action to raise the Federal debt ceiling.” Wieting adds: “Such further agreements may be reached with even more difficulty.”

#### Best academic theory validates our impact

Royal 2010 (Jedediah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, 2010, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-214)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 10981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fearon, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner, 1999). Seperately, Polllins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium, and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996,2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that ‘future expectation of trade’ is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavior of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectation of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases , as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002, p.89). Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. ‘Diversionary theory’ suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to create a ‘rally round the flag’ effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995), and Blomberg, Hess and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997) Miller (1999) and Kisanganie and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force.

### Gun Control

#### Obama wont spend capital

Volsky 12/30 (Igor Volsky, “Obama Pledges To Push For Gun Control Measures If ‘American People Decide It’s Important’,” Think Progress, http://thinkprogress.org/politics/2012/12/30/1379691/obama-pledges-to-push-for-gun-control-measures-if-american-people-decide-its-important/)

But Obama stressed that reform cannot happen without broad public support, suggesting that he will rally public opinion for sensible gun safety regulations or drop the effort if Americans are not on board.¶ “We’re not going to get this done unless the American people decide it’s important and so this is not going to be a matter of me spending political capital. One of the things that you learn having now been in this office for four years. The old adage of Abraham Lincoln’s, ‘with public opinion there is nothing you can’t do and without public opinion there is very little you can get done in this town.’” Watch it:

#### Debt ceiling is top of the agenda

Barbieri and Sahadi 1-2 [Rich Barbieri and Jeanne Sahadi 1-2-2013 CNN Money “It's official: U.S. hits debt ceiling” http://money.cnn.com/2012/12/31/news/economy/debt-ceiling/]

It's official: U.S. debt reached its legal borrowing limit Monday, giving Congress about two months before it must raise the debt ceiling or risk causing the government to default on its bills and financial obligations.¶ "I can confirm we will reach the statutory debt limit today, Dec. 31," a Treasury Department official said Monday.¶ A bipartisan fiscal cliff deal passed by the Senate early Tuesday and awaiting a vote in the House did not address the debt ceiling issue.¶ As expected, Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner had submitted a letter to Congress on Monday saying he had begun a "debt issuance suspension period" that would last through Feb. 28. That means Treasury will employ a series of "extraordinary measures" so it does not exceed the debt limit, currently set at $16.394 trillion.¶ Such measures include suspending the reinvestment of federal workers' retirement account contributions in short-term government bonds.¶ By taking those steps, Treasury can buy about $200 billion of headroom. That normally can cover about two months' worth of borrowing, although continuing uncertainty about tax rates and spending make it hard to determine precisely how long the extraordinary measures will last.¶ The bottom line: Congress will have to raise the debt ceiling soon -- as soon as late February.¶ And that sets the stage for yet another fight on Capitol Hill, where some Republican lawmakers view the debt limit as leverage in negotiations with President Obama over spending cuts and reforms to Medicare and Social Security.

### Link

#### Nuclear power investment throws off debt deals

Jim Snyder and Brian Wingfield, 2-13-12 reporters for Bloomberg News, “Obama Budget Would Cut $40 Billion In Fossil-Fuel Credits”, February 13th, 2012, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-13/obama-proposes-cutting-40-billion-in-u-s-fossil-fuel-credits.html

The budget would fund research in fossil-fuel energy, primarily for carbon capture and storage programs, at $421 million in 2013, a 21 percent reduction from current spending. Last year, the president requested authority for an additional $36 billion in loan guarantees for nuclear energy, which Congress denied. The budget for 2013 didn’t renew the request. “The 2013 budget does not include any additional loan authority or appropriated credit subsidy as the program will focus on deploying the significant amount of remaining resources appropriated in prior years,” according to the budget document. The coastal oil-producing states of Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, California and Alaska face a $200 million cut in an Interior Department conservation and preservation program to protect fish and wetlands. The six states failed to use about $540 million out of $1 billion provided in 2007-2010, according to the Obama’s budget plan. “States have been slow to obligate funding,” today’s budget proposal said. “In a period of severe fiscal restraint, leaving these unobligated funds in an account where they are not being deployed is no longer defensible.”

#### LFTRs are politically controversial – congress has huge interests in maintaining nuclear status quo with uranium and avoiding additional costs of government involvement.

John McClaughry | September 11, 2012 A Cheaper, Safer Sort of Nuclear Power The case for thorium.

 http://reason.com/archives/2012/09/11/a-cheaper-safer-sort-of-nuclear-power

From 1965 to 1969, Weinberg's molten salt reactor experiment had operated successfully, in the later months with thorium-derived U233 fuel. By 1973, Weinberg was gone, molten salt was rejected, and thorium was dead. Rickover's uranium-based industrial empire was preserved, as Westinghouse and other companies built the admiral's naval r eactors; the cheaper, safer alternative was shelved.¶ A man with all the capital in the world couldn't crack into the U.S. nuclear power market: Since it involves uranium, the government stands adamantly in the way, arm in arm with the interests committed to defeating any challenge from disruptive technology. (Nuclear Regulatory Commission approval of a new reactor type typically takes up to 10 years.) That's why Martin believes the LFTR or a variant is more likely to be developed and eventually marketed by China, Russia, India, France, Canada, or even the Czech Republic, all of which are actively pursuing the idea.¶ Is the LFTR just another fantasy? Weinberg's R&D program solved the major technical problems over 40 years ago. There are several unsolved but not insuperable issues: getting the neutron-eating lithium 6 out of the lithium salt, separating certain fission product salts from the molten salt carrier, and managing small amounts of gaseous tritium. And of course, it will take a lot of engineering to put all the pieces together into one efficient, factory-built 100 Mw modular plant sized to supply, say, Terre Haute, Indiana. It remains to be seen how hard it will be to get such a plant insured, but LFTRs are inherently far safer than light water reactors. If one obtains a Nuclear Regulatory Commission license as a certification of safety, insurers ought to accept it—but there will terrific pressure from the established industry to drag out that certification for as long as possible.¶ Martin's book is a good read, but when he proposes the steps he thinks are needed to bring his "superfuel" into widespread use, he just comes up with more industrial policy. He wants the government that snuffed out thorium and molten salt reactors four decades ago to subsidize them back into existence, perhaps (one might conjecture) making use of the now vacant Solyndra factory. Maybe the government ought to just get out of the way? If thorium is the Next Big Energy Thing, let its advocates prove it—as soon as Washington stops protecting anachronistic technologies and the companies that sell them, and lets new ideas and talent bring us into a brighter energy future.

### A2: Winners Win

Spending money can’t be a win for Obama right after he just got done with the fiscal cliff

#### Only true for top agenda items.

**Mathews and Todd, 2009** (Chris and Todd, political director at NBC, Hardball, June 22, google)

MATTHEWS: What are the political stakes for Obama get health care passed this year? Does the success of Obama`s presidency ride on it? Chuck Todd is NBC News chief White House correspondent and NBC News political director, as well. Eugene Robinson‘s an MSNBC political analyst, and of course, lest we forget—I never will—Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist for “The Washington Post.” MATTHEWS: Gentlemen, let‘s start and I want to start with Chuck, our guy on the beat. One thing we`ve learned, it seems, from presidents is you better win that first year. Reagan won the first year. Bush won the first year. If you win the first year, you really get it going. If you don`t win on your big issue, your pet project, if you will -- and it`s more important than that -- you really set a standard for defeat and you go down to further losses down the road. Your thoughts on this. CHUCK TODD, NBC CORRESPONDENT/POLITICAL DIRECTOR: Well, no, you`re -- A, you`re absolutely right. And B, it`s, like, people that are familiar with the way Rahm Emanuel thinks on trying to strategize when it comes to a legislative agenda and getting these big things done, you know, this is the lessons he feels like he learned the hard way in that first two years of the Clinton administration, `93, `94, when a lot of their big things went down. Sure, they got their big stimulus package, but they never did get health care. And that is what defines those first two years when you look back on it.

#### Can’t win on energy – proves the link

Matthew N. Eisler, Research Fellow at the Center for Contemporary History and Policy at the Chemical Heritage Foundation, 12 [“Science, Silver Buckshot, and ‘All of The Above’” Science Progress, April 2, http://scienceprogress.org/2012/04/science-silver-buckshot-and-%E2%80%9Call-of-the-above%E2%80%9D/]

Conservatives take President Obama’s rhetoric at face value. Progressives see the president as disingenuous. No doubt White House planners regard delaying the trans-border section of the Keystone XL pipeline and approving the Gulf of Mexico portion as a stroke of savvy realpolitik, but one has to wonder whether Democratic-leaning voters really are as gullible as this scheme implies. And as for the president’s claims that gasoline prices are determined by forces beyond the government’s control (speculation and unrest in the Middle East), it is probably not beyond the capacity of even the mildly educated to understand that the administration has shown little appetite to reregulate Wall Street and has done its part to inflate the fear premium through confrontational policies in the Persian Gulf. Committed both to alternative energy (but not in a rational, comprehensive way) and cheap fossil fuels (but not in ways benefiting American motorists in an election year), President Obama has accrued no political capital from his energy policy from either the left or the right by the end of his first term. The president long ago lost the legislative capacity for bold action in practically every field, including energy, but because the GOP’s slate of presidential candidates is so extraordinarily weak in 2012, he may not need it to get re-elected. At least, that is the conventional wisdom in Democratic circles. Should President Obama win a second term, Congress is likely to be even more hostile than in his first term, as in the Clinton years. And as in the Clinton years, that will probably mean four more years of inaction and increased resort to cant.

#### Overreaching burns capital.

**Politico, 2009** (“RNC hopefuls predict Obama backlash” January 5, google)

The candidates vying to lead the Republican National Committee predicted at a Monday debate that the Obama administration would outspend its political capital and spark a ballot box backlash. “I think they’re going to give us the gift of an overreaching, overpowering government that will limit our freedom,” South Carolina Republican Party Chair Katon Dawson said, arguing that Obama’s agenda would amount to “overpromising and building up bigger government.” Saul Anuzis, who chairs the Michigan GOP, agreed that Obama’s agenda would open up political opportunities for Republicans.

#### Obama thinks that pol cap is finite – he’ll back off controversial issues even if he’s winning

Kuttner 9, co-editor of The American Prospect and a senior fellow at Demos, author of "Obama's Challenge: America's Economic Crisis and the Power of a Transformative Presidency, 4/28/’9

(Robert, “Obama Has Amassed Enormous Political Capital, But He Doesn't Know What to Do with It,” http://www.alternet.org/economy/138641/obama\_has\_amassed\_enormous\_political\_capital,\_but\_he\_doesn%27t\_know\_what\_to\_do\_with\_it/?page=entire)

We got a small taste of what a more radical break might feel like when Obama briefly signaled with the release of Bush's torture memos that he might be open to further investigation of the Bush's torture policy, but then backtracked and quickly asked the Democratic leadership to shut the idea down. Evidently, Obama's political self wrestled with his constitutional conscience, and won. Civil libertarians felt a huge letdown, but protest was surprisingly muted. Thus the most important obstacle for seizing the moment to achieve enduring change: Barack Obama's conception of what it means to promote national unity. Obama repeatedly declared during the campaign that he would govern as a consensus builder. He wasn't lying. However, there are two ways of achieving consensus. One is to split the difference with your political enemies and the forces obstructing reform. The other is to use presidential leadership to transform the political center and alter the political dynamics. In his first hundred days, Obama has done a little of both, but he defaults to the politics of accommodation.

### A2 McCain

#### He’s key to the agenda

Adams 8 – Rebecca, writer for Congressional Quarterly

[“CQ Weekly Vantage Point: Farewell or a Future? McCain Still Has Role as Bipartisan Dealmaker,” Lexis]cn

A likelier scenario, observers say, is that McCain will revert to his role as a bipartisan broker of compromise — and, depending on Barack Obama’s enthusiasm for courting the aid of his presidential rival, McCain could serve as a critical liaison to Senate moderates as the new administration works with a Senate majority just shy of the 60-vote, filibuster-resistant supermajority. That role would permit McCain to bolster the bipartisan credentials he so frequently advertised in his campaign and to refine his legacy in case he decides to retire from public life in 2010, when his fourth term ends and he turns 74. “He can only be a leader for the moderates,” says GOP strategist John Feehery, who worked for 18 years on Capitol Hill. “But at the end of the day, moderates will hold all the power.”

\

Obama could have reason to solicit his support on any number of policy fronts,

 including the economy, national security (where McCain wields considerable clout as the top Republican on the Armed Services Committee) and the curtailment of global warming — all likely high-priority items on the next president’s agenda. And McCain would probably be keen to add to his already extensive resume of bipartisan collaboration on questions such as nominations to the federal bench, immigration and campaign finance. He probably would not be able to bring major factions of the Senate GOP to the bargaining table, but he could broker agreements on some key issues with influential moderates such as Lindsey Graham of South Carolina and Mel Martinez of Florida. A home-state GOP colleague in the House, John Shadegg , notes that McCain is in closer accord with Democrats than fellow Republicans in some instances, including on legislative proposals curbing global warming. “That’s an area in which there is the potential that Sen. McCain could agree with the president-elect, but I don’t know that McCain can bring along the minority,” Shadegg says. “Given the state of the economy, there will be lots of concerns.” Shadegg predicts that McCain will face minimal opposition if he runs for re-election in two years. But several McCain associates think he may be edging toward retirement. In either case, former McCain aides say he does not intend to fade into the senatorial background as Democrat John Kerry of Massachusetts did after losing the presidency in 2004. “It will be very important that someone in a leadership position in the Republican Party send the signal that they are willing to work with President Obama. McCain is the logical choice,” says Mark McKinnon, a former media adviser for President Bush and for McCain through much of the primary season. “I think Sen. McCain’s interest after this election will be not any political ambition but a genuine desire to make his last chapter in Washington all about bipartisan healing.” The former GOP nominee will be focused on “settling differences rather than settling scores,” McKinnon says. Dan Schnur, a spokesman for McCain in the 2000 election and director of the Jesse M. Unruh Institute of Politics at the University of Southern California, says there is no reason why McCain wouldn’t pick up where he left off in the Senate. “He could be a very valuable ally to President Obama in building bipartisan support for at least some of the administration’s priorities, starting with national security and political reform,” Schnur says. “He spent a lot of years building a reputation as someone who works across the party aisle. He has a strong incentive to spend his last years in the Senate reinforcing that image.”

# Rd 3 Neg v Central Florida

### Off

#### "Financial incentives for energy production" involve the exchange of money for production.

Book 11 [Managing Director, ClearView Energy Partners, LLC]

Kevin, Testimony before U.S. HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

SUBCOMMITTEES ON SELECT REVENUE MEASURES AND OVERSIGHT, SEPTEMBER 22, http://waysandmeans.house.gov/UploadedFiles/Booktestimony922.pdf

Incentive cost ratios, implied abatement costs and implied displacement costs offer three possible ways to measure the performance of **federal financial incentives for energy production** and consumption. Metrics of this sort could be used to prioritize spending – dynamically, perhaps through a reverse auction – or through legislated formulas **that balance incentives for high-yield, low-cost sources with high-potential, emerging sources.** Fuels or technologies that consistently fall short of established benchmarks may require a different type of government financial intervention (e**.g. manufacturing assistance or pre-competitive R&D** in place of production **tax credits**) or a different mode of financial support (e.g. loan guaranteesinstead of tax credits **or deductions)**.

#### For is a term of exclusion – requiring direct action upon

US CUSTOMS COURT 39 AMERICAN COLORTYPE CO. v. UNITED STATES C. D. 107, Protest 912094-G against the decision of the collector of customs at the port of New York UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT, THIRD DIVISION 2 Cust. Ct. 132; 1939 Cust. Ct. LEXIS 35

The same reasons used by the appellate court may be adopted in construing the language of the statute herein involved. If the words "for industrial use" mean no more than the words "articles of utility," there could be no reason for inserting the additional words "for industrial use" in the paragraph. Therefore, it must be held that the [\*135] new language "for industrial use" was intended to have a different meaning from the words "articles of utility," as construed in the case of Progressive Fine Arts Co. v. United States, [\*\*8] supra. Webster's New International Dictionary defines the word "industrial" as follows: Industrial. 1. Relating to industry or labor as an economic factor, or to a branch or the branches of industry; of the nature of, or constituting, an industry or industries \* \* \* . The transferring of the scenes on an oil painting to a printed copy is a branch of industry under the definition above quoted. Some of the meanings of the preposition "for" signify intent, as shown by the following definition in the same dictionary: For. 2. Indicating the end with reference to which anything is, acts, serves, or is done; as: a. As a preparation for; with the object of; in order to be, become, or act as; conducive to. \* \* \*. d. Intending, or in order, to go to or in the direction of. Therefore, the words "articles for industrial use" in paragraph 1807 imply that Congress intended to exclude from that provision articles either purchased or imported with the intention to use the same in industry for manufacturing purposes.

#### Violation:

#### Incentives are for CONSTRUCTION not FOR energy production

#### The plan conditions the incentives on something OTHER THAN production- High socioeconomic areas, which is an external condition that is in no way a financial incentive

#### Vote Negative

#### Limits- there are infinite financial incentives that can be tied to things external to energy production- limiting the incentives part of the topic to directly involving production is key to limits because of the difficulty of defining what a restriction on energy production is

#### Our limit is the only non- arbitrary one because it is the most grammatically correct- financial incentives for energy production is an adjectival phrase- even if their aff is a financial incentive- it is not DIRECTLY for energy production

### Off

#### Obama using PC to avoid debate on the debt ceiling- he will succeed

Klein 1-2 [Ezra Klein 1-2-2013 Washington Post “Calm down, liberals. The White House won” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/01/02/calm-down-liberals-the-white-house-got-a-good-deal-on-the-fiscal-cliff/]

Fourth, I don’t think the White House has a shred of credibility when they say they won’t negotiate over the debt ceiling. They may not call what they’re about to do negotiating over the debt ceiling, but that’ll be what they’re doing. That said, I’m quite convinced that they don’t intend to be held hostage over the debt ceiling. As a former constitutional law professor, the president sees himself as a steward of the executive branch and is deeply hostile to setting the precedent that congressional minorities can hold presidents hostage through the debt ceiling. At some point in the coming talks, Boehner or McConnell or both are going to realize that the White House really, seriously will not accept a bargain in which what they “got” was an increase in the debt limit, and so they’re going to have to decide at that point whether to crash the global economy.¶ Fifth, the constellation of economic interest groups that converge on Washington understands the debt ceiling better than they did in 2011, are becoming more and more tired of congress’s tendency to negotiate by threatening to trigger economic catastrophes, and is getting better at knowing who to blame. It’s not a meaningless sign that John Engler, the former Republican Governor of Michigan who now leads the Business Roundtable, called for a five-year solution to the debt ceiling. ¶ It’s worth keeping this in perspective: All it means is that the White House can potentially demand a perfectly reasonable compromise of one dollar in revenue-generating tax reform for every dollar in spending cuts. When you add in the fiscal cliff deal, and the 2011 Budget Control Act, that’ll still mean that the total deficit reduction enacted over the last few years tilts heavily towards spending, particularly once you account for reduced war costs. ¶ But that is, arguably, another reason that the White House isn’t in such a bad position here: They’ve set up a definition of success that will sound reasonable to most people — a dollar in tax reform for a dollar in spending cuts — while the Republicans have a very unreasonable sounding definition, in which they get huge cuts to Medicare or they force the United States into default. So while it’s possible that the White House will crumble, rendering itself impotent in negotiations going forward, and while it’s possible that the we’ll breach the debt ceiling, both possibilities seem less likely than Republicans agreeing to a deal that pairs revenue-generating tax reform with spending cuts.

#### LFTR funding is controversial – seen as pumping money into wasteful endeavor – benefits of the tech have empirically been smokescreens.

The Guardian, 2011 Don't believe the spin on thorium being a greener nuclear option http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/jun/23/thorium-nuclear-uranium

Without exception, [thorium reactors] have never been commercially viable, nor do any of the intended new designs even remotely seem to be viable. Like all nuclear power production they rely on extensive taxpayer subsidies; the only difference is that with thorium and other breeder reactors these are of an order of magnitude greater, which is why no government has ever continued their funding.'¶ China's development will persist until it experiences the ongoing major technical hurdles the rest of the nuclear club have discovered, he says.¶ Others see thorium as a smokescreen to perpetuate the status quo: the world's only operating thorium reactor – India's Kakrapar-1 – is actually a converted PWR, for example. 'This could be seen to excuse the continued use of PWRs until thorium is [widely] available,' points out Peter Rowberry of No Money for Nuclear (NM4N) and Communities Against Nuclear Expansion (CANE).¶ In his reading, thorium is merely a way of deflecting attention and criticism from the dangers of the uranium fuel cycle and excusing the pumping of more money into the industry.

#### Obama PC is key - failure collapses the global economy

Maass 1-2 [Harold Maass 1-2-2013 The Week “The looming debt-ceiling fight: Worse than the fiscal cliff?” http://theweek.com/article/index/238312/the-looming-debt-ceiling-fight-worse-than-the-fiscal-cliff]

Since the agreement heading for Obama's desk doesn't raise the debt ceiling, which we've already hit, says Zachary A. Goldfarb at The Washington Post, it leaves "the Treasury to use what it calls 'extraordinary measures' as long as it can to pay the government's bills." When the bean counters run out of tricks, we could face a "catastrophic default" if Congress doesn't act fast.¶ In many ways, the threat of default in two months is a more serious risk than the Jan. 1 fiscal cliff deadline. If Congress does not increase the debt ceiling, the government will quickly run out of ways to pay the nation's bills and make interest payments on the nation’s outstanding debt. Any failure by the government to meet its financial obligations could be seen as a default, shaking world financial markets, given the special role that U.S. government bonds play in the global economy.¶ Obama is still smarting from the 2011 debt-ceiling dispute, says Neil Munro at The Daily Caller. In that fight, "the GOP eventually pressured him to accept spending curbs in exchange for an increase to the debt limit up to $16.4 trillion." Obama has been complaining about that defeat ever since, and he's vowing not to let it happen again. But the GOP-led House is adamant about using "its authority over the nation's debt ceiling to pressure Obama to shrink future spending."

#### Economic decline causes nuclear conflict

Mathew J. Burrows (counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC), PhD in European History from Cambridge University) and Jennifer Harris (a member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit) April 2009 “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” http://www.twq.com/09april/docs/09apr\_Burrows.pdf

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

### Off

#### Electricity prices are dropping and will stay low

Dallas Burtraw, one of the nation’s foremost experts on environmental regulation in the electricity sector, and studies electricity restructuring, competition, and economic deregulation, “Falling Emissions and Falling Prices: Expectations for the Domestic Natural Gas Boom,” Common Resources, August 21, 2012, <http://common-resources.org/2012/falling-emissions-and-falling-prices-expectations-for-the-domestic-natural-gas-boom/>, accessed 10-25-2012.

Moreover, the boom in domestic natural gas production could have even more immediate affects for U.S. electricity consumers. The increased supply of gas is expected to lower natural gas prices and retail electricity prices over the next 20 years, according to a [new RFF Issue Brief](http://www.rff.org/Publications/Pages/PublicationDetails.aspx?PublicationID=22019). These price decreases are expected to be even larger if demand for electricity continues on a slow-growth trajectory brought on by the economic downturn and the increased use of energy efficiency. For example, RFF analysis found that delivered natural gas prices would have been almost 35% higher in 2020 if natural gas supply projections had matched the lower estimates released by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) in 2009. Instead, with an increased gas supply, consumers can expect to pay $4.9 per MMBtu for delivered natural gas in 2020 instead of $6.6 per MMBtu. These trends are even more exaggerated if demand for electricity were to increase to levels projected by the EIA just three years ago, in 2009.This decrease in natural gas prices is expected to translate into a decrease in retail electricity prices for most electricity customers in most years out to 2020. Compared to the world with the lower gas supply projections, average national electricity prices are expected to be almost 6% lower, falling from 9.25 cents to 8.75 cents per kilowatt-hour in 2020. Residential, commercial, and industrial customers are all expected to see a price decrease, with the largest price changes occurring in parts of the country that have competitive electricity markets. All of these prices decreases translate into real savings for most electricity customers. The savings are largest for commercial customers, who stand to save $33.9 Billion (real $2009) under the new gas supply projections in 2020. Residential customers also stand to save big, with estimates of $25.8 Billion (real $2009) in savings projected for 2020.

#### New nuclear reactors drive up electricity prices

Mark Cooper, SENIOR FELLOW FOR ECONOMIC ANALYSIS INSTITUTE FOR ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT¶ VERMONT LAW SCHOOL, "THE ECONOMICS OF NUCLEAR REACTORS: RENAISSANCE OR RELAPSE?," 2009, http://www.vermontlaw.edu/Documents/Cooper%20Report%20on%20Nuclear%20Economics%20FINAL%5B1%5D.pdf

Within the past year, estimates of the cost of nuclear power from a new generation of ¶ reactors have ranged from a low of 8.4 cents per kilowatt hour (kWh) to a high of 30 cents. This ¶ paper tackles the debate over the cost of building new nuclear reactors, with the key findings as ¶ follows: ¶ • The initial cost projections put out early in today’s so-called “nuclear renaissance” were about ¶ one-third of what one would have expected, based on the nuclear reactors completed in the ¶ 1990s. ¶ • The most recent cost projections for new nuclear reactors are, on average, over four times as high as the initial “nuclear renaissance” projections. ¶ • There are numerous options available to meet the need for electricity in a carbon-constrained ¶ environment that are superior to building nuclear reactors. Indeed, nuclear reactors are the worst option from the point of view of the consumer and society. ¶ • The low carbon sources that are less costly than nuclear include efficiency, cogeneration, ¶ biomass, geothermal, wind, solar thermal and natural gas. Solar photovoltaics that are presently ¶ more costly than nuclear reactors are projected to decline dramatically in price in the next ¶ decade. Fossil fuels with carbon capture and storage, which are not presently available, are ¶ projected to be somewhat more costly than nuclear reactors. ¶ • Numerous studies by Wall Street and independent energy analysts estimate efficiency and ¶ renewable costs at an average of 6 cents per kilowatt hour, while the cost of electricity from ¶ nuclear reactors is estimated in the range of 12 to 20 cents per kWh. ¶ • The additional cost of building 100 new nuclear reactors, instead of pursuing a least cost ¶ efficiency-renewable strategy, would be in the range of $1.9-$4.4 trillion over the life the ¶ reactors. ¶ Whether the burden falls on ratepayers (in electricity bills) or taxpayers (in large subsidies), ¶ incurring excess costs of that magnitude would be a substantial burden on the national economy and ¶ add immensely to the cost of electricity and the cost of reducing carbon emissions.

#### Turns case- High energy prices reinforce apartheid by making electricity inaccessible

#### High energy prices jack up food prices – means drastic cuts in food aid

Tom Capehart, Specialist in Agricultural Policy¶ Resources, Science and Industry Division, and ¶ Joe Richardson¶ Specialist in Domestic Social Policy¶ Domestic Social Policy Division, “Food Price Inflation: Causes and Impacts,” Congressional Research Service, April 10, 2008, <http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/RS22859_20080410.pdf>, accessed 10-25-2012.

Higher commodity and food prices reduce our ability to provide food aid to other¶ countries without additional appropriations. Food aid usually takes the form of basic food¶ grains such as wheat, sorghum, and corn, and vegetable oil — commodities critical to¶ developing-country diets. Since there is very little value added for these commodities,¶ shifts in prices translate directly into higher prices for food-insecure countries or reduced¶ food aid contributions per dollar spent. Also, higher energy costs have increased shipping¶ costs for both food purchases and food aid. Unlike some domestic nutrition programs,¶ foreign food aid is not adjusted to account for changing costs. After a long period of¶ declining food costs, developing countries are facing increased food import bills — for¶ some countries as high as 25% in 2007.¶ 13¶ The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has indicated that rising¶ food and fuel prices would result in a significant reduction in emergency food aid.¶ According to press reports in March 2008, USAID expects a $200 million shortfall in¶ funding to meet emergency food aid needs. For FY2008, Congress appropriated $1.2¶ billion for P.L. 480 food aid, the same as FY2007. For FY2009, the President’s budget¶ again requested $1.2 billion. In six out of ten years since 1999, supplemental funding for¶ P.L. 480 Title II food aid has been appropriated.¶ Last year, the U.N. World Food Program (WFP) estimated it would need $2.9 billion¶ to cover 2008 food aid needs. Recent commodity, energy, and food cost increases have¶ boosted this estimate to $3.4 billion. According to the WFP, the current price increases¶ force the world’s poorest people to spend a larger proportion of their income on food.

#### Food price spikes cause insecurity that causes global resource wars that escalate to nuclear war

Michael Klare (professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College in Amherst, Mass) March 11, 2006 “The Coming Resource Wars” http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Oil\_watch/ComingResourceWars.html

It's official: the era of resource wars is upon us. In a major London address, British Defense Secretary John Reid warned that global climate change and dwindling natural resources are combining to increase the likelihood of violent conflict over land, water and energy. Climate change, he indicated, "will make scarce resources, clean water, viable agricultural land even scarcer" -- and this will "make the emergence of violent conflict more rather than less likely." Although not unprecedented, Reid's prediction of an upsurge in resource conflict is significant both because of his senior rank and the vehemence of his remarks. "The blunt truth is that the lack of water and agricultural land is a significant contributory factor to the tragic conflict we see unfolding in Darfur," he declared. "We should see this as a warning sign." Resource conflicts of this type are most likely to arise in the developing world, Reid indicated, but the more advanced and affluent countries are not likely to be spared the damaging and destabilizing effects of global climate change. With sea levels rising, water and energy becoming increasingly scarce and prime agricultural lands turning into deserts, internecine warfare over access to vital resources will become a global phenomenon. Reid's speech, delivered at the prestigious Chatham House in London (Britain's equivalent of the Council on Foreign Relations), is but the most recent expression of a growing trend in strategic circles to view environmental and resource effects -- rather than political orientation and ideology -- as the most potent source of armed conflict in the decades to come. With the world population rising, global consumption rates soaring, energy supplies rapidly disappearing and climate change eradicating valuable farmland, the stage is being set for persistent and worldwide struggles over vital resources. Religious and political strife will not disappear in this scenario, but rather will be channeled into contests over valuable sources of water, food and energy. Prior to Reid's address, the most significant expression of this outlook was a report prepared for the U.S. Department of Defense by a California-based consulting firm in October 2003. Entitled "An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and Its Implications for United States National Security," the report warned that global climate change is more likely to result in sudden, cataclysmic environmental events than a gradual (and therefore manageable) rise in average temperatures. Such events could include a substantial increase in global sea levels, intense storms and hurricanes and continent-wide "dust bowl" effects. This would trigger pitched battles between the survivors of these effects for access to food, water, habitable land and energy supplies. "Violence and disruption stemming from the stresses created by abrupt changes in the climate pose a different type of threat to national security than we are accustomed to today," the 2003 report noted. "Military confrontation may be triggered by a desperate need for natural resources such as energy, food and water rather than by conflicts over ideology, religion or national honor." Until now, this mode of analysis has failed to command the attention of top American and British policymakers. For the most part, they insist that ideological and religious differences -- notably, the clash between values of tolerance and democracy on one hand and extremist forms of Islam on the other -- remain the main drivers of international conflict. But Reid's speech at Chatham House suggests that a major shift in strategic thinking may be under way. Environmental perils may soon dominate the world security agenda. This shift is due in part to the growing weight of evidence pointing to a significant human role in altering the planet's basic climate systems. Recent studies showing the rapid shrinkage of the polar ice caps, the accelerated melting of North American glaciers, the increased frequency of severe hurricanes and a number of other such effects all suggest that dramatic and potentially harmful changes to the global climate have begun to occur. More importantly, they conclude that human behavior -- most importantly, the burning of fossil fuels in factories, power plants, and motor vehicles -- is the most likely cause of these changes. This assessment may not have yet penetrated the White House and other bastions of head-in-the-sand thinking, but it is clearly gaining ground among scientists and thoughtful analysts around the world. For the most part, public discussion of global climate change has tended to describe its effects as an environmental problem -- as a threat to safe water, arable soil, temperate forests, certain species and so on. And, of course, climate change is a potent threat to the environment; in fact, the greatest threat imaginable. But viewing climate change as an environmental problem fails to do justice to the magnitude of the peril it poses. As Reid's speech and the 2003 Pentagon study make clear, the greatest danger posed by global climate change is not the degradation of ecosystems per se, but rather the disintegration of entire human societies, producing wholesale starvation, mass migrations and recurring conflict over resources. "As famine, disease, and weather-related disasters strike due to abrupt climate change," the Pentagon report notes, "many countries' needs will exceed their carrying capacity" -- that is, their ability to provide the minimum requirements for human survival. This "will create a sense of desperation, which is likely to lead to offensive aggression" against countries with a greater stock of vital resources. "Imagine eastern European countries, struggling to feed their populations with a falling supply of food, water, and energy, eyeing Russia, whose population is already in decline, for access to its grain, minerals, and energy supply." Similar scenarios will be replicated all across the planet, as those without the means to survival invade or migrate to those with greater abundance -- producing endless struggles between resource "haves" and "have-nots." It is this prospect, more than anything, that worries John Reid. In particular, he expressed concern over the inadequate capacity of poor and unstable countries to cope with the effects of climate change, and the resulting risk of state collapse, civil war and mass migration. "More than 300 million people in Africa currently lack access to safe water," he observed, and "climate change will worsen this dire situation" -- provoking more wars like Darfur. And even if these social disasters will occur primarily in the developing world, the wealthier countries will also be caught up in them, whether by participating in peacekeeping and humanitarian aid operations, by fending off unwanted migrants or by fighting for access to overseas supplies of food, oil, and minerals. When reading of these nightmarish scenarios, it is easy to conjure up images of desperate, starving people killing one another with knives, staves and clubs -- as was certainly often the case in the past, and could easily prove to be so again. But these scenarios also envision the use of more deadly weapons. "In this world of warring states," the 2003 Pentagon report predicted, "nuclear arms proliferation is inevitable." As oil and natural gas disappears, more and more countries will rely on nuclear power to meet their energy needs -- and this "will accelerate nuclear proliferation as countries develop enrichment and reprocessing capabilities to ensure their national security." Although speculative, these reports make one thing clear: when thinking about the calamitous effects of global climate change, we must emphasize its social and political consequences as much as its purely environmental effects. Drought, flooding and storms can kill us, and surely will -- but so will wars among the survivors of these catastrophes over what remains of food, water and shelter. As Reid's comments indicate, no society, however affluent, will escape involvement in these forms of conflict. We can respond to these predictions in one of two ways: by relying on fortifications and military force to provide some degree of advantage in the global struggle over resources, or by taking meaningful steps to reduce the risk of cataclysmic climate change. No doubt there will be many politicians and pundits -- especially in this country -- who will tout the superiority of the military option, emphasizing America's preponderance of strength. By fortifying our borders and sea-shores to keep out unwanted migrants and by fighting around the world for needed oil supplies, it will be argued, we can maintain our privileged standard of living for longer than other countries that are less well endowed with instruments of power. Maybe so. But the grueling, inconclusive war in Iraq and the failed national response to Hurricane Katrina show just how ineffectual such instruments can be when confronted with the harsh realities of an unforgiving world. And as the 2003 Pentagon report reminds us, "constant battles over diminishing resources" will "further reduce [resources] even beyond the climatic effects." Military superiority may provide an illusion of advantage in the coming struggles over vital resources, but it cannot protect us against the ravages of global climate change. Although we may be somewhat better off than the people in Haiti and Mexico, we, too, will suffer from storms, drought and flooding. As our overseas trading partners descend into chaos, our vital imports of food, raw materials and energy will disappear as well. True, we could establish military outposts in some of these places to ensure the continued flow of critical materials -- but the ever-increasing price in blood and treasure required to pay for this will eventually exceed our means and destroy us. Ultimately, our only hope of a safe and secure future lies in substantially reducing our emissions of greenhouse gases and working with the rest of the world to slow the pace of global climate change

### Off

#### Text: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission should issue a guidance document that bans the siting of nuclear power plants in low socio-economic areas in the United States.

### Case

#### “Structural violence” is reductive and inevitable

Boulding 1977 (Kenneth E. Boulding, economist, educator, peace activist, poet, religious mystic, devoted Quaker, systems scientist, and interdisciplinary philosopher, “Twelve Friendly Quarrels with Johan Galtung,” Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 14, No. 1, JSTOR)

Finally, we come to the great Galtung metaphors of 'structural violence' 'and 'positive peace'. They are metaphors rather than models, and for that very reason are suspect. Metaphors always imply models and meta- phors have much more persuasive power than models do, for models tend to be the preserve of the specialist. But when a metaphor implies a bad model it can be very dangerous, for it is both persuasive and wrong. The metaphor of structural violence I would argue falls right into this category. The metaphor is that poverty, deprivation, ill health, low expectations of life, a condition in which more than half the human race lives, is 'like' a thug beating up the victim and 'taking his money away from him in the street, or it is 'like' a conqueror stealing the land of the people and reducing them to slavery. The implication is that poverty and its associated ills are the fault of the thug or the conqueror and the solution is to do away with thugs and conquerors. While there is some truth in the metaphor, in the modern world at least there is not very much. Violence, whether of the streets and the home, or of the guerilla, of the police, or of the armed forces, is a very different phenomenon from poverty. The processes which create and sustain poverty are not at all like the processes which create and sustain violence, although like everything else in 'the world, everything is somewhat related to every- thing else.¶ There is a very real problem of the struc- tures which lead to violence, but unfortunately Galitung's metaphor of structural violence as he has used it has diverted atten- tion from this problem. Violence in the behavioral sense, that is, somebody actually doing damage to somebody else and trying to make them worse off, is a 'threshold' phenomenon, rather like the boiling over of a pot. The temperature under a pot can rise for a long time without its boiling over, but at some 'threshold boiling over will take place. The study of the structures which underlie violence are a very important and much neglected part of peace research and indeed of social science in general. Thresh- old phenomena like violence are difficult to study because they represent 'breaks' in the system rather than uniformities. Violence, whether between persons or organizations, occurs when the 'strain' on a system is too great for its 'strength'. The metaphor here is that violence is like what happens when we break a piece of chalk. Strength and strain, however, especially in social systems, are so interwoven historically that it is very difficult to separate them.¶ The diminution of violence involves two¶ possible strategies, or a mixture of the two;¶ one is the increase in the strength of the sys-¶ tem, 'the other is the diminution of the strain.¶ The strength of systems involves habit, culture, taboos, and sanctions, all these 'things which enable a system to stand increasing¶ strain without breaking down into violence. The strains on the system 'are largely dy- namic in character, such as arms races, mu- tually stimulated hostility, changes in rela- tive economic position or political power, which are often hard to identify. Conflicts of interest 'are only part 'of the strain on a sys-¶ tem, and not always the most important part. It is very hard for people ito know their interests, and misperceptions of 'interest take place mainly through the dynamic processes, not through the structural ones. It is only perceptions of interest which affect people's behavior, not the 'real' interests, whatever these may be, and the gap between perception and reality can be very large and re- sistant to change.¶ However, what Galitung calls structural violence (which has been defined 'byone un- kind commenltatoras anything that Galitung doesn't like) was originally defined as any unnecessarily low expectation of life, on that assumption that anybody who dies before the allotted span has been killed, however unintentionally and unknowingly, by some- body else. The concept has been expanded to include all 'theproblems of poverty, desti- tution, deprivation, and misery. These are enormouslyreal and are a very high priority for research and action, but they belong to systems which are only peripherally related to 'the structures whi'ch produce violence. This is not rto say that the cultures of vio- lence and the cultures of poverty are not sometimes related, though not all poverty cultures are cultures of violence, and cer- tainly not all cultures of violence are pover- ty cultures. But the dynamicslof poverty and the success or failure to rise out of it are of a complexity far beyond anything which the metaphor of structural violence can offer. While the metaphor of structural violence performed a service in calling attention to a problem, it may have done a disservice in preventing us from finding the answer.

#### Not the root cause of conflict – other factors overwhelm

Volf 2002 Miroslav Volf (Henry B. Wright Professor of Theology at Yale Divinity School since 1998) Journal of Ecumenical Studies 1-1-02

Though “otherness”–cultural, ethnic, religious, racial difference–is an important factor in our relations with others, we should not overestimate it as a cause of conflict. During the war in the former Yugoslavia in the early 1990′s, I was often asked, “What is this war about? Is it about religious and cultural differences? Is it about economic advantage? Is it about political power? Is it about land?” The correct response was, of course, that the war was about all of these things. Monocausal explanations of major eruptions of violence are rarely right. Moreover, various causes are intimately intertwined, and each contributes to others. That holds true also for otherness, which I am highlighting here. However, neither should we underestimate otherness as a factor. The contest for political power, for economic advantage, and for a share of the land took place between people who belonged to discrete cultural and ethnic groups. Part of the goal of the war in the former Yugoslavia was the creation of ethnically clean territories with economic and political autonomy. The importance of “otherness” is only slightly diminished if we grant that the sense of ethnic and religious belonging was manipulated by unscrupulous, corrupt, and greedy politicians for their own political and economic gain. The fact that conjured fears for one’s identity could serve to legitimize a war whose major driving force lay elsewhere is itself a testimony to how much “otherness” matters.

#### Human life is inherently valuable

Penner 2005 Melinda Penner (Director of Operations – STR, Stand To Reason) 2005 “End of Life Ethics: A Primer”, Stand to Reason, http://www.str.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=5223

Intrinsic value is very different. Things with intrinsic value are valued for their own sake. They don’t have to achieve any other goal to be valuable. They are goods in themselves. Beauty, pleasure, and virtue are likely examples. Family and friendship are examples. Something that’s intrinsically valuable might also be instrumentally valuable, but even if it loses its instrumental value, its intrinsic value remains. Intrinsic value is what people mean when they use the phrase "the sanctity of life." Now when someone argues that someone doesn’t have "quality of life" they are arguing that life is only valuable as long as it obtains something else with quality, and when it can’t accomplish this, it’s not worth anything anymore. It's only instrumentally valuable. The problem with this view is that it is entirely subjective and changeable with regards to what might give value to life. Value becomes a completely personal matter, and, as we all know, our personal interests change over time. There is no grounding for objective human value and human rights if it’s not intrinsic value. Our legal system is built on the notion that humans have intrinsic value. The Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that each person is endowed by his Creator with certain unalienable rights...." If human beings only have instrumental value, then slavery can be justified because there is nothing objectively valuable that requires our respect. There is nothing other than intrinsic value that can ground the unalienable equal rights we recognize because there is nothing about all human beings that is universal and equal. Intrinsic human value is what binds our social contract of rights. So if human life is intrinsically valuable, then it remains valuable even when our capacities are limited. Human life is valuable even with tremendous limitations. Human life remains valuable because its value is not derived from being able to talk, or walk, or feed yourself, or even reason at a certain level. Human beings don’t have value only in virtue of states of being (e.g., happiness) they can experience. The "quality of life" view is a poison pill because once we swallow it, we’re led down a logical slippery slope. The exact same principle can be used to take the life of human beings in all kinds of limited conditions because I wouldn't want to live that way. Would you want to live the life of a baby with Down’s Syndrome? No? Then kill her. Would you want to live the life of an infant with cerebral palsy? No? Then kill him. Would you want to live the life of a baby born with a cleft lip? No? Then kill her. (In fact, they did.) Once we accept this principle, it justifies killing every infant born with a condition that we deem a life we don’t want to live. There’s no reason not to kill every handicapped person who can’t speak for himself — because I wouldn’t want to live that way. This, in fact, is what has happened in Holland with the Groningen Protocol. Dutch doctors euthanize severely ill newborns and their society has accepted it.

#### Calculation good doesn’t devalue life

Revesz 2008 Richard L. Revesz (Dean and Lawrence King Professor of Law at New York University School of Law, JD Yale Law School) and Michael A Livermore. (JD NYU School of Law, Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Integrity, and Managing director of the NYU Law Review). Retaking Rationality How Cots-Benefit Analysis Can Better protect the Environment and Our Health. 2008. P. 1-4.

Governmental decisions are also fundamentally different from personal decisions in that they often affect people in the aggregate. In our individual lives, we come into contact with at least some of the consequences of our decisions. If we fail to consult a map, we pay the price: losing valuable time driving around in circles and listening to the complaints of our passengers. We are constantly confronted with the consequences of the choices that we have made. Not so for governments, however, which exercise authority by making decisions at a distance. Perhaps one of the most challenging aspects of governmental decisions is that they require a special kind of compassion—one that can seem, at first glance, cold and calculating, the antithesis of empathy. The aggregate and complex nature of governmental decisions does not address people as human beings, with concerns and interests, families and emotional relationships, secrets and sorrows. Rather, people are numbers stacked in a column or points on a graph, described not through their individual stories of triumph and despair, but by equations, functions, and dose-response curves. The language of governmental decisionmaking can seem to—and to a certain extent does—ignore what makes individuals unique and morally important. But, although the language of bureaucratic decisionmaking can be dehumanizing, it is also a prerequisite for the kind of compassion that is needed in contemporary society. Elaine Scarry has developed a comparison between individual compassion and statistical compassion.' Individual compassion is familiar—when we see a person suffering, or hear the story of some terrible tragedy, we are moved to take action. Statistical compassion seems foreign—we hear only a string of numbers but must comprehend "the concrete realities embedded there."' Individual compassion derives from our social nature, and may be hardwired directly into the human brain.' Statistical compassion calls on us to use our higher reasoning power to extend our natural compassion to the task of solving more abstract—but no less real—problems. Because compassion is not just about making us feel better—which we could do as easily by forgetting about a problem as by addressing it—we have a responsibility to make the best decisions that we can. This book argues that cost-benefit analysis, properly conducted, can improve environmental and public health policy. Cost-benefit analysis—the translation of human lives and acres of forest into the language of dollars and cents—can seem harsh and impersonal. But such an approach is also necessary to improve the quality of decisions that regulators make. Saving the most lives, and best protecting the quality of our environment and our health—in short, exercising our compassion most effectively—requires us to step back and use our best analytic tools. Sometimes, in order to save a life, we need to treat a person like a number. This is the challenge of statistical compassion. This book is about making good decisions. It focuses on the area of environmental, health and safety regulation. These regulations have been the source of numerous and hard-fought controversies over the past several decades, particularly at the federal level. Reaching the right decisions in the areas of environmental protection, increasing safety, and improving public health is clearly of high importance. Although it is admirable (and fashionable) for people to buy green or avoid products made in sweatshops, efforts taken at the individual level are not enough to address the pressing problems we face—there is a vital role for government in tackling these issues, and sound collective decisions concerning regulation are needed. There is a temptation to rely on gut-level decisionmaking in order to avoid economic analysis, which, to many, is a foreign language on top of seeming cold and unsympathetic. For government to make good decisions, however, it cannot abandon reasoned analysis. Because of the complex nature of governmental decisions, we have no choice but to deploy complex analytic tools in order to make the best choices possible. Failing to use these tools, which amounts to abandoning our duties to one another, is not a legitimate response. Rather, we must exercise statistical compassion by recognizing what numbers of lives saved represent: living and breathing human beings, unique, with rich inner lives and an interlocking web of emotional relationships. The acres of a forest can be tallied up in a chart, but that should not blind us to the beauty of a single stand of trees. We need to use complex tools to make good decisions while simultaneously remembering that we are not engaging in abstract exercises, but that we are having real effects on people and the environment. In our personal lives, it would be unwise not to shop around for the best price when making a major purchase, or to fail to think through our options when making a major life decision. It is equally foolish for government to fail to fully examine alternative policies when making regulatory decisions with life-or-death consequences. This reality has been recognized by four successive presidential administrations. Since 1981, the cost-benefit analysis of major regulations has been required by presidential order. Over the past twenty-five years, however, environmental and other progressive groups have declined to participate in the key governmental proceedings concerning the cost-benefit analysis of federal regulations, instead preferring to criticize the technique from the outside. The resulting asymmetry in political participation has had profound negative consequences, both for the state of federal regulation and for the technique of cost-benefit analysis itself. Ironically, this state of affairs has left progressives open to the charge of rejecting reason, when in fact strong environmental and public health pro-grams are often justified by cost-benefit analysis. It is time for progressive groups, as well as ordinary citizens, to retake the high ground by embracing and reforming cost-benefit analysis. The difference between being unthinking—failing to use the best tools to analyze policy—and unfeeling—making decisions without compassion—is unimportant: Both lead to bad policy. Calamities can result from the failure to use either emotion or reason. Our emotions provide us with the grounding for our principles, our innate interconnectedness, and our sense of obligation to others. We use our powers of reason to build on that emotional foundation, and act effectively to bring about a better world.

#### Sustainable neolib now

Economist 2012 (The Economist, February 16, 2012, “Blood, Gore and capitalism,” http://www.economist.com/blogs/schumpeter/2012/02/sustainable-capitalism)

THESE are busy days for Al Gore. In late January, the former vice-president turned climate-change warrior took to the high seas, leading a luxury cruise-cum-fact-finding mission to Antarctica for a bunch of billionaires and policy wonks. They were to see for themselves the melting ice shelf and enjoy what remains of the spectacular views. Then, on February 15th, he was in New York to launch a manifesto (pdf) for what he calls “sustainable capitalism”. The manifesto is published by the non-profit arm of Generation Investment Management, a fund-management company Mr Gore launched in 2004 with David Blood, an ex-partner at Goldman Sachs. The company focuses on firms with what it calls sustainable business models. Unlike Mr Gore's seafaring adventures, which generated a lively blogging war between Mr Gore, shipmates such as Richard Branson, and their right-wing critics, the manifesto is unlikely to set anyone's pulse racing. Yet its very dullness is a virtue, for it reflects the practical lessons learnt from several years of trying to make a success of the investment business, where the devil lies very much in the boring detail. The big picture outlined by Messrs Blood and Gore is hardly novel. An obsession with short-term profits rather than sustainable long-term profits led to the apotheosis of unsustainable capitalism—the crash of September 2008—and the subsequent bail-out of the financial system (though in this case, a lack of environmental concern was the least of the unsustainability problems). Like many people, they had expected this crash to be a turning point, after which capitalism would be reorientated towards the long term. In the event, this did not happen. Indeed, says Mr Gore, the “conversation about sustainability has if anything gone backwards”. To help remedy this, the manifesto suggests several changes to the way the capitalist system works. (It does not go into detail about other farther-reaching reforms for which Mr Gore has long advocated, such as putting a price on carbon.) The sexiest of these, assuming securities law turns you on, is a proposal—already made elsewhere by organisations such as the Aspen Institute—for “loyalty shares” that pay out more to investors that have owned them continuously for at least three years. The average holding period for a share is now seven months, down from several years in the 1990s. Rewarding longer ownership would require a lot of new legislation, particularly to apply it to existing firms. Even among those who favour long-termism there is debate about whether longer ownership is necessarily the same as more effective ownership. Still, it is worth discussing. Lovers of accountancy may be taken more by two other proposals. One, which would probably need legislation though could conceivably be introduced without it by regulators such as America’s Securities and Exchange Commission, is to require all companies to publish “integrated reports” that would include details of their environmental, social and governance (ESG) performance alongside their financial returns. Making such reporting mandatory would be a big step, especially given opposition from the significant number of firms that say that the science of ESG reporting is too immature to be integrated with financial reports. A better approach, cited in the manifesto, may be South Africa's new requirement that firms either publish an integrated report or explain why not. That should stimulate lively debate in either case. The Blood and Gore manifesto also wants firms to have to account for assets that might become "stranded" —worth much less—in the event of policy changes such as the imposition of a price on carbon emissions or higher charges for the use of water. This, the pair contend, would reveal many companies to be in much worse shape than they now appear, given plausible scenarios for how policy in these areas might one day develop. This scenario-planning might seem like a lot of extra work about stuff that is only hypothetical, and thus a burdensome extra cost. But Mr Blood points out that many firms already apply a price of carbon internally,¶ for example when evaluating significant investments, as they increasingly think it likely that governments will impose one. So perhaps it isn't that much more work. A key issue is whether all this extra information and rewards for loyalty will result in demands for more sustainable performance from those who own companies. As well as calling for company bosses to be paid in ways that incentivise sustainable long-term performance, the manifesto rightly shines a critical light on the pay of fund managers employed by institutional shareholders such as pension funds. Often, these managers are paid for short-term financial results, even though the liabilities of those investors—all of our pensions, for instance—are mostly very long-term. This prompts the thought that institutional investors that incentivise short-term performance when their liabilities are long-term may be in breach of their fiduciary duty as managers of other people's money. Indeed, maybe this incentive mismatch could provide the basis for a lawsuit. Messrs Blood and Gore say they are intrigued by the possibilities for such litigation to drive change, though they are not inclined to bring it themselves. But they do want to see the definition of what it means to be a fiduciary expanded to include an emphasis on sustainable investing. To their critics, Messrs Blood and Gore simply want to weigh capitalism down with political correctness. Yet they insist that a focus on firms that deliver sustainable results is actually the best long-term investment strategy. That, after all, is why they created Generation. Unlike earlier "green" and "ethical" investment funds, which screened out "bad" companies, effectively sacrificing financial return for purity, Generation set out to outperform the market by finding firms that it expected to do better than average over the long term.

#### Nuke power is safe- decreases structural violence

Hinkle 2012 (A. Barton Hinkle, journalist, July 2, 2012, “Don’t Judge Uranium Mining in a Vacuum,” Reason, http://reason.com/archives/2012/07/02/dont-judge-uranium-mining-in-a-vacuum)

Should Virginia lift its ban on uranium mining? The question has generated a lot of heat, but not much light. Last week, this column looked at uranium mining in isolation, and made three points: ¶ The recent report by the National Academy of Sciences was too vague to be of much use, and the use to which it has been put by opponents is misleading.¶ Opponents of lifting the moratorium throw around a lot of numbers that sound scary but mean little.¶ The uranium industry in Canada, where more uranium has been produced than in any other country on the planet, has an excellent environmental, health, and safety record, according to a review of the literature by the Canadian government.¶ That last point is worth dwelling on. Among many other things, the Canadian government – not the industry, the government—says “uranium mining and processing workers were as healthy as the general Canadian male population.” And: “Radon exposure to members of the public from [government]-regulated [mining] activities is virtually zero.” And: "Do uranium mines and mills increase radon levels in the environment? No." And: "Studies and monitoring have shown that there are no significant impacts to the health of the public living near uranium mines and mills." ¶ Also: "**Studies carried out over several decades have repeatedly demonstrated that people who live near [uranium mines** and processing facilities] **are as healthy as the rest of the general population." And: “It is completely safe to consume fish, game and fruit from regions near operating uranium mines and mills.”** And just for good measure: “No increased risk to children living near nuclear power plants or uranium mining, milling, and refining sites was detected.”¶ In short, then, **there is very little to fear from uranium mining or nuclear power when considered in isolation.** But we must not consider the issue in isolation – because the **fossil-fuel alternatives are**, in fact, **considerably worse.¶** Just ask Joseph Romm, who studies energy issues at the Center for American Progress – a liberal think tank founded and run by former Clinton and Obama staffers. “There is no question,” Romm has said, that “nothing is worse than fossil fuels for killing people.”¶ He is not alone. In 2010 – admittedly, before the tsunami-caused disaster at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear plant in Japan – the OECD’s Nuclear Energy Agency produced a report comparing the risks from nuclear power with those from other energy sources. It found that, “contrary to many people’s perception, nuclear energy presents very much lower risks. For example, more than 2,500 people are killed every year in severe energy-related accidents…. In contrast, there has only been one severe accident in nuclear power plants over this period of time (Chernobyl) resulting in 31 [direct and nearly immediate] fatalities.” ¶ The OECD says the total number of Chernobyl-related fatalities could rise as high as 33,000 over the next seven decades, “but we note that the OECD Environment Directorate estimates that 960,000 premature deaths resulted from levels of particulates in the air in the year 2000 alone, of which energy sources accounted for about 30 percent.” That works out to a 9:1 ratio in nuclear power’s favor. ¶ Then there’s The Washington Post, which reported – after Fukushima – that **“making electricity from nuclear power turns out to be far less damaging to human health than making it from coal, oil, or even clean-burning natural gas, according to numerous analyses.** That’s even more true if the predicted effects of climate change are thrown in.” ¶ How much less damaging? This much: **“Compared with nuclear power, coal is responsible for five times as many worker deaths from accidents, 470 times as many deaths due to air pollution among members of the public, and more than 1,000 times as many cases of serious illness, according to a study of the health effects of electricity generation in Europe.” ¶** But what about radiation? Well. According to a 2007 piece in Scientific American, “Coal Ash Is More Radioactive than Nuclear Waste.” **In fact, “the fly ash emitted by a power plant** – a by-product of burning **coal** for electricity – **carries into the surrounding environment 100 times more radiation than a nuclear power plant producing the same amount of energy.” ¶** Gerald Marsh concurs. Two years ago the retired nuclear physicist told Popular Mechanics, “The amount of radiation put out by a coal plant far exceeds that of a nuclear power plant, even if you use scrubbers.”¶ And again, remember: **All these effects are in addition to anthropogenic climate change, which environmentalists insist is the greatest existential threat facing humanity** – at least when they are not ignoring the issue in order to frighten people about the supposed perils of uranium mining.

#### The alternative is not non- neolib but distorted versions like China’s- the financial crisis doesn’t doom it

Rogoff 2011 (Kenneth Rogoff, Professor of Economics at Harvard University and recipient of the 2011 Deutsche Bank Prize in Financial Economics, was the chief economist at the International Monetary Fund from 2001 Dec. 2, 2011 Is Modern Capitalism Sustainable? http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/is-modern-capitalism-sustainable-)

CAMBRIDGE – I am often asked if the recent global financial crisis marks the beginning of the end of modern capitalism. It is a curious question, because it seems to presume that there is a viable replacement waiting in the wings. The truth of the matter is that, for now at least, the only serious alternatives to today’s dominant Anglo-American paradigm are other forms of capitalism. European capitalism, which combines generous health and social benefits with reasonable working hours, long vacation periods, early retirement, and relatively equal income distributions, would seem to have everything to recommend it – except sustainability. China’s Darwinian capitalism, with its fierce competition among export firms, a weak social-safety net, and widespread government intervention, is widely touted as the inevitable heir to Western capitalism, if only because of China’s huge size and consistent outsize growth rate. Yet China’s economic system is continually evolving. Indeed, it is far from clear how far China’s political, economic, and financial structures will continue to transform themselves, and whether China will eventually morph into capitalism’s new exemplar. In any case, China is still encumbered by the usual social, economic, and financial vulnerabilities of a rapidly growing lower-income country. Perhaps the real point is that, in the broad sweep of history, all current forms of capitalism are ultimately transitional. Modern-day capitalism has had an extraordinary run since the start of the Industrial Revolution two centuries ago, lifting billions of ordinary people out of abject poverty. Marxism and heavy-handed socialism have disastrous records by comparison. But, as industrialization and technological progress spread to Asia (and now to Africa), someday the struggle for subsistence will no longer be a primary imperative, and contemporary capitalism’s numerous flaws may loom larger. First, even the leading capitalist economies have failed to price public goods such as clean air and water effectively. The failure of efforts to conclude a new global climate-change agreement is symptomatic of the paralysis. Second, along with great wealth, capitalism has produced extraordinary levels of inequality. The growing gap is partly a simple byproduct of innovation and entrepreneurship. People do not complain about Steve Jobs’s success; his contributions are obvious. But this is not always the case: great wealth enables groups and individuals to buy political power and influence, which in turn helps to generate even more wealth. Only a few countries – Sweden, for example – have been able to curtail this vicious circle without causing growth to collapse. A third problem is the provision and distribution of medical care, a market that fails to satisfy several of the basic requirements necessary for the price mechanism to produce economic efficiency, beginning with the difficulty that consumers have in assessing the quality of their treatment. The problem will only get worse: health-care costs as a proportion of income are sure to rise as societies get richer and older, possibly exceeding 30% of GDP within a few decades. In health care, perhaps more than in any other market, many countries are struggling with the moral dilemma of how to maintain incentives to produce and consume efficiently without producing unacceptably large disparities in access to care. It is ironic that modern capitalist societies engage in public campaigns to urge individuals to be more attentive to their health, while fostering an economic ecosystem that seduces many consumers into an extremely unhealthy diet. According to the United States Centers for Disease Control, 34% of Americans are obese. Clearly, conventionally measured economic growth – which implies higher consumption – cannot be an end in itself. Fourth, today’s capitalist systems vastly undervalue the welfare of unborn generations. For most of the era since the Industrial Revolution, this has not mattered, as the continuing boon of technological advance has trumped short-sighted policies. By and large, each generation has found itself significantly better off than the last. But, with the world’s population surging above seven billion, and harbingers of resource constraints becoming ever more apparent, there is no guarantee that this trajectory can be maintained. Financial crises are of course a fifth problem, perhaps the one that has provoked the most soul-searching of late. In the world of finance, continual technological innovation has not conspicuously reduced risks, and might well have magnified them. In principle, none of capitalism’s problems is insurmountable, and economists have offered a variety of market-based solutions. A high global price for carbon would induce firms and individuals to internalize the cost of their polluting activities. Tax systems can be designed to provide a greater measure of redistribution of income without necessarily involving crippling distortions, by minimizing non-transparent tax expenditures and keeping marginal rates low. Effective pricing of health care, including the pricing of waiting times, could encourage a better balance between equality and efficiency. Financial systems could be better regulated, with stricter attention to excessive accumulations of debt. Will capitalism be a victim of its own success in producing massive wealth? For now, as fashionable as the topic of capitalism’s demise might be, the possibility seems remote. Nevertheless, as pollution, financial instability, health problems, and inequality continue to grow, and as political systems remain paralyzed, capitalism’s future might not seem so secure in a few decades as it seems now.

#### Neolib solves the environment

Zey 1997 (Michael Zey, Professor of Management at Montclair State University, 1997, The Futurist, “The Macroindustrial Era: A New Age of Abundance and Prosperity”, March/April, http://www.zey.com/Featured\_2.htm)

This brings me to one of my major points about the necessity of growth. A recurring criticism of growth - be it industrial, economic, or technological - centers around its negative consequences. A good example of this is the tendency of economic and industrial growth to generate pollution. However, I contend that growth invariably provides solutions to any problems it introduces. The following examples will illustrate my point. Although economic growth can initially lead to such problems as pollution and waste, studies show that, after a country achieves a certain level of prosperity, the pendulum begins to swing back toward cleaner air and water. In fact, once a nation's per capita income rises to about $4,000 (in 1993 dollars), it produces less of some pollutants per capita. The reason for this is quite simple: Such a nation can now afford technologies such as catalytic converters and sewage systems that treat and eliminate a variety of wastes. According to Norio Yamamoto, research director of the Mitsubishi Research Institute, "We consider any kind of environmental damage to result from mismanagement of the economy." He claims that the pollution problems of poorer regions such as eastern Europe can be traced largely to their economic woes. Hence he concludes that, in order to ensure environmental safety, "we need a sound economy on a global basis." Thus, the answer to pollution, the supposed outgrowth of progress, ought to be more economic growth. Such economic growth can be accelerated by any number of actions: the transfer of technology, the sharing of scientific know-how, and economic investment. The World Bank estimates that every dollar invested in developing countries will grow to $100 in 50 years. As their wealth increases, these countries can take all the necessary steps to invest in pollution-free cars, catalytic converters, and other pollution-free technologies, such as the cleanest of all current large-scale energy sources, nuclear power. They can also afford to invest in bioremediation - the utilization of viruses to literally eat such impurities as oil spills and toxic waste. Russia is actively growing and exporting microorganisms that eat radioactive and metallic wastes from such sources as uranium, plutonium, magnesium, and silver.

#### Neolib Solves War

Hillebrand 2010 Evan E. Hillebrand (Professor of Diplomacy at University of Kentucky and a Senior Economist for the Central Intelligence Agency) 2010 “Deglobalization Scenarios: Who Wins? Who Loses?” Global Economy Journal, Volume 10, Issue 2 2010

A long line of writers from Cruce (1623) to Kant (1797) to Angell (1907) to Gartzke (2003) have theorized that economic interdependence can lower the likelihood of war. Cruce thought that free trade enriched a society in general and so made people more peaceable; Kant thought that trade shifted political power away from the more warlike aristocracy, and Angell thought that economic interdependence shifted cost/benefit calculations in a peace-promoting direction. Gartzke contends that trade relations enhance transparency among nations and thus help avoid bargaining miscalculations. There has also been a tremendous amount of empirical research that mostly supports the idea of an inverse relationship between trade and war. Jack Levy said that, “While there are extensive debates over the proper research designs for investigating this question, and while some empirical studies find that trade is associated with international conflict, most studies conclude that trade is associated with peace, both at the dyadic and systemic levels” (Levy, 2003, p. 127). There is another important line of theoretical and empirical work called Power Transition Theory that focuses on the relative power of states and warns that when rising powers approach the power level of their regional or global leader the chances of war increase (Tammen, Lemke, et al, 2000). Jacek Kugler (2006) warns that the rising power of China relative to the United States greatly increases the chances of great power war some time in the next few decades. The IFs model combines the theoretical and empirical work of the peacethrough trade tradition with the work of the power transition scholars in an attempt to forecast the probability of interstate war. Hughes (2004) explains how he, after consulting with scholars in both camps, particularly Edward Mansfield and Douglas Lemke, estimated the starting probabilities for each dyad based on the historical record, and then forecast future probabilities for dyadic militarized interstate disputes (MIDs) and wars based on the calibrated relationships he derived from the empirical literature. The probability of a MID, much less a war, between any random dyad in any given year is very low, if not zero. Paraguay and Tanzania, for example, have never fought and are very unlikely to do so. But there have been thousands of MIDs in the past and hundreds of wars and many of the 16,653 dyads have nonzero probabilities. In 2005 the mean probability of a country being involved in at least one war was estimated to be 0.8%, with 104 countries having a probability of at least 1 war approaching zero. A dozen countries12, however, have initial probabilities over 3%. model predicts four great power wars in the deglobalization scenario vs. 2 in the globalization scenario.16 The globalization scenario projects that the probability for war will gradually decrease through 2035 for every country—but not every dyad--that had a significant (greater than 0.5% chance of war) in 2005 (Table 6). The decline in prospects for war stems from the scenario’s projections of rising levels of democracy, rising incomes, and rising trade interdependence—all of these factors figure in the algorithm that calculates the probabilities. Not all dyadic war probabilities decrease, however, because of the power transition mechanism that is also included in the IFs model. The probability for war between China and the US, for example rises as China’s power13 rises gradually toward the US level but in these calculations the probability of a China/US war never gets very high.14 Deglobalization raises the risks of war substantially. In a world with much lower average incomes, less democracy, and less trade interdependence, the average probability of a country having at least one war in 2035 rises from 0.6% in the globalization scenario to 3.7% in the deglobalization scenario. Among the top-20 war-prone countries, the average probability rises from 3.9% in the globalization scenario to 7.1% in the deglobalization scenario. The model estimates that in the deglobalization scenario there will be about 10 wars in 2035, vs. only 2 in the globalization scenario15. Over the whole period, 2005-2035, the IV. Winners and Losers Deglobalization in the form of reduced trade interdependence, reduced capital flows, and reduced migration has few positive effects, based on this analysis with the International Futures Model. Economic growth is cut in all but a handful of countries, and is cut more in the non-OECD countries than in the OECD countries. Deglobalization has a mixed impact on equality. In many non-OECD countries, the cut in imports from the rest of the world increases the share of manufacturing and in 61 countries raises the share of income going to the poor. But since average productivity goes down in almost all countries, this gain in equality comes at the expense of reduced incomes and increased poverty in almost all countries. The only winners are a small number of countries that were small and poor and not well integrated in the global economy to begin with—and the gains from deglobalization even for them are very small. Politically, deglobalization makes for less stable domestic politics and a greater likelihood of war. The likelihood of state failure through internal war, projected to diminish through 2035 with increasing globalization, rises in the deglobalization scenario particularly among the non-OECD democracies. Similarly, deglobalization makes for more fractious relations among states and the probability for interstate war rises.

#### Best studies

Hegre et al 2009 (H’vard Hegre, Professor of Political Science @University of Oslo, , John R. Oneal, Professor of Political Science @ The University of Alabama, Bruce Russett, Professor of Political Science @ Yale University) August 25, 2009 “Trade Does Promote Peace: New Simultaneous Estimates of the Reciprocal Effects of Trade and Conflict” http://www.yale-university.com/leitner/resources/docs/HORJune09.pdf

Liberals expect economically important trade to reduce conflict because interstate violence adversely affects commerce, prospectively or contemporaneously. Keshk, Reuveny, & Pollins (2004) and Kim & Rousseau (2005) report on the basis of simultaneous analyses of these reciprocal relations that conflict impedes trade but trade does not deter conflict. Using refined measures of geographic proximity and size—the key elements in the gravity model of international interactions—reestablishes support for the liberal peace, however. Without careful specification, trade becomes a proxy for these fundamental exogenous factors, which are also important influences on dyadic conflict. KPR‘s and KR‘s results are spurious. Large, proximate states fight more and trade more. Our re-analyses show that, as liberals would expect, commerce reduces the risk of interstate conflict when proximity and size are properly modeled in both the conflict and trade equations. We provided new simultaneous estimates of liberal theory using Oneal & Russett‘s (2005) data and conflict equation and a trade model derived from Long (2008). These tests confirm the pacific benefit of trade. Trade reduces the likelihood of a fatal militarized dispute, 1950–2000 in our most comprehensive analysis, as it does in the years 1984-97 when additional measures of traders‘ expectations of domestic and interstate conflict are incorporated (Long, 2008) and in the period 1885-2000. This strong support for liberal theory is consistent with Kim‘s (1998) early simultaneous estimates, Oneal, Russett & Berbaum‘s (2003) Granger-style causality tests, and recent research by Robst, Polachek & Chang (2007). Reuveny & Kang (1998) and Reuveny (2001) report mixed results. It is particularly encouraging that, when simultaneously estimated, the coefficient of trade in the conflict equation is larger in absolute value than the corresponding value in a simple probit analysis. Thus, the dozens of published articles that have addressed the endogeneity of trade by controlling for the years of peace—as virtually all have done since 1999—have not overstated the benefit of interdependence. Admittedly, our instrumental variables are not optimal. In some cases, for example, in violation of the identification rule, the creation or end of a PTA may be a casus belli. More importantly, neither of our instruments explains a large amount of variance. Thus, future research should be directed to identifying better instruments. Our confidence in the commercial peace does not depend entirely on the empirical evidence, however; it also rests on the logic of liberal theory. Our new simultaneous estimates—as well as our re-analyses of KPR and KR—indicate that fatal disputes reduce trade. Even with extensive controls for on-going domestic conflict, militarized disputes with third parties, and expert estimates of the risks of such violence, interstate conflict has an adverse contemporaneous effect on bilateral trade. This is hardly surprising (Anderton & Carter, 2001; Reuveny, 2001; Li & Sacko, 2002; Oneal, Russett & Berbaum, 2003; Glick & Taylor, 2005; Kastner, 2007; Long, 2008; Findlay & O‘Rourke, 2007; cf. Barbieri & Levy, 1999; Blomberg & Hess, 2006; and Ward & Hoff, 2007). If conflict did not impede trade, economic agents would be indifferent to risk and the maximization of profit. Because conflict is costly, trade should reduce interstate violence. Otherwise, national leaders would be insensitive to economic loss and the preferences of powerful domestic actors. Whether paid prospectively or contemporaneously, the economic cost of conflict should reduce the likelihood of military conflict, ceteris paribus, if national leaders are rational

#### Economic rationality produces a productive ontology

Boetke 03(Peter, professor of economics at George Mason ,Review of “Economics as Ideology”, published in Revue de Philosophie economique, http://www.gmu.edu/departments/economics/pboettke/pubs/recenstion\_douvrage.pdf)

It is my belief that Hoover is led to this, and other positions in his book that I find objectionable, because he fails to see economics as a discipline which can provide us with knowledge equivalent in ontological stature to the law of gravity and that democratic deliberations often produce economic policies that are the equivalent of engineering proposals for human beings to float rather than walk or drive to their next destination. If my characterization is correct, then as we saw in the quote from Mises, the economists will find themselves in opposition to proposed policy solutions to right this or that perceived social wrong. The economist is put in the unenviable position of reminding fellow citizens that wishing it so doesn't necessarily make it so. The science of economics puts parameters on our utopias, and those who advocate utopian solutions cannot stand any suggestion that their plan for the future is unworkable. The discipline of economics in addition to providing a critique, also suggests that any alternative arrangement being proposed must specify the institutional mechanisms by which incentives between actors will become aligned and the correct information will flow to right actors in time for them to make appropriate decisions or learn from their previous decisions that mistakes were made so the appropriate adjustments will be made. If no mechanism is in place, then incentive incompatibilities and coordination failures will result so that no matter how beautiful the proposed policy might appear on paper the solution will be one of economic waste and political opportunism. Because Hoover's book doesn't deal with economic science in such a sustained way, it cannot at the end of the day explain the evolution of modern economic thought and without that there is no way to understand the creation of contemporary politics in the wake of the breakdown of the Keynesian consensus in the 1970s, the collapse of communism in the 1980s and the realization of the tragic failure of development planning in the third world in the 1990s. Economic reality, it turns out more than psycho-history is the best way to understand the way the world work. The distinction between ontology and epistemology are often forgotten in discussions of the methodology and philosophy of the social sciences. We come to know the laws of gravity in a manner different than we come to know the law of demand (question of epistemology), but the forces at work that are described by the law of gravity and the law of demand are nevertheless real in the same way (question of ontology). The argument for methodological dualism between the natural and social sciences that was made by Mises and then Hayek crucially relies on this distinction between ontology and epistemology. In other words, economics is capable of establishing laws that have the same ontological claim as those derived in physics, but they are arrived at through procedures of inquiry entirely different from those employed in the natural sciences.

#### Economic rationality key to survival

Rockwell 08(Rockwell Jr., president of the Ludwig von Mises Institute, 5/19/2008, Llewellyn, “Everything You Love You Owe to Capitalism,” <http://mises.org/story/2982>)

For a person who has read in economics, and absorbed its essential lessons, the world around us becomes vivid and clear, and certain moral imperatives strike us. We know now that commerce deserves defense. We see entrepreneurs as great heroes. We sympathize with the plight of producers. We see unions not as defenders of rights but as privileged cartels that exclude people who need work. We see regulations not as consumer protection but rather as cost-raising rackets lobbied for by some producers to hurt other producers. We see antitrust not as a safeguard against corporate excess but as a bludgeon used by big players against smarter competitors. In short, economics helps us see the world as it is. And its contribution lies not in the direction of the assembly of ever more facts, but in helping those facts fit a coherent theory of the world. And here we see the essence of our job at the Mises Institute. It is to educate and instill a systematic method for understanding the world as it is. Our battleground is not the courts, nor the election polls, nor the presidency, nor the legislature, and certainly not the wicked arena of lobbying and political payoffs. Our battleground concerns a domain of existence that is more powerful in the long run. It concerns the ideas that individuals hold about how the world works. As we get older and see ever more young generations coming up behind us, we are often struck by the great truth that knowledge in this world is not cumulative over time. What one generation has learned and absorbed is not somehow passed on to the next one through genetics or osmosis. Each generation must be taught anew. Economic theory, I'm sorry to report, is not written on our hearts. It was a long time in the process of being discovered. But now that we know, it must be passed on — and in this way, it is like the ability to read, or to understand great literature. It is the obligation of our generation to teach the next generation. "If the world had drawn the correct lessons from these events, there would be no more need for economic education and no more need even for the bulk of what the Mises Institute does." And we are not merely talking here of knowledge for knowledge's sake. What is at stake is our prosperity. It is our standard of living. It is the well-being of our children and all of society. It is freedom and the flourishing of civilization that stand in the balance. Whether we grow and thrive and create and flourish, or wither and die and lose all that we have inherited, ultimately depends on these abstract ideas we hold concerning cause and effect in society. These ideas do not usually come to us by pure observation. They must be taught and explained.

#### Perfect rationality may be impossible, but doesn’t mean our methods are flawed or useless. The fact that some level of rational behavior can be accounted for means economics is invaluable in studying discourse and human relations

McKenzie 09 [Richard B. McKenzie, Predictably Rational?: In Search of Defenses for Rational Behavior in Economics, p. 203, Springer Press, 2009]

The various historical and disciplinary analyses of rational behavior in this book lead inextricably to an overarching conclusion: Perfect rational behavior, the type widely presumed in neoclassical economics – a decision making process in which people flawlessly (with impeccable consistency and transitivity) make choices among known alternatives with known resources at their disposable – is not, and cannot be, descriptive of the full scope of the human predicament. Frank Knight’s observations regarding “scientific economics” is key to understanding the limits of rational behavior: “The first question in regard to scientific economics is the question of how far life is rational how far its problems reduce to the form of using given means to achieve given ends…[L]ife is at bottom an exploration in the field of values, an attempt to discover values, rather than on the knowledge of them to produce and enjoy them to the greatest possible extent” (1935, p. 105). Nevertheless, there can be a rationality of a sort – and an economics of a sort – so far as wants are determined and to the extent that people can and do contemplate the relative merits of alternative courses of production and consumption. Behavioral psychologists and economists have more recently documented many imperfections in human rationality, and its derivatives, decision making, and behaviors (see Chap. 6), but neoclassical economists should neither consider such findings unexpected or deny them. Oddly, as will be seen in Chaps. 10 and 11, the behaviorals’ findings should even be welcomed as a reason d’etre for the economics as a course of study and method for thinking and deducing insights about real-world human behavior. The standard defense of perfect rationality in economics is Milton Friedman’s statement: In order to make testable predictions, we must abstract from the real world the models of behavior. Assuming complex forms of rationality, or just less than perfect rationality, can complicate thinking with no necessary improvement in the “fruitfulness” of the theory. There are four other major lines of defense for continued use of rationality as a theoretical tool of analysis.

#### Epistemological change doesn’t effect anything

Jackson 2010 (Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, Associate Professor of International Relations in the School of International Service at the American University in Washington, DC, 2010, “The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and its Implications for the Study of World Politics,” ebook)

Faced with the impossibility of putting an end to the science question within IR by turning to the philosophy of science, what should we do? Since we cannot resolve the question of what science is by appealing to a consensus in philosophy, one option is to become philosophers of science ourselves, and to spend our time and our scholarly efforts trying to resolve thorny and abstract issues about the status of theory and evidence and the limits of epistemic certainty. But this is an unappealing option for a scholarly field defined, if loosely, by its empirical focus (world politics), and it would be roughly akin to advising physicists to become philosophers of physics in order to resolve the question of what physics was and whether it was a science. This also mis-states the relationship between philosophical debates and scientific practice; practicing scientists have a pretty good working definition of what it means for something to be “scientific,” but this “is less a matter of strategy than of ongoing evaluative practice,” conducted in the course of everyday knowledge-producing activities (Taylor 1996, 133). We do not expect physicists to give philosophical answers to questions about the scientific status of their scholarship; we expect them to produce knowledge of the physical world. Similarly, we should not expect IR scholars to engage in “philosophy of IR” to the detriment of generating knowledge about world politics; the latter, not the former, is our main vocational task.

#### Ontology/epistemology don’t come first or indict our scholarship

Owen 2002 (David Owen, reader of political theory at the University of Southampton, Millennium, Volume 31, Number 3, pg. 655-657)

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

## 2NC

## T

### 2NC Limits Overview

#### Limits outweigh –

#### A. Most logical—the significance of one-of-many issues is minimal. Constraints inherently increase meaning.

#### B. It’s a precursor—education is inevitable, unfocused education isn’t productive. Limits determine the direction and productivity of learning.

#### Small schools- Huge topic with constantly developing literature magnifies resource disparities- Big programs can have a new aff every other round- No topic generics sufficient to restore balance

#### Key to fairness- essential to ensure that debates at the end of the year have meaningful clash over the mechanism

#### Literally doubles the educational benefit

**Arrington 2009** (Rebecca, UVA Today, “Study Finds That Students Benefit From Depth, Rather Than Breadth, in High School Science Courses” March 4)

A recent study reports that high school students who study fewer science topics, but study them in greater depth, have an advantage in college science classes over their peers who study more topics and spend less time on each. Robert Tai, associate professor at the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education, worked with Marc S. Schwartz of the University of Texas at Arlington and Philip M. Sadler and Gerhard Sonnert of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics to conduct the study and produce the report. "Depth Versus Breadth: How Content Coverage in High School Courses Relates to Later Success in College Science Coursework" relates the amount of content covered on a particular topic in high school classes with students' performance in college-level science classes. The study will appear in the July 2009 print edition of Science Education and is currently available as an online pre-print from the journal. "As a former high school teacher, I always worried about whether it was better to teach less in greater depth or more with no real depth. This study offers evidence that teaching fewer topics in greater depth is a better way to prepare students for success in college science," Tai said. "These results are based on the performance of thousands of college science students from across the United States." The 8,310 students in the study were enrolled in introductory biology, chemistry or physics in randomly selected four-year colleges and universities. Those who spent one month or more studying one major topic in-depth in high school earned higher grades in college science than their peers who studied more topics in the same period of time. The study revealed that students in courses that focused on mastering a particular topic were impacted twice as much as those in courses that touched on every major topic

#### Turns their offense—limits are vital to creativity and innovation

David Intrator (President of The Creative Organization) October 21, 2010 “Thinking Inside the Box,” http://www.trainingmag.com/article/thinking-inside-box

One of the most pernicious myths about creativity, one that seriously inhibits creative thinking and innovation, is the belief that one needs to “think outside the box.” As someone who has worked for decades as a professional creative, nothing could be further from the truth. This a is view shared by the vast majority of creatives, expressed famously by the modernist designer Charles Eames when he wrote, “Design depends largely upon constraints.” The myth of thinking outside the box stems from a fundamental misconception of what creativity is, and what it’s not. In the popular imagination, creativity is something weird and wacky. The creative process is magical, or divinely inspired. But, in fact, creativity is not about divine inspiration or magic. It’s about problem-solving, and by definition a problem is a constraint, a limit, a box. One of the best illustrations of this is the work of photographers. They create by excluding the great mass what’s before them, choosing a small frame in which to work. Within that tiny frame, literally a box, they uncover relationships and establish priorities. What makes creative problem-solving uniquely challenging is that you, as the creator, are the one defining the problem. You’re the one choosing the frame. And you alone determine what’s an effective solution. This can be quite demanding, both intellectually and emotionally. Intellectually, you are required to establish limits, set priorities, and cull patterns and relationships from a great deal of material, much of it fragmentary. More often than not, this is the material you generated during brainstorming sessions. At the end of these sessions, you’re usually left with a big mess of ideas, half-ideas, vague notions, and the like. Now, chances are you’ve had a great time making your mess. You might have gone off-site, enjoyed a “brainstorming camp,” played a number of warm-up games. You feel artistic and empowered. But to be truly creative, you have to clean up your mess, organizing those fragments into something real, something useful, something that actually works. That’s the hard part. It takes a lot of energy, time, and willpower to make sense of the mess you’ve just generated. It also can be emotionally difficult. You’ll need to throw out many ideas you originally thought were great, ideas you’ve become attached to, because they simply don’t fit into the rules you’re creating as you build your box.

### A2: PTC Limits out Nuke Affs

There are still tons of restrictions affs on the nuclear side- impossibility of placing restrictions on energy production on that half of the topic means that we should limit the incentives part of the topic more

#### You can make the Nuclear PTC escalate to offset construction costs

NEI, October 2009, Nuclear Energy Institute, “Policies That Support New Nuclear Power Plant Development,” <http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/newplants/factsheet/policiessupportnewplantdevelopment/>

The production tax credit (PTC) for new nuclear generation (section 1306 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005) allows 6,000 megawatts of new nuclear capacity to earn $18 per megawatt-hour for the first eight years of operation. The maximum tax credit for any one plant is capped at $125 million per year. In 2005, $18 per megawatt-hour was comparable to the PTC for renewable resources. However, unlike the renewable PTC, which increases annually with inflation, the nuclear PTC does not escalate. In 2006, the Internal Revenue Service published guidelines for implementing the nuclear PTC program. For a facility to be eligible for credits: The construction and operating license application must be submitted to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission by Dec. 31, 2008. The plant must be under construction by January 1, 2014. The plant must be operating by January 1, 2021. The 6,000 megawatts of available credits will be divided among eligible facilities on a pro rata basis according to the facilities' nameplate capacities. Although the PTC reduces the cost of the power generated by these new plants once they are up and running, it does little to offset the construction and commissioning risk.

## CP

### Coal DA

#### Coal is getting cleaner- no more emissions

Miller 2010 [Steve Miller, president and CEO of the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity 8-16-2010, The National Journal, “’Clean Coal’ is Essential to U.S.” http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2010/08/how-viable-is-clean-coal.php#1616515]

Second, has CCT worked? Absolutely—to the benefit of the environment, electricity consumers, and taxpayers. Over the past thirty years, America’s coal-based electricity providers have invested over $90 billion in technologies to reduce emissions of major air pollutants, while providing affordable, reliable electricity. EPA’s latest analysis shows that sulfur dioxide emissions are 56% lower than in 1980, while nitrogen dioxide emissions are 46% lower during this period—even as the use of coal to generate electricity has almost tripled. Clean coal technologies have played a critical role in these reductions, and investments in CCT to meet new regulations will cut emissions significantly more in the years ahead.¶ Third, can clean coal technologies help address climate concerns? Yes—carbon capture and storage technologies (CCS) will do that. Last week, the President’s Interagency Task Force on Carbon Capture and Storage found “there are no insurmountable technological, legal, institutional, regulatory or other barriers that prevent CCS from playing a role in reducing greenhouse gas emissions.” The task force noted that CO2 has been removed from industrial gas streams for more than sixty years and that we have transported CO2 in pipelines for almost forty years. Further, it is well documented that American businesses have safely stored CO2 underground to extract otherwise unrecoverable oil deposits for more than twenty years.

#### Rise of natural gas is killing coal

Jon Sharpe, August 31 2012, “New EPA regs not driving coal demand” <http://seekingalpha.com/article/839701-new-epa-regulations-not-driving-coal-demand>

So if not environmental regulations, what is driving coal equity values? The reduced overall costs of combined cycle natural gas cogeneration and extremely low natural gas prices, and lower cost renewables are major factors. The rise in coal inventories over the last year and EIA reports on electricity generation suggest that significant coal capacity was idled in favor of natural gas generators as natural gas prices plummeted.

#### Coal is down 20% in usage from last year.

HFN’12Monday, 28 May 2012 Source - Hydrogen Fuel News <http://www.s> teel gur u.c om/ ra w\_ m a t e r I al \_ n e ws / U S \_ c o a l \_ g e n e rated\_energy\_falls\_by\_20pct\_in\_the\_past\_year/265898.htmlThe US Energy Information Administration has released new figures concerning the state of coal generation in the country. According to the agency, electricity produced by burning coal has dropped by nearly 20% over the past year. Coal generated energy now accounts for 36% of the electricity produced in the US down from what it had been in 2011. The agency notes that this steep drop in coal energy production is due to several factors, including the attractiveness of alternative energy. Price of natural gas cited as major contributor to drop in coal energy production The EIA notes that natural gas has played a significant role in the decline of coal energy production. Natural gas prices have dropped significantly in the past few years, which have made it an attractive alternative to coal and oil. Though natural gas burns cleaner than these fossil-fuels, it still produces greenhouse gases when burned for energy. Despite this, the inexpensive nature of natural gas will lead to an increased use of the fuel in 2012. EIA expects growth of natural gas marker to continue through the year The EIA notes that in the first quarter of 2012, natural gas accounted for approximately 28% of energy generation in the U.S. This is up from 20.7%, the level it had been during the same period in 2011. The EIA believes that this trend will continue throughout 2012 and into the future. Other forms of alternative energy, such as solar and wind power, is also expected to begin playing a larger role in the country’s energy scheme, but may take a back seat to the position of natural gas due to financial issues. Coal production expected to drop this year due to financial issues Production at coal mines is expected to drop approximately 10% this year, according to EIA estimates. This is, again, due to the financial aspects of the industry. Financial issues are beginning to have a profound impact on the alternative energy industry and natural gas market in the U.S. As fossil-fuels become more expensive, renewable sources of fuel are becoming more popular, such is the case with natural gas.

### A2: Links to Politics

#### Guidance documents avoid politics- especially true in divided government

Raso 2010 [Connor N. J.D., Yale Law School expected 2010; Ph.D., Stanford University Department of Political Science expected 2010 “Note: Strategic or Sincere? Analyzing Agency Use of Guidance Documents” The Yale Law Journal January, 119 Yale L.J. 782]

Agency leaders facing a Congress and President in agreement on their issue area have a relatively simple means of minimizing political pressure: obey their political principals. This is not to suggest that agencies hold no discretion during unified government. 100 Nonetheless, agencies hold greater slack when Congress and the President are divided. This situation is more likely when different political parties control the two branches. 101 Such division increases the cost of issuing a legislative rule. By contrast, a guidance document is less likely to draw the attention of Congress and the President because it is exempt from the numerous procedural requirements that alert the political branches to agency rulemakings. 102 In short, this Note argues that the advantage of avoiding this attention increases when Congress and the President are divided because the agency cannot please both of its superiors.

#### Informal rulemaking ensures less Congressional backlash

Hamilton and Schroeder 1994 [James T. Hamilton is an assistant Professor of Public Policy, Economics and Political Science at Duke University, Christopher H. Schroeder is a Professor of Law at Duke University School of Law “Strategic Regulators and the Choice of Rulemaking Procedures: The Selection of Formal vs. Informal Rules in Regulating Hazardous Waste http://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4229&context=lcp]

3. As the regulatory costs imposed on parties increase, the more likely the parties will resist and, hence, the more likely the agency is to use informal rulemaking. Industry interest groups may attempt to weaken costly formal rules by commenting on them during the formal rulemaking process or by challenging them in court. Similarly, environmentalists may attempt to strengthen provisions through submissions and court challenges. Regulatory costs for industry include expenditures arising from compliance and enforcement actions, while costs for environmentalists may relate to the potential environmental damages posed by the activity regulated. The more at stake for regulated parties and other intervenors, the more likely the agency may be to issue the rule informally. Issuing a costly rule through the informal process has several advantages for the agency: it makes input from interest groups less likely than under the formal process; reduces the ease with which Congress may monitor agency performance and hence lessens the ability of interest groups to "pull the fire alarm" on agency actions; lessens the probability that an interest group will be able to challenge the rule in court as informal rules lack the long administrative records of formally published rules; and enables the agency to alter costs of compliance for particular parties since informal rules may be applied with more discretion than formal rules.

#### Empirical data proves agencies use informal rulemaking to circumvent controversy

Hamilton and Schroeder 1994 [James T. Hamilton is an assistant Professor of Public Policy, Economics and Political Science at Duke University, Christopher H. Schroeder is a Professor of Law at Duke University School of Law “Strategic Regulators and the Choice of Rulemaking Procedures: The Selection of Formal vs. Informal Rules in Regulating Hazardous Waste http://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4229&context=lcp]

An alternative explanation for the over 19,500 pages of OSWER documents is that they are simply clarifications that spell out the requirements of the formally published rules. If this were the case, however, there would be few differences between those CFR rules with and without OSWER documents, except perhaps in terms of which rules were more technical and thus required elaboration. We have presented hypotheses about why the agency may strategically choose to issue requirements informally and tested these with data from the rules implementing RCRA. Our results are consistent with a strategic agency that chooses informality when it wishes to provide for greater discretion in agency actions, to establish rules that entail major costs, to promote standards that involve controversy, to provide for individual negotiations over issues that involve smaller numbers of facilities, and to avoid congressional and judicial scrutiny and constraints as signaled by actions such as court remands.

## Neolib Good

### Tech

### Util

#### Public policy requires act util – rights cannot come first

William H. Shaw. PhD. Contemporary Ethics: Taking Account of Utilitarianism. P. 171-2. 1999

Utilitarianism ties right and wrong to the promotion of well-being, but it is not only a personal ethic or a guide to individual conduct. It is also a "public philosophy"' - that is, a normative basis for public policy and the structuring of our social, legal, and political institutions. Indeed, it was just this aspect of utilitarianism that primarily engaged Bentham, John Stuart Mill, his father James, and their friends and votaries. For them utilitarianism was, first and foremost, a social and political philosophy and only secondarily a private or personal moral code. In particular, they saw utilitarianism as providing the yardstick by which to measure, assess, and, where necessary, reform government social and economic policy and the judicial institutions of their day. In the public realm, utilitarianism is especially compelling. Because of its consequentialist character, a utilitarian approach to public policy requires officials to base their actions, procedures, and programs on the most accurate and detailed understanding they can obtain of the circumstances in which they are operating and the likely results of the alternatives open to them. Realism and empiricism are the hallmarks of a utilitarian orientation, not customary practice, unverified abstractions, or wishful thinking. Promotion of the well-being of all seems to be the appropriate, indeed the only sensible, touchstone for assessing public policies and institutions, and the standard objections to utilitarianism as a personal morality carry little or no weight against it when viewed as a public philosophy.

#### We should evaluate actions by their managerial consequences - rolling back the steady evolution toward multilateral world peace should be avoided

Dyer 2004 http://www.commondreams.org/views04/1230-05.htm Gwynne Dyer December 30, 2004 is a Canadian journalist based in London whose articles are published in 45 papers worldwide. This is an abridged version of the last chapter in his updated book, War, first published in 1985. His latest book is Future: Tense. The Coming Global Order, published by McClelland and Stewart. by the Toronto Star The End of War Our Task Over the Next Few Years is to Transform the World of Independent States into a Genuine Global Village by Gwynne Dyer

War is deeply embedded in our history and our culture, probably since before we were even fully human, but weaning ourselves away from it should not be a bigger mountain to climb than some of the other changes we have already made in the way we live, given the right incentives. And we have certainly been given the right incentives: The holiday from history that we have enjoyed since the early '90s may be drawing to an end, and another great-power war, fought next time with nuclear weapons, may be lurking in our future. The "firebreak" against nuclear weapons use that we began building after Hiroshima and Nagasaki has held for well over half a century now. But the proliferation of nuclear weapons to new powers is a major challenge to the stability of the system. So are the coming crises, mostly environmental in origin, which will hit some countries much harder than others, and may drive some to desperation. Add in the huge impending shifts in the great-power system as China and India grow to rival the United States in GDP over the next 30 or 40 years and it will be hard to keep things from spinning out of control. With good luck and good management, we may be able to ride out the next half-century without the first-magnitude catastrophe of a global nuclear war, but the potential certainly exists for a major die-back of human population. We cannot command the good luck, but good management is something we can choose to provide. It depends, above all, on preserving and extending the multilateral system that we have been building since the end of World War II. The rising powers must be absorbed into a system that emphasizes co-operation and makes room for them, rather than one that deals in confrontation and raw military power. If they are obliged to play the traditional great-power game of winners and losers, then history will repeat itself and everybody loses. Our hopes for mitigating the severity of the coming environmental crises also depend on early and concerted global action of a sort that can only happen in a basically co-operative international system. When the great powers are locked into a military confrontation, there is simply not enough spare attention, let alone enough trust, to make deals on those issues, so the highest priority at the moment is to keep the multilateral approach alive and avoid a drift back into alliance systems and arms races. And there is no point in dreaming that we can leap straight into some never-land of universal brotherhood; we will have to confront these challenges and solve the problem of war within the context of the existing state system. The solution to the state of international anarchy that compels every state to arm itself for war was so obvious that it arose almost spontaneously in 1918. The wars by which independent states had always settled their quarrels in the past had grown so monstrously destructive that some alternative system had to be devised, and that could only be a pooling of sovereignty, at least in matters concerning war and peace, by all the states of the world. So the victors of World War I promptly created the League of Nations. But the solution was as difficult in practice as it was simple in concept. Every member of the League of Nations understood that if the organization somehow acquired the ability to act in a concerted and effective fashion, it could end up being used against them, so no major government was willing to give the League of Nations any real power. Instead, they got World War II, and that war was so bad — by the end the first nuclear weapons had been used on cities — that the victors made a second attempt in 1945 to create an international organization that really could prevent war. They literally changed international law and made war illegal, but they were well aware that all of that history and all those reflexes were not going to vanish overnight. It would be depressing to catalogue the many failures of the United Nations, but it would also be misleading. The implication would be that this was an enterprise that should have succeeded from the start, and has failed irrevocably. On the contrary; it was bound to be a relative failure at the outset. It was always going to be very hard to persuade sovereign governments to surrender power to an untried world authority which might then make decisions that went against their particular interests. In the words of the traditional Irish directions to a lost traveler: "If that's where you want to get to, sir, I wouldn't start from here." But here is where we must start from, for it is states that run the world. The present international system, based on heavily armed and jealously independent states, often exaggerates the conflicts between the multitude of human communities in the world, but it does reflect an underlying reality: We cannot all get all we want, and some method must exist to decide who gets what. That is why neighboring states have lived in a perpetual state of potential war, just as neighboring hunter-gatherer bands did 20,000 years ago. If we now must abandon war as a method of settling our disputes and devise an alternative, it only can be done with the full co-operation of the world's governments. That means it certainly will be a monumentally difficult and lengthy task: Mistrust reigns everywhere and no nation will allow even the least of its interests to be decided upon by a collection of foreigners. Even the majority of states that are more or less satisfied with their borders and their status in the world would face huge internal opposition from nationalist elements to any transfer of sovereignty to the United Nations. The good news for humans is that it looks like peaceful conditions, once established, can be maintained. And if baboons can do it, why not us? The U.N. as presently constituted is certainly no place for idealists, but they would feel even more uncomfortable in a United Nations that actually worked as was originally intended. It is an association of poachers turned game-keepers, not an assembly of saints, and it would not make its decisions according to some impartial standard of justice. There is no impartial concept of justice to which all of mankind would subscribe and, in any case, it is not "~~mankind~~ human" that makes decisions at the United Nations, but governments with their own national interests to protect. To envision how a functioning world authority might reach its decisions, at least in its first century or so, begin with the arrogant promotion of self-interest by the great powers that would continue to dominate U.N. decision-making and add in the crass expediency masquerading as principle that characterizes the shifting coalitions among the lesser powers in the present General Assembly: It would be an intensely political process. The decisions it produced would be kept within reasonable bounds only by the need never to act in a way so damaging to the interest of any major member or group of members that it forced them into total defiance, and so destroyed the fundamental consensus that keeps war at bay. There is nothing shocking about this. National politics in every country operates with the same combination: a little bit of principle, a lot of power, and a final constraint on the ruthless exercise of that power based mainly on the need to preserve the essential consensus on which the nation is founded and to avoid civil war. In an international organization whose members represent such radically different traditions, interests, and levels of development, the proportion of principle to power is bound to be even lower. It's a pity that there is no practical alternative to the United Nations, but there isn't. If the abolition of great-power war and the establishment of international law is truly a hundred-year project, then we are running a bit behind schedule but we have made substantial progress. We have not had World War III, and that is thanks at least in part to the United Nations, which gave the great powers an excuse to back off from several of their most dangerous confrontations without losing face. No great power has fought another since 1945, and the wars that have broken out between middle-sized powers from time to time — Arab-Israeli wars and Indo-Pakistani wars, mostly — seldom lasted more than a month, because the U.N.'s offers of ceasefires and peacekeeping troops offered a quick way out for the losing side. If you assessed the progress that has been made since 1945 from the perspective of that terrifying time, the glass would look at least half-full. The enormous growth of international organizations since 1945, and especially the survival of the United Nations as a permanent forum where the states of the world are committed to avoiding war (and often succeed), has already created a context new to history. The present political fragmentation of the world into more than 150 stubbornly independent territorial units will doubtless persist for a good while to come. But it is already becoming an anachronism, for, in every other context, from commerce, technology, and the mass media to fashions in ideology, music, and marriage, the outlines of a single global culture (with wide local variations) are visibly taking shape. It is very likely that we began our career as a rising young species by exterminating our nearest relatives, the Neanderthals, and it is entirely possible we will end it by exterminating ourselves, but the fact that we have always had war as part of our culture does not mean that we are doomed always to fight wars. Other aspects of our behavioral repertoire are a good deal more encouraging. There is, for example, a slow but quite perceptible revolution in human consciousness taking place: the last of the great redefinitions of humanity. At all times in our history, we have run our affairs on the assumption that there is a special category of people (our lot) whom we regard as full human beings, having rights and duties approximately equal to our own, and whom we ought not to kill even when we quarrel. Over the past 15,000 or 20,000 years we have successively widened this category from the original hunting-and-gathering band to encompass larger and larger groups. First it was the tribe of some thousands of people bound together by kinship and ritual ties; then the state, where we recognize our shared interests with millions of people whom we don't know and will never meet; and now, finally, the entire human race. There was nothing in the least idealistic or sentimental in any of the previous redefinitions. They occurred because they were useful in advancing people's material interests and ensuring their survival. The same is true for this final act of redefinition: We have reached a point where our moral imagination must expand again to embrace the whole of mankind. It's no coincidence that the period in which the concept of the national state is finally coming under challenge by a wider definition of humanity is also the period that has seen history's most catastrophic wars, for they provide the practical incentive for change. But the transition to a different system is a risky business: The danger of another world war which would cut the whole process short is tiny in any given year, but cumulatively, given how long the process of change will take, it is extreme. That is no reason not to keep trying. Our task over the next few generations is to transform the world of independent states in which we live into some sort of genuine international community. If we succeed in creating that community, however quarrelsome, discontented, and full of injustice it will probably be, then we shall effectively have abolished the ancient institution of warfare. Good riddance.

## 1NR

#### Same Politics Cards as above (sorry I lost this speech doc)

# Rd 6 Neg v Dartmouth

## 1NC

### OFF

#### They are a regulation not a restriction

Mohammed 7

 Kerala High Court Sri Chithira Aero And Adventure ... vs The Director General Of Civil ... on 24 January, 1997 Equivalent citations: AIR 1997 Ker 121 Author: P Mohammed Bench: P Mohammed

Microlight aircrafts or hang gliders shall not be flown over an assembly of persons or over congested areas or restricted areas including cantonment areas, defence installations etc. unless prior permission in writing is obtained from appropriate authorities. These provisions do not create any restrictions. There is no total prohibition of operation of microlight aircraft or hang gliders. The distinction between 'regulation' and 'restriction' must be clearly perceived. The 'regulation' is a process which aids main function within the legal precinct whereas 'restriction' is a process which prevents the function without legal sanction. Regulation is allowable but restriction is objectionable. What is contained in the impugned clauses is, only regulations and not restrictions, complete or partial. They are issued with authority conferred on the first respondent, under Rule 133A of the Aircraft Rules consistent with the provisions contained in the Aircraft Act 1934 relating to the operation, use etc. of aircrafts flying in India.

#### "Financial incentives for energy production" involve the exchange of money for production.

Book 11 [Managing Director, ClearView Energy Partners, LLC]

Kevin, Testimony before U.S. HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

SUBCOMMITTEES ON SELECT REVENUE MEASURES AND OVERSIGHT, SEPTEMBER 22, http://waysandmeans.house.gov/UploadedFiles/Booktestimony922.pdf

Incentive cost ratios, implied abatement costs and implied displacement costs offer three possible ways to measure the performance of **federal financial incentives for energy production** and consumption. Metrics of this sort could be used to prioritize spending – dynamically, perhaps through a reverse auction – or through legislated formulas **that balance incentives for high-yield, low-cost sources with high-potential, emerging sources.** Fuels or technologies that consistently fall short of established benchmarks may require a different type of government financial intervention (e**.g. manufacturing assistance or pre-competitive R&D** in place of production **tax credits**) or a different mode of financial support (e.g. loan guaranteesinstead of tax credits **or deductions)**.

#### The affirmative is an indirect regulation that effects but does not restrict electricity output- The incentive is for construction not production- Topical affs have to pay out per kilowatt hour

#### Vote neg-

#### Limits- They open up the entirety of the energy policy- Unreasonable research burden no core neg ground and ridiculous tangentially related affs to some kind of incentives
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#### Obama is in perfect position on the debt ceiling

Klein 1-2 [Ezra Klein 1-2-2013 Washington Post “Calm down, liberals. The White House won” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/01/02/calm-down-liberals-the-white-house-got-a-good-deal-on-the-fiscal-cliff/]

Fourth, I don’t think the White House has a shred of credibility when they say they won’t negotiate over the debt ceiling. They may not call what they’re about to do negotiating over the debt ceiling, but that’ll be what they’re doing. That said, I’m quite convinced that they don’t intend to be held hostage over the debt ceiling. As a former constitutional law professor, the president sees himself as a steward of the executive branch and is deeply hostile to setting the precedent that congressional minorities can hold presidents hostage through the debt ceiling. At some point in the coming talks, Boehner or McConnell or both are going to realize that the White House really, seriously will not accept a bargain in which what they “got” was an increase in the debt limit, and so they’re going to have to decide at that point whether to crash the global economy.¶ Fifth, the constellation of economic interest groups that converge on Washington understands the debt ceiling better than they did in 2011, are becoming more and more tired of congress’s tendency to negotiate by threatening to trigger economic catastrophes, and is getting better at knowing who to blame. It’s not a meaningless sign that John Engler, the former Republican Governor of Michigan who now leads the Business Roundtable, called for a five-year solution to the debt ceiling. ¶ It’s worth keeping this in perspective: All it means is that the White House can potentially demand a perfectly reasonable compromise of one dollar in revenue-generating tax reform for every dollar in spending cuts. When you add in the fiscal cliff deal, and the 2011 Budget Control Act, that’ll still mean that the total deficit reduction enacted over the last few years tilts heavily towards spending, particularly once you account for reduced war costs. ¶ But that is, arguably, another reason that the White House isn’t in such a bad position here: They’ve set up a definition of success that will sound reasonable to most people — a dollar in tax reform for a dollar in spending cuts — while the Republicans have a very unreasonable sounding definition, in which they get huge cuts to Medicare or they force the United States into default. So while it’s possible that the White House will crumble, rendering itself impotent in negotiations going forward, and while it’s possible that the we’ll breach the debt ceiling, both possibilities seem less likely than Republicans agreeing to a deal that pairs revenue-generating tax reform with spending cuts.

#### Airborne wind is controversial in Congress – cost, wake of Solyndra,

JIM KOZUBEK NOVEMBER 4, 2011, Airborne Wind Energy Industry Struggles To Flyhttp://idealab.talkingpointsmemo.com/2011/11/airborne-wind-energy-industry-struggles-to-take-off.php

One hurdle the nascent industry has to surmount, as most emerging technologies and industries do, is regulation. The Federal Aviation Administration is currently weighing a decision as to whether to allow such tethered gliders to operate. So far a ruling appears at least a year away, Shepard said. ¶ For its part, Makani to date has burned through most of its working capital, and is nearing completion of its 18-month ARPA-E grant-funded pilot project. And while the nascent industry awaits an FAA ruling, investors have been skittish of sinking capital into technology.¶ Sky WindPower was named by TIME Magazine as one of the top 50 top inventions of 2008, but has yet to land investment capital; Dmitri Cherny, founder of energy glider developer Highest Wind, was the darling of New Hampshire’s Speed Venture Summit in 2009, only to come away empty-handed from scores of meetings in venture capital circuits in New Hampshire and South Carolina. ¶ “There have been only a few limited proofs of aspects of whole concepts because these are expensive undertakings requiring more than just angel and vc support,” Shepard said. “As with development of all new energy supplies and the systems to support the capture of energy that have preceded this new energy field, governments will have to provide additional support.”¶

---

Whether justified or not, the current environment for that kind of support doesn’t look encouraging. The emerging clean tech sector now faces a more skeptical public and congress in the wake of the bankruptcy of the solar panel company Solyndra. And DOE and ARPA-E’s loan programs are under investigation by the department’s inspector general. ¶ Nevertheless, Cherny has filed for a small government grant and says he plans to move his company to Lake Marion in South Carolina this spring. Airborne devices generate “a lot of electricity at a minimal impact,” he said.

#### Obama PC is key - failure collapses the global economy

Maass 1-2 [Harold Maass 1-2-2013 The Week “The looming debt-ceiling fight: Worse than the fiscal cliff?” http://theweek.com/article/index/238312/the-looming-debt-ceiling-fight-worse-than-the-fiscal-cliff]

Since the agreement heading for Obama's desk doesn't raise the debt ceiling, which we've already hit, says Zachary A. Goldfarb at The Washington Post, it leaves "the Treasury to use what it calls 'extraordinary measures' as long as it can to pay the government's bills." When the bean counters run out of tricks, we could face a "catastrophic default" if Congress doesn't act fast.¶ In many ways, the threat of default in two months is a more serious risk than the Jan. 1 fiscal cliff deadline. If Congress does not increase the debt ceiling, the government will quickly run out of ways to pay the nation's bills and make interest payments on the nation’s outstanding debt. Any failure by the government to meet its financial obligations could be seen as a default, shaking world financial markets, given the special role that U.S. government bonds play in the global economy.¶ Obama is still smarting from the 2011 debt-ceiling dispute, says Neil Munro at The Daily Caller. In that fight, "the GOP eventually pressured him to accept spending curbs in exchange for an increase to the debt limit up to $16.4 trillion." Obama has been complaining about that defeat ever since, and he's vowing not to let it happen again. But the GOP-led House is adamant about using "its authority over the nation's debt ceiling to pressure Obama to shrink future spending."

#### Economic decline causes nuclear conflict

Mathew J. Burrows (counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC), PhD in European History from Cambridge University) and Jennifer Harris (a member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit) April 2009 “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” http://www.twq.com/09april/docs/09apr\_Burrows.pdf

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

### OFF

The United States Congress should immediately establish a government-wide staged-process Quadrennial Energy Review to recommend goals, priorities and actions for implementation of a national energy policy, immediately establish a deadline for completion of each stage by February 1st of each year, with a deadline for completion of the entire review by February 1st, 2014, and every subsequent four years and immediately provide all necessary support for expedited build up of relevant analytic capabilities.

The Executive Secretariat of the review should immediately establish a policy determination to provide full support for making a recommendation to substantially increase funding for a competitive matching fund for airborne wind energy production in the United States and reduce airspace restrictions on airborne wind energy production in the United States

a top priority of the first stage of the review.

#### CP competes – it tests the word “resolved” which means “to make a firm decision about”, the word “should” which is “used to imply obligation or duty”

[American Heritage Dictionary at dictionary.com]

#### The CP is a distinct option from the plan and overcomes agency conflict- also avoids politics and provides greater certainty

Moniz 12 [Ernest Moniz, Cecil and Ida Green Professor of Physics and Engineering Systems and Director of the Energy Initiative at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Former Clinton Administration Under Secretary of the Department of Energy and as Associate Director for Science in the Office of Science and Technology Policy ; serves on the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, Spring 2012, Stimulating Energy Technology Innovation, Daedalus, Vol. 141, No. 2, Pages 81-93]

It should come as no surprise that I do not have the answers for how the government should intersect the latter stages of the innovation process in a general sense. However, PCAST recommended a pragmatic approach to an integrated federal energy policy that would employ all the tools available to the government in a coherent way. Termed **the** Quadrennial Energy Review (**QER**), the process is necessarily complex, but **history suggests** that **anything short of a full multiagency effort is unlikely to provide a robust plan that accounts for the many threads of an energy policy**. Furthermore, a degree of analysis is required that has not been present in previous efforts.¶ Energy policy is derivative of many policies: environment, technology and competitiveness, diplomacy and security, natural resources, and land and food, among many others. Indeed, multiple agencies that are not labeled “energy” have major equities and long-held perspectives on key elements of energy policy. Often, the preferred policies for different agencies’ agendas conflict. Further, states and local governments play a strong role, for example with building codes, and their approaches can vary dramatically in different parts of the country; certainly, California’s energy policies have influenced the national market. The tools available to support innovation are also diverse, ranging from direct support of RD&D to a variety of economic incentives, regulation, standards, and federal procurement, among other instruments. Congress is equally fragmented: in the House of Representatives and Senate, many committees beyond those tasked with energy policy have equities that mirror those of the different executive agencies. **To overcome this fragmentation** of responsibilities and perspectives, and **especially if the goal is a plan that has staying power in advancing adoption and diffusion, PCAST recommended a QER process** to provide a multiyear roadmap that:¶• lays out an integrated view of short-, intermediate-, and long-term objectives for Federal energy policy in the context of economic, environmental, and security priorities;¶ • outlines **legislative proposals** to Congress;¶ • puts forward anticipated Executive actions (programmatic, regulatory, fiscal, and so on) coordinated across multiple agencies;¶ • **identifies resource requirements** for the RD&D programs **and** for innovation **incentive programs**; and, most important,¶ • provides a strong analytical base.14¶ This is a tall order intellectually and organizationally. Several process elements are essential to fostering a chance for success. First, the Executive Office of the President (eop) must use its convening power to ensure effective cooperation among the myriad relevant agencies. However, the capacity to carry out such an exercise and to sustain it does not (and should not) reside in the eop. The doe is the logical home for a substantial Executive Secretariat supporting the eop interagency process that would present decision recommendations to the president. However, the scope of the analytical capability needed does not currently reside at the doe or any other agency. The doe needs to build this capability, presumably supplemented by contractor support to gather data, develop and run models, and carry out analysis, such as independent energy-system engineering and economic analysis. Market trends and prices would be part of the analysis, including international markets and robust analyses of uncertainty. The Energy Information Administration can help with some data gathering and models, but its independence from the policy function needs to be preserved. The national laboratories also lack this range of functions, and tasking them with providing the analytical support to the policy process would be regarded as a conflict of interest; their focus is best directed at research, invention, and technology transfer. Building this analysis capacity is a large job that will take time.¶ For the QER to succeed, the government must seek substantial input from many quarters in a transparent way; certainly, ongoing dialogue with Congress and the energy industry are essential. The good news is that members of Congress have supported the development of the QER as a way to present a coherent **starting point for congressional action across many committees.** A hope is that **Congress could then use the QER as a basis for** a four or five-year **authorization that would provide the private sector with the increased confidence needed to make sound clean energy investment decisions**.¶ Given the magnitude of the task, PCAST recommended in 2011 that the doe carry out a Quadrennial Technology Review (qtr)–a first step centered in a single department and focused on technology. The qtr resulted in a rebalancing of the R&D portfolio toward the oil dependence challenge through advanced vehicle development, particularly transportation electrification. The key now will be to extend the processes developed for the qtr to the multiagency QER, involving the eop in a leadership role. Taking the next steps in 2012 will maintain momentum and establish the capabilities needed for the QER by early 2015, the time frame recommended by PCAST.¶ While some may view 2015 as a frustratingly long time away, the alternative is to rely on wishes rather than analysis while failing to gain multiple perspectives in a fair and open manner. **Rushing the process will result in a poorly done job that will not accomplish** any of the **key** QER **goals**. Certainly, **it will not bring together succeeding administrations and Congresses around a** reasonably **shared vision** and set of objectives **that can accelerate innovation in service of national competitiveness and environmental and security goals. Continuing with fragmented** and economically inefficient **policies, technologies “du jour,” and frequent shifts will complicate private-sector decisions rather than facilitate innovation**. The government unavoidably plays a strong role in the innovation process, even when this is unacknowledged in policy and political debates. The issue now is to present both a set of principles and fact-based analyses supporting coordinated government-wide actions that earn decent buy-in from major stakeholders.

#### The CP solves better- agency coordination

SEPI 2012 [Strategic Energy Policy Initiative November 2012 Bipartisan Policy Center “The Executive Branch ¶ and National Energy ¶ Policy: Time for ¶ Renewal” http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/BPC\_Governance\_Report\_0.pdf]

To address the problems of focus, coordination, and execution that have hampered past ¶ efforts to develop and implement effective national energy policy, the Strategic Energy ¶ Policy Initiative recommends a new approach. The initiative’s proposal combines a highlevel National Energy Strategy with a companion Quadrennial Energy Review, as described ¶ in more detail below. This process is intended to mirror the approach currently used to ¶ develop U.S. national security policy, wherein the executive branch prepares a high-level ¶ National Security Strategy (NSS) outlining major security concerns confronting the nation ¶ and plans for addressing them. The NSS document is purposefully short (the latest version ¶ was 128 pages), to the point, and general in content. The implementation details are ¶ provided separately in supporting documents, including notably the Quadrennial Defense ¶ Review (QDR), which is prepared by the Department of Defense.¶ 21¶ ¶ Similarly, the Strategic Energy Policy Initiative recommends that administrations rely on the ¶ expertise of existing federal agencies and on the leadership and coordination capacities that ¶ exist within the EOP. Given the complexities of the energy ecosystem; the diffuse roles and ¶ responsibilities for decision making that exist within the federal government, the Congress, ¶ and the broader economy; and the international dimensions of most important energy ¶ challenges, this effort will require high-level leadership (e.g., Senate-confirmed Cabinet ¶ members or heads of agencies), extensive technical expertise, effective cross-agency ¶ coordination, and broad consultation with states and energy stakeholders.

### OFF

#### The aff attempts to manage the world render Earth and its inhabitants as objects, awaiting USFG action. This dualism renders everything a resource at humanity’s disposal

McWhorter 92 (Ladelle, Professor of Philosophy and Women’s Studies at Richmond, Heidegger and the earth: Essays in environmental philosophy, Thomas Jefferson University Press, pp. 6)

The danger of a managerial approach to the world lies not, then, in what it knows - not in its penetration into the secrets of galactic emergence or nuclear fission - but in what it forgets, what it itself conceals. It forgets that any other truths are possible, and it forgets that the belonging together of revealing with concealing is forever beyond the power of human manage­ment. We can never have, or know, it all; we can never manage everything. What is now especially dangerous about this sense of our own managerial power, born of forgetfulness, is that it results in our viewing the world as mere resources to be stored or consumed. Managerial or technological thinkers, Heidegger says, view the earth, the world, all things as mere Bestand, standing-reserve. All is here simply for human use. No plant, no animal, no ecosystem has a life of its own, has any significance, apart from human desire and need. Nothing, we say, other than human beings, has any intrinsic value. All things are instruments for the working out of human will. Whether we believe that God gave Man dominion or simply that human might (sometimes called intelligence or rationality) in the face of ecological fragility makes us always right, we managerial, technological thinkers tend to believe that the earth is only a stockpile or a set of commodities to be managed, bought, and sold. The forest is timber; the river, a power source. Even people have become resources, human resources, personnel to be managed, or populations to be controlled. This managerial, technological mode of revealing, Heidegger says, is embedded in and constitutive of Western culture and has been gathering strength for centuries. Now it is well on its way to extinguishing all other modes of revealing, all other ways of being human and being earth. It will take tremendous effort to think through this danger, to think past it and beyond, tremendous courage and resolve to allow thought of the mystery to come forth; thought of the inevitability, along with revealing, of conceal­ment, of loss, of ignorance; thought of the occurring of things and their passage as events not ultimately under human control. And of course even the call to allow this thinking - couched as it so often must he in a grammatical imperative appealing to an agent - is itself a paradox, the first that must be faced and allowed to speak to us and to shatter us as it scatters thinking in new directions, directions of which we have not yet dreamed, directions of which we may never dream

#### There is no end- Try or die

Beckman 2k [Tad: Emeritus Professor of Philosophy, Humanities and Social Sciences at Harvey Mudd College, “Martin Heidegger and Environmental Ethics,” http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/Heidart.html].

The threat of nuclear annihilation is, currently, the most dramatic and ironic sign of technology's "success" and of its overwhelming power; mass itself has been grasped as a standing-reserve of enormous energy. On the one hand we consider ourselves, rightfully, the most advanced humans that have peopled the earth but, on the other hand, we can see, when we care to, that our way of life has also become the most profound threat to life that the earth has yet witnessed. [(14)](http://thuban.ac.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/Heidart.html#N_14_) Medical science and technology have even begun to suggest that we may learn enough about disease and the processes of aging in the human body that we might extend individual human lives indefinitely. In this respect, we have not only usurped the gods' rights of creation and destruction of species, but we may even usurp the most sacred and terrifying of the gods' rights, the determination of mortality or immortality. The gods, it is true, have been set aside in our time; they are merely antiquated conceptions. The gods, it is true, have been set aside in our time; they are merely antiquated conceptions. The "withdrawal of the gods" is a sign of our pervasive power and our progressive "ego-centrism." **The human ego stands at the center of everything and, indeed, sees no other thing or object with which it must reckon on an equal footing. We have become alone in the universe in the most profound sense. Looking outward, we see only ourselves in so far as we see only objects standing-in-reserve for our dispositions.** It is no wonder that we have "ethical problems" with our environment because the whole concept of the environment has been profoundly transformed. **A major portion of the environment in which modern Westerners live, today, is the product of human fabrication and this makes it ever more difficult for us to discover a correct relationship with that portion of the environment that is still given to us. It is all there to be taken, to be manipulated, to be used and consumed,** it seems. But what in that conception limits us or hinders us from using it in any way that we wish? **There is nothing that we can see today that really hinders us from doing anything with the environment, including if we wish destroying it completely and for all time.** This, I take it is the challenge of environmental ethics, the challenge of finding a way to convince ourselves that there are limits of acceptable human action where the environment is involved. But where can we look for the concepts that we need to fabricate convincing arguments?

#### Our alternative is to detach and release- this means a reorientation of how we relate to the world and the beings within it.

Sabatino 07 [Charles J.: professor of philosophy at Daemen College “A Heideggerian Reflection on the Prospects of Technology” reprinted in Janus Head 10(1) www.janushead.org/10-1/sabatino.pdf p. 72-73].
The point of seeing the danger is not that we then retreat from the enterprise of technology. Quite to the contrary, the danger haunting the technological era is that there is no retreat. However, it is precisely this realization that can turn our heads around and bring us to go forward in a manner Heidegger refers to as releasement. Releasement represents a form of letting go, but not in the sense of surrendering to the inevitable, or dismantling it; or merely leaving things alone.10 Releasement is similar to the Buddhist notion of detachment. To detach (*de-tache*: unstake, let loose from being tied down) is to set something free. Detachment does not leave things alone, for so long as we dwell within the world and its network of relatedness, there is nothing alone. However, it represents a way of relating and thus a way of handling things that no longer clings, possesses, holds on, and claims as one’s own. To detach and release represents a reversal that learns to let things be what they are. It does so by handling what is in a way that respects that though everything is available and accessible, though it is all laid forth before us, nevertheless, it is not ours to possess sand do with as we will simply because we can. Things are what they are and not simply what we demand them to be. This is no small matter in a world where everything has become a resource to fuel the machinery that produces what we want, where nothing is respected except for what it can be taken up and used for, where there is little meaning or value to anything except as material, energy, even information that can be mobilized and put to work to suit our purposes. Even people, in so many instances, are caught up and swept up into the routines of usefulness, only to be marginalized with no place to belong when no longer useful. Heidegger did not spell out with any clarity the specific kinds of technology an attitude of releasement would have us develop or how we would use it differently. Nevertheless, it would have to be consistent with our belonging within the world; and so we could speculate that we would proceed in a way that works with, not against nature, works with and not against one another, works with and not against the interdependencies that find us all connected and thus vulnerable within a shared world. Releasement need not abandon what is possible with the genome, the stem cell; but it would have us approach such areas of research with a hand that remains open: not in the manner of taking, but as receiving and thus grateful before all that is granted and all that becomes possible. It would proceed as the steadied and care-ful hands of the micro-biologist who is astounded, thus humbled, by the world that opens before him[/her]. It would proceed, seeking to bring hope where there is suffering and pain, yet thankful for the miracle of those healing energies of life itself that make it all possible. It would proceed with the diligence and care of the parent, proud yet humbled, frightened yet ready to care. The difference would play a basic role not only in the kinds of technol­ogy we develop, but also in the purposes to which we put that technology. Do we see ourselves at the center of a world that is increasingly at our disposal, in which nothing else matters but what we will to do, becoming ever more powerful and able to extend what we can control, what we can produce and consume without limits, as though entitled to do so? Do we continue to develop and use technology to enhance the advantage of some regardless of the expense to others? Do we proceed with technology blindly believing that every problem can be fixed with technology itself? Or, do we see ourselves as uniquely destined to a level of responsibility and care toward one another and the earth that is frightening precisely in the power that has been given over to us? And therefore, do we see ourselves as needing to consider how what we do with technology impacts one another as well as the earth that births and sustains us as all belonging together within the shared gift of world?

### Hegemony

#### Regional Regimes solve your impact now- hegemony causes balancing that breaks them up

Barry R. Posen is Ford International Professor of Political Science and director of the security studies program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The American Interest November/December 2007 “The Case for Restraint” http://www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=331

Whatever else it may achieve, U.S. activism is bound to discomfit other states. The great preponderance of U.S. power makes direct opposition to the United States difficult and dangerous, but other states are doing what they can to put themselves in a better position. Some fear U.S. freedom of action, worry about the possibility of being drawn into policies inimical to their interests, and so wish to distance themselves from the United States—even as they free-ride within the broader U.S. security umbrella. The European Union has gradually strengthened its military capabilities so that it can get along without the United States if it must. Others fear that U.S. policies will harm their interests indirectly, and look for ways to concert their power, as Russia and China have done in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization. Still others expect U.S. attentions to be directed straight at them, and so they seek to improve their abilities to deter U.S. military action or fight the United States directly if they must. North Korea and Iran pursue nuclear weapons for those purposes. Iran also has developed a conventional capability to inflict costs on U.S. forces in the Gulf and has been implicated in inflicting such costs in Iraq. To the extent that the United States continues its current activist policy path, these reactions will continue and will slowly increase the costs of future U.S. activism. They will also reduce the propensity of others to share these costs.

#### Empirically proven

Christopher J. Fettweis (Professor of national security affairs @ U.S. Naval War College) 2010 “Threat and Anxiety in US Foreign Policy,” Survival, Volume 52, Issue 2 April 2010 , pages 59 – 82

One potential explanation for the growth of global peace can be dismissed fairly quickly: US actions do not seem to have contributed much. The limited evidence suggests that there is little reason to believe in the stabilising power of the US hegemon, and that there is no relation between the relative level of American activism and international stability. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defence spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defence in real terms than it had in 1990, a 25% reduction.29 To internationalists, defence hawks and other believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible 'peace dividend' endangered both national and global security. 'No serious analyst of American military capabilities', argued neo-conservatives William Kristol and Robert Kagan in 1996, 'doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America's responsibilities to itself and to world peace'.30 And yet the verdict from the 1990s is fairly plain: the world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable US military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums; no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races; no regional balancing occurred once the stabilis-ing presence of the US military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in US military capabilities. Most of all, the United States was no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Bill Clinton, and kept declining as the George W. Bush administration ramped the spending back up. Complex statistical analysis is unnecessary to reach the conclusion that world peace and US military expenditure are unrelated.

#### Unipolarity fosters conflict

Nuno P. Monteiro is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yale University “Unrest Assured Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful” International Security Volume 36, Number 3, Winter 2011/12 Project Muse

Wohlforth further argued that a durable unipolar world is also a peaceful world. In his view, “the existing distribution of capabilities generates incentives for cooperation.”13 U.S. power preponderance not only ends hegemonic rivalry but gives the United States incentives to manage security globally, limiting competition among major powers.14 This benevolent view of unipolarity, which Wohlforth developed further in World Out of Balance: International Relations and the Challenge of American Primacy with his coauthor, Stephen Brooks, emerged as one of the most influential perspectives in debates about current international politics, echoing Francis Fukuyama’s popular view of the “end of history” and the universalization of Western liberal democracy.15 The question of unipolar durability remains the subject of spirited debate. Many analysts, such as Robert Kagan, continue to argue that “American predominance is unlikely to fade any time soon.”16 Others, however, believe that it is in serious decline.17 Potential peer competitors, especially China, are on the [End Page 10] rise.18 U.S. travails in Afghanistan and Iraq seem to confirm Paul Kennedy’s argument on the inevitability of imperial overstretch,19 and some see the financial crisis that began in 2008 as the death knell of U.S. predominance.20 Given all of these factors, Robert Pape argues that “the unipolar world is indeed coming to an end.”21 In contrast, the question of unipolar peacefulness has received virtually no attention. Although the past decade has witnessed a resurgence of security studies, with much scholarship on such conflict-generating issues as terrorism, preventive war, military occupation, insurgency, and nuclear proliferation, no one has systematically connected any of them to unipolarity. This silence is unjustified. The first two decades of the unipolar era have been anything but peaceful. U.S. forces have been deployed in four interstate wars: Kuwait in 1991, Kosovo in 1999, Afghanistan from 2001 to the present, and Iraq between 2003 and 2010.22 In all, the United States has been at war for thirteen of the twenty-two years since the end of the Cold War.23 Put another way, the first two decades of unipolarity, which make up less than 10 percent of U.S. history, account for more than 25 percent of the nation’s total time at war.24 And yet, the theoretical consensus continues to be that unipolarity encourages peace. Why? To date, scholars do not have a theory of how unipolar systems operate.25 The debate on whether, when, and how unipolarity will end (i.e., the debate on durability) has all but monopolized our attention. [End Page 11]

#### Hegemony doesn’t solve war – causes instability and prolif – drags US in causes bigger conflicts

Ben Friedman (research fellow in defense and homeland security, Cato. PhD candidate in political science, MIT) July 2010 “Military Restraint and Defense Savings” 20 July 2010, http://www.cato.org/testimony/ct-bf-07202010.html

Another argument for high military spending is that U.S. military hegemony underlies global stability. Our forces and alliance commitments dampen conflict between potential rivals like China and Japan, we are told, preventing them from fighting wars that would disrupt trade and cost us more than the military spending that would have prevented war. The theoretical and empirical foundation for this claim is weak. It overestimates both the American military's contribution to international stability and the danger that instability abroad poses to Americans. In Western Europe, U.S. forces now contribute little to peace, at best making the tiny odds of war among states there slightly more so.7 Even in Asia, where there is more tension, the history of international relations suggests that without U.S. military deployments potential rivals, especially those separated by sea like Japan and China, will generally achieve a stable balance of power rather than fight. In other cases, as with our bases in Saudi Arabia between the Iraq wars, U.S. forces probably create more unrest than they prevent. Our force deployments can also generate instability by prompting states to develop nuclear weapons. Even when wars occur, their economic impact is likely to be limited here.8 By linking markets, globalization provides supply alternatives for the goods we consume, including oil. If political upheaval disrupts supply in one location, suppliers elsewhere will take our orders. Prices may increase, but markets adjust. That makes American consumers less dependent on any particular supply source, undermining the claim that we need to use force to prevent unrest in supplier nations or secure trade routes.9 Part of the confusion about the value of hegemony comes from misunderstanding the Cold War. People tend to assume, falsely, that our activist foreign policy, with troops forward supporting allies, not only caused the Soviet Union's collapse but is obviously a good thing even without such a rival. Forgotten is the sensible notion that alliances are a necessary evil occasionally tolerated to balance a particularly threatening enemy. The main justification for creating our Cold War alliances was the fear that Communist nations could conquer or capture by insurrection the industrial centers in Western Europe and Japan and then harness enough of that wealth to threaten us — either directly or by forcing us to become a garrison state at ruinous cost. We kept troops in South Korea after 1953 for fear that the North would otherwise overrun it. But these alliances outlasted the conditions that caused them. During the Cold War, Japan, Western Europe and South Korea grew wealthy enough to defend themselves. We should let them. These alliances heighten our force requirements and threaten to drag us into wars, while providing no obvious benefit.

#### States are willing to retrench- the transition is smooth even if it’s a fast collapse

Paul K. MacDonald is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Williams College and Joseph M. Parent is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami Spring 2011 International Security “Graceful Decline? The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment” Volume 35 Number 4 pg 7-44

This article has advanced three main arguments. First, retrenchment pessimists are incorrect when they suggest that retrenchment is an uncommon policy response to great power decline. States often curtail their commitments and mellow their ambitions as they fall in the ranks of great powers. Second and related, declining great powers react in a prompt and proportionate manner to their dwindling fortunes. They do this for the same reason that they tend to seize opportunities to expand: international incentives are strong inducements. [End Page 43] In the high-stakes world of great power politics, states can seldom afford to fool themselves or pamper parochial interests when relative power is perilously slipping away. Third, the rate of relative decline explains not only the extent of retrenchment but also the form. The faster the rate of decline, the more likely states are to reform their militaries, increase reliance on allies, and refrain from using force in international disputes. Taken together, these findings suggest that retrenchment is an attractive strategy for dealing with great power decline. Although we make no claim that the rate of relative decline explains everything, we suggest that our study represents a solid first cut and that domestic political factors loom too large in discussions of power transitions and hegemonic change. Retrenchment has a bad reputation, but our findings suggest its benefits are overlooked. Competition spurs states to improve themselves, and if done intelligently this makes states better. The historical record gives little cause for despair; spending can be curbed, interest groups controlled, and innovation fostered. And there is a fair chance of rebound; declining powers rise to the challenge of decline so well that they recapture their former glory with some regularity. Of course, it may be unwise to speak these conclusions too loudly. Some of the invigorating effects of decline may depend on the pervasive pessimism it arouses. [End Page 44]

#### Smooth decline now- fighting to maintain power causes more conflict

Adam Quinn Lecturer in International Politics at the University of Birmingham International Affairs 87:4 (2011) 803–824 “The art of declining politely: Obama’s prudent presidency and the waning of American power” http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/87\_4quinn.pdf

As noted in the opening passages of this article, the narratives of America’s decline and Obama’s restraint are distinct but also crucially connected. Facing this incipient period of decline, America’s leaders may walk one of two paths. Either the nation can come to terms with the reality of the process that is under way and seek to finesse it in the smoothest way possible. Or it can ‘rage against the dying of the light’, refusing to accept the waning of its primacy. President Obama’s approach, defined by restraint and awareness of limits, makes him ideologically and temperamentally well suited to the former course in a way that, to cite one example, his predecessor was not. He is, in short, a good president to inaugurate an era of managed decline. Those who vocally demand that the President act more boldly are not merely criticizing him; in suggesting that he is ‘weak’ and that a ‘tougher’ policy is needed, they implicitly suppose that the resources will be available to support such a course. In doing so they set their faces against the reality of the coming American decline. 97 If the United States can embrace the spirit of managed decline, then this will clear the way for a judicious retrenchment, trimming ambitions in line with the fact that the nation can no longer act on the global stage with the wide latitude once afforded by its superior power. As part of such a project, it can, as those who seek to qualify the decline thesis have suggested, use the significant resources still at its disposal to smooth the edges of its loss of relative power, preserving influence to the maximum extent possible through whatever legacy of norms and institutions is bequeathed by its primacy. The alternative course involves the initiation or escalation of conflictual scenarios for which the United States increasingly lacks the resources to cater: provocation of a military conclusion to the impasse with Iran; deliberate escalation of strategic rivalry with China in East Asia; commitment to continuing the campaign in Afghanistan for another decade; a costly effort to consistently apply principles of military interventionism, regime change and democracy promotion in response to events in North Africa. President Obama does not by any means represent a radical break with the traditions of American foreign policy in the modern era. Examination of his major foreign policy pronouncements reveals that he remains within the mainstream of the American discourse on foreign policy. In his Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech in December 2009 he made it clear, not for the first time, that he is no pacifist, spelling out his view that ‘the instruments of war do have a role to play in preserving the peace’, and that ‘the United States of America has helped underwrite global security for more than six decades with the blood of our citizens and the strength of our arms’. 98 In his Cairo speech in June the same year, even as he sought distance from his predecessor with the proclamation that ‘no system of government can or should be imposed by one nation on any other’, he also endorsed with only slight qualification the liberal universalist view of civil liberties as transcendent human rights. ‘I … have an unyielding belief that all people yearn for certain things,’ he declared. ‘The ability to speak your mind and have a say in how you are governed; confidence in the rule of law and the equal administration of justice; government that is transparent and doesn’t steal from the people; the freedom to live as you choose. These are not just American ideas.’ 99 His Westminster speech repeated these sentiments. Evidently this is not a president who wishes to break signally with the mainstream, either by advocating a radical shrinking of America’s military strength as a good in itself or by disavowing liberal universalist global visions, as some genuine dissidents from the prevailing foreign policy discourse would wish. 100 No doubt sensibly, given the likely political reaction at home, it is inconceivable that he would explicitly declare his strategy to be one of managed American decline. Nevertheless, this is a president who, within the confines of the mainstream, embraces caution and restraint to the greatest extent that one could hope for without an epochal paradigm shift in the intellectual framework of American foreign policy-making. 101 In contemplating the diminished and diminishing weight of the United States upon the scales of global power, it is important not to conflate the question of what will be with that of what we might prefer. It may well be, as critics of the decline thesis sometimes observe, that the prospect of increased global power for a state such as China should not, on reflection, fill any westerner with glee, whatever reservations one may have held regarding US primacy. It is also important not to be unduly deterministic in projecting the consequences of American decline. It may be a process that unfolds gradually and peacefully, resulting in a new order that functions with peace and stability even in the absence of American primacy. Alternatively, it may result in conflict, if the United States clashes with rising powers as it refuses to relinquish the prerogatives of the hegemon, or continues to be drawn into wars with middle powers or on the periphery in spite of its shrinking capacity to afford them. Which outcome occurs will depend on more than the choices of America alone. But the likelihood that the United States can preserve its prosperity and influence and see its hegemony leave a positive legacy rather than go down thrashing its limbs about destructively will be greatly increased if it has political leaders disposed to minimize conflict and consider American power a scarce resource—in short, leaders who can master the art of declining politely. At present it seems it is fortunate enough to have a president who fits the bill.

#### No resource wars

Idean Salehyan (Professor of Political Science at the University of North Texas) May 2008 “From Climate Change to Conflict? No Consensus Yet\*” Journal of Peace Research, vol. 45, no. 3 http://emergingsustainability.org/files/resolver%20climate%20change%20and%20conflict.pdf

First, the deterministic view has poor predictive power as to where and when conflicts will break out. For every potential example of an environmental catastrophe or resource shortfall that leads to violence, there are many more counter-examples in which conflict never occurs. But popular accounts typically do not look at the dogs that do not bark. Darfur is frequently cited as a case where desertification led to food scarcity, water scarcity, and famine, in turn leading to civil war and ethnic cleansing.5 Yet, food scarcity and hunger are problems endemic to many countries – particularly in sub-Saharan Africa – but similar problems elsewhere have not led to large-scale violence. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, food shortages and malnutrition affect more than a third of the population in Malawi, Zambia, the Comoros, North Korea, and Tanzania,6 although none of these countries have experienced fullblown civil war and state failure. Hurricanes, coastal flooding, and droughts – which are all likely to intensify as the climate warms – are frequent occurrences which rarely lead to violence. The Asian Tsunami of 2004, although caused by an oceanic earthquake, led to severe loss of life and property, flooding, population displacement, and resource scarcity, but it did not trigger new wars in Southeast Asia. Large-scale migration has the potential to provoke conflict in receiving areas (see Reuveny, 2007; Salehyan & Gleditsch, 2006), yet most migration flows do not lead to conflict, and, in this regard, social integration and citizenship policies are particularly important (Gleditsch, Nordås & Salehyan, 2007). In short, resource scarcity, natural disasters, and long-term climatic shifts are ubiquitous, while armed conflict is rare; therefore, environmental conditions, by themselves, cannot predict violent outbreaks. Second, even if local skirmishes over access to resources arise, these do not always escalate to open warfare

 and state collapse. While interpersonal violence is more or less common and may intensify under resource pressures, sustained armed conflict on a massive scale is difficult to conduct. Meier, Bond & Bond (2007) show that, under certain circumstances, environmental conditions have led to cattle raiding among pastoralists in East Africa, but these conflicts rarely escalate to sustained violence. Martin (2005) presents evidence from Ethiopia that, while a large refugee influx and population pressures led to localized conflict over natural resources, effective resource management regimes were able to ameliorate these tensions. Both of these studies emphasize the role of local dispute-resolution regimes and institutions – not just the response of central governments – in preventing resource conflicts from spinning out of control. Martin’s analysis also points to the importance of international organizations, notably the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, in implementing effective policies governing refugee camps. Therefore, local hostilities need not escalate to serious armed conflict and can be managed if there is the political will to do so. Third, states often bear responsibility for environmental degradation and resource shortfalls, either through their own projects and initiatives or through neglect of the environment. Clearly, climate change itself is an exogenous stressor beyond the control of individual governments. However, government policies and neglect can compound the effects of climate change. Nobel Prizewinning economist Amartya Sen finds that, even in the face of acute environmental scarcities, countries with democratic institutions and press freedoms work to prevent famine because such states are accountable to their citizens (Sen, 1999). Others have similarly shown a strong relationship between democracy and protection of the environment (Li & Reuveny, 2006). Faced with global warming, some states will take the necessary steps to conserve water and land, redistribute resources to those who need them most, and develop disaster-warning and -response systems. Others will do little to respond to this threat. While a state’s level of income and technological capacity are certainly important, democracy – or, more precisely, the accountability of political leaders to their publics – is likely to be a critical determinant of how states respond to the challenge. Fourth, violent conflict is an inefficient and sub-optimal reaction to changes in the environment and resource scarcities. As environmental conditions change, several possible responses are available, although many journalists and policymakers have focused on the potential for warfare. Individuals can migrate internally or across borders, or they can invest in technological improvements, develop conservation strategies, and shift to less climate-sensitive livelihoods, among other adaptation mechanisms. Engaging in armed rebellion is quite costly and risky and requires large-scale collective action. Individuals and households are more likely to engage in simpler, personal, or smallscale coping strategies. Thus, organized violence is inefficient at the individual level. But, more importantly, armed violence against the state is used as a means to gain leverage over governments so as to gain some form of accommodation, namely, the redistribution of economic resources and political power. Organized armed violence rarely (if ever) arises spontaneously but is usually pursued when people perceive their government to be unwilling to listen to peaceful petitions. As mentioned above, rebellion does not distribute resources by itself, and protracted civil wars can have devastating effects on the economy and the natural environment, leaving fewer resources to bargain over. Thus, organized violence is inefficient at the collective level. Responsive, accountable political leaders – at all levels of government – are more likely to listen to citizen demands for greater access to resources and the means to secure their livelihoods. Political sensitivity to peaceful action can immunize states from armed insurrection.

### Warming

Tech is way more inefficient than thought AND risks global weather changes

Science Daily. 11. Gone With the Wind: Why the Fast Jet Stream Winds Cannot Contribute Much Renewable Energy After All. Nov. 30, 2011. http://www.winddaily.com/reports/High\_altitude\_winds\_have\_large\_potential\_as\_a\_source\_of\_clean\_energy\_999.html The assumption that high jet steam wind speeds in the upper atmosphere correspond to high wind power has now been challenged by researchers of the Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry in Jena, Germany. Taking into account that the high wind speeds result from the near absence of friction and not from a strong power source, Axel Kleidon and colleagues found that the maximum extractable energy from jet streams is approximately 200 times less than reported previously. Moreover, climate model simulations show that energy extraction by wind turbines from jet streams alters their flow, and this would profoundly impact the entire climate system of the planet. Jet streams are regions of continuous wind speeds greater than 25 m/s that occur at altitudes of 7-16 km. Their high speeds seem to suggest an almost unlimited source of renewable energy that would only need airborne wind energy technology to utilize it. Claims that this potential energy source could "continuously power all civilization" sparked large investments into exploitation of this potential energy resource. However, just like any other wind and weather system on Earth, jet streams are ultimately caused by the fact that the equatorial regions are heated more strongly by the sun than are polar regions. This difference in heating results in large differences in temperature and air pressure between the equator and the poles, which are the driving forces that set the atmosphere into motion and create wind. It is this differential heating that sets the upper limit on how much wind can be generated and how much of this could potentially be used as a renewable energy resource. It is well known in meteorology that the high wind speeds of jet streams result from the near absence of friction. In technical terms, this fact is referred to in meteorology as "geostrophic flow." This flow is governed by an accelerating force caused by pressure differences in the upper atmosphere, and the so-called Coriolis force arising from Earth's rotation. Because the geostrophic flow takes place in the upper atmosphere, far removed from the influence of the surface and at low air density, the slow-down by friction plays a very minor role. Hence, it takes only very little power to accelerate and sustain jet streams. "It is this low energy generation rate that ultimately limits the potential use of jet streams as a renewable energy resource," says Dr. Axel Kleidon, head of the independent Max Planck Research Group 'Biospheric Theory and Modelling'. Using this approach based on atmospheric energetics, Kleidon's group used climate model simulations to calculate the maximum rate at which wind energy can be extracted from the global atmosphere. Their estimate of a maximum of 7.5 TW (1 TW = 10^12 W, a measure for power and energy consumption) is 200-times less than previously reported and could potentially account for merely about half of the global human energy demand of 17 TW in 2010. Max Planck researchers also estimated the climatic consequences that would arise if jet stream wind power would be used as a renewable energy resource. As any wind turbine must add some drag to the flow to extract the energy of the wind and convert it into electricity, the balance of forces of the jet stream must also change as soon as energy is extracted. If 7.5 TW were extracted from jet streams as a renewable energy source, this would alter the natural balance of forces that shape the jet streams to such an extent that the driving atmospheric pressure gradient between the equator and the poles is depleted. "Such a disruption of jet stream flow would slow down the entire climate system. The atmosphere would generate 40 times less wind energy than what we would gain from the wind turbines," explains Lee Miller, first author of the study. "This results in drastic changes in temperature and weather."

#### Claims that wind power can reduce emissions are flawed – based on cooked statistics from a powerful lobby interested in maintaining the subsidy/PTC.

Walter Cudnohufsky founder and head of Walter Cudnohufsky Associates Inc. “a full-service landscape architecture and land planning firm based in Western Massachusetts with a client base in the Berkshires founder and for it’s first 20 years Director of the Conway School of landscape Design, a nationally recognized School of sustainable planning and design and avid water color painter My One-Time, Tacit Support of Industrial Wind: A Confessional

January 20, 2012 <http://www.masterresource.org/2012/01/confession-support-windpower/>

Any proof of consistent wind turbine performance is either adulterated, non-existent or lacks full accounting. The books are cooked! Vast amounts of money have corrupted, not clarified, wind development. Statistics are reported in a simplistic manner and have not been supported. Technology is simply not a savior in this case. Schumacher’s belief in appropriate-scale technology and solutions come to mind here. Today’s politicians and corporations have rarely placed themselves in favorable light, also true with industrial wind.¶ So it comes down to my having guilt for participating in expanding energy climate problems and fear for our children’s future. It is probably good that I and others have guilt and fear to motivate us. Perhaps it is why industrial wind is an emotional issue for so many?¶ That we have gone down the wrong, soon to be proven dead end, road should not be not a total surprise. In our complacency, and by not attending to the issue, we have allowed our energy and environmental policies to be hijacked and dictated by special single interest lobbyists. Instead of wise decisions based on the scientific method, we are hearing only financially sponsored platitudes and rhetoric. This multi-dimensional disaster is essentially guaranteed by this fundamental flaw in our policy making process.

#### Natural Gas industry is strong

Smith 2012 [Rebecca Smith Wall Street Journal 3-15-2012 “Cheap Natural Gas Unplugs U.S. Nuclear-Power Revival” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304459804577281490129153610.html]

Across the country, utilities are turning to natural gas to generate electricity, with 258 plants expected to be built from 2011 through 2015, federal statistics indicate. Not only are gas-fired plants faster to build than reactors, they are much less expensive. The U.S. Energy Information Administration says it costs about $978 per kilowatt of capacity to build and fuel a big gas-fired power plant, compared with $5,339 per kilowatt for a nuclear plant.¶ Already, the inexpensive natural gas is putting downward pressure on electricity costs for consumers and businesses.¶ The EIA has forecast that the nation will add 222 gigawatts of generating capacity between 2010 and 2035—equivalent to one-fifth of the current U.S. capacity. The biggest chunk of that addition—58%—will be fired by natural gas, it said, followed by renewable sources, including hydropower, at 31%, then coal at 8% and nuclear power at 4%.

#### Every renewable dollar takes money out of natural gas investment- even if it doesn’t actually make the market

Downey 2012 [Richard Downey Unatego Area Landowners Association 2012 JULY 29 “Natural Gas vs. Subsidized Renewables Is No Contest” http://eidmarcellus.org/marcellus-shale/renewables-versus-natural-gas-no-contest/11392/]

A “fractivist” ended the recent Otsego County Natural Gas Advisory Committee’s meeting by intoning the following statement: A dollar spent on natural gas is one less dollar spent on renewables.¶ Very deep, but what does this mean? It’s probably about subsidies, so let’s scroll back to Economics 101.¶ Demand determines where money is spent in free markets. However, in command-and-control societies, the money goes where the kings and commissars (the elites) deem it best. Our society is a little of both, but thankfully, still more of the former. So, in spite of loan guarantees, tax credits, state supported rebates, state mandates and quotas, direct subsidies and grants, and manipulated tariffs, renewables still fail to make the market.¶ Take solar heated homes. After decades of popularization and righteous approval, and with tons of subsidies, solar heated homes are still marginal in the United States. According to the 2010 Census (American Community Survey), there are only 38,000 in the entire country. In contrast, there are 57,000,000 homes heated with natural gas. Why? Natural gas is cheaper, more reliable, more adaptable to a mass market (i.e., scaleable), and more builder friendly. In other words, people like it.¶ This holds true for wind, biomass, hydro, wave, geothermal and other forms of renewable energy. Renewables gobble up massive subsidies and, yet, are nowhere near fossil fuel pricing. Competitive? Not even with the pork barrel.¶ But, hey, that doesn’t mean people can’t make a buck on them. Massive subsidies attract the wheeler/dealers and the crony capitalists. Never mind the business wont fly. When Uncle Sam picks up the tab, roll ‘em, and let it ride! More money where that came from, baby!

#### Natural gas cements climate leadership

**Casten 2009** (Sean Casten, president of Recycled Energy Development, December 16, 2009, “Natural gas as a near-term CO2 mitigation strategy,” Grist, http://goo.gl/b8z08)

Discussions of CO2 reduction tend to start from a presumption of near-term economic disruption coupled to long-term investment in green technology. The presumption isn’t right. The U.S. could reduce its total CO2 footprint by 14-20 percent tomorrow with no disruption in our access to energy services, without investing in any new infrastructure. The Waxman-Markey proposal to reduce CO2 emissions by 17 percent over 10 years is constrained only by its ambition. This near-term opportunity would be realized by ramping up our nation’s generation of electricity from gas and ramping down our generation from coal, taking advantage only of existing assets. Its scale and potential for immediate impact deserves consideration; even partial action towards this goal would have dramatic political and environmental consequences, establishing U.S. leadership and credibility in global climate negotiations.

#### Climate leadership five extinction threats- Biodiversity, soil erosion, ocean acidification, de-fo, pollution

**Khosla 2009** (Ashok Khosla, president of the International Union for Conservation of Nature, January 27, 2009, “A new President for the United States: We have a dream,” http://goo.gl/RQsL8)

A rejuvenated America, with a renewed purpose, commitment and energy to make its contribution once again towards a better world could well be the turning point that can reverse the current decline in the state of the global economy, the health of its life support systems and the morale of people everywhere. This extraordinary change in regime brings with it the promise of a deep change in attitudes and aspirations of Americans, a change that will lead, hopefully, to new directions in their nation’s policies and action. In particular, we can hope that from being a very reluctant partner in global discussions, especially on issues relating to environment and sustainable development, the United States will become an active leader in international efforts to address the Millennial threats now confronting civilization and even the survival of the human species. For the conservation of biodiversity, so essential to maintaining life on Earth, this promise of change has come not a moment too soon. It would be a mistake to put all of our hopes on the shoulder of one young man, however capable he might be. The environmental challenges the world is facing cannot be addressed by one country, let alone by one man. At the same time, an inspired US President guided by competent people, who does not shy away from exercising the true responsibilities and leadership his country is capable of, could do a lot to spur the international community into action. To paraphrase one of his illustrious predecessors, “the world asks for action and action now.” What was true in President Roosevelt’s America 77 years ago is even more appropriate today. From IUCN’s perspective, the first signals are encouraging. The US has seriously begun to discuss constructive engagement in climate change debates. With Copenhagen a mere 11 months away, this commitment is long overdue and certainly very welcome. Many governments still worry that if they set tough standards to control carbon emissions, their industry and agriculture will become uncompetitive, a fear that leads to a foot-dragging “you go first” attitude that is blocking progress. A positive intervention by the United States could provide the vital catalyst that moves the basis of the present negotiations beyond the narrowly defined national interests that lie at the heart of the current impasse. The logjam in international negotiations on climate change should not be difficult to break if the US were to lead the industrialized countries to agree that much of their wealth has been acquired at the expense of the environment (in this case greenhouse gases emitted over the past two hundred years) and that with the some of the benefits that this wealth has brought, comes the obligation to deal with the problems that have resulted as side-effects. With equitable entitlement to the common resources of the planet, an agreement that is fair and acceptable to all nations should be easy enough to achieve. Caps on emissions and sharing of energy efficient technologies are simply in the interest of everyone, rich or poor. And both rich and poor must now be ready to adopt less destructive technologies – based on renewables, efficiency and sustainability – both as a goal with intrinsic merit and also as an example to others. But climate is not the only critical global environmental issue that this new administration will have to deal with. Conservation of biodiversity, a crucial prerequisite for the wellbeing of all humanity, no less America, needs as much attention, and just as urgently. The United States’ self-interest in conserving living natural resources strongly converges with the global common good in every sphere: in the oceans, by arresting the precipitate decline of fish stocks and the alarming rise of acidification; on land, by regenerating the health of our soils, forests and rivers; and in the atmosphere by reducing the massive emission of pollutants from our wasteful industries, construction, agriculture and transport systems.

#### Only gas solves warming- renewables take too long

Ward 2011 (Richard Ward, director of energy initiatives at the Aspen Science Center and senior energy advisor to the UN Foundation’s Energy Future Coalition, Spring 2011, “Ally Renewables with Natural Gas,” Earth Island Journal, EBSCO)

The scientific consensus is stark: Earth systems are dangerously close to tipping points which, once crossed, could ignite negative feedback loops and catastrophic climate change beyond human capacity to remedy. Because burning hydrocarbons is the cause, many environmentalists advocate a complete ban on carbon fuel sources in favor of renewables. This is compelling until we consider the numbers. The US uses about 100 quadrillion BTUs of energy a year and emits 6 billion tons of the world’s 30 billion tons of CO2. We use nearly 40 quads of oil for transportation and about 40 quads of energy for electric power. By contrast, our production from wind and solar is only 0.5 quads. To replace the 67 quads of oil, coal, and natural gas with wind and solar would take decades. In this time, the emissions from coal and oil would drive the planet over the brink. Even if we were to able ramp up solar and wind power by 20 times our current capacity over the next 20 years, the total contribution would only be 10 percent of the energy we need. We do not have time to be purists. The renewables revolution must occur. But we must make significant cuts in the carbon emissions today — and natural gas offers the fastest way to do that. Each year, coal emits 2 billion tons of CO2 for electric power generation in the United States. Because natural gas is 50 to 70 percent more carbon efficient than coal for the same energy output, switching our coal generation to natural gas will radically reduce the nation’s emissions by up to 500 million tons of CO2 per year in the near-term (1-2 years) and by more than a billion tons per year in the medium-term (10 years). There are no other options that provide these volumes of reductions this fast. Rapidly transitioning our energy infrastructure away from coal and oil toward renewables backed up by clean burning natural gas makes good sense. Renewables emit no greenhouse gases, and when the sun is not shining and the wind is not blowing, burning natural gas creates far less health and environmental damage than coal and oil. As we expand our renewables portfolio, the natural gas electricity generation could be ratcheted back. The reason that natural gas generation can be ramped up so quickly in the US is that the infrastructure for electrical generation is sitting idle most of the time. For most of the year, the natural gas-fed electric power plants are used less than 40 percent of the time. The Congressional Research Office estimates that by simply dispatching gas ahead of coal, the US could reduce 400 million tons of CO2 per year with existing infrastructure. Just because transitioning from coal to renewables and natural gas is smart doesn’t mean it will be easy. The coal lobby will not go away quietly. They sponsor climate skep- tics, support efforts to shut down natural gas development, and flood the air space with disingenuous information. Fear is their best tool. The latest example is that leaking pipes will make a shift to natural gas more dangerous and emit more methane than staying with coal. Environmentalists must not be fooled. It is good that the EPA has raised leaking flanges and compressors as a concern, not to discredit natural gas, but to improve regulations to ensure that the gas stays in the pipes until it is burned. Coal-fired power plants remain among the top emmitters of fine particle pollution, mercury, SO2 and NOx in the country. According to the Clean Air Task Force, this pollution caused over 13,000 premature deaths in 2010, almost 10,000 hospitalizations, and more than 20,000 heart attacks. Shifting to renewables and natural gas is the patriotic thing to do because significantly more Americans die every year from coal emissions than have died in the World Trade Center at- tack and the eight years of Iraq and Afghan wars combined (nearly 11,000 fatalities).

#### Assign warming zero percent probability – flawed models and predictions

Craig D. Idso (founder and chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change) and Sherwood B. Idso (president of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change) February 2011 “Carbon Dioxide and Earth’s Future Pursuing the Prudent Path” http://www.co2science.org/education/reports/prudentpath/prudentpath.pdf

As presently constituted, earth’s atmosphere contains just slightly less than 400 ppm of the colorless and odorless gas we call carbon dioxide or CO2. That’s only four-hundredths of one percent. Consequently, even if the air's CO2 concentration was tripled, carbon dioxide would still comprise only a little over one tenth of one percent of the air we breathe, which is far less than what wafted through earth’s atmosphere eons ago, when the planet was a virtual garden place. Nevertheless, a small increase in this minuscule amount of CO2 is frequently predicted to produce a suite of dire environmental consequences, including dangerous global warming, catastrophic sea level rise, reduced agricultural output, and the destruction of many natural ecosystems, as well as dramatic increases in extreme weather phenomena, such as droughts, floods and hurricanes. As strange as it may seem, these frightening future scenarios are derived from a single source of information: the ever-evolving computer-driven climate models that presume to reduce the important physical, chemical and biological processes that combine to determine the state of earth’s climate into a set of mathematical equations out of which their forecasts are produced. But do we really know what all of those complex and interacting processes are? And even if we did -- which we don't -- could we correctly reduce them into manageable computer code so as to produce reliable forecasts 50 or 100 years into the future? Some people answer these questions in the affirmative. However, as may be seen in the body of this report, real-world observations fail to confirm essentially all of the alarming predictions of significant increases in the frequency and severity of droughts, floods and hurricanes that climate models suggest should occur in response to a global warming of the magnitude that was experienced by the earth over the past two centuries as it gradually recovered from the much-lower-than-present temperatures characteristic of the depths of the Little Ice Age. And other observations have shown that the rising atmospheric CO2 concentrations associated with the development of the Industrial Revolution have actually been good for the planet, as they have significantly enhanced the plant productivity and vegetative water use efficiency of earth's natural and agro-ecosystems, leading to a significant "greening of the earth." In the pages that follow, we present this oft-neglected evidence via a review of the pertinent scientific literature. In the case of the biospheric benefits of atmospheric CO2 enrichment, we find that with more CO2 in the air, plants grow bigger and better in almost every conceivable way, and that they do it more efficiently, with respect to their utilization of valuable natural resources, and more effectively, in the face of environmental constraints. And when plants benefit, so do all of the animals and people that depend upon them for their sustenance. Likewise, in the case of climate model inadequacies, we reveal their many shortcomings via a comparison of their "doom and gloom" predictions with real-world observations. And this exercise reveals that even though the world has warmed substantially over the past century or more -- at a rate that is claimed by many to have been unprecedented over the past one to two millennia -- this report demonstrates that none of the environmental catastrophes that are predicted by climate alarmists to be produced by such a warming has ever come to pass. And this fact -- that there have been no significant increases in either the frequency or severity of droughts, floods or hurricanes over the past two centuries or more of global warming -- poses an important question. What should be easier to predict: the effects of global warming on extreme weather events or the effects of elevated atmospheric CO2 concentrations on global temperature? The first part of this question should, in principle, be answerable; for it is well defined in terms of the small number of known factors likely to play a role in linking the independent variable (global warming) with the specified weather phenomena (droughts, floods and hurricanes). The latter part of the question, on the other hand, is ill-defined and possibly even unanswerable; for there are many factors -- physical, chemical and biological -- that could well be involved in linking CO2 (or causing it not to be linked) to global temperature. If, then, today's climate models cannot correctly predict what should be relatively easy for them to correctly predict (the effect of global warming on extreme weather events), why should we believe what they say about something infinitely more complex (the effect of a rise in the air’s CO2 content on mean global air temperature)? Clearly, we should pay the models no heed in the matter of future climate -- especially in terms of predictions based on the behavior of a non-meteorological parameter (CO2) -- until they can reproduce the climate of the past, based on the behavior of one of the most basic of all true meteorological parameters (temperature). And even if the models eventually solve this part of the problem, we should still reserve judgment on their forecasts of global warming; for there will yet be a vast gulf between where they will be at that time and where they will have to go to be able to meet the much greater challenge to which they aspire

#### Oceans resilient

Easterbrook 1995, Distinguished Fellow, Fullbright Foundation (Gregg, A Moment on Earth pg 25) MI

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

#### No proof of tipping points – we’ve recovered from worse temp increases

Thomas Fuller July 6, 2010. “Global warming, uncertainty, tipping points and the precautionary principle” Environmental Policy Examiner. http://www.examiner.com/environmental-policy-in-national/global-warming-uncertainty-tipping-points-and-the-precautionary-principle

Others are more optimistic, and say that if we act right now, but really right now, we can avoid crossing the line and making permanent changes. They say that because we don't know where the tipping point really is and because we do not know the extent of damage that could be caused by a permanently warmer planet, the Precautionary Principle more or less compels us to take drastic action to fight climate change. There are opposing arguments to this. One of the best arguments against the Precautionary Principle is the error it led us into the last time it was used. Then Vice President Dick Cheney argued that if there was even a 1% chance that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, then it was important to us to invade Iraq, find the weapons and institute regime change. What's important to understand about that is that Cheney was wrong, not because Hussein didn't have WMD. He was wrong in his application of logic. The first step in dealing with this type of situation is reducing the uncertainty in your calculations. For Cheney, this would have meant first, quantifying the type and amounts of WMD Hussein might realistically possess, Hussein's realistic delivery options for WMD, and his propensity to use them. Second, in a Strangelovian way, Cheney would have used existing Pentagon scenarios to calculate the damage to life and the political framework of the Middle East if Husseing used these weapons and compared it very cold-bloodedly to the losses certain to result from our intervention. The problem is Cheney didn't do any of the math. He merely pronounced that Hussein's possible possession of WMD meant that a Tipping Point had already been reached, and that the Precautionary Principle mandated our intervention. But pronouncing it doesn't make it so. There are solid philosophical arguments against both the Tipping Point and the Precautionary Principle, and well-educated and intelligent people on both sides of the fence. And this argument extends to the application of both concepts to climate change. One argument from skeptics is that the Earth has warmed before without reaching a Tipping Point. It may have been warmer than today during Medieval Times, and it certainly has been warmer for most of the period since the end of the last Ice Age. And yet temperatures did eventually decline. In the more remote past, temperatures were dramatically warmer during several periods, but again, temperatures declined. Another argument is that if we rigorously applied the Precautionary Principle to poorly understood phenomena, we would halt all technological progress and innovation. If our society is paralysed by fear of the unknown, we may reject the next invention that might dramatically improve our lives.What disturbs me is that we are willing to discuss in endless detail with incredible amounts of name-calling the causes and effects of global warming, without discussing the validity of using Tipping Points and the Precautionary Principle as guiding lights for how we should react. From what I have seen in the popular media, the use of those terms is very Cheney-esque. People mention the existence of Tipping Points and the Precautionary Principle and assume that that closes the conversation.

### Grid

#### Cyberterror threats are exaggerated – too many vested interests for accurate predictions

Jerry Brito (senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center and directs the Technology Policy Program at George Mason University) and Tate Watkins (research associate for the Technology Policy Program and the State and Local Policy Project at George Mason University) April 26, 2011 “Loving the Cyber Bomb? The Dangers of Threat Inflation in Cybersecurity Policy” <http://mercatus.org/sites/default/files/publication/WP1124_Loving_cyber_bomb.pdf>

An industrial complex reminiscent of the Cold War‘s may be emerging in cybersecurity today. Some serious threats may exist, but we have also seen evidence of threat inflation. Alarm raised over potential cyber threats has led to a cyber industry build-up and political competition over cyber pork. 1. Build-up In many cases, those now inflating the scope and probability of cyber threats might well benefit from increased regulation and more government spending on information security. Cybersecurity is a big and booming industry.163 The U.S. government is expected to spend $10.5 billion per year on information security by 2015, and analysts have estimated the worldwide market to be as much as $140 billion per year.164 The Department of Defense has also said it is seeking more than $3.2 billion in cybersecurityfunding for 2012.16In recent years, in addition to traditional information security providers like MacAfee, Symantec, and Checkpoint, defense contractors and consulting firms have recognized lucrative opportunities in cybersecurity.166 To weather probable cuts on traditional defense spending, and to take advantage of the growing market, these firms have positioned themselves to compete with information security firms for government contracts.167 Lockheed Martin, Boeing, L-3 Communications, SAIC, and BAE Systems have all launched cybersecurity business divisions in recent years.168 Other traditional defense contractors, like Northrop Grumman, Raytheon, and ManTech International, have also invested in information security products and services.169 Such investments appear to have positioned defense firms well. In 2009, the top 10 information technology federal contractors included Lockheed Martin, Boeing, Northrop Grumman, General Dynamics, Raytheon, SAIC, L-3 Communications, and Booz Allen Hamilton.170 Traditional IT firms also see more opportunities to profit from cybersecurity business in both the public and private sectors.171 Earlier this year, a software security company executive noted ―a very large rise in interest in spending on computer security by the government.‖172 And as one IT market analyst put it: ―It‘s a cyber war and we‘re fighting it. In order to fight it, you need to spend more money, and some of the core beneficiaries of that trend will be the security software companies.‖173 Some companies from diverse industries have also combined forces in the cybersecurity buildup. In 2009, a combination of defense, security, and tech companies, including Lockheed, McAfee, Symantec, Cisco, Dell, Hewlett-Packard, Intel, Juniper Networks, and Microsoft, formed a cybersecurity technology alliance to study threats and innovate solutions.174 IT lobbyists, too, have looked forward to cybersecurity budget increases, to the dismay of at least one executive at a small tech firm, who claimed, ―Money gets spent on the vendors who spend millions lobbying Congress

.‖175 There are serious real online threats, and security firms, government agencies, the military, and private companies clearly must invest to protect against such threats. But as with the Cold War bomber and missile gap frenzies, we must be wary of parties with vested interests exaggerating threats, leading to unjustified and superfluous defense spending in the name of national security.

## 2NC

### For is a term of exclusion – requiring direct action upon

US CUSTOMS COURT 39 AMERICAN COLORTYPE CO. v. UNITED STATES C. D. 107, Protest 912094-G against the decision of the collector of customs at the port of New York UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT, THIRD DIVISION 2 Cust. Ct. 132; 1939 Cust. Ct. LEXIS 35

The same reasons used by the appellate court may be adopted in construing the language of the statute herein involved. If the words "for industrial use" mean no more than the words "articles of utility," there could be no reason for inserting the additional words "for industrial use" in the paragraph. Therefore, it must be held that the [\*135] new language "for industrial use" was intended to have a different meaning from the words "articles of utility," as construed in the case of Progressive Fine Arts Co. v. United States, [\*\*8] supra. Webster's New International Dictionary defines the word "industrial" as follows: Industrial. 1. Relating to industry or labor as an economic factor, or to a branch or the branches of industry; of the nature of, or constituting, an industry or industries \* \* \* . The transferring of the scenes on an oil painting to a printed copy is a branch of industry under the definition above quoted. Some of the meanings of the preposition "for" signify intent, as shown by the following definition in the same dictionary: For. 2. Indicating the end with reference to which anything is, acts, serves, or is done; as: a. As a preparation for; with the object of; in order to be, become, or act as; conducive to. \* \* \*. d. Intending, or in order, to go to or in the direction of. Therefore, the words "articles for industrial use" in paragraph 1807 imply that Congress intended to exclude from that provision articles either purchased or imported with the intention to use the same in industry for manufacturing purposes.

### Energy Production distinct from material production, transport & waste treatment

Is Cumulative Fossil Energy Demand a Useful Indicator for the Environmental Performance of Products? M A R K A . J . HUIJBREGTS , \* , † L I N D A J . A . R O M B O U T S , † S T E F A N I E H E L L W E G , ‡ R O L F F R I S C H K N E C H T , § A . J A N H E N D R I K S , † D I K V A N D E M E E N T , † , | A D M . J . R A G A S , † L U C A S R E I J N D E R S , ⊥ A N D J A A P S T R U I J S | Department of Environmental Science, Institute for Wetland and Water Research, Faculty of Science, Radboud University Nijmegen, P.O. Box 9010, NL-6500 GL Nijmegen, The Netherlands, Institute for Chemical- and Bioengineering, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zu¨rich, CH-8093 Zu¨rich, Switzerland, Ecoinvent Centre, Ueberlandstrasse 129, CH-8600 Duebendorf, Switzerland, Laboratory for Ecological Risk Assessment, National Institute of Public Health and the Environment, P.O. Box 1, NL-3720 BA, Bilthoven, The Netherlands, and Institute for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Dynamics, University of Amsterdam, Nieuwe Achtergracht 166, NL-1018 WV, Amsterdam, The Netherlands 2006 American Chemical Society VOL. 40, NO. 3, 2006 / ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY 9 641 http://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/es051689g

The appropriateness of the fossil Cumulative Energy Demand (CED) as an indicator for the environmental performance of products and processes is explored with a regression analysis between the environmental life-cycle impacts and fossil CEDs of 1218 products, divided into the product categories “energy production”, “material production”, “transport”, and “waste treatment”. Our results show that, for all product groups but waste treatment, the fossil CED correlates well with most impact categories, such as global warming, resource depletion, acidification, eutrophication, tropospheric ozone formation, ozone depletion, and human toxicity (explained variance between 46% and 100%). We conclude that the use of fossil fuels is an important driver of several environmental impacts and thereby indicative for many environmental problems. It may therefore serve as a screening indicator for environmental performance. However, the usefulness of fossil CED as a stand-alone indicator for environmental impact is limited by the large uncertainty in the product-specific fossil CEDbased impact scores (larger than a factor of 10 for the majority of the impact categories; 95% confidence interval). A major reason for this high uncertainty is nonfossil energy related emissions and land use, such as landfill leachates, radionuclide emissions, and land use in agriculture and forestry.

### 2NC Limits Overview

### Limits outweigh –

### A. Most logical—the significance of one-of-many issues is minimal. Constraints inherently increase meaning.

### B. It’s a precursor—education is inevitable, unfocused education isn’t productive. Limits determine the direction and productivity of learning.

### Small schools- Huge topic with constantly developing literature magnifies resource disparities- Big programs can have a new aff every other round- No topic generics sufficient to restore balance

### Key to fairness- essential to ensure that debates at the end of the year have meaningful clash over the mechanism

### Literally doubles the educational benefit

**Arrington 2009** (Rebecca, UVA Today, “Study Finds That Students Benefit From Depth, Rather Than Breadth, in High School Science Courses” March 4)

A recent study reports that high school students who study fewer science topics, but study them in greater depth, have an advantage in college science classes over their peers who study more topics and spend less time on each. Robert Tai, associate professor at the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education, worked with Marc S. Schwartz of the University of Texas at Arlington and Philip M. Sadler and Gerhard Sonnert of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics to conduct the study and produce the report. "Depth Versus Breadth: How Content Coverage in High School Courses Relates to Later Success in College Science Coursework" relates the amount of content covered on a particular topic in high school classes with students' performance in college-level science classes. The study will appear in the July 2009 print edition of Science Education and is currently available as an online pre-print from the journal. "As a former high school teacher, I always worried about whether it was better to teach less in greater depth or more with no real depth. This study offers evidence that teaching fewer topics in greater depth is a better way to prepare students for success in college science," Tai said. "These results are based on the performance of thousands of college science students from across the United States." The 8,310 students in the study were enrolled in introductory biology, chemistry or physics in randomly selected four-year colleges and universities. Those who spent one month or more studying one major topic in-depth in high school earned higher grades in college science than their peers who studied more topics in the same period of time. The study revealed that students in courses that focused on mastering a particular topic were impacted twice as much as those in courses that touched on every major topic

### Turns their offense—limits are vital to creativity and innovation

David Intrator (President of The Creative Organization) October 21, 2010 “Thinking Inside the Box,” http://www.trainingmag.com/article/thinking-inside-box

One of the most pernicious myths about creativity, one that seriously inhibits creative thinking and innovation, is the belief that one needs to “think outside the box.” As someone who has worked for decades as a professional creative, nothing could be further from the truth. This a is view shared by the vast majority of creatives, expressed famously by the modernist designer Charles Eames when he wrote, “Design depends largely upon constraints.” The myth of thinking outside the box stems from a fundamental misconception of what creativity is, and what it’s not. In the popular imagination, creativity is something weird and wacky. The creative process is magical, or divinely inspired. But, in fact, creativity is not about divine inspiration or magic. It’s about problem-solving, and by definition a problem is a constraint, a limit, a box. One of the best illustrations of this is the work of photographers. They create by excluding the great mass what’s before them, choosing a small frame in which to work. Within that tiny frame, literally a box, they uncover relationships and establish priorities. What makes creative problem-solving uniquely challenging is that you, as the creator, are the one defining the problem. You’re the one choosing the frame. And you alone determine what’s an effective solution. This can be quite demanding, both intellectually and emotionally. Intellectually, you are required to establish limits, set priorities, and cull patterns and relationships from a great deal of material, much of it fragmentary. More often than not, this is the material you generated during brainstorming sessions. At the end of these sessions, you’re usually left with a big mess of ideas, half-ideas, vague notions, and the like. Now, chances are you’ve had a great time making your mess. You might have gone off-site, enjoyed a “brainstorming camp,” played a number of warm-up games. You feel artistic and empowered. But to be truly creative, you have to clean up your mess, organizing those fragments into something real, something useful, something that actually works. That’s the hard part. It takes a lot of energy, time, and willpower to make sense of the mess you’ve just generated. It also can be emotionally difficult. You’ll need to throw out many ideas you originally thought were great, ideas you’ve become attached to, because they simply don’t fit into the rules you’re creating as you build your box.

# Grid Defense

### No unauthorized launch – psychological resistance.

Quinlan, 2009 (Michael, former top official in the British Ministry of Defence, “Thinking about Nuclear Weapons: Principles, Problems, Prospects” p. 63-69)

Even if initial nuclear use did not quickly end the fighting, the supposition of inexorable momentum in a developing exchange, with each side rushing to overreaction amid confusion and uncertainty, is **implausible**. It fails to consider what the situation of the decisionmakers would really be. Neither side could want escalation. Both would be appalled at what was going on. Both would be desperately looking for signs that the other was ready to call a halt. Both, given the capacity for evasion or concealment which modem delivery platforms and vehicles can possess, could have in reserve significant forces invulnerable enough not to entail use-or-lose pressures. (It may be more open to question, as noted earlier, whether newer nuclear weapon possessors can be immediately in that position; but it is within reach of any substantial state with advanced technological capabilities, and attaining it is certain to be a high priority in the development of forces.) As a result, neither side can have any predisposition to suppose, in an ambiguous situation of fearful risk, that the right course when in doubt is to go on copiously launching weapons. And none of this analysis rests on any presumption of highly subtle or pre-concerted rationality. The rationality required is plain. The argument is reinforced if we consider the possible reasoning of an aggressor at a more dispassionate level. Any substantial nuclear armoury can inflict destruction outweighing any possible prize that aggression could hope to seize. A state attacking the possessor of such an armoury must therefore be doing so (once given that it cannot count upon destroying the armoury pre-emptively) on a judgement that the possessor would be found lacking in the will to use it. If the attacked possessor used nuclear weapons, whether first or in response to the aggressor's own first use, this judgement would begin to look dangerously precarious.

### Cyber-terrorism is drastically exaggerated – no major attack has happened and 99 percent of hackers couldn’t inflict serious damage

USIP (United States Institute for Peace) December 2004 “Cyberterrorism How Real Is the Threat?” Cyberterrorism

How Real Is the Threat?

Amid all the dire warnings and alarming statistics that the subject of cyberterrorism generates, it is important to remember one simple statistic: so far, there has been no recorded instance of a terrorist cyberattack on U.S. public facilities, transportation systems, nuclear power plants, power grids, or other key components of the national infrastructure. Cyberattacks are common, but they have not been conducted by terrorists and they have not sought to inflict the kind of damage that would qualify them as cyberterrorism. Technological expertise and use of the Internet do not constitute evidence of planning for a cyberattack. Joshua Green (“The Myth of Cyberterrorism,” Washington Monthly, November 2002) makes this point after reviewing the data retrieved from terrorists in Afghanistan: When U.S. troops recovered al Qaeda laptops in Afghanistan, officials were surprised to find its members more technologically adept than previously believed. They discovered structural and engineering software, electronic models of a dam, and information on computerized water systems, nuclear power plants, and U.S. and European stadiums. But nothing suggested they were planning cyberattacks, only that they were using the Internet to communicate and coordinate physical attacks. Neither al Qaeda nor any other terrorist organization appears to have tried to stage a serious cyberattack. For now, insiders or individual hackers are responsible for most attacks and intrusions and the hackers’ motives are not political. According to a report issued in 2002 by IBM Global Security Analysis Lab, 90 percent of hackers are amateurs with limited technical proficiency, 9 percent are more skilled at gaining unauthorized access but do not damage the files they read, and only 1 percent are highly skilled and intent on copying files or damaging programs and systems. Most hackers, it should be noted, try to expose security flaws in computer software, mainly in the operating systems produced by Microsoft. Their efforts in this direction have sometimes embarrassed corporations but have also been responsible for alerting the public and security professionals to serious security flaws. Moreover, although there are hackers with the ability to damage systems, disrupt e-commerce, and force websites offline, the vast majority of hackers do not have the necessary skills and knowledge. The ones who do, generally do not seek to wreak havoc. Douglas Thomas, a professor at the University of Southern California, spent seven years studying computer hackers in an effort to understand better who they are and what motivates them. Thomas interviewed hundreds of hackers and explored their “literature.” In testimony on July 24, 2002, before the House Subcommittee on Government Efficiency, Financial Management and Intergovernmental Relations, Thomas argued that “with the vast majority of hackers, I would say 99 percent of them, the risk [of cyberterrorism] is negligible for the simple reason that those hackers do not have the skill or ability to organize or execute an attack that would be anything more than a minor inconvenience.” His judgment was echoed in Assessing the Risks of Cyberterrorism, Cyber War, and Other Cyber Threats, a 2002 report for the Center for Strategic and International Studies, written by Jim Lewis, a sixteen-year veteran of the State and Commerce Departments. “The idea that hackers are going to bring the nation to its knees is too far-fetched a scenario to be taken seriously,” Lewis argued. “Nations are more robust than the early analysts of cyberterrorism and cyberwarfare give them credit for. Infrastructure systems [are] more flexible and responsive in restoring service than the early analysts realized, in part because they have to deal with failure on a routine basis.” Many computer security experts do not believe that it is possible to use the Internet to inflict death on a large scale. Some pointed out that the resilience of computer systems to attack is the result of significant investments of time, money, and expertise. As Green describes, nuclear weapons systems are protected by “air-gapping”: they are not connected to the Internet or to any open computer network and thus they cannot be accessed by intruders, terrorists, or hackers. Thus, for example, the Defense Department protects sensitive systems by isolating them from the Internet and even from the Pentagon’s own internal network. The CIA’s classified computers are also air-gapped, as is the FBI’s entire computer system.

### The threshold for this impact is incredibly high – no chance of serious cyber war

Dr. James A. Lewis, senior fellow at CSIS where he writes on technology, national security and the international economy, October 2009 “The “Korean” Cyber Attacks and Their Implications for Cyber Conflict”

http://csis.org/files/publication/091023\_Korean\_Cyber\_Attacks\_and\_Their\_Implications\_for\_Cyber\_Conflict.pdf

Only a few nations –Russia, China, Israel, France, the United States, and the United Kingdom, and perhaps a small number of the most sophisticated cyber criminals – have the advanced capabilities needed to launch a cyber attack that could do serious and long-term damage equivalent to sabotage or bombing and thus rise to the level of an act of war. A sophisticated attack against infrastructure requires planning, reconnaissance, resources and skills that are currently available only to these advanced cyber attackers. As part of their larger military planning, these nations have likely planned to launch such attacks in the event of a crisis.8 Such attacks are not yet within the scope of capabilities possessed by most non-state hackers. Serious cyber attack independent of some larger conflict is unlikely. To transpose cyber to the physical world, there are remarkably few instances of a nation engaging in covert sabotage attacks against another nation (particularly larger powers) unless they were seeking to provoke or if conflict was imminent. The political threshold for serious cyber attack (as opposed to espionage) by a nation-state is very high, likely as high as the threshold for conventional military action. At a minimum, this suggests that a serious cyber attack is a precursor, a warning, that some more serious conflict is about to begin. Absent such larger conflict, however, a nation-state is no more likely to launch a serious cyber attack than they are to shoot a random missile at an opponent.9 The risk is too great and the benefits of a cyber attack by itself too small for political leaders to authorize the use of this capability in anything short of a situation where they had already decided on military action. Cyber weapons are not decisive; cyber attack by itself will not win a conflict, particularly against a large and powerful opponent. It is striking that to date; no cyber "attack" that rises above the level of espionage or crime has been launched outside of a military conflict.

# Hegemony

## Regional Regimes

### International system resilient – no conflict

Christopher Preble (director of foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute) August 2010 “U.S. Military Power: Preeminence for What Purpose?” http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/u-s-military-power-preeminence-for-what-purpose/

Most in Washington still embraces the notion that America is, and forever will be, the world’s indispensable nation. Some scholars, however, questioned the logic of hegemonic stability theory from the very beginning. A number continue to do so today. They advance arguments diametrically at odds with the primacist consensus. Trade routes need not be policed by a single dominant power; the international economy is complex and resilient. Supply disruptions are likely to be temporary, and the costs of mitigating their effects should be borne by those who stand to lose — or gain — the most. Islamic extremists are scary, but hardly comparable to the threat posed by a globe-straddling Soviet Union armed with thousands of nuclear weapons. It is frankly absurd that we spend more today to fight Osama bin Laden and his tiny band of murderous thugs than we spent to face down Joseph Stalin and Chairman Mao. Many factors have contributed to the dramatic decline in the number of wars between nation-states; it is unrealistic to expect that a new spasm of global conflict would erupt if the United States were to modestly refocus its efforts, draw down its military power, and call on other countries to play a larger role in their own defense, and in the security of their respective regions. But while there are credible alternatives to the United States serving in its current dual role as world policeman / armed social worker, the foreign policy establishment in Washington has no interest in exploring them. The people here have grown accustomed to living at the center of the earth, and indeed, of the universe. The tangible benefits of all this military spending flow disproportionately to this tiny corner of the United States while the schlubs in fly-over country pick up the tab.

### Regional regimes solve hotspots

Joseph M. Parent Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami. Paul K. Macdonald is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College. Nov/Dec 2011, Vol. 90, Issue 6 Foreign Affairs “The Wisdom of Retrenchment” Ebsco

Although Russia continues to meddle in its near abroad and has employed oil and gas embargoes to coerce its immediate neighbors, western Europe's resources are more than sufficient to counter an assertive Russia. A more autonomous Europe would take some time to develop a coherent security and defense policy and would not always see events through the same lens as Washington. But reducing Europe's dependence on the United States would create a strong incentive for European states to spend more on defense, modernize their forces, and better integrate their policies and capabilities. U.S. forces in the European theater could safely be reduced by 40-50 percent without compromising European security. Asia is also ready for a decreased U.S. military presence, and Washington should begin gradually withdrawing its troops. Although China has embarked on an ambitious policy of military modernization and engages in periodic saber rattling in the South China Sea, its ability to project power remains limited. Japan and South Korea are already shouldering greater defense burdens than they were during the Cold War. India, the Philippines, and Vietnam are eager to forge strategic partnerships with the United States. Given the shared interest in promoting regional security, these ties could be sustained through bilateral political and economic agreements, instead of the indefinite deployments and open-ended commitments of the Cold War. In the event that China becomes domineering, U.S. allies on its borders will act as a natural early warning system and a first line of defense, as well as provide logistical hubs and financial support for any necessary U.S. responses. Yet such a state of affairs is hardly inevitable. For now, there are many less expensive alternatives that can strengthen the current line of defense, such as technology transfers, arms sales, and diplomatic mediation. Defending the territorial integrity of Japan and South Korea and preventing Chinese or North Korean adventurism demands rapid-response forces with strong reserves, not the 30,000 soldiers currently stationed in each country. Phasing out 20 percent of those forces while repositioning others to Guam or Hawaii would achieve the same results more efficiently.

### We will transition smoothly- realism

Paul K. MacDonald is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Williams College and Joseph M. Parent is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami Spring 2011 International Security “Graceful Decline? The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment” Volume 35 Number 4 pg 7-44

We advance the neorealist argument that states, competing for security in anarchy, respond with rough rationality to their environment.38 They do this because, [End Page 18] in the competitive arena of world politics, inert or improvident great powers receive negative feedback until they are disabused of their delusions or replaced at the top rungs by more sensible states. Great powers that do not react with agility and alacrity to a lower position are unlikely to last in the unforgiving game of power politics. Rivals will be quick to detect and exploit incompetence. The underlying logic of this behavior is solvency. States, like firms, tend to go bankrupt when they budget blithely and live beyond their means. When ends are too ambitious for available means—a situation sometimes called the "Lippmann gap"39—states are overextended and open to predation. To avoid insolvency, states adopt retrenching policies as a way to gain breathing room, regroup, and retard if not reverse their decline. In the long term, decline is inevitable, but in the short term it is anything but.40 States can improve their relative growth by imitating the practices of lead states. And, like firms, states are capable of recovery if they make astute adjustments. Reorganization requires some combination of resources and time, which states can generate by paring back military expenditures, avoiding costly conflicts, and shifting burdens onto others. The alternatives—resignation to continual decline, disregard of risks, unbalanced ends and means—are worse. Negative feedback drives this process, if states rationally adjust their commitments in response to decline. What matters most in explaining the extent of retrenchment is not geography, leadership, or regime type; the most important factor is the rate of decline relative to other great powers. Consequently, our central hypothesis is that declining power generates prompt and proportionate declines in grand strategic interests. We do not claim that all states retrench rationally all the time. What we claim is that great powers prudently scale back their grand strategic interests when they experience acute relative decline because they feel their power ebbing.

## A2: NRG

### Globalization ensures no military invasions

LeVine 2012 [Steve LeVine is the author of The Oil and the Glory and a longtime foreign correspondent June 27, 2012 Foreign Policy “Pax-Sinica: Why the U.S. should hand over Afghanistan and Central Asia to China” http://oilandglory.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/26/pax\_sinica\_why\_the\_us\_should\_hand\_over\_afghanistan\_and\_central\_asia\_to\_china]

But that's not how business actually gets done in this era of globalization. In Russia, for example, President Vladimir Putin has recently let three contracts for the prized Arctic go to ExxonMobil, Italy's ENI, and Norway's Statoil. In Africa, the hottest new play is the eastern coastline states of Kenya, Mozambique, and Tanzania, but the boom is led by American, British, and Italian companies. In other words, you do not have to be Chinese to win big. And there do not have to be gunboats.

## 2NC Impact Calc

### Crises are inevitable the question is whether they escalate

Nuno P. Monteiro is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yale University “Unrest Assured Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful” International Security Volume 36, Number 3, Winter 2011/12 Project Muse

From the perspective of the overall peacefulness of the international system, then, no U.S. grand strategy is, as in the Goldilocks tale, “just right.”116 In fact, each strategic option available to the unipole produces significant conflict. Whereas offensive and defensive dominance will entangle it in wars against recalcitrant minor powers, disengagement will produce regional wars among minor and major powers. Regardless of U.S. strategy, conflict will abound. Indeed, if my argument is correct, the significant level of conflict the world has experienced over the last two decades will continue for as long as U.S. power remains preponderant. From the narrower perspective of the unipole’s ability to avoid being involved in wars, however, disengagement is the best strategy. A unipolar structure provides no incentives for conflict involving a disengaged unipole. Disengagement would extricate the unipole’s forces from wars against recalcitrant minor powers and decrease systemic pressures for nuclear proliferation. There is, however, a downside. Disengagement would lead to heightened conflict beyond the unipole’s region and increase regional pressures for nuclear proliferation. As regards the unipole’s grand strategy, then, the choice is between a strategy of dominance, which leads to involvement in numerous conflicts, and a strategy of disengagement, which allows conflict between others to fester.

### Most probable- hegemony fosters miscalc

Joseph M. Parent Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami. Paul K. Macdonald is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College. Nov/Dec 2011, Vol. 90, Issue 6 Foreign Affairs “The Wisdom of Retrenchment” Ebsco

Curbing the United States' commitments would reduce risks, but it cannot eliminate them. Adversaries may fill regional power vacuums, and allies will never behave exactly as Washington would prefer. Yet those costs would be outweighed by the concrete benefits of pulling back. A focus on the United States' core interests in western Europe would limit the risk of catastrophic clashes with Russia over ethnic enclaves in Georgia or Moldova by allowing the United States to avoid commitments it would be unwise to honor. By narrowing its commitments in Asia, the United States could lessen the likelihood of conflict over issues such as the status of Taiwan or competing maritime claims in the South China Sea. Just as the United Kingdom tempered its commitments and accommodated U.S. interests in the Western Hemisphere at the turn of the last century, the United States should now temper its commitments and cultivate a lasting compromise with China over Taiwan.

## A2: Go Down Fighting

### No we won’t we are still incredibly secure

Paul K. MacDonald is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College and Joseph M. Parent is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami. Spring 2012 International Security “Correspondence: Decline and Retrenchment—Peril or Promise?” Volume 36 Number 4 pg 197-203

Finally, where Thompson believes that hegemonic transitions are different in kind from other transitions, we believe the difference is in degree. As we note in our article, there are sound reasons to assume that hegemonic powers should manage acute relative decline much like—if not better than—their less powerful counterparts (pp. 41-42). Great powers that fall in the ranks from number one to number two will continue to possess sizable bases of military and economic capabilities that afford them considerable security from external threats. Moreover, their relative power should provide them opportunities to attract new allies and deter ambitious enemies, all while shedding inessential external commitments. In contrast, a great power that falls in the ranks from number three to number four is more likely to lack capabilities, be closer to bankruptcy, [End Page 201] have run out of options, and be in danger of decisive defeat. The data, admittedly exiguous but the best available, bear this supposition out. The only hegemonic transition since 1870, the United States passing the United Kingdom in 1872, was not calamitous or dissimilar to other great powers facing declines of similar depth. The most war-prone ordinal transition among our cases, Germany overtaking the United Kingdom in 1935, consisted of two great powers competing for third place.

### Nations that face decline will opt to go down silently- statistics prove

Paul K. MacDonald is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Williams College and Joseph M. Parent is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami Spring 2011 International Security “Graceful Decline? The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment” Volume 35 Number 4 pg 7-44

Based on our universe of cases, the predictions of retrenchment pessimists receive little support. In contrast to arguments that retrenchment is rare, we find that great powers facing acute relative decline adopted retrenchment in at least eleven and at most fifteen of the eighteen cases, a range of 61-83 percent. By any accounting, a majority of the countries in these cases retrenched shortly after their ordinal transition. Nor does the evidence support the view that domestic interests constrain retrenchment. Every one of the great powers in our [End Page 28] sample that chose to retrench did so within five years of the ordinal transition. This suggests timely responses to external constraints rather than domestic intransigence. Moreover, there does not appear to be a strong connection between regime type and retrenchment. Democracies account for about two-thirds of the great powers in our study, and are slightly more likely to face acute relative declines, accounting for thirteen of our eighteen cases, or 72 percent. Of the twelve democracies, seven retrenched, two did not, and three are debatable, yielding parameters from 58 to 83 percent. There are only three cases of autocracy, which makes comparison among groups difficult, but of these, two retrenched and one case is arguable, producing a range of 67-100 percent.59 In short, evidence at the coarse-grained level tentatively supports the neorealist approach outlined above: during acute relative decline, a significant majority of great powers of differing regime types elected to retrench. Wars, preventive or otherwise, do not appear to be a common fate for declining states, and recovery of lost rank was fairly frequent. Declining great powers found themselves embroiled in an interstate war in only four of the eighteen cases, and in only one of these cases—1935 United Kingdom—did the declining power go to war with the power that had just surpassed it in ordinal rank.60 In addition, in six of fifteen cases, declining great powers that adopted a policy of retrenchment managed to rebound, eventually recovering their ordinal rank from the state that surpassed them. These findings suggest that retrenching states rarely courted disaster and occasionally regained their prior position. Further, even if retrenchment was not successful, this does not prove that a preferable policy existed.61 In many cases of decline, there are few restorative solutions available; politics is often a game of unpalatable alternatives. Short of a miracle, it is hard to say what great powers such as Britain, France, or the Soviet Union could have done to stay aloft, even with the benefit of hindsight.

### Historically that doesn’t happen- the faster the collapse the less likely that we go down fighting

Paul K. MacDonald is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Williams College and Joseph M. Parent is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami Spring 2011 International Security “Graceful Decline? The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment” Volume 35 Number 4 pg 7-44

First, we challenge the retrenchment pessimists' claim that domestic or international constraints inhibit the ability of declining great powers to retrench. In fact, when states fall in the hierarchy of great powers, peaceful retrenchment is the most common response, even over short time spans. Based on the empirical record, we find that great powers retrenched in no less than eleven and no more than fifteen of the eighteen cases, a range of 61-83 percent. When international conditions demand it, states renounce risky ties, increase reliance on allies or adversaries, draw down their military obligations, and impose adjustments on domestic populations. Second, we find that the magnitude of relative decline helps explain the extent of great power retrenchment. Following the dictates of neorealist theory, great powers retrench for the same reason they expand: the rigors of great power politics compel them to do so.12 Retrenchment is by no means easy, but [End Page 9] necessity is the mother of invention, and declining great powers face powerful incentives to contract their interests in a prompt and proportionate manner. Knowing only a state's rate of relative economic decline explains its corresponding degree of retrenchment in as much as 61 percent of the cases we examined. Third, we argue that the rate of decline helps explain what forms great power retrenchment will take. How fast great powers fall contributes to whether these retrenching states will internally reform, seek new allies or rely more heavily on old ones, and make diplomatic overtures to enemies. Further, our analysis suggests that great powers facing acute decline are less likely to initiate or escalate militarized interstate disputes. Faced with diminishing resources, great powers moderate their foreign policy ambitions and offer concessions in areas of lesser strategic value. Contrary to the pessimistic conclusions of critics, retrenchment neither requires aggression nor invites predation. Great powers are able to rebalance their commitments through compromise, rather than conflict. In these ways, states respond to penury the same way they do to plenty: they seek to adopt policies that maximize security given available means. Far from being a hazardous policy, retrenchment can be successful. States that retrench often regain their position in the hierarchy of great powers. Of the fifteen great powers that adopted retrenchment in response to acute relative decline, 40 percent managed to recover their ordinal rank. In contrast, none of the declining powers that failed to retrench recovered their relative position.

## Basing No Solvo

### Military dominance is waning- even as we spend more success is lagging

Joseph M. Parent Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami. Paul K. Macdonald is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College. Nov/Dec 2011, Vol. 90, Issue 6 Foreign Affairs “The Wisdom of Retrenchment” Ebsco

The United States invests more in its military manpower and hardware than all other countries combined. As the political scientist Barry Posen argues, this has allowed it to exercise "command of the commons." With its vast fleet of attack submarines and aircraft carriers, the United States controls the seas--even those that are not its territorial waters and those outside its exclusive economic zone. Its fighter aircraft and unmanned aerial vehicles give it unrivaled air superiority. And its dominance of outer space and cyberspace is almost as impressive. But the United States' return on its military investment is falling. Manpower and technology costs are increasing rapidly. The Government Accountability Office reports that since the end of the Cold War, funding for weapons acquisition has increased by 57 percent while the average acquisition cost has increased by 120 percent. According to the Congressional Research Service, between 1999 and 2005, the real cost of supporting an active-duty service member grew by 33 percent. Meanwhile, the benefits of unrestricted defense spending have not kept up with the costs. As Gates put it, U.S. defense institutions have become "accustomed to the post-9/11 decade's worth of 'no questions asked' funding requests," encouraging a culture of waste and inefficiency he described as "a semi-feudal system--an amalgam of fiefdoms without centralized mechanisms to allocate resources." The trend of the last decade is disturbing: as military spending soared, U.S. success abroad sagged. To be clear, the United States continues to field the best-armed, most skilled military in the world. The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have bent, but not broken, the all-volunteer force, and the burden of maintaining this formidable force is not unacceptably onerous. The proposed $553 billion base-line defense budget for 2012 represents just 15 percent of the federal budget and less than five percent of GDP. (TO put that figure in perspective, consider that the proposed 2012 budget for Social Security spending tops $760 billion.) Yet current trends will make it harder for the United States to continue to purchase hegemony as easily as it has in the past. Changes in military tactics and technology are eroding the United States' advantages. The proliferation of antiship cruise missiles makes it harder for the U.S. Navy to operate near adversaries' shores. Advanced surface-to-air missiles likewise raise the cost of maintaining U.S. air superiority in hostile theaters. Nationalist and tribal insurgencies, fueled by a brisk small-arms trade, have proved difficult to combat with conventional ground forces. U.S. defense dominance is getting more expensive at a moment when it is becoming less expensive for other states and actors to challenge the sole superpower.

### Military lead is unsustainable

Gideon Rachman is chief foreign-affairs commentator for the Financial Times and author of Zero-Sum Future: American Power in an Age of Anxiety. Foreign Policy JANUARY/FEBRUARY 2011 “Think Again: American Decline” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/think\_again\_american\_decline?page=0,0

As for the U.S. military, the lesson of the Iraq and Afghan wars is that America's martial prowess is less useful than former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and others imagined. U.S. troops, planes, and missiles can overthrow a government on the other side of the world in weeks, but pacifying and stabilizing a conquered country is another matter. Years after apparent victory, America is still bogged down by an apparently endless insurgency in Afghanistan. Not only are Americans losing their appetite for foreign adventures, but the U.S. military budget is clearly going to come under pressure in this new age of austerity. The present paralysis in Washington offers little hope that the United States will deal with its budgetary problems swiftly or efficiently. The U.S. government's continuing reliance on foreign lending makes the country vulnerable, as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's humbling 2009 request to the Chinese to keep buying U.S. Treasury bills revealed. America is funding its military supremacy through deficit spending, meaning the war in Afghanistan is effectively being paid for with a Chinese credit card. Little wonder that Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has identified the burgeoning national debt as the single largest threat to U.S. national security. Meanwhile, China's spending on its military continues to grow rapidly. The country will soon announce the construction of its first aircraft carrier and is aiming to build five or six in total. Perhaps more seriously, China's development of new missile and anti-satellite technology threatens the command of the sea and skies on which the United States bases its Pacific supremacy. In a nuclear age, the U.S. and Chinese militaries are unlikely to clash. A common Chinese view is that the United States will instead eventually find it can no longer afford its military position in the Pacific. U.S. allies in the region -- Japan, South Korea, and increasingly India -- may partner more with Washington to try to counter rising Chinese power. But if the United States has to scale back its presence in the Pacific for budgetary reasons, its allies will start to accommodate themselves to a rising China. Beijing's influence will expand, and the Asia-Pacific region -- the emerging center of the global economy -- will become China's backyard.

### Spreading tech ensures loss of military dominance on the battlefield

Barry R. Posen is Ford International Professor of Political Science and director of the security studies program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The American Interest November/December 2007 “The Case for Restraint” http://www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=331

The Diffusion of Power. The diffusion of power, especially of military capacity, is the third important trend of the last twenty years. Though the United States faces few if any plausible competitors in the open oceans or space, or even in the air at medium and high altitudes, states and groups have learned how to tilt with the Americans using the advantages of their home turf. Ruthless, committed and skilled Somalis, Iraqis, Afghans and miscellaneous al-Qaeda fighters have fought U.S. forces directly; they seldom “win”, but they do make the Americans pay. Somali, Iraqi and al-Qaeda air-defense gunners have shot down dozens of U.S. helicopters, mainly with heavy machine guns and rocket-propelled grenades. Serb SAM operators using mainly 1970s technology shot down few U.S. aircraft, but so complicated U.S. air operations that most Serb ground forces in Kosovo survived the 1999 air campaign. At the same time, the ability to manufacture such relatively low-tech weapons has spread. Simple long-range artillery rockets and more complex anti-ship missiles manufactured in Iran turned up in the hands of Hizballah in the summer 2006 war with Israel. According to the U.S. government, components of “Explosively Formed Penetrators” (EFPs), off-route, anti-armored-vehicle mines discovered in Iraq were manufactured and supplied by Iran—which surely has more sophisticated versions of the same weapons on the other side of the border. Iran is also one of the world’s largest producers of new warheads for the ubiquitous Soviet-designed RPG-7 rocket-propelled grenade launcher. More ominously, Iranian arms exporters now offer night-vision devices for sale. If they work, a presumed U.S. area of great tactical superiority in infantry combat will soon wane. More important than the proliferation of moderately sophisticated conventional weapons is the apparent spread of military expertise. The combination of good-enough conventional weapons, large numbers of committed young men, proven tactics and competent training, cleverly adapted to urban, suburban and rural environments that favor infantry, has inflicted meaningful combat costs on high-technology U.S. ground forces. Costs get even higher if the United States or other Western forces intend to settle into other countries to reform their politics, and are thus forced into long counterinsurgency campaigns.

## Resource Wars

#### No conflict over resources – your literature base overfocuses on instances of conflict – for every example to prove resource wars exist there are several examples that disprove it. Their research is based on dated data – cooperation is more likely

Simon Dalby (Dept. Of Geography, Carleton University) 2006 "Security and environment linkages revisited" in Globalisation and Environmental Challenges: Reconceptualising Security in the 21st Century, www.ntu.edu.sg/idss/publications/SSIS/SSIS001.pdf)

In parallel with the focus on human security as a necessity in the face of both natural and artificial forms of vulnerability, recent literature has emphasised the opportunities that environmental management presents for political cooperation between states and other political actors, on both largescale infrastructure projects as well as more traditional matters of wildlife and new concerns with biodiversity preservation (Matthew/Halle/Switzer 2002). Simultaneously, the discussion on water wars, and in particular the key finding the shared resources frequently stimulate cooperation rather than conflict, shifted focus from conflict to the possibilities of environmental action as a mode of peacemaking. Both at the international level in terms of environmental diplomacy and institution building, there is considerable evidence of cooperative action on the part of many states (Conca/Dabelko 2002). Case studies from many parts of the world suggest that cooperation and diplomatic arrangements can facilitate peaceful responses to the environmental difficulties in contrast to the pessimism of the 1990’s where the focus was on the potential for conflicts. One recent example of the attempts to resolve difficulties in the case of Lake Victoria suggests a dramatic alternative to the resource war scenarios. The need to curtail over-fishing in the lake and the importance of remediation has encouraged cooperation; scarcities leading to conflict arguments have not been common in the region, and they have not influenced policy prescriptions (Canter/Ndegwa 2002). Many conflicts over the allocations of water use rights continue around the world but most of them are within states and international disputes simply do not have a history of leading to wars.

## 1NR

### Uniqueness

#### Squo solves China models the plan

Hinckley 12/12 (Elias Hinckley leads the clean energy practice at Kilpatrick Townsend, “The Road to Chinese Shale Gas Goes Through the U.S.,” Consumer Energy Report, http://www.consumerenergyreport.com/2012/12/12/the-road-to-chinese-shale-gas-goes-through-the-u-s/)

China is reported to have massive unconventional natural gas resources. Technically recoverable gas reserves are forecast to be 36 trillion cubic meters, making it the world’s largest reserve pool according to EIA, and nearly 50% larger than the U.S.’s reserves. In the country’s most recent 5-year plan it laid out a goal of 6.5 billion cubic meters of production by 2015, a steep increase from the current production level of zero.¶ A combination of three factors has created an explosion of interest in China shale gas and the associated fracking technologies: (1) natural gas prices in China have been trading several times higher than gas in North America (and even at a significant premium over the EU); (2) there is a forecast for tremendous growth in the demand for energy in China over the coming decades; and (3) the current plans for power generation call for the building of vast amounts of greenhouse gas producing new coal-fired generation, which creates a number of concerns both inside and outside of China.¶ What stands between China and a shale gas revolution like the one underway in the U.S.? There are two significant hurdles.¶ First, much of the recoverable gas will be technically very challenging to extract – it is relatively deep, much of the gas exists at the limits of depths for what has successfully been fracked in the U.S., much of the reserve geography is mountainous and difficult to access, and the vast reserves in the arid north of China will require some way to frack waterlessly or utilize a source of water that has yet to be identified.¶ Second, almost all fracking technology and experience is owned by U.S. companies, and certainly the potential to pursue these more challenging gas reserves will require cutting edge technology and processes. All of which guarantees that the path to Chinese shale gas must successfully leverage the technology and expertise of the U.S. gas services and technology industry.¶ Investment by Chinese companies into the U.S. shale market is already underway. The two largest oil companies in China have made significant investments. CNOOC has partnered with Chesapeake Energy on production ventures and Sinopec joined with Devon Energy in a similar agreement. Both deals were minority interests in actual gas production, and were generally viewed as investments to try to learn the fracking process by being part of the exploration and production team. How successful these early ventures will be for exporting fracking know-how and technology remains to be seen. Regardless of how these early investments play out, the interest by other companies – energy companies, manufacturing companies, technology companies and others – to be part of the Chinese shale revolution is ready and significant.¶ As this shopping binge starts in earnest, and there are indications of that happening right now, the price of fracking technologies, from valves and pipes to chemicals and advanced analytics, along with actual extraction expertise is going to rise here in the U.S. as Chinese firms bid to acquire the necessary technology and expertise to accelerate its own shale gas revolution. How significant the technology and expertise price increases will be remains to be seen, but the Chinese appetite, and the likely pace of acquisition over the next few years will likely have a material impact on not just the service and technology, but on the cost of production here in the U.S.

#### Exports won’t hurt the market

Boudreaux 2012 (Donald J. Boudreaux, professor of economics at George Mason University, December 16, 2012, “Let America’s Gas Industry Boom,” New York Post, http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/let\_america\_gas\_industry\_boom\_tp8U0EtNyDPRHvtiobMw0J)

The argument that exporting gas would lead to significantly higher energy prices at home suffers two notable flaws.¶ First, it’s overstated. Charles Ebinger, director of the Brookings Energy Security Initiative, recently released a study showing that allowing natural-gas exports would have a “very minimal” impact on domestic prices. The consulting firm Deloitte projects that allowing exports would cause a 20-year price increase of just 1.7 percent.¶ This isn’t surprising. With their market spanning the globe rather than merely the United States, American producers would build larger-scale and more efficient production facilities, as well as invest more in exploration and cutting-edge research. These “supply-side” effects would push gas prices downward.¶ On the other hand, if Uncle Sam obstructs exports, entrepreneurs would be less likely to take the risk of starting new projects, given that regulators have demonstrated an eagerness to step in and suppress profits available in foreign markets.¶ Cheniere Energy was one of the last natural-gas companies to get export approval before the regulatory hold; it’s now building a massive new liquefaction facility in Sabine Pass, La. (Natural gas is liquefied for export.) This operation is expected to create between 30,000 and 50,000 new jobs — all positions that wouldn’t exist if Cheniere had been banned from exporting.¶ The argument against natural-gas exports is also economically backward. A nation prospers through international trade precisely by exporting those goods and services that it can produce at relatively low cost.

#### Natural gas transition now in electricity

StreetInsider 7-17 [StreetInsider , “Natural Gas Fueled Cars: Game Changer or Day Dreamer? (UNG)” 7-17-2012 http://www.streetinsider.com/Commodities/Natural+Gas+Fueled+Cars%3A+Game+Changer+or+Day+Dreamer%3F+(UNG)/7585751.html]

Thanks to advances in technology, the U.S. is now the world's largest producer of natural gas. The supply is so great, natural gas prices collapsed to 10-year lows this year.¶ Power companies have been quick to make the swap from coal to natural gas following the price declines, but the automotive industry is nowhere near making natural gas a viable alternative to petroleum products. Currently, there are only about 500 public CNG filling stations in the U.S. That is less than 0.03 percent of the total 159k fueling stations in America.

### Leadership Impact

#### Natural gas cements climate leadership

**Casten 2009** (Sean Casten, president of Recycled Energy Development, December 16, 2009, “Natural gas as a near-term CO2 mitigation strategy,” Grist, http://goo.gl/b8z08)

Discussions of CO2 reduction tend to start from a presumption of near-term economic disruption coupled to long-term investment in green technology. The presumption isn’t right. The U.S. could reduce its total CO2 footprint by 14-20 percent tomorrow with no disruption in our access to energy services, without investing in any new infrastructure. The Waxman-Markey proposal to reduce CO2 emissions by 17 percent over 10 years is constrained only by its ambition. This near-term opportunity would be realized by ramping up our nation’s generation of electricity from gas and ramping down our generation from coal, taking advantage only of existing assets. Its scale and potential for immediate impact deserves consideration; even partial action towards this goal would have dramatic political and environmental consequences, establishing U.S. leadership and credibility in global climate negotiations.

#### Climate leadership five extinction threats- Biodiversity, soil erosion, ocean acidification, de-fo, pollution

**Khosla 2009** (Ashok Khosla, president of the International Union for Conservation of Nature, January 27, 2009, “A new President for the United States: We have a dream,” http://goo.gl/RQsL8)

A rejuvenated America, with a renewed purpose, commitment and energy to make its contribution once again towards a better world could well be the turning point that can reverse the current decline in the state of the global economy, the health of its life support systems and the morale of people everywhere. This extraordinary change in regime brings with it the promise of a deep change in attitudes and aspirations of Americans, a change that will lead, hopefully, to new directions in their nation’s policies and action. In particular, we can hope that from being a very reluctant partner in global discussions, especially on issues relating to environment and sustainable development, the United States will become an active leader in international efforts to address the Millennial threats now confronting civilization and even the survival of the human species. For the conservation of biodiversity, so essential to maintaining life on Earth, this promise of change has come not a moment too soon. It would be a mistake to put all of our hopes on the shoulder of one young man, however capable he might be. The environmental challenges the world is facing cannot be addressed by one country, let alone by one man. At the same time, an inspired US President guided by competent people, who does not shy away from exercising the true responsibilities and leadership his country is capable of, could do a lot to spur the international community into action. To paraphrase one of his illustrious predecessors, “the world asks for action and action now.” What was true in President Roosevelt’s America 77 years ago is even more appropriate today. From IUCN’s perspective, the first signals are encouraging. The US has seriously begun to discuss constructive engagement in climate change debates. With Copenhagen a mere 11 months away, this commitment is long overdue and certainly very welcome. Many governments still worry that if they set tough standards to control carbon emissions, their industry and agriculture will become uncompetitive, a fear that leads to a foot-dragging “you go first” attitude that is blocking progress. A positive intervention by the United States could provide the vital catalyst that moves the basis of the present negotiations beyond the narrowly defined national interests that lie at the heart of the current impasse. The logjam in international negotiations on climate change should not be difficult to break if the US were to lead the industrialized countries to agree that much of their wealth has been acquired at the expense of the environment (in this case greenhouse gases emitted over the past two hundred years) and that with the some of the benefits that this wealth has brought, comes the obligation to deal with the problems that have resulted as side-effects. With equitable entitlement to the common resources of the planet, an agreement that is fair and acceptable to all nations should be easy enough to achieve. Caps on emissions and sharing of energy efficient technologies are simply in the interest of everyone, rich or poor. And both rich and poor must now be ready to adopt less destructive technologies – based on renewables, efficiency and sustainability – both as a goal with intrinsic merit and also as an example to others. But climate is not the only critical global environmental issue that this new administration will have to deal with. Conservation of biodiversity, a crucial prerequisite for the wellbeing of all humanity, no less America, needs as much attention, and just as urgently. The United States’ self-interest in conserving living natural resources strongly converges with the global common good in every sphere: in the oceans, by arresting the precipitate decline of fish stocks and the alarming rise of acidification; on land, by regenerating the health of our soils, forests and rivers; and in the atmosphere by reducing the massive emission of pollutants from our wasteful industries, construction, agriculture and transport systems.

### NG Solves- Renewables

#### Natural gas key to renewables- solves barriers like intermittency

Podesta and Wirth 2009 (John Podesta, President and CEO of the Center for American Progress, and Timothy E. Wirth, steering committee for Energy Future Coalition and former U.S. senator from Colorado, August 10, 2009, “Natural Gas: A Bridge Fuel for the 21st Century,” Center for American Progress, http://goo.gl/Aw0Ob)

The recent development of technology that enables the affordable development of significant shale gas reserves in the lower 48 states could fundamentally alter the U.S. energy system and play a larger role in helping to more rapidly and cost-effectively speed the transition to a low-carbon economy and reduce global warming pollution. The Energy Information Administration estimates that the United States has approximately 1,770 trillion cubic feet (tcf) of technically recoverable gas, including 238 tcf of proven reserves. The Potential Gas Committee estimates total U.S. gas resources at 2,074 tcf. It is estimated that “technically recoverable unconventional gas” including shale gas accounts for nearly two-thirds of American onshore gas resources. At the current production rates, “the current recoverable resource estimate provides enough natural gas to supply the U.S. for the next 90 years.” These gas findings in Arkansas, Louisiana, Michigan, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and elsewhere have increased proven reserves of U.S. natural gas by 13 percent, and driven potential reserves even higher. Natural gas is “by the far the cleanest burning” fossil fuel, and produces slightly more than one-fifth of all U.S. energy. Oil and coal combined comprise about two thirds of all energy consumption. Their combustion produces substantially more global warming and other conventional pollution than natural gas. Combusting natural gas to make electricity produces about half of the global warming pollution of coal, and one-third of petroleum burned in cars. Given its domestic abundance and its lower pollutant levels, natural gas should play a larger role in our energy mix. Enhancing the role of natural gas is valuable for many reasons. Tens of gigawatts of highly efficient natural gas generation capacity were installed over the past two decades but only about two-fifths of this capacity is used at any given time. At little to no additional cost for infrastructure, natural gas generation can be easily substituted for existing coal-fired capacity without any new plant or transmission construction. In some parts of the country, a CO2 price of as little as $7 to $14 per ton would provide sufficient incentive to give priority to dispatch of gas-fired electricity into the grid over that of coal. Natural gas can serve as a bridge fuel to a low-carbon, sustainable energy future. In particular, natural gas can provide the critical low-carbon “firming” or back-up fuel that can enable deep market penetration of both wind power and concentrated solar thermal power. The marriage of gas and renewable energy in the form of hybrid wind-gas and solargas plants addresses the issue of renewable intermittency, greatly enabling low-cost/low emissions power generation.

#### Solves inevitable investment crunch

Aflaki 2012 (Sam Aflaki, Assistant Professor Operations Management & Information Technology at HEC Paris, and Serguei Netessine, The Timken Chaired Professor of Global Technology and Innovation, Professor of Technology and Operations Management, Research Director of the INSEAD-Wharton, June 1, 2012, “Strategic Investment in Renewable Energy Sources,” INSEAD Working Paper, http://www.insead.edu/facultyresearch/research/doc.cfm?did=49970)Overall, our analysis indicates that the intermittency of renewable energy sources is a problematic feature that handicaps investment decisions in these technologies. Although raising carbon taxes is meant to improve the attractiveness of renewables, we show that this is probably not an effective policy. A more effective approach to increasing capacity investment in renewables would be to reduce intermittency. There are various options to achieve this goal. The first option is storage, for which various (relatively new technologies) are available.13 These technologies include pumped- storage hydropower, which stores electricity in the form of potential energy, and pumped heat electricity storage, which uses argon gas to store power in the form of heat. There are many recent papers that consider the problem of optimal storage policies while taking installed generation capacity as fixed (for a comprehensive review, see Faghih et al. 2012). Other options besides storage include the “curtailing” of intermittent generation (as described in Wu and Kapuscinski 2012) and the pooling of multiple generation units (possibly with different technologies) whose supply is not perfectly correlated. This latter approach may be possible only for large generators with enough resources to invest in multiple wind farms in different geographical regions. So even though there are no economies of scale in wind electricity generation, clearly there are statistical economies of scale in terms of reduced intermittency. Our analysis is a first step toward further research on an integrated framework that will combine these solutions with an explanation of how long- run capacity decisions are affected by the cost structure of renewables. Our results suggest the possibility of additional value to these solutions if generation capacity decisions are taken into account.

#### Key to renewable market penetration

Podesta and Wirth 2009 (John Podesta, President and CEO of the Center for American Progress, and Timothy E. Wirth, steering committee for Energy Future Coalition and former U.S. senator from Colorado, August 10, 2009, “Natural Gas: A Bridge Fuel for the 21st Century,” Center for American Progress, http://goo.gl/Aw0Ob)

The recent development of technology that enables the affordable development of significant shale gas reserves in the lower 48 states could fundamentally alter the U.S. energy system and play a larger role in helping to more rapidly and cost-effectively speed the transition to a low-carbon economy and reduce global warming pollution. The Energy Information Administration estimates that the United States has approximately 1,770 trillion cubic feet (tcf) of technically recoverable gas, including 238 tcf of proven reserves. The Potential Gas Committee estimates total U.S. gas resources at 2,074 tcf. It is estimated that “technically recoverable unconventional gas” including shale gas accounts for nearly two-thirds of American onshore gas resources. At the current production rates, “the current recoverable resource estimate provides enough natural gas to supply the U.S. for the next 90 years.” These gas findings in Arkansas, Louisiana, Michigan, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and elsewhere have increased proven reserves of U.S. natural gas by 13 percent, and driven potential reserves even higher. Natural gas is “by the far the cleanest burning” fossil fuel, and produces slightly more than one-fifth of all U.S. energy. Oil and coal combined comprise about two thirds of all energy consumption. Their combustion produces substantially more global warming and other conventional pollution than natural gas. Combusting natural gas to make electricity produces about half of the global warming pollution of coal, and one-third of petroleum burned in cars. Given its domestic abundance and its lower pollutant levels, natural gas should play a larger role in our energy mix. Enhancing the role of natural gas is valuable for many reasons. Tens of gigawatts of highly efficient natural gas generation capacity were installed over the past two decades but only about two-fifths of this capacity is used at any given time. At little to no additional cost for infrastructure, natural gas generation can be easily substituted for existing coal-fired capacity without any new plant or transmission construction. In some parts of the country, a CO2 price of as little as $7 to $14 per ton would provide sufficient incentive to give priority to dispatch of gas-fired electricity into the grid over that of coal. Natural gas can serve as a bridge fuel to a low-carbon, sustainable energy future. In particular, natural gas can provide the critical low-carbon “firming” or back-up fuel that can enable deep market penetration of both wind power and concentrated solar thermal power. The marriage of gas and renewable energy in the form of hybrid wind-gas and solargas plants addresses the issue of renewable intermittency, greatly enabling low-cost/low emissions power generation.

### NG Solves- Straight Up

#### Natural gas key during transition

Nordhaus and Shellenberger 2012 (Ted Nordhaus, energy analyst and chairman of the Breakthrough Institute, and Michael Shellenberger, energy analyst, author and president of the Breakthrough Institute, February 27, 2012, “Beyond Cap and Trade, A New Path to Clean Energy,” Yale Environment 360, http://goo.gl/dtQf4)

A funny thing happened while environmentalists were trying and failing to cap carbon emissions in the U.S. Congress. U.S. carbon emissions started going down. The decline began in 2005 and accelerated after the financial crisis. The latest estimates from the U.S. Energy Information Administration now suggest that U.S. emissions will continue to decline for the next few years and remain flat for a decade or more after that. The proximate cause of the decline in recent years has been the recession and slow economic recovery. But the reason that EIA is projecting a long-term decline over the next decade or more is the glut of cheap natural gas, mostly from unconventional sources like shale, that has profoundly changed America’s energy outlook over the next several decades. Gas is no panacea. It still puts a lot of carbon into the atmosphere and has created a range of new pollution problems at the local level. Methane leakage resulting from the extraction and burning of natural gas threatens to undo much of the carbon benefit that gas holds over coal. And even were we to make a full transition from coal to gas, we would then need to transition from gas to renewables and nuclear in order to reduce U.S. emissions deeply enough to achieve the reductions that climate scientists believe will be necessary to avoid dangerous global warming. But the shale gas revolution, and its rather significant impact on the U.S. carbon emissions outlook, offers a stark rebuke to what has been the dominant view among policy analysts and environmental advocates as to what it would take in order to begin to bend down the trajectory of U.S. emissions, namely a price on carbon and a binding cap on emissions. The existence of a better and cheaper substitute is today succeeding in reducing U.S. emissions where efforts to raise the cost of fossil fuels through carbon caps or pricing — and thereby drive the transition to renewable energy technologies — have failed. In fact, the rapid displacement of coal with gas has required little in the way of regulations at all. Conventional air pollution regulations do represent a very low, implicit price on carbon. And a lot of good grassroots activism at the local and regional level has raised the political costs of keeping old coal plants in service and bringing new ones online. But those efforts have become increasingly effective as gas has gotten cheaper. The existence of a better and cheaper substitute has made the transition away from coal much more viable economically, and it has put the wind at the back of political efforts to oppose new coal plants, close existing ones, and put in place stronger EPA air pollution regulations. Yet if cheap gas is harnessing market forces to shutter old coal plants, the existence of cheap gas from unconventional places is by no means the product of those same forces, nor of laissez faire energy policies. Our current glut of gas and declining emissions are in no small part the result of 30 years of federal support for research, demonstration, and commercialization of non-conventional gas technologies without which there would be no shale gas revolution today. Starting in the mid-seventies, the Ford and Carter administrations funded large-scale demonstration projects that proved that shale was a potentially massive source of gas. In the years that followed, the U.S. Department of Energy continued to fund research and demonstration of new fracking technologies and developed new three-dimensional mapping and horizontal drilling technologies that ultimately allowed firms to recover gas from shale at commercially viable cost and scale. And the federal non-conventional gas tax credit subsidized private firms to continue to experiment with new gas technologies at a time when few people even within the natural gas industry thought that firms would ever succeed in economically recovering gas from shale. The gas revolution now unfolding — and its potential impact on the future trajectory of U.S. emissions — suggests that the long-standing emphasis on emissions reduction targets and timetables and on pricing have been misplaced. Even now, carbon pricing remains the sine qua non of climate policy among the academic and think-tank crowds, while much of the national environmental movement seems to view the current period as an interregnum between the failed effort to cap carbon emissions in the last Congress and the next opportunity to take up the cap-and-trade effort in some future Congress. And yet, the European Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS), which has been in place for almost a decade now and has established carbon prices well above those that would have been established by the proposed U.S. system, has had no discernible impact on European emissions. The carbon intensity of the European economy has not declined at all since the imposition of the ETS. Meanwhile green paragon Germany has embarked upon a coal-building binge under the auspices of the ETS, one that has accelerated since the Germans shut down their nuclear power plants. Even so, proponents of U.S. emissions limits maintain that legally binding carbon caps will provide certainty that emissions will go down in the future, whereas technology development and deployment — along with efforts to regulate conventional air pollutants — do not. Certainly, energy and emissions projections have proven notoriously unreliable in the past — it is entirely possible that future emissions could be well above, or well below, the EIA’s current projections. But the cap-and-trade proposal that failed in the last Congress, like the one that has been in place in Europe, would have provided no such certainty. It was so riddled with loopholes, offset provisions, and various other cost-containment mechanisms that emissions would have been able to rise at business-as-usual levels for decades. Arguably, the actual outcome might have been much worse. The price of the environmental movement’s demand for its “legally binding” pound of flesh was a massive handout of free emissions allocations to the coal industry, which might have slowed the transition to gas that is currently underway. Continuing to drive down U.S. emissions will ultimately require that we develop low- or no-carbon alternatives that are better and cheaper than gas. That won’t happen overnight. The development of cost-effective technologies to recover gas from shale took more than 30 years. But we’ve already made a huge down payment on the technologies we will need. Over the last decade, we have spent upwards of $200 billion to develop and commercialize new renewable energy technologies. China has spent even more. And those investments are beginning to pay off. Wind is now almost as cheap as gas in some areas — in prime locations with good proximity to existing transmission. Solar is also close to achieving grid parity in prime locations as well. And a new generation of nuclear designs that promises to be safer, cheaper, and easier to scale may ultimately provide zero-carbon baseload power. All of these technologies have a long way to go before they are able to displace coal or gas at significant scale. But the key to getting there won’t be more talk of caps and carbon prices. It will be to continue along the same path that brought us cheap unconventional gas — developing and deploying the technologies and infrastructure we need from the bottom up. When all is said and done, a cap, or a carbon price, may get us the last few yards across the finish line. But a more oblique path, focused on developing better technologies and strengthening conventional air pollution regulations, may work just as well, or even better. For one thing should now be clear: The key to decarbonizing our economy will be developing cheap alternatives that can cost-effectively replace fossil fuels. There simply is no substitute for making clean energy cheap.

### Solves- A2 Turns

#### No emissions turns- Preponderance of comprehensive life cycle analyses conclude aff

**Fulton and Mellquist 2011** (Mark Fulton, Managing Director Global Head of Climate Change Investment Research, and Nils Mellquist, Vice President and Senior Research Analyst, August 25, 2011, “Comparing Life-Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Natural Gas and Coal,” Worldwatch Institute, http://goo.gl/NhfkG)

Natural gas has been widely discussed as a less carbon-intensive alternative to coal as a power sector fuel. In April 2011, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency released revised methodologies for estimating fugitive methane emissions from natural gas systems. These revisions mostly affected the production component of the natural gas value chain (namely, gas well cleanups), causing a very substantial increase in the methane emissions estimate from U.S. natural gas systems.12 This large increase in the upstream component of the natural gas value chain caused some to question the GHG advantage of gas versus coal over the entire life-cycle from source to use. As a result of this renewed attention, while it remains unambiguous that natural gas has a lower carbon content per unit of energy than coal does, several recent bottom-up studies have questioned whether natural gas retains its greenhouse gas advantage when the entire life cycles of both fuels are considered.3 Particular scrutiny has focused on shale formations, which are the United States’ fastest growing marginal supply source of natural gas. Several recent bottom-up life-cycle studies have found the production of a unit of shale gas to be more GHG-intensive than that of conventional natural gas.4 Consequently, if the upstream emissions associated with shale gas production are not mitigated, a growing share of shale gas would increase the average life-cycle greenhouse gas footprint of the total U.S. natural gas supply. Applying the latest emission factors from the EPA’s 2011 upward revisions, our top-down life-cycle analysis (LCA)5 finds that the EPA’s new methodology increases the life-cycle emissions estimate of natural gas-fired electricity for the baseline year of 2008 by about 11 percent compared with its 2010 methodology. But even with these adjustments, we conclude that on average, U.S. natural gas-fired electricity generation still emitted 47 percent less GHGs than coal from source to use using the IPCC’s 100-year global warming potential for methane of 25. This figure is consistent with the findings of all but one of the recent life-cycle analyses that we reviewed. While our LCA finds that the EPA’s updated estimates of methane emissions from natural gas systems do not undercut the greenhouse gas advantage of natural gas over coal, methane is nevertheless of concern as a GHG, and requires further attention. In its recent report on improving the safety of hydraulic fracturing, the U.S. Secretary of Energy’s Advisory Board’s Subcommittee on Shale Gas Production recommended that immediate efforts be launched to gather improved methane emissions data from shale gas operations.6 In the meantime, methane emissions during the production, processing, transport, storage, and distribution of all forms of natural gas can be mitigated immediately using a range of existing technologies and best practices, many of which have payback times of three years or less.7 Such capture potential presents a commercial and investment opportunity that would further improve the life-cycle GHG footprint of natural gas. Although the adoption of these practices has been largely voluntary to date, the EPA proposed new air quality rules in July 2011 that would require the industry to mitigate many of the methane emissions associated with natural gas development, and in particular with shale gas development.8

### Link

#### Subsidies ensure wind competes with natural gas

Jenkins et al 2012[Jesse Jenkins, Director of Energy and Climate Policy, Breakthrough Institute¶ Mark Muro, Senior Fellow, Metropolitan Policy Program, Brookings Institution¶ Ted Nordhaus and Michael Shellenberger, Cofounders, Breakthrough Institute¶ Letha Tawney, Senior Associate, World Resources Institute¶ Alex Trembath, Policy Associate, Breakthrough Institute April 2012, “Beyond Boom and Bust” Brookings Institute http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/4/18%20clean%20investments%20muro/0418\_clean\_investments\_final%20paper\_pdf]

At present, the federal PTC for wind power production brings the levelized cost of electricity from¶ new wind power projects down to an estimated range of $33-65 per megawatt-hour (MWh), depending¶ on the quality of wind resource.¶ 41¶ At these prices wind power is broadly competitive with new gasfired generation (with levelized costs as low as $52 at likely gas prices, see Box 1), supporting robust¶ market expansion.¶ However, the PTC is scheduled to expire at the end of 2012, creating significant market uncertainty¶ 42¶ and prompting manufacturers of wind turbine components to prepare for layoffs and substantial market¶ contraction.¶ 43 Without the PTC, the unsubsidized cost of a typical new wind power project ranges from¶ about $60-90 per MWh (for “Class 3” and above wind sites), making wind energy competitive with gasfired generation only in the best of wind regimes with ready access to existing transmission capacity.¶ 44¶ Very few of these ideal sites remain available for development. If the PTC expires without any replacement, market analysts expect annual wind energy installations to collapse from a projected peak of 8-10.5¶ gigawatts (GW) in 2012 to just 1.5-2 GW in 2013.¶ 45

#### Even if the bridge fails

Pierce 2011 (Richard Pierce, “NATURAL GAS: A LONG BRIDGE TO A PROMISING DESTINATION,” Utah Environmental Law Review, online)

Returning to the metaphor inspired by the earmark the Alaskan Senator inserted in an appropriations Bill, the gas “bridge” will not be a “bridge to nowhere.” It is unlikely to lead to the destination that the policymakers who coined the phrase expect—replacement of hydrocarbons with carbon-free renewable resources. It is likely to lead to a destination, however, that is a dramatic improvement on the status quo in virtually all respects. Displacement of coal and oil with natural gas as a generating fuel will improve both the economy and the environment. In the U.S., replacing coal with gas would reduce total emissions of green house gases attributable to electric generation by 45 per cent.20 That is well-short of the 80 per cent reduction in global emissions that climate scientists believe to be needed to mitigate global warming, but it is a major step in the right direction. If we combine that step with the other steps that make sense in their effects on both the economy and the environment—a carbon tax21 and real-time pricing of electricity22—we will have a reasonable chance of meeting our climate goals. Replacing coal with gas will have other significant environmental benefits as well, e.g., elimination of the tens of thousands of premature deaths and hundred of thousands of illnesses in the U.S. each year that are caused by inhalation of pollutants emitted by coal-fired generating plants.23 Moreover, we could extend the benefits of the U.S. gas boom to the transportation sector by increasing the direct use of compressed natural gas in vehicles and/or by increasing the indirect use of natural gas by increasing the number of vehicles that are powered by gas- generated electricity.