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#### Collapse of natural gas industry inevitable- Overleveraged, prices too low

**Fahey 2012** (Jonathan Fahey, April 9, 2012, “Natural gas glut means drilling boom must slow,” Boston Globe, lexis)

The U.S. natural gas market is bursting at the seams. So much natural gas is being produced that soon there may be nowhere left to put the country's swelling surplus. After years of explosive growth, natural gas producers are retrenching. The underground salt caverns, depleted oil fields and aquifers that store natural gas are rapidly filling up after a balmy winter depressed demand for home heating. The glut has benefited businesses and homeowners that use natural gas. But with natural gas prices at a 10-year low — and falling — companies that produce the fuel are becoming victims of their drilling successes. Their stock prices are falling in anticipation of declining profits and scaled-back growth plans. Some of the nation's biggest natural gas producers, including Chesapeake Energy, ConocoPhillips and Encana Corp., have announced plans to slow down. "They've gotten way ahead of themselves, and winter got way ahead of them too," says Jen Snyder, head of North American gas for the research firm Wood Mackenzie. "There hasn't been enough demand to use up all the supply being pushed into the market." So far, efforts to limit production have barely made a dent. Unless the pace of production declines sharply or demand picks up significantly this summer, analysts say the nation's storage facilities could reach their limits by fall. That would cause the price of natural gas, which has been halved over the past year, to nosedive. Citigroup commodities analyst Anthony Yuen says the price of natural gas — now $2.08 per 1,000 cubic feet — could briefly fall below $1. "There would be no floor," he says. Since October, the number of drilling rigs exploring for natural gas has fallen by 30 percent to 658, according to the energy services company Baker Hughes. Some of the sharpest drop-offs have been in the Haynesville Shale in Northwestern Louisiana and East Texas and the Fayetteville Shale in Central Arkansas. But natural gas production is still growing, the result of a five-year drilling boom that has peppered the country with wells. The workers and rigs aren't just being sent home. They are instead being put to work drilling for oil, whose price has averaged more than $100 a barrel for months. The oil rig count in the U.S is at a 25-year high. This activity is adding to the natural gas glut because natural gas is almost always a byproduct of oil drilling. Analysts say that before long companies could have to start slowing the gas flow from existing wells or even take the rare and expensive step of capping off some wells completely. "Something is going to have to give," says Maria Sanchez, manager of energy analysis at Bentek Energy, a research firm. U.S. natural gas production has boomed in recent years as a result of new drilling techniques that allow companies to unlock fuel trapped in shale formations. Last year, the U.S. produced an average of 63 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day, a 24 percent increase from 2006. But over that period consumption has grown half as fast. The nation's storage facilities could easily handle this extra supply until recently because cold winters pushed up demand for heating and hot summers led to higher demand for air conditioning. Just over half the nation's homes are heated with natural gas, and one-quarter of its electricity is produced by gas-fired power plants. But this past winter was the fourth warmest in the last 117 years, according to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. It was the warmest March since 1950. Between November and March, daily natural gas demand fell 5 percent, on average, from a year earlier, according to Bentek Energy. Yet production grew 8 percent over the same period. "We haven't ever seen a situation like this before," says Chris McGill, Vice President for Policy Analysis at the American Gas Association, an industry group. At the end of winter, there is usually about 1.5 trillion cubic feet of gas in storage. Today there is 2.5 trillion cubic feet because utilities withdrew far less than usual this past winter. There is 4.4 trillion cubic feet of natural gas storage capacity in the U.S. If full, that would be enough fuel to supply the country for about 2 months. If current production and consumption trends were to continue, Bentek estimates that storage facilities would be full on October 10. Storage capacity, which has grown by 15 percent over the past decade, cannot be built fast enough to address the rapidly expanding glut. And analysts note there is little financial incentive to build more anyway.

#### Wrecks economy without the aff

Whitman 2012 (Christine Todd Whitman, former EPA Administrator and Governor of New Jersey, May 9, 2012, “It's dangerous to depend on natural gas,” CNN Money, http://tech.fortune.cnn.com/2012/05/09/christine-whitman-nuclear-energy/)

The United States needs an "all of the above" energy strategy that focuses on low-carbon electricity sources that will lower energy costs, reduce dependency on foreign fuel sources and promote clean electricity. This is a prudent strategy to help drive American manufacturing and transportation networks of the future. Most importantly, this approach can put the country on a sustainable path toward long-term economic growth.¶ While today's rock-bottom natural gas prices are attractive, an unbalanced dependence on natural gas in the electricity sector would put Americans at risk, both economically and in terms of longer term energy security.¶ While many look at energy prices from today's lens, successful energy policy requires a long view that promotes fuel diversity but doesn't pick technology winners; it preserves our air, land and water and is affordable for consumers.¶ We need only look at the volatile history of natural gas prices. Consider the shift from the low, stable prices of the 1990s to the record-high rates and wild supply fluctuations of the mid-2000s.¶ We should take advantage of our domestic energy resources, recognizing that today's natural gas market is still vulnerable. The present oversupply of natural gas opens opportunities for exports into foreign markets at prices two-to-three times higher. If demand from other countries increases as they meet growing energy demand, it will cause our prices to align with higher world prices. During my tenure as governor of a state that relies heavily on nuclear energy, I can attest to the cost effectiveness of nuclear fuel and the protection it offers against price spikes in natural gas or future environmental controls such as a cost on carbon. Nuclear energy doesn't emit any greenhouse gases or controlled pollutants while producing power and it is affordable, predictable and efficient. Moreover, a nuclear power plant with a footprint of one square mile generates the same amount of energy as 20 square miles of solar panels or 2,400 wind turbines spread out across 235 square miles.

#### No res now

Lazear 2012 (Edward P. Lazear, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers from 2006-2009, professor at Stanford University's Graduate School of Business and a Hoover Institution fellow, April 2, 2012, “The Worst Economic Recovery in History,” Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303816504577311470997904292.html)

How many times have we heard that this was the worst recession since the Great Depression? That may be true—although the double-dip recession of the early 1980s was about comparable. Less publicized is that our current recovery pales in comparison with most other recoveries, including the one following the Great Depression.¶ The Great Depression started with major economic contractions in 1930, '31, '32 and '33. In the three following years, the economy rebounded strongly with growth rates of 11%, 9% and 13%, respectively.¶ The current recovery began in the second half of 2009, but economic growth has been weak. Growth in 2010 was 3% and in 2011 it was 1.7%. Who knows what 2012 will bring, but the current growth rate looks to be about 2%, according to the consensus of economists recently polled by Blue Chip Economic Indicators. Sadly, we have never really recovered from the recession. The economy has not even returned to its long-term growth rate and is certainly not making up for lost ground. No doubt, there are favorable economic numbers to be found, but overall we continue to struggle.¶ During the postwar period up to the current recession (1947-2007), the average annual growth rate for the U.S. was 3.4%. The last three decades have experienced somewhat slower growth than the earlier periods, but even in the period 1977-2007, the average growth rate was 3%. According to the National Bureau of Economic Research, the recovery began in the second half of 2009. Since that time, the economy has grown at 2.4%, below our long-term trend by either measure. At this point, the economy is 12% smaller than it would have been had we stayed on trend growth since 2007.¶ Worse, the gap is growing over time. Today, the economy is four percentage points further from the trend line than it was the first quarter of 2009 when this administration's nearly $900 billion fiscal stimulus efforts began. If forecasts of around 2% growth turn out to be accurate, we will add to that gap this year.¶ Contrast this weak growth with the recovery that followed the other large recession of recent decades. In the early 1980s, the economy experienced a double-dip recession, with contractions in both 1980 and '82. But growth rates in the subsequent two years averaged almost 6%. The high growth that persisted throughout the 1980s brought the economy quickly back to the trend line. Unlike the current period, from 1983 on, the economy was in rapid catch-up mode and eventually regained all that had been lost during the early '80s.¶ Indeed, that was the expectation. As economist Victor Zarnowitz of the University of Chicago argued many years ago, the strength of the recovery is related to the depth of the recession. Big recessions are followed by robust recoveries, presumably because more idle resources are available to be tapped. Unfortunately, the current post-recession period has not followed the pattern.¶ The 2007-09 recession was induced by a financial crisis and some, most notably economists Carmen Reinhart and Kenneth Rogoff (authors of "This Time is Different: Eight Centuries of Financial Folly"), argue that financial crises pose more difficult recovery problems than do policy-induced recessions.¶ The early '80s recession could be viewed as induced by the Federal Reserve's tight monetary policy (i.e., raising interest rates), which was designed to rein in inflation. Growth returns more rapidly, they argue, when the policy hindering it changes (i.e., the Fed lowers interest rates) than when the economy is struggling after a severe credit crisis like the one we experienced after the 2008 collapse of Bear Stearns.¶ But some, Stanford economist John Taylor being their leading spokesman, argue that the current recession was caused by Fed policy as well—rates remained too low for too long in the lead up to the subprime mortgage fiasco. The Great Depression also began with a financial crisis but saw high growth rates following contractionary years, and the output lost in negative years was eventually regained through higher subsequent growth.¶ Are there other factors that may have contributed to the slow recovery that we are experiencing? It would be difficult to argue that government polices over the past three years have enhanced confidence in the U.S. business environment. Threats of higher taxes, the constantly increasing regulatory burden, the failure to pursue an aggressive trade policy that will open markets to U.S. exports, and the enormous increase in government spending all are growth impediments. Policies have focused on short-run changes and gimmicks—recall cash for clunkers and first-time home buyer credits—rather than on creating conditions that are favorable to investment that raise productivity and wages.¶ There are some positive developments. The labor market is improving, albeit slowly. Profits remain high and the stock market has enjoyed some recent success. We can hope that these indicate better times and higher growth ahead. But unless we move to a set of economic policies that are aimed at growing the economy rather than at promoting social agendas, this may be the first "recovery" in history that fails to see us return to long-term average growth.

### Cap

#### 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.

#### Capitalism is a system of ethics—alt causes extinction

Francois-Rene Rideau. (Phd. University of Nice). "Capitalsim is the Instituion of Ethics: A Speech prepared for the Libertarian International Convention." 2005. http://fare.tunes.org/liberty/sofia2005.html

I In a strong sense, Capitalism is Ethics: a paradigm of individual choice. Behaving according to the rules of Capitalism is being an ethical agent respectful of the ethical nature of oneself and other persons. Violating the rules of Capitalism is denying the ethical nature of oneself and other persons. 2 Ethics: a Paradigm of Individual Choice Let's start by examining the nature of Ethics. Ethics is the process of distinguishing between good and bad. Like any process, it is relevant only in as much as it affects human behaviour. And it affects human behaviour, because an individual, when confronted with many opportunities, and in as much as he's able to make the difference, will naturally be inclined to choose the opportunity that's best. Best according to him, that is. No, not best according to the criteria that he is ready to publicly admit he applies; best according to what he really thinks matters; this means best for himself first, though that self includes the persons and causes he identifies with. I therefore insist that Ethics is about Choice. Without a choice, good and bad have no relevant meaning. And within a choice, it's actually the comparison ``better´´ and ``worse´´ between opportunities that matters, it isn't an absolute ``good´´ outside of context. I insist on Individual Choice: every decision is necessarily made by an individual person. Any so-called ``collective´´ phenomenon is the emerging result of individual actions; there are no social forces that act outside and above of individuals; every decision or action that may or may not participate of a collective phenomenon is actually made by a single individual [2]. I also insist on the subjective nature of ethical judgments: moral judgements are necessarily based upon individual criteria, due to personal knowledge and subjective preferences [3]. Enjoyment is individual, and so is suffering individual. All preferences are individual: good is good for someone, or more precisely according to someone. And good or bad only directly matters if it's good or bad for the extended self of the individual making the decision. There is no good without someone to benefit: there is no possible ``collective good´´ that benefits a murky ``collective´´ unless it's a good that benefits all the members of said collective. A ``collective´´ judgment may objectively compare preferences and results over each individuals; in some cases, it may then conclude that everyone is better off in some situation than in some other. Hence the concept of Pareto optimality, but more importantly, hence the principle that mutually voluntary exchanges benefit all involved parties. On the other hand, there is no objective way to reconcile conflicts when someone loses and someone else wins; there is no objective common scale on which to project individual preferences and deduce a collective aggregate value [4]. 3 Responsibility: The Dynamic Feedback of Ethics Up to now, we have seen that Ethics is a paradigm of individual choice. According to what rules will individuals make decisions? How may we acquire correct rules of behaviour that benefit us, rather than incorrect rules of behaviour that actually harm us? What can make our ethical theories to actually be good? In cybernetical terms, we speak of the structural coupling between two structures. The two structures concerned are the real world and each of our mental models of it. What ensures the relevance of our models and its ethical rules with respect to the real world and the laws of nature, so that our decisions actually benefit us? As always, the answer, in cybernetical terms, is feedback. You may have heard of experiments where a man is cut from his sensorial feedback, eyes and ears shut, plunged into a bath at body temperature, with artificial breathing and feeding. After a long enough time in such a situation, the man goes crazy. His mind has been disconnected from reality. Cut a man from his sensorial feedback, and after some time, he'll go raving mad, without sensorial direction. Well, the same is true for man as moral being: cut him from his moral feedback, and after some time, he'll behave in a morally crazy way, without moral compass. In the realm of morality, the feedback is named responsibility. Responsibility is when someone suffers the consequences of some decisions. And this means both the positive consequences and the negative consequences. When responsibility coincides with liberty, when the person who takes some decision suffers the full consequences of these decisions, then there is a feedback loop; then people benefit from their good choices and lose from their bad choices; and so they may learn from experience. As you may know, experience is the best teacher; but it is an expensive teacher, that always gives the lesson after it gives the examination. However, intelligent people learn from other people's experience, not just their own — so they may learn the lesson and succeed at future examinations without having to fail at first. When it matches liberty of choice, responsibility before the consequences of one's own choice is the one principle of progress in human history. It is the feedback from reality that makes us stick to reality and improve ourselves within it. Responsibility is what keeps human action relevant to human fate. Without responsibility, we lose track of how to behave; worse, with misplaced responsibility, where those who decide are not those who suffer the consequences of decisions, then we get on the wrong track, and we run into disasters. To avoid confusion, note the distinction between (1) responsibility in fact, that falls upon whoever actually suffers the consequences of action, (2) the feeling of responsibility, that some people may or may not have, whether or not they actually suffer the direct consequences of given actions. It is through the feeling of responsibility that some people may adjust their actions; but it is actual responsibility that creates a dynamics whereby people learn to feel the right kind of responsibility rather than a wrong one. We may also distinguish (3) responsibility in law, which is about the praise or blame that people get, but I'll get to that later. Some people may try to equate Responsibility in Fact with some kind of immanent justice. However, it must be understood that conscious human action is part of the feedback that constitutes Responsibility. If humans don't consciously create feedback, then responsibility may fail to exist. In other words, in this matter as in others, We can't ``let nature decide´´ — we are part of nature; we can't ``let god enforce his will´´ — we are among god's agents; we can't ``let authority tell us´´ — we are the makers of the authority that determines things; it isn't above us, it is us. And we'll see that this is what Law is about. To summarize what Ethics is, Ethics is a paradigm of individual choice between opportunities, which choices are kept relevant to the meaning of human life through the feedback of responsibility. That is why Capitalism is precisely the Institution of Ethics: Capitalism is the formal recognition of Human Action as a Paradigm of Individual Choice between Opportunities. 4 Capitalism: the Institution of Ethics Indeed, what is Capitalism? Capitalism is a Theory of Law. It is a Theory of Law that consists in the definition of individual property rights. A Theory of Law gives means to resolve and prevent conflicts. Conflicts arise when individuals make incompatible decisions about some resources that may be used in only one of the proposed ways at most. Capitalism is a Theory of Law based upon the recognition that human action is made of individual decisions, that are kept relevant through responsibility. Because a resource may be spent but by individual decision, whoever ultimately gets to decide the use or fate of a resource in fact possesses that resource. The only way to prevent future conflicts about resources is thus to determine whose decision is to prevail about said resources, who may legitimately possess it. Capitalism is thus based upon acknowledging to each potentially disputed resource a proprietor, an owner. The owner may decide how this resource is preserved or spent. But under Capitalism, the way that ownership of resources is distributed is not arbitrary. Capitalism recognizes that possession in fact [5], without any previous conflicting claim from anyone else, makes for valid property rights [6]. Hence, the personal liberties by which each individual owns his own body, mind, and activity. Hence also the homesteading rule by which individuals appropriate natural resources by being the first to put them to actual use. Capitalism also recognizes the necessity of responsibility. Thus, it seeks to match the liberty of making a decision with the responsibility for the consequences of making said decision. Hence, creators get to own whatever they create, whether it's good or bad. Hence, destroyers get to be responsible for what they destroy, whether it's good or bad. If during a transformation, one both creates and destroys things, one gets both the praise and the blame accordingly. And blame means that the culprit must compensate the victim for encroachment to the victim's property. Finally, Capitalism recognizes the goodness of mutually volontary exchanges. Hence, not only is a property individual: all decisions concerning it are ultimately borne by a one person, the owner. A property is also transferable: the owner may give or exchange his property with any other willing individual, at mutually agreed conditions. Finally, a property is divisible: either through physical division, time sharing or any agreed upon arrangement, the owner may split his property so as to exchange part of it with another individual, through contract. These are the principles of Capitalism. 5 Law and Facts But what relationship does Capitalism have to reality? Indeed, what does any Theory of Law have to do with reality? What binds Fact to Law? The choice between actions, good and bad, legitimate or illegitimate, still resides upon individual choice. Just because some action has been identified as legitimate or illegitimate doesn't magically drive individuals towards or away from this action. Once again, there is one distinction that may drive an individual's behaviour, when said individual is able to make this distinction: it is the distinction between what is good for said person and what is bad for said person. But unless you can somehow tie legitimacy to individual good, then it remains an irrelevant distinction as far as human action goes. That's where the domain of Law comes into play. Widely held opinions about what is legitimate, bind individual interest, through the implementation and expectation of enforcement. Because people expect punishment for their deeds that are generally found to be bad, they will refrain from indulging such deeds — or suffer the wrath of society, and eventually be removed from society, should they persist. Ideas have consequences. Ideas about legitimacy have consequences in terms of what rules of behaviour people adopt. Law is part of what makes fact. A wide feeling of legitimacy breeds force. Right makes Might. Certainly, force gives means to do massive propaganda so as to cultivate a feeling of legitimacy. Might gives the means to make Right. And it has to, if it is to survive without yielding to a revolt. That is why, for instance, you mustn't imagine slaves as being on the constant brink of revolt. Those who could revolt did so before they were conquered, and died; thereafter the few who revolt are destroyed before the majority rises. And so the vast majority of living slaves find that their fate, if not deserved, is by all means normal, a necessary burden in the natural order of society. And I mean not only slaves, but all oppressed people, by all kinds of oppression, including whichever you can observe around you. But this is also why you shouldn't confuse Law, as the mighty ones want it to be, Law, as their lawyers write it, Law, as their uniform-wearing thugs enforce it, and Law, as established by the population at large, whether through official or unofficial means. 6 The Enforcement of Property Rights If Law in general gets its power from enforcement, how are property rights to be enforced within Capitalism? Well, under a system of Capitalism, the owner of some resource may defend his property against trespassers, intruders, robbers; and the owner of destroyed or altered property may require tort reparation from intentional or unintentional borrowers, thieves, vandals, destroyers. Defense and reparation of property may require the use of force; the enforcement of property rights thus imply a sphere for the legitimate use of force. Now, force itself requires the use of resources; thus, the paradigm of property rights implies that the owners of said resources be responsible for deciding whether and how to use resources for property enforcement. Under a regime of property rights, property owners will spend the resources they desire to defend the properties they consider deserve a defense; they may start with defending their own property, and that of those they care for; but they may also help prevent and prosecute any property encroachment that is repugnant to them, whoever the victim may be. And they may organize in the most efficient ways they find, on a free market. A monopoly on the use of force, taking some resources by force from people to organize defense, and forbidding them to use other resources to defend themselves, is thus in itself a violation of property rights. A monopolist Government, a State, is thus a negation of Capitalism, and actually the biggest negation there is of Capitalism. 7 Capitalism as a Phenomenon Now, you'll tell me, such unrestricted Capitalism doesn't exist — at least yet. Its opponents call it ``wild´´ capitalism, the law of the jungle. But it doesn't exist because it's actually much more civilized than our societies currently are. Whatever the case may be, in absence of such complete Capitalism, universally recognized as valid Law, what is the relevance of Capitalism in society? That's where I would like to say a few things about Capitalism as a phenomenon. Capitalism is a word coined by Marx. I don't mean the great philosopher, Groucho Marx, I mean the bad humorist, Karl Marx. Marx defined ``Capitalism´´ as the private ownership of means of production, as opposed to government ownership of those means of production in the name of the ``collective´´. He actually made up the term from the word ``capitalist´´, which designates someone who earns his living out of the proceeds of his capital investments. What is capital? Capital is any resource that has to be reserved in advance, so that production may take place that will only bear fruits later. It includes any tools and machinery, but also the resources needed to sustain the lives of the workers until production is successful — assuming it is successful, eventually. If we are to understand capital as productive material machinery, then the first capitalist man was the first tool owner, the first person to foresee the future utility of a tool and keep that solid stick or hard stone for a future use. The first capitalist was the first human, the first homo abilis. What distinguishes man from animal is precisely this ability to use, keep and develop tools. And capitalism is humanity. Everyone is a capitalist in as much as one owns anything that is for use at a latter date. But those who distinguish as are more capitalist than others, are those who see further than other people, and keeps things for future use that other people fail to prepare or neglect to keep. If capital is to be understood in a broader sense, as any material thing that one may possess, that will enable future production, then first capitalist was the first animal to keep food for next year, or even for next day. And if these possessions are to include absorbed chemicals as well as chemicals stored outside one's body, then the first capitalist was the first living cell, that kept chemicals inside a membrane. Capitalism, as a phenomenon, is life itself. Those who fight Capitalism, the phenomenon, are actually seeking to destroy mankind, they are seeking to destroy life itself. They want to put an end to civilization and return to brutish animality. They want to put an end to animality and return to vegetation. They want to put an end to vegetation, to change, to life itself, and return to the purity and stability of death.

#### Sustainable capitalism 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.

#### 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.

#### War exacerbates structural impacts

Joshua S. Goldstein, pub. date: 2001, Prof. of IR @ American University, Washington D.C. He is the author of a broad range of research works on international conflict, cooperation, and political economy, with a central focus on great-power relations and world order, War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa, Cambridge University, pp. 412

First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, “if you want peace, work for justice.” Then, if one believes that sexism contributes to war, one can work for gender justice specifically (or perhaps among others) in order to pursue peace. This approach beings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices cause war. The evidence in this book suggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War is not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although theses influence wars’ outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueled and sustained these and other injustices. So, “if you want peace, work for peace.” Indeed, if you want justice (gender and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis, from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war, It runs downward too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes towards war and the military may be the most important way to “reverse women’s oppression.” The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice beings to the peace movement energy, allies, and moral grounding, yet in light of this book’s evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate.

#### Util is good and doesn’t devalue life

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.

### CP

#### Resource demands mean costs skyrocket and plants have to accept it

DOE 11 (INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGIES PROGRAM Guiding Principles for Successfully Implementing Industrial Energy Assessment Recommendations April 2011 (DRAFT); http://www1.eere.energy.gov/manufacturing/pdfs/implementation\_guidebook.pdf)

A plant should only participate in an assessment if it is willing to make an ongoing commitment to implementation. This commitment is more than just participating in a single energy assessment; it is agreeing to make implementation a long-term requirement. Plants should demonstrate this commitment from the very beginning. Key Take-Away: Ensure that management provides resources for the assessment and the implementation of recommendations Plant managers should play an active role in supporting both the assessment process and the implementation of viable projects. At the onset of the planning process, it is crucial that management makes a commitment to seeing all acceptable or reasonable projects through. Additionally, management must agree to provide the following: • Financial resources and incentives for the assessment and the implementation of identified recommendations • Budget • Equipment • Transportation • Staff. This can entail conducting research before the assessment begins to identify potential funding opportunities: • Rebates • Loans • Upfront payments to help mitigate the costs of potential projects. • Tax incentives • Production exemption • No utility tax for consumption tied to production in some states. Another option is to schedule a meeting with a local utility company to find out what financial and technical resources are available.

#### Plan key to licensing—no agency signal

Waterman 2009 (Richard W. Waterman, Professor of Political Science at University of Kentucky, 2009, “Bush and Nuclear Regulatory Commission,” President George W. Bush’s Influence Over Bureacracy and Policy, google books)

The historic 1994 congressional elections, however, are consistent with expectations. When the Republicans took control of Congress for the first time in 40 years (in January 1995), there was a decline of almost 3.5 civil penalties assessed per month. Since the 1994 electoral earthquake meant that the chairs of both the House and Senate oversight committees were in the hands of Republicans for the first time since the NRC was established, this likely sent shockwaves throughout the agency. Because Congress possesses both the power of the purse and oversight authority, NRC personnel altered their enforcement behavior in a manner that was consistent with the political philosophy of the new dominant coalition in Congress.

#### Links to politics

Bezdek 2011 (Roger H. Bezdek, Contributing Editor, February 2011, “New Congress digs in its heels,” World Oil, http://www.misi-net.com/publications/WorldOil-0211.pdf)

Cap and trade is dead, but EPA is attempting to impose GHG regulations independent of legislation, and is facing strong opposition from Congress. The agency announced that it will propose GHG limits for power plants this July and for oil refineries in December; final rules will be issued in 2012. EPA added fuel to the fire by waiting until Dec. 23— the day after Congress adjourned for the year—to make the announcement. ¶ Rep. Upton has vowed that the House won’t “let this administration regulate what they’ve been unable to legislate.” The GOP wasted no time: On Jan. 6, three House Republicans— Marsha Blackburn (Tenn.), Shelley Capito (W.Va.) and Ted Poe (Texas)— introduced bills to block EPA from regulating GHGs. Blackburn’s bill seeks to “amend the Clean Air Act to provide that greenhouse gases are not subject to the Act”; Capito’s would delay EPA from regulating GHGs for two years; and Poe’s would prohibit agency fund- ing “to be used to implement or enforce a cap-and-trade program for greenhouse gases.” House Republicans also elimi- nated the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming cre- ated in 2007, with House Speaker John Boehner (Ohio) telling reporters, “The global warming committee doesn’t need to be a separate committee. We believe the Science Committee is more than ca- pable of handling this issue, and in the process we’ll save several million dollars.”

### Elections

#### Romney wins-

#### Key states- predictive

Talgo 9/16 (Tyler Talgo, “Why Romney Will Win The Election,” USC Annenberg school of Journalism, Neon Tommy, http://www.neontommy.com/news/2012/09/why-romney-will-win-election)

In summary, there are a number of conclusions that can be safely made about the outcome of this election. The fact of the matter is that if Romney is trailing Obama by a considerable amount in a state in which Obama has high polling averages, he does not have much room to compete. But, in states in which Obama is polling in the mid-forties without a significant lead, the undecided gap will most likely favor Romney. Obama will not win any of the swing states in which he has a RealClearPolitics polling average below 49 percent and within three points of Romney, or states in which he does not have more than a five point lead overall. This includes all the swing states except Nevada, Pennsylvania and Michigan. At the end of the day, this election will be a referendum on the president’s record, and whether or not voters are better off today than they were four years ago. Barack Obama may promise hope and change again for round two, but on election day the undecided gap will only remember his promises to cut the deficit in half and maintain the unemployment rate, and his now-infamous statement, “If you’ve got a business, you didn’t build that. Someone else made that happen.”¶ In the words of Michael Moore, “I think people should start to practice the words ‘President Romney.’”

#### Voter ID laws and diebold

Reich 9/20 (Robert Reich, Chancellor's Professor of Public Policy at the University of California at Berkeley, September 20, 2012, Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-reich/romney-election-chances\_b\_1899694.html)

4. As they've displayed before, the Republican Party will do whatever it can to win -- even if it means disenfranchising certain voters. To date, 11 states have enacted voter identification laws, all designed by Republican legislatures and governors to dampen Democratic turnout.¶ The GOP is also encouraging what can only be termed "voter vigilante" groups to "monitor polling stations to prevent fraud" -- which means intimidating minorities who have every right to vote. We can't know at this point how successful these efforts may be but it's a dangerous wildcard. And what about those Diebold voting machines?¶ So don't for a moment believe "Romney's dead," and don't be complacent. The hard work lies ahead, in the next seven weeks.

#### Energy not key

Presson 2012 (Jacob Pressen, August 6, 2012, “Energizing the 2012 Campaign: Why aren’t we talking about energy politics?,” Spopitics, http://www.spopitics.com/energizing-the-2012-campaign-why-arent-we-talking-about-energy-politics/)

Any campaign that takes place during an economic downturn, whether it’s at the beginning (like 2008) or closer to the end (as Democrats hope 2012 will be) of the downturn, economic issues will always dominate. And there is good reason for this: the electorate naturally turns inward when personal wealth and livelihoods are at stake.¶ This is why Romney’s recent foray abroad, despite demonstrating an alarming lack of diplomatic tact and message control, really won’t faze voters in the US. This is also why energy politics won’t come up that much for the time being. If it’s too much of a walk from jobs to energy, the candidates and their campaigns just won’t do it.¶ The closest the campaigns have come was the controversy over the Keystone Pipeline approval, where Republicans tried to force the Obama administration into giving a direct answer and the administration still found a way to answer indirectly. Romney criticized the President briefly for costing the nation jobs and being responsible for high energy prices, but then moved on. It just wasn’t a key issue.

#### Renewables outweigh

Gardner 2012 (Amy Gardner and Rosalind S. Helderman, August 14, 2012, “Obama, Romney campaigns shift to debate over energy,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/wind-energy-will-be-obama-focus-today-in-iowa/2012/08/14/11026ea4-e615-11e1-936a-b801f1abab19\_story.html)

Romney has been critical of the Obama administration’s policies toward alternative energy sources, particularly a half-billion-dollar loan to solar-panel maker Solyndra, which subsequently collapsed. Romney and other Republicans have accused the administration of favoring Solyndra because its largest investors were funds linked to Oklahoma billionaire George Kaiser, an Obama donor.¶ The so-called Production Tax Credit, which is set to expire at the end of this year, provides tax credits to producers of wind power according to how many megawatts they produce. According to the Obama administration, the tax credit works in concert with the Advanced Energy Manufacturing Tax Credit to provide a 30 percent investment credit to manufacturers who invest in equipment for clean energy projects in the United States.¶ Obama took credit Tuesday for an explosion in wind energy production. Although it is still a small fraction of the energy industry, wind represents nearly one-third of all new energy capacity added in last year.¶ The president also made an unscheduled stop in Haverhill, Iowa, to tour the Heil Family Farm, part of a cooperative of six other landowners that operate 52 wind turbines on 20,000 acres of land. The cooperative produces 120 megawatts of wind energy, which by the Heil family’s estimate powers about 30,000 Iowa homes. The windmills were visible for miles around as the president’s motorcade pulled up for the visit.¶ Meanwhile, Romney traveled into the heart of coal country in Beallsville, Ohio to sharply accuse the president of trying to destroy the coal industry in favor of wind and solar energy.

#### Incentives now, links must distinguish plan from squo- Obama supports nukes

Taso 2011 (Firas Eugen Taso, May 2011, , “21st Century Civilian Nuclear Power and the Role of Small Modular Reactors”, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy; Tufts University, <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/docview/877618836>)

The UK in particular recognized that a likely future energy supply shortfall could be filled by either new nuclear plant construction or maintaining existing plants beyond their programmed lifetime in the context of the international climate change debate and the dependence on foreign imports. Additionally, in late 20th, early 21st century, nuclear power is of particular interest to China and India as they experience rapid economic growth and a rising need for energy. In the U.S., three consortia responded in 2004 to the U.S. Department of Energy's solicitation under the Nuclear Power 2010 Program and were all awarded matching funds for nuclear power development. The Bush Administration’s Energy Policy Act of 2005 awarded loan guarantees for up to six new reactors, and authorized the Department of Energy to build a reactor based on the Generation IV (Very-High-Temperature Reactor) concept to produce both electricity and hydrogen.The Obama administration also seems committed to advance nuclear power in the United States through loan guarantees and continues support for first-movers in the space.6

#### SMRs good for Obama

Johnson 2012 (John Johnson, April 25, 2012, “US Campaign Trail: is nuclear in the equation?,” Nuclear Energy Insider, http://analysis.nuclearenergyinsider.com/new-build/us-campaign-trail-nuclear-equation)

As the U.S. Presidential election draws closer, Americans are most concerned about job creation and how the candidates plan to boost the U.S. economy.¶ ¶ Alternative energy policies have received a fair amount of publicity from the Obama administration, although nuclear power specifically is rarely mentioned on the campaign trial, primarily due to perceived safety questions.¶ ¶ Just the same, the Obama Administration is considered a nuclear supporter, having made several moves to help jumpstart America’s nuclear energy industry.¶ ¶ Obama plugged nuclear power during his first State Of The Union speech several years ago, and has generally been upbeat about the energy source’s future in the U.S. The Campaign Obama, a Democrat, will face Mitt Romney in the November election. Romney is expected to be named the official Republican nominee in August.¶ ¶ While Romney has not taken a stance on nuclear energy during his campaign, the Obama administration has made significant investments in the sector, including a $450m budget request in March intended to advance the development of American-made small modular reactors (SMRs). Congress still needs to approve the authorization for funding.¶ ¶ The SMRs are expected to be ready for commercial use within 10 years, and are intended for small electric grids and for locations that cannot support large reactors, offering utilities the flexibility to scale production as demand changes.¶ ¶ “The Obama Administration and the Energy Department are committed to an all-of-the-above energy strategy that develops every source of American energy, including nuclear power, and strengthens our competitive edge in the global clean energy race,” U.S. Energy Secretary Steven Chu said when the program was announced. ¶ ¶ “Through the funding for small modular nuclear reactors, the Energy Department and private industry are working to position America as the leader in advanced nuclear energy technology and manufacturing.” ¶ ¶ John Keeley, manager of media relations for the Nuclear Energy Institute, said that the Obama administration has done what it can to support the deployment on new build-outs in the United States to build out nuclear, as well as supporting research and development efforts, such as those in the small reactor space. ¶ ¶ Research support¶ ¶ In addition, the U.S. has invested $170 million in research grants at more than 70 universities, supporting research and development into a full spectrum of technologies, from advanced reactor concepts to enhanced safety design.¶ ¶ “The President was explicit in his State Of The Union speech about the virtues of nuclear as a technology and its role in clean air generation,” said Keeley. “And he has been supportive of developing more nuclear plants in this country. Those initiatives have to be identified as significant evidence of support for the nuclear sector.”¶ ¶ There are currently 104 nuclear power reactors operating in the U.S. in 31 states, operated by 30 different utilities. There are four new nuclear reactors being built in the U.S., including two in George at total expected cost of $14bn. ¶ ¶ In another sign of the U.S support for the industry, the federal government provided utility company Southern with an $8.3bn loan guarantee for the Vogtle Units 3 and 4, the first new nuclear plants to be built in the U.S. in the last 30 years. They are expected to be operational in 2016 and 2017.¶ ¶ The U.S. Energy Department has also supported the Vogtle project and the development of the next generation of nuclear reactors by providing more than $200m through a cost-share agreement to support the licensing reviews for the Westinghouse AP1000 reactor design certification. ¶ ¶ In addition to the Vogtle plants, SCANA, a subsidiary of South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. plans to add two reactors to its nuclear power plant near Jenkinsville, S.C., by 2016 and 2019.¶ ¶ “There is certainly political consensus in support of clean generation, and large scale cultural consensus as well,” said Keeley. ¶ ¶ Political benefits of nuclear support¶ As gas prices in the U.S. continue to soar, it’s possible that the tide will turn more in favor of nuclear and other clean energy sources, especially as electric cars take a stronger foothold. In addition, the job creation benefits from nuclear could work their way into the political landscape as well.

#### ZERO CHANCE CTBT PASSES – TROUBLES WITH START.

BROOKES 6-9. [Peter, Heritage Foundation senior fellow, “Another bad arms control idea” New York Post]

So now President "Who Needs Nukes?" Obama wants to re-engage the Senate on the once-rejected 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It's unclear why the administration believes a re-heated version of the treaty (which bans explosive nuclear-weapons testing) is any more palatable today than it was when it was first served up to the Senate in 1999. Deepening skepticism will be the emerging problems with the US-Russia New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, which the Obama team rammed through during the lame-duck Congress late last year. Senators likely won't have much appetite for another helping of arms control anytime soon -- especially last century's leftovers.

### 2AC Oil Disad

#### No link-

#### No tradeoff

Toth 2006 (Ferenc L. Toth, senior energy economist with the Planning and Economic Studies Section in the Department of Nuclear Energy at IAEA, Hans-Holger Rogner, head of Planning and Economic Studies at IAEA, “Oil and nuclear power: Past, present, and future,” IAEA, http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/ST/NE/Pess/assets/oil+np\_toth+rogner0106.pdf)

The current relationship between nuclear power and oil has become distinctly different than it was a few decades ago. At the onset of the 21st century, nuclear and oil for electricity generation are targeting different electricity market segments with little overlap in the longer run. Oil for electricity generation in most industrialized countries serves, where not barred for environmental reasons, more the function of the disposal of residual oil for which no other applications can be found. However, advanced refineries converting larger portions of the barrel into premium products and stringent environmental regulation constrain the use of residual oil for power generation. Other uses of oil products include peak supply, back-up fuel, and dispersed non-grid generation. These markets have been relative captive for oil but this may change in the future with the advent of fuel cells. Since nuclear power has no role to play in these captive markets, growth prospects for oil are unaffected by a nuclear presence in the electricity generating market.

#### No indirect effects

Toth 2006 (Ferenc L. Toth, senior energy economist with the Planning and Economic Studies Section in the Department of Nuclear Energy at IAEA, Hans-Holger Rogner, head of Planning and Economic Studies at IAEA, “Oil and nuclear power: Past, present, and future,” IAEA, http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/ST/NE/Pess/assets/oil+np\_toth+rogner0106.pdf)

The second dimension of the oil–nuclear competition is indirect: nuclear electricity versus oil products at the level of end-use. It involves many factors including economics, productivity, convenience, regulation, availability, product quality, and social preferences. These factors limit the room for competition between electricity and oil products (and vice versa) in the residential, commercial, industrial, feedstock and transportation markets. Here the characteristics of fuels and associated conversion technologies can be an advantage or disadvantage in meeting a particular energy service demand. As we have witnessed over recent decades, transportation services have remained the domain of oil products despite many government policies targeted at the introduction of non-oil based transportation fuels including electric cars. Likewise, many energy services are exclusively a domain of electricity (information/communication, lighting, control, etc.) where oil products are essentially excluded. Electricity is an end-use energy technology without any emissions, highly efficient, versatile, and convenient to use. No wonder then that it has been the fastest growing end-use energy carrier worldwide. Oil use outside the transportation and chemical sectors (feedstock) and non-energy use has declined in the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors of the OECD countries (1973: 707 Mtoe; 2002: 403 Mtoe) in large part as a result of increased use of electricity and natural gas. In developing countries, oil use in these sectors has been increasing from 124 Mtoe to 354 Mtoe over the 1973–2002 period (IEA, 2004). Globally, however, oil use in these sectors has declined from 960 Mtoe to 811 Mtoe over this period.

#### Oil is losing ground in electricity markets already

Levi 2011 (Michael A. Levi, senior fellow and director of the program on energy security and climate change at the Council on Foreign Relations, March 16, 2011, “5 myths about nuclear energy,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/5-myths-about-nuclear-energy/2011/03/15/AB9P3Oe\_story.html?fb\_ref=NetworkNews)

When people talk about energy independence, they’re thinking about oil, which we mostly use in vehicles and industrial production. When they talk about nuclear, though, they’re thinking about electricity. More nuclear power means less coal, less natural gas, less hydroelectric power and less wind energy. But unless we start putting nuclear power plants in our cars and semis, more nuclear won’t mean less oil.¶ This wasn’t always the case: During the the heyday of nuclear power, the early 1970s (45 plants broke ground between 1970 and 1975), oil was a big electricity source, and boosting nuclear power was a real way to squeeze petroleum out of the economy. Alas, we’ve already replaced pretty much all the petroleum in the power sector; the opportunity to substitute oil with nuclear power is gone.

#### Plan key to oil shale

ITA 2011 (US Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration, February 2011, “The Commercial Outlook for U.S. Small Modular Nuclear Reactors,” http://trade.gov/mas/ian/build/groups/public/@tg\_ian/@nuclear/documents/webcontent/tg\_ian\_003185.pdf)

Some SMRs could be suited for specialized applications. The small size and output of some designs could provide advantages over large nuclear units for industrial or district heating applications because using a traditional reactor would be too ex- pensive and would produce far too much energy to be used efficiently for those purposes. SMRs could also be used for energy-intensive activities located in remote areas, such as desalination plants and certain mining operations. A similar application could be to provide heat and electricity for oil shale recovery, which is a particularly energy-intensive operation. If nuclear reactors, rather than fossil fuel–based technology, could power oil extraction from tight shale then they could significantly lower the carbon emissions from such recovery and make the extraction more attractive.

#### Only thing stopping peak oil

Monbiot 2012 (George Monbiot, July 2, 2012, “We were wrong on peak oil. There's enough to fry us all,” Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/jul/02/peak-oil-we-we-wrong)

The facts have changed, now we must change too. For the past 10 years an unlikely coalition of geologists, oil drillers, bankers, military strategists and environmentalists has been warning that peak oil – the decline of global supplies – is just around the corner. We had some strong reasons for doing so: production had slowed, the price had risen sharply, depletion was widespread and appeared to be escalating. The first of the great resource crunches seemed about to strike.¶ Among environmentalists it was never clear, even to ourselves, whether or not we wanted it to happen. It had the potential both to shock the world into economic transformation, averting future catastrophes, and to generate catastrophes of its own, including a shift into even more damaging technologies, such as biofuels and petrol made from coal. Even so, peak oil was a powerful lever. Governments, businesses and voters who seemed impervious to the moral case for cutting the use of fossil fuels might, we hoped, respond to the economic case.¶ Some of us made vague predictions, others were more specific. In all cases we were wrong. In 1975 MK Hubbert, a geoscientist working for Shell who had correctly predicted the decline in US oil production, suggested that global supplies could peak in 1995. In 1997 the petroleum geologist Colin Campbell estimated that it would happen before 2010. In 2003 the geophysicist Kenneth Deffeyes said he was "99% confident" that peak oil would occur in 2004. In 2004, the Texas tycoon T Boone Pickens predicted that "never again will we pump more than 82m barrels" per day of liquid fuels. (Average daily supply in May 2012 was 91m.) In 2005 the investment banker Matthew Simmons maintained that "Saudi Arabia … cannot materially grow its oil production". (Since then its output has risen from 9m barrels a day to 10m, and it has another 1.5m in spare capacity.)¶ Peak oil hasn't happened, and it's unlikely to happen for a very long time.¶ A report by the oil executive Leonardo Maugeri, published by Harvard University, provides compelling evidence that a new oil boom has begun. The constraints on oil supply over the past 10 years appear to have had more to do with money than geology. The low prices before 2003 had discouraged investors from developing difficult fields. The high prices of the past few years have changed that.¶ Maugeri's analysis of projects in 23 countries suggests that global oil supplies are likely to rise by a net 17m barrels per day (to 110m) by 2020. This, he says, is "the largest potential addition to the world's oil supply capacity since the 1980s". The investments required to make this boom happen depend on a long-term price of $70 a barrel – the current cost of Brent crude is $95. Money is now flooding into new oil: a trillion dollars has been spent in the past two years; a record $600bn is lined up for 2012.¶ The country in which production is likely to rise most is Iraq, into which multinational companies are now sinking their money, and their claws. But the bigger surprise is that the other great boom is likely to happen in the US. Hubbert's peak, the famous bell-shaped graph depicting the rise and fall of American oil, is set to become Hubbert's Rollercoaster.¶ Investment there will concentrate on unconventional oil, especially shale oil (which, confusingly, is not the same as oil shale). Shale oil is high-quality crude trapped in rocks through which it doesn't flow naturally.¶ There are, we now know, monstrous deposits in the United States: one estimate suggests that the Bakken shales in North Dakota contain almost as much oil as Saudi Arabia (though less of it is extractable). And this is one of 20 such formations in the US. Extracting shale oil requires horizontal drilling and fracking: a combination of high prices and technological refinements has made them economically viable. Already production in North Dakota has risen from 100,000 barrels a day in 2005 to 550,000 in January.

#### US not key to prices

Cleveland 2010 (Cutler Cleveland, professor of geography and environment at Boston University, PhD in geography from the University of Illinois, June 17, 2010, “The Myth of Energy Independence,” The Energy Watch, http://www.theenergywatch.com/2010/06/17/the-myth-of-energy-independence/)

Increased U.S. production would have little impact on the level or volatility of oil prices. The price of oil is determined in a global market by a complex array of forces including speculation, weather, geopolitics, decisions by OPEC, and most importantly, by market fundamentals–short and long run supply and demand forces. At the margin, producing decisions made in the U.S. have little influence on this process.

#### War exacerbates structural impacts

Joshua S. Goldstein, pub. date: 2001, Prof. of IR @ American University, Washington D.C. He is the author of a broad range of research works on international conflict, cooperation, and political economy, with a central focus on great-power relations and world order, War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa, Cambridge University, pp. 412

First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, “if you want peace, work for justice.” Then, if one believes that sexism contributes to war, one can work for gender justice specifically (or perhaps among others) in order to pursue peace. This approach beings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices cause war. The evidence in this book suggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War is not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although theses influence wars’ outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueled and sustained these and other injustices. So, “if you want peace, work for peace.” Indeed, if you want justice (gender and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis, from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war, It runs downward too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes towards war and the military may be the most important way to “reverse women’s oppression.” The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice beings to the peace movement energy, allies, and moral grounding, yet in light of this book’s evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate.
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#### No extinction – reject this environmental alarmism

Amy Kaleita (assistant professor of agricultural and biosystems engineering at Iowa State University) and Gregory Forbes (research analyst at the Pacific Research Institute) 2007 “Hysteria’s History” http://www.undergroundnotes.com/graphics2/Hysteria\_History.pdf

Apocalyptic stories about the irreparable, catastrophic damage that humans are doing to the natural environment have been around for a long time. These hysterics often have some basis in reality, but are blown up to illogical and ridiculous proportions. Part of the reason they’re so appealing is that they have the ring of plausibility along with the intrigue of a horror flick. In many cases, the alarmists identify a legitimate issue, take the possible consequences to an extreme, and advocate action on the basis of these extreme projections. In 1972, the editor of the journal Nature pointed out the problem with the typical alarmist approach: “[Alarmists’] most common error is to suppose that the worst will always happen.”82 But of course, if the worst always happened, the human race would have died out long ago. When alarmism has a basis in reality, the challenge becomes to take appropriate action based on that reality, not on the hysteria. The aftermath of Silent Spring offers examples of both sorts of policy reactions: a reasoned response to a legitimate problem and a knee-jerk response to the hysteria. On the positive side, Silent Spring brought an end to the general belief that all synthetic chemicals in use for purposes ranging from insect control to household cleaning were uniformly wonderful, and it ushered in an age of increased caution on the appropriate use of chemicals. In the second chapter of her famous book, Carson wrote, “It is not my contention that chemical insecticides must never be used. I do contend that… we have allowed these chemicals to be used with little or no advance investigation of their effect on soil, water, wildlife, and man himself.” In this passage, Carson seemed to advocate reasoned response to rigorous scientific investigation, and in fact this did become the modern approach to environmental chemical licensure and monitoring. An hour-long CBS documentary on pesticides was aired during the height of the furor over Silent Spring. In the documentary, Dr. Page Nicholson, a water-pollution expert with the Public Health Service, wasn’t able to answer how long pesticides persist in water once they enter it, or the extent to which pesticides contaminate groundwater supplies. Today, this sort of information is gathered through routine testing of chemicals for use in the environment. 20 V: Lessons from the Apocalypse However, there was, as we have seen, a more sinister and tragic response to the hysteria generated by Silent Spring. Certain developing countries, under significant pressure from the United States, abandoned the use of DDT. This decision resulted in millions of deaths from malaria and other insect-borne diseases. In the absence of pressure to abandon the use of DDT, these lives would have been spared. It would certainly have been possible to design policies requiring caution and safe practices in the use of supplemental chemicals in the environment, without pronouncing a death sentence on millions of people. A major challenge in developing appropriate responses to legitimate problems is that alarmism catches people’s attention and draws them in. Alarmism is given more weight than it deserves, as policy makers attempt to appease their constituency and the media. It polarizes the debaters into groups of “believers” and “skeptics,” so that reasoned, fact-based compromise is difficult to achieve. Neither of these aspects of alarmism is healthy for the development of appropriate policy. Further, alarmist responses to valid problems risk foreclosing potentially useful responses based on ingenuity and progress. There are many examples from the energy sector where, in the presence of demands for economy, efficiency, or less pollution, the marketplace has responded by developing better alternatives. That is not to say that we should blissfully squander our energy resources; on the contrary, we should be careful to utilize them wisely. But energy-resource hysteria should not lead us to circumvent scientific advancement by cherry-picking and favoring one particular replacement technology at the expense of other promising technologies. Environmental alarmism should be taken for what it is—a natural tendency of some portion of the public to latch onto the worst, and most unlikely, potential outcome. Alarmism should not be used as the basis for policy. Where a real problem exists, solutions should be based on reality, not hysteria.

### 1AR No Link

#### No competition

Toth 2006 (Ferenc L. Toth, senior energy economist with the Planning and Economic Studies Section in the Department of Nuclear Energy at IAEA, Hans-Holger Rogner, head of Planning and Economic Studies at IAEA, “Oil and nuclear power: Past, present, and future,” IAEA, http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/ST/NE/Pess/assets/oil+np\_toth+rogner0106.pdf)

While the past expansion of nuclear energy occurred to the detriment of oil in the power sector, this is no longer the case today and highly unlikely to reoccur in the future. The respective market structures in which nuclear and oil operate now display little overlap and an expansion of nuclear power would not impinge on oil sales to power generation. Nuclear supplies base load to large grid-integrated markets where oil provides some peak supply, back-up capacity, small-scale and non-grid applications. Oil’s main markets are the low energy demand intensity rural and remote areas usually with little or no grid integration. In an environmentally unconstrained future, nuclear power competes primarily against coal and possibly natural gas, depending on how closely natural gas prices track oil market prices and whether or not gas infrastructures are in place. However, current trends towards electricity market liberalization relying more on private sector shareholder value maximization create economic barriers to the expansion of present-day nuclear plants because of their high up-front capital costs and long amortization periods. In the absence of public policy support and/or the emergence of innovative reactor designs that lower the costs and further improve operating safety, nuclear power’s market share might indeed follow a downward trajectory. Yet there is some evidence to the contrary. The order of the new Olkiluoto reactor in Finland is based on several studies, each confirming that nuclear generation is the best economic option to satisfy increasing demand for electricity (WNA, 2004).