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### 1NC K

#### Environmental apocalypticism causes eco-authoritarianism and mass violence against those deemed environmental threats---also causes political apathy which turns case

Buell 3Frederick—cultural critic on the environmental crisis and a Professor of English at Queens College and the author of five books, *From Apocalypse To Way of Life,* pages 185-186

Looked at critically, then, crisis discourse thus suffers from a number of liabilities. First, it seems to have become a **political liability** almost as much as an asset. It calls up a **fierce and effective opposition** with its predictions; worse, its more specific predictions are all too **vulnerable to refutation by events**. It also **exposes environmentalists to being called grim doomsters** and antilife Puritan extremists. Further, concern with crisis has all too often tempted people to try to find a “total solution” to the problems involved— a phrase that, as an astute analyst of the limitations of crisis discourse, John Barry, puts it, is all too reminiscent of the Third Reich’s infamous “final solution.”55 A total crisis of society—environmental crisis at its gravest—threatens to translate despair into inhumanist authoritarianism; more often, however, it helps keep merely dysfunctional authority in place. It thus leads, Barry suggests, to the belief that only elite- and expert-led solutions are possible.56 At the same timeit **depoliticizes people**, inducing them to accept their impotence as individuals; this is something that has made many people today feel, ironically and/or passively, that since it makes no difference at all what any individual does on his or her own, one might as well go along with it. Yet another pitfall for the full and sustained elaboration of environmental crisis is, though least discussed, perhaps the most deeply ironic. A problem with deep cultural and psychological as well as social effects, it is embodied in a startlingly simple proposition: the worse one feels environmental crisis is, the more one is tempted to turn one’s back on the environment. This means, preeminently, turning one’s back on “nature”—on traditions of nature feeling, traditions of knowledge about nature (ones that range from organic farming techniques to the different departments of ecological science), and traditions of nature-based activism. If nature is thoroughly wrecked these days, **people need to delink from nature** and live in postnature—a conclusion that, as the next chapter shows, many in U.S. society drew at the end of the millenium. Explorations of how deeply “nature” has been wounded and how intensely vulnerable to and dependent on human actions it is can thus lead, ironically, to **further indifference** to nature-based environmental issues, not greater concern with them. But what quickly becomes evident to any reflective consideration of the difficulties of crisis discourse is that all of these liabilities are in fact bound tightly up with one specific notion of environmental crisis—with 1960s- and 1970s-style environmental apocalypticism. Excessive concern about them does not recognize that crisis discourse as a whole has significantly changed since the 1970s. They remain inducements to look away from serious reflection on environmental crisis only if one does not explore how environmental crisis has turned of late from apocalypse to dwelling place. The apocalyptic mode had a number of prominent features: it was preoccupied with running out and running into walls; with scarcity and with the imminent rupture of limits; with actions that promised and temporally predicted imminent total meltdown; and with (often, though not always) the need for immediate “total solution.” **Thus doomsterism was its reigning mode;** eco-authoritarianism was a grave temptation; and as crisis was elaborated to show more and more severe deformations of nature, temptation increased to refute it, or give up, or even cut off ties to clearly terminal “nature.”

#### That causes mass wars

Brzoska 8Michael Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg, “The securitization of climate change and the power of conceptions of security,” Paper prepared for the International Studies Association Convention 2008

In the literature on securitization it is implied that when a problem is securitized it is difficult to limit this to an increase in attention and resources devoted to mitigating the problem (Brock 1997, Waever 1995). **Securitization regularly leads to all-round ‘exceptionalism’** in dealing with the issue as well as to a shift in institutional localization towards ‘security experts’ (Bigot 2006), such as the military and police. Methods and instruments associated with these security organizations – such as more use of arms, force and violence – will gain in importance in the discourse on ‘what to do’. A good example of securitization was the period leading to the Cold War (Guzzini 2004 ). Originally a political conflict over the organization of societies, in the late 1940s, **the East-West confrontation became an existential conflict that was overwhelmingly addressed with military means**, **including the potential annihilation of humankind**. Efforts to alleviate the political conflict were, throughout most of the Cold War, secondary to improving military capabilities. Climate change could meet a similar fate. An essentially political problem concerning the distribution of the costs of prevention and adaptation and the losses and gains in income arising from change in the human environment might be perceived as intractable, thus **necessitating the** build-up of military and police forces **to prevent it from becoming a major security problem**. The portrayal of climate change as a security problem could, in particular, cause the richer countries in the global North, which are less affected by it, to strengthen measures aimed at protecting them from the spillover of violent conflict from the poorer countries in the global South that will be most affected by climate change. It could also be used by major powers as a justification for improving their military preparedness against the other major powers, thus leading to arms races.

#### Vote neg to reframe environmental crisis away from crisis discourse---this moves the debate away from top-down expertism that causes serial policy failure

Foust et al. 8 Christina R. Foust, Assistant Professor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, et al., with William O. Murphy, Doctoral Student and Graduate Teaching Instructor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, and Chelsea Stow, Doctoral Student and Graduate Teaching Instructor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, 2008, “Global Warming and Apocalyptic Rhetoric: A Critical Frame Analysis of US Popular and Elite Press Coverage from 1997-2007,” Paper Submitted to the Environmental Communication Division of the National Communication Association Convention in San Diego, 11/20, p. 22-23

In conclusion, we hope to inspire more scholarship in the spirit of Moser and Dilling’s (2007) call for a greater inter-disciplinary conversation on climate change. The methodological tool of frame analysis can help foster common ground between humanities scholars, social scientists, and climate scientists, concerned about global warming. Frame analysis can also be a **valuable tool** in **identifying the troubling aspects of how a discourse evolves** and is communicated—and in so doing, it **can** lead to more effective communication. Deconstructing the **harmful effects of an apocalyptic frame**, we feel some responsibility to try to **offer alternative frames** which might balance the need to communicate the urgency of climate change, **without moving people to denial and despair**. We would like to see the press inspire more of a public dialogue on how we can mitigate climate change, rather than encouraging readers to continue to be resigned to the catastrophic telos. This does not mean that we should ignore the potentially devastating consequences of global warming (now and in the future); but it does mean that we must begin a conversation about how to change our daily routines to make things better. We believe that the press could promote greater human agency in the issue of climate change, so that people do not become resigned to the telos of global warming. **This includes encouraging more personal and civic responsibility,** rather than suggesting that experts will take care of it **(or that we can do nothing to mitigate the impacts of climate change).** Journalists could acknowledge the expertise of scientists, balanced with an acknowledgement of the power of common sense and morality— such a move may help avoid casting scientists as prophets. Through a less tragic, more productive framing of the issues of climate change, **we may expand the common ground needed to build a political will for dealing with climate change**.

### CP

#### The United States federal government should establish a cap-and-trade system for carbon emissions in the United States. The federal government should reduce the corporate income tax and business capital-gains taxes. The United States federal government should phase out all energy subsidies.

#### Targeting specific industries and technology fails---cap and trade is key to market-based solutions that solve the case better

Morris et al 12 Adele C. Morris, Fellow and Deputy Director of the. Climate and Energy Economics project at Brookings, Pietro S. Nivola, Charles Schultze, Brookings Scholars, "CLEAN ENERGY:REVISITING THE CHALLENGES OF INDUSTRIAL POLICY" June 4 www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/6/04%20clean%20energy%20morris%20nivola%20schultze/04\_clean\_energy\_morris\_nivola\_schultze.pdf

Public investments of these magnitudes, targeted at specific industries, arguably constitute an industrial policy, albeit a sectoral one, unlike the earlier proposals of the 1980's —that is, a government strategy to steer resources toward select producers or technologies. The rationale and efficacy of these clean-energy expenditures call for scrutiny.

Proponents offer numerous reasons for scaling up particular energy technologies at the taxpayer's expense. One set of reasons involves the need to remediate market failures that have not been corrected by other policies. For example, clean-energy technologies are said to emit fewer greenhouse gases than do traditional sources per unit of energy produced. The United States does not have an economy-wide policy to control greenhouse gases, most notably, one that puts a price on C02 that reflects the environmental harm associated with use of fossil fuels.

A far more effective policy than subsidies for clean energy research, development and demonstration would be a tax or a cap-and-trade regime that would put an appropriate price on carbon and other greenhouse gases. Properly implemented, this alternative approach would help level the playing field for greener energy sources, for it would require emitters to pay prices that reflect the costs their emissions impose on society. The enhanced efficiency that would result has been widely recognized by economists.6 True costs would flow to purchasers of goods and services that require energy, suitably inducing conservation. Emitters would have incentives to invest in equipment and new production techniques, use alternative fuels, and seek other methods to reduce emissions. And America's innovators would channel their efforts into inventing, scaling up, and marketing competitive forms of clean energy. However, because existing market signals do not suffice to encourage climate-friendly technologies, carefully targeted federal funding seems warranted. But as we explain later, it is ironically only after incorporating the social costs of energy into market prices that many clean energy subsidies will succeed in deploying new technologies.

### 1NC D Rule

#### You should prioritize questions of epistemology---in the context of economics the knowledge-production process is more important than the outcomes

Anderson 89 Thomas, Libertarian Alliance, "Economics and Knowledge" Economic Notes No. 21 www.libertarian.co.uk/lapubs/econn/econn021.pdf

Before there can be a substantial or meaningful advance of knowledge in any discipline, there must be a firm foundation laid in a theory of knowledge, an epistemology, and its application to the particular discipline. Obviously, one's conclusions cannot be any sounder than one's method of attaining them. With a few rare and wonderful exceptions, the intellectual leaders of today do not concern themselves publicly with epistemology, let alone with sound epistemology, or understandable epistemology. So there is a large vacuum in this area, and for obvious reasons especially in writings designed as popularizations. Those who hold positions of influence on recognised intellectual establishments may consider these questions when they congregate in little esoteric groups, but the whole field is supposed to be outside the realm of the average student, citizen or voter.

Continued…

A sound theory of knowledge is the only path leading to the rescue of economics. The great free market economists and philosophers are increasingly realising this and are laboring mightily to make up the deficit. All students of economics should join them.Remember to apply sound principles of knowledge theory to anything you study. In all of your writings or speeches, whether highly sublime and original, or merely popularizations, remember to trace back, isolate, present and check your fundamental premises.

#### The affirmative forecloses the ability of markets and human ingenuity to solve the impacts they invoke---fatal conceit in the context of energy policy makes their impacts inevitable and cause policy failure

Robinson 8 Colin, Institute of Economic Affairs “Climate Change Policy: Challenging the Activists,” http://www.iea.org.uk/files/upld-book440pdf?.pdf

There is, however, more to the apocalyptic forecast than that because it always contains a call to action. It comes in two parts. Part one is the ‘conditional’ forecast – what would happen on unchanged policy. Part two is the plan – what should be done to avoid the dire consequences that the forecast reveals. The latter-day apocalyptic forecaster, when turning to the plan, almost invariably recommends centralised solutions carried out by governments and international organisations. It would be unusual, if not unprecedented, for someone, having seen the apocalypse, to recommend leaving solution of the foreseen problems entirely to decentralised market forces. There must be coordinated, centralised national government or international action so that someone is seen to be doing something. Recom- mendations are usually for direct government intervention in the market by targets, regulations, government-controlled investment programmes, taxes or sometimes ‘market instruments’ (of which more later).

But there is a serious problem with the view that centralised action, via governments and international organisations, is required to avoid the apocalypse. This form of action suffers from the same inherent problems as does central planning, which has, wherever it has been tried, failed. Briefly, there are two reasons. First, the information required for centralised action to work – which is information about the future – cannot readily be gathered. Information is not available off the shelf, to be collected together in Whitehall or similar locations, because it is essentially decentralised and much of it is tacit. The production and dissemination of information are primarily market phenomena and the suppression of markets, which is the inevitable consequence of central planning, also suppresses the information that planners would need if they were to operate successfully.

The second problem is that, even if the information were avail- able, the incentives to deal with problems are lacking. There is no Whitehall counterpart to the powerful self-interest motives to solve problems that exist in markets. On the contrary, the pursuit of self-interest by people in organisations that have a monopoly of policy-making is most unlikely to be to the public benefit. Public choice theory has shown the dangers of assuming, as much main- stream economic theory does, that politicians and bureaucrats, domestic and international, are wise, far-sighted and disinterested and will simply identify and then pursue the ‘public good’.

By contrast, the market system is essentially a massive problem- solving mechanism. Markets may appear to operate slowly and ‘imperfectly’ but they do so surely: their existence is the reason why past apocalyptic forecasts have not come true. Competitive markets are powerful adaptive systems which contain strong incentives to solve the problems of the day, whether trivial or apparently serious. Unfortunately, the essence of the market’s functions is often clouded by the mechanistic neoclassical models used by many economists which concentrate on end-states of markets rather than the processes by which they adjust to change. Hayek’s insight – that competition is a process of discovery, quite different from stylised textbook models of competition which show the states of markets once competition has been exhausted – is the key to understanding the problem-solving power of markets (Hayek, 1948). Competitive markets provide the information and the incentives that spark the discovery process in which human ingenuity is exercised to deal with economic, social and technological problems. Marketplace incentives, operating mainly through price signals, induce entrepreneurs to seek out and then exploit market opportunities so as to make profits. Sometimes, entrepreneurial action may result in no more than the discovery of a slightly cheaper way of making a product or a slightly more efficient method of organising a firm. At other times, it may result in a major invention and its subsequent exploitation with global consequences. On a Hayekian view, the apocalyptic forecaster/ planner who believes he or she can see a long way into the future and has the answer to the world’s problems, substituting for and surpassing the problem-solving capabilities of markets, has been misled into the ‘pretence of knowledge’, if not into a ‘fatal conceit’ (Hayek and Bartley, 1988).

Of course, no one can be sure that there will always be an economic or technological fix for every conceivable problem that ever arises. But past history, including the failure of predicted catastrophes to materialise, suggests that market systems act effectively to deal even with predicted global disasters. Russell Lewis’s chapter in this volume gives some examples of past false predictions of catastrophe. One particularly apposite example, on which it is worth dwelling because it is the most recent and the one that bears similarities to the concerns of today, is the ‘energy crisis’ of the 1970s when there was a consensus that rapid depletion of energy resources (especially crude oil), allied with the exploitation of monopoly power by the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), would result in ever-rising energy prices. ‘The days of cheap energy are gone for ever’ was the slogan of many commentators, unwise enough to think they could see ‘for ever’ into the future. Only centralised action by governments and inter- national bodies could, it was argued, avoid a major world energy crisis. In the event, despite the almost total absence of the government and international action that had been deemed so important, energy markets adjusted to the ‘crisis’ so that, within ten years, the world was (by the mid-1980s) awash with oil and OPEC was meeting to try to prop up crude oil prices. Instead of crude oil prices tripling in real terms by the end of the century, as had been the consensus of forecasts in 1980, they began to decline almost as soon as the fore- casts were made and halved by the end of the century. Even in the first half of 2008, despite increases in crude prices in the previous few years, they were still lower in real terms than in 1980.3

#### This is an a priori voting issue---sound economic epistemology is key to the efficacy of all social and political praxes---accesses every impact

Reisman 96 George, Pepperdine University Professor Emeritus of Economics, Capitalism: A Treatise on Economics, http://www.capitalism.net/Capitalism/Economics%20and%20Capitalism.htm

In the absence of a widespread, serious understanding of the principles of economics, the citizens of an advanced, division-of-labor society, such as our own, are in a position analogous to that of a crowd wandering among banks of computers or other highly complex machinery, with no understanding of the functioning or maintenance or safety requirements of the equipment, and randomly pushing buttons and pulling levers. This is no exaggeration. In the absence of a knowledge of economics, our contemporaries feel perfectly free to enact measures such as currency depreciation and price controls. They feel free casually to experiment with the destruction of such fundamental economic institutions as the freedom of contract, inheritance, and private ownership of the means of production itself. In the absence of a knowledge of economics, our civilization is perfectly capable of destroying itself, and, in the view of some observers, is actually in the process of doing so.

Thus, the importance of economics consists in the fact that ultimately our entire modern material civilization depends on its being understood. What rests on modern material civilization is not only the well-being but also the very lives of the great majority of people now living. In the absence of the extensive division of labor we now possess, the production of modern medicines and vaccines, the provision of modern sanitation and hygiene, and the production even of adequate food supplies for our present numbers, would simply be impossible. The territory of the continental United States, for example, counting the deserts, mountains, rivers, and lakes, amounts to less than nine acres per person with its present population—not enough to enable that population to survive as primitive farmers. In Western Europe and Japan, the problem of overpopulation would, of course, be far more severe. Needless to say, the present vast populations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America would be unable to survive in the absence of Western food and medical supplies.

### DA

#### Obama’s PC is high and key to fiscal cliff negotiations---it’s not assured and GOP opposition’s likely but overcome-able

Kimberly Atkins 11-8, Boston Herald columnist, “Prez returns to D.C. with more clout,” 11/8/12, http://bostonherald.com/news/columnists/view/20221108prez\_returns\_to\_dc\_with\_more\_clout

When President Obama returned yesterday to the White House, he brought with him political capital earned in a tough re-election fight as well as a mandate from voters — which means bold changes and bruising fights could lie ahead. ¶ The first agenda item is already waiting for him: reaching an agreement with lawmakers to avert the looming fiscal cliff. GOP lawmakers have previously shot down any plan involving tax increases. Obama’s win — based in part on a message of making the wealthiest Americans pay more — may already be paying dividends.¶ In remarks at the Capitol yesterday, House Speaker John Boehner seemed to acknowledge the GOP has to take a different tack than the obstructionism that has marred progress in the past.¶ “The president has signaled a willingness to do tax reform with lower rates. Republicans have signaled a willingness to accept new revenue if it comes from growth and reform,” Boehner said. “Let’s start the discussion there.” ¶ Obama’s fresh political clout could extend to longer term fiscal policies beyond the fiscal cliff, though don’t expect GOP pushback to vanish. House Republicans still have plenty of fight in them. ¶ Comprehensive immigration reform — designed to smooth the path to citizenship while also strengthening the nation’s borders — also will be high on the president’s priority list. But unlike in his first term, when such a plan got little more than lip service in the face of staunch GOP opposition, Obama’s 3-to-1 support from Latinos on Election Day gives him the incentive to get it done. It also robs Republicans, who learned firsthand that dwindling support from Hispanics and other minority groups is costing them dearly, of any reason to stand in the way. ¶ An influx of new female voices in the Senate could also make Obama’s next four years the “Term of the Woman,” putting a new focus on equal pay and reproductive rights. ¶ U.S. Sen. Patty Murray of Washington state, who chairs the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, told reporters yesterday that having a historically high 20 women in the Senate in January won’t just mean more attention to women’s issues. She said the Senate will function better overall with “great women who have really strong voices” on board, such as U.S. Sen.-elect Elizabeth Warren. “There is no stronger advocate for middle-class Americans,” Murray said of Warren. ¶ None of this, of course, will be a cakewalk, but unlike his first term, Obama will have more power to push back.

#### Extending the PTC requires tons of political capital---subsumes your link turns

Leone 6/4 Steve is the Associate Editor of Renewable Energy World. “Looming Deadline for PTC Extension is Major Focus at Windpower 2012,” 2012, http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2012/06/looking-deadline-for-ptc-extension-is-major-focus-at-windpower-2012

ATLANTA -- For the past five years, the Production Tax Credit (PTC) has helped usher in an era of intense growth from the wind-rich fields of the Midwest to the emerging manufacturing hubs in the Southeast.¶ The industry thrived on relative stability confident that today’s deal would be backed by tomorrow’s policy. The American industry will soon pass a milestone of 50 gigawatts (GW) of cumulative capacity. And this year promises to be the biggest on record.¶ But there is a tangible shift occurring across North America and the pending expiration of the PTC looms over companies large and small. The generation-based tax credit is set to expire at the end of the year, and though the PTC appears to have **plenty of anecdotal support on Capitol Hill**, it has so far failed to garner the political resolve needed to ensure its extension.¶ That has caused plenty of jitters across the American industry, from developers reluctant to take on a project to manufacturers who are seeing their orders drying up. There are plenty of indications that a policy solution could be found but with that come other questions: Will the credit be extended for one year only?; If so, what comes after that?; and is the continued reliance on tax credits really the best long-term solution?¶ A recent New York Times editorial made the case that real estate investment trusts and master limited partnerships could open up new avenues for wind investment by allowing projects to tap into capital that hasn’t been there before. But the industry has coalesced around the push for a PTC extension, though differences remain in how long that extension should be.¶ American Wind Energy Association CEO Denise Bode indicated the organization is pushing for a one-year extension, with the hopes that a longer-term solution can be found the following year.¶ “We’re willing to talk in the future about all sorts of alternatives,” said Bode. “But we need to stop the bleeding now.”¶ A short-term deal may not be the ideal solution from a stability standpoint, but it may be all the political capital the wind industry can muster up in an election year in which the government’s role in energy investment has become a central issue.¶ During a recent trip to Newton, Iowa, President Obama visited TPI Composites, a growing wind manufacturer that stepped in to fill the void that occured when Maytag left town. Speaking in front of giant wind blades, Obama urged an increasingly divided Congress to find common ground on a job-creating issue by passing a PTC extension before the August recess.¶ In a time where all politics appears to be theater, presumptive GOP nominee Mitt Romney recently set up his podium with the backdrop of Solyndra, the failed solar manufacturing company that received more than half a billion dollars in a federal loan guarantee. The company’s bankruptcy has stood as a black eye for the Obama administration’s clean energy policy, and the wind industry and advanced biofuels have certainly, if unfairly, carried some of that burden.¶ Now, many in the industry believe it’s unlikely the Republican-led House will support the wind industry with an August PTC extension. If anything, a deal would more likely come in the short window following the November election. Doing so then may salvage parts of 2014, but it won’t do much to dent the bleak projections for 2013. Most wind projects take 18 to 24 months, so such a late extension wouldn’t immediately translate into new orders.

Sequestration destroys US global military power---collapses deterrence and triggers multiple scenarios for nuclear war (Iranian adventurism, Hormuz closing, African instability, terrorism, Korean war, Taiwan war, Russian military modernization, Afghanistan instability, naval power)

Hunter 9/30 Duncan is a U.S. Representative from Alaska. “SEQUESTRATION SENDS WRONG MESSAGE TO U.S. FRIENDS AND FOES ALIKE,” 2012, http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2012/sep/30/tp-sequestration-sends-wrong-message-to-us/?page=1#article

Over the next 10 years, because of **sequestration**, the Pentagon will be forced to absorb $500 billion in budget cuts that **will** **strike at the heart of America’s military**. Making this even more dangerous is the fact that the legislation triggering sequestration, the Budget Control Act, also imposed an additional $450 billion in defense budget cuts for a total of nearly $1 trillion of reductions over the next decade. The next 10 years are sure to be no different from the last. In the Middle East, Iranis desperately searching to fill a regional power vacuum and enhance its weapons program**, while threatening to** close the Strait of Hormuz **and targeting Israel** with unapologetic provocation. Meanwhile, the United States still has an obligation to Iraq. There is a necessity for diplomatic support and engagement, even though the ground combat mission is over. Africa is also experiencing power struggles of its own. The situations in Libya and Egypt are evolving, while Yemen and Somalia are acting as staging grounds for al-Qaeda. There is also the threat of Somali pirates in international waters. Multiple high-profile hostage situations and combat rescues show just how serious of a threat that rogue bands of pirates are to naval and commercial shipping lanes. **There is also the threat of** North Korea **with its aggressive pursuit of advanced aerial weaponry,** Russia **with its focus on arms modernization, and** China **with its large-scale and rapid military buildup.** China’s **display of hostility toward** Taiwan — a friend and ally of the United States — **also shows no sign of diminishing**. With all of this, more than 70,000 American troops are in Afghanistan, facing down a dangerous enemy. For the United States and other nations, interest in Afghanistan and the region will continue long after the last of the coalition ground forces leave and the next phase of the mission begins. **Ignoring America’s obligation as a world leader and the patchwork of threats that exist today won’t eliminate the risk posed by an Iran that one day acquires nuclear weapons or a North Korea that eventually acquires effective strike capabilit**y. More likely, **these and other threats will develop more quickly and efficiently, putting the** global interests **of the U.S. directly in the cross hairs.** Through a robust national defense, the United States has always sent a clear message around the world that American intentions are good and we stand by our allies. **The strength of the U.S. military has** dissuaded conflict **and suggested to adversaries that challenging freedom is a losing proposition**. **It was this deterrent**, in fact, **that won the Cold War and turned the U.S. military into the world’s most effective fighting force.** Sequestration would change all of this**, for the worse.** In the words of Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, sequestration is a “nutty formula, and it’s goofy to begin with, and it’s not something, frankly, that anybody responsible ought to put into effect.” He also said **sequestration is the equivalent of “**shooting ourselves in the head**.”** Tough words, but Secretary Panetta is right. Sequestration would produce **the smallest ground force since 1940**, the smallest Navy since 1915 and the smallest tactical fighter force in Air Force history. Ironically, the president’s defense policy shift to the Pacific increases reliance on the Navy, but with the smallest fleet in nearly a century, controlling the oceans and projecting force will become an even more difficult and selective process, requiring prioritization that would create vulnerabilities elsewhere. Resetting America’s armed forces after a decade-plus of combat action is another necessity that cannot be overlooked. There is also a guarantee of pink slips throughout the uniformed services and every industry that directly supports the U.S. military. In San Diego, the military sustains hundreds of thousands of jobs, and billions of dollars in economic productivity. San Diego — even for all of its strategic value — is not immune to job loss and other economic impacts accompanying deep budget cuts. Sequestration is a term Americans should get to know and understand, because it will have real and lasting consequences if left unchecked. The upside is that the risks and dangers can be avoided as long as Congress and the president act in the coming months. The clock is ticking to stave off sequestration — a move that **would signal to our friends and enemies alike that we uphold our promises and stand ready to defend our interests against any threat.**

#### Hegemony solves nuke war and extinction

Thomas P.M. Barnett 11 Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7 http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads

It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our **stunningly successful stewardship of global order** since World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace. We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. ¶ As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come.

#### turns econ

Morici 8/7 Peter, PhD, is a "recognized expert on economic policy and international economics." He is a Professor of International Business at the R.H. Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland. "Fix fiscal cliff now or face next Great Depression," 2012, http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/08/07/fix-fiscal-cliff-now-or-face-next-great-depression/

President Obama and Republicans are engaging in dangerous brinksmanship. Putting off a political solution to the looming “fiscal cliff” until after the election **risks a** second Great Depression.¶ Without a compromise by January, $400 billion in mandatory spending cuts and more than $100 billion in tax increases will immediately go into effect. **With our economy only growing by only $300 billion annually, such a shock would thrust it into a prolonged contraction.**

### DA

#### Incentives cause government dependence and undermines incentives for innovation

Loris 11 Nicolas Loris is an analyst in the Heritage Foundation’s Roe Institute of Economic Policy Studies. "Power Down the Subsidies to Energy Producers" Aug 3 www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2011/08/power-down-the-subsidies-to-energy-producers

America has an energy addiction - and it’s not an addiction to oil, as many politicians would have you think. It’s an addiction to government subsidies. The addicts, you see, are energy producers, not the consumers.

Their growing dependence on federal handouts is the real cause of America’s energy crisis. Energy subsidies have needlessly wasted taxpayer dollars, retarded commercialization of new technologies and failed to reduce our reliance on foreign energy sources. Washington would do well to end all energy subsidies.

Energy subsidies come in numerous forms ranging from direct expenditures to targeted tax breaks, from production mandates to loan guarantees. Basically, any public policy that favorsthe production or consumption of one type of energy over another can be considered a subsidy.

None of them come cheap. According to the Energy Information Agency, the federal government gave the energy industry $8.2 billion in subsidies and financial aid in 1999. This figure more than doubled to $17.9 billion in 2007 and more than doubled again to $37.2 billion last year.

But the damage subsidies inflict on our economy extends well beyond direct costs. A special endorsement from the government artificially props up that technology. This reduces the incentive for the producer to become cost-competitive, stifles innovation and encourages government dependence.

The federal government has no business picking commercial winners and losers. That’s the job of the marketplace. Indeed, it’s doubly damaging when government decides to manipulate the market through subsidies, because government - almost invariably - picks losers. That’s not surprising, because companies that seek handouts most strenuously are those that cannot compete without them.

#### Solves great power war

**Baru 9** Sanjaya is a Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School in Singapore Geopolitical Implications of the Current Global Financial Crisis, Strategic Analysis, Volume 33, Issue 2 March 2009 , pages 163 – 168

Hence, economic policies and performance do have **strategic consequences.**2 In the modern era, the idea that strong economic performance is the **foundation of power** was argued most persuasively by historian Paul Kennedy. 'Victory (in war)', Kennedy claimed, 'has repeatedly gone to the side with more flourishing productive base'.3 Drawing attention to the interrelationships between economic **wealth, technological innovation, and the ability of states to** efficiently **mobilize economic and technological resources for power projection and national defence**, Kennedy argued that nations that were able to better combine military and economic strength scored over others. 'The fact remains', Kennedy argued, 'that all of the major shifts in the world's military-power balance have followed alterations in the productive balances; and further, that the rising and falling of the various empires and states in the international system has been confirmed by the outcomes of the **major Great Power wars**, where victory has always gone to the side with the greatest material resources'.4 In Kennedy's view, the geopolitical consequences of an economic crisis, or even decline, would be transmitted through a nation's inability to find adequate financial resources to simultaneously sustain economic growth and **military power**.

### Econ

#### Recovery now

Rosenberg 10/25 YUVAL ROSENBERG, The Fiscal Times, "Are You Better Off? More Americans Say Yes" www.thefiscaltimes.com/Articles/2012/10/25/Are-You-Better-Off-More-Americans-Say-Yes.aspx#page1

In an encouraging sign about the tenuous economic recovery – and a potentially promising one for the Obama campaign – slightly more Americans say they feel financially better off, rather than worse, compared with a year ago.

With unemployment falling to 7.8 percent as of September, the housing market finally showing signs of improvement and the U.S. stock market up more than 12 percent on the year, consumers have been feeling more optimistic about the economy. Now a poll by the Gallup Organization finds that, for the first time in more than five years, the percentage of Americans who say they feel financially stronger than they did a year ago, 38 percent, is higher than those who say they are worse off, 34 percent.

The new data doesn’t quite address what has been a key question this election season: Are Americans better off than they were four years ago? But like recent surveys of consumer confidence, the new poll results suggest that Americans are at least sensing some signs of economic improvement. In 2009, President Obama’s first year in office, 54 percent said they were worse off than they had been the previous year.

#### Employment and confidence are growing

Francis 11/6 David, US News, "Is the Economic Recovery Real?" money.usnews.com/money/business-economy/articles/2012/11/06/is-the-economic-recovery-real

Good news on the economic front continues to pour in. In yet another sign of improvement in the U.S. economy, the Bureau of Labor Statistics announced last week that employers added 171,000 jobs in October, and revised the number of jobs added in September from 114,000 to 148,000. It also reported that more unemployed people who had given up on finding work are now looking for a job—a sign of growing confidence in the economy.

#### Transmission costs and lack of location undermine solvency

Magdi Ragheb, 4/23/12, Associate Professor of Nuclear, Plasma, and Radiological Engineering at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, “Economics of Wind Energy”, <https://netfiles.uiuc.edu/mragheb/www/NPRE%20475%20Wind%20Power%20Systems/Economics%20of%20Wind%20Energy.pdf>

**Transmission costs are a major issue in wind energy development.** Some of the best locations for generating wind energy are far distant from the consuming industrial and population centers. Some areas have a better, more reliable source of wind power than others. Although half the USA’s installed wind power capacity is based in Texas and California, the greatest potential for wind generation can be found in areas where there is little demand for electrical power. For instance, there exists a significant amount of wind potential in North Dakota, but there are just not a lot of people or industries in North Dakota to consume the electrical power. The highest wind speeds exist in the remote and inaccessible Aleutian Islands in Alaska. A massive upgrade of the transmission lines nationwide through the national electrical power grid is needed to tap those distant sources.

#### Extending the PTC won’t solve the econ

Phillip Brown, 6/20/12, Specialist in Energy Policy for the Congressional Research Service, “U.S. Renewable Electricity: How Does the Production Tax Credit (PTC) Impact Wind Markets?”, <http://www.nationalaglawcenter.org/assets/crs/R42576.pdf>

Neither BNEF nor EIA estimate a scenario where wind installations meet or exceed existing U.S. wind turbine manufacturing capacity (see Figure 2). As a result, **a PTC extension is unlikely to result in stimulating additional wind manufacturing facilities in the U**nited **S**tates. Estimated wind installations in 2013 and 2014 are expected to drop to levels much lower than existing U.S. manufacturing capacity, including PTC extension scenarios. Whether the PTC expires or is extended, U.S. wind manufacturing utilization levels will likely be less than levels needed to support the wind market in 2012. Therefore, some U.S. wind manufacturing facilities could reduce operations or even completely shut down in 2013 and beyond.

### Warming

#### No impact---mitigation and adaptation will solve---no tipping point or “1% risk” args

Robert O. Mendelsohn 9, the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, June 2009, “Climate Change and Economic Growth,” online: http://www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/gcwp060web.pdf

The heart of the debate about climate change comes from a number of warnings from scientists and others that give the impression that human-induced climate change is an immediate threat to society (IPCC 2007a,b; Stern 2006). Millions of people might be vulnerable to health effects (IPCC 2007b), crop production might fall in the low latitudes (IPCC 2007b), water supplies might dwindle (IPCC 2007b), precipitation might fall in arid regions (IPCC 2007b), extreme events will grow exponentially (Stern 2006), and between 20–30 percent of species will risk extinction (IPCC 2007b). Even worse, there may be catastrophic events such as the melting of Greenland or Antarctic ice sheets causing severe sea level rise, which would inundate hundreds of millions of people (Dasgupta et al. 2009). Proponents argue there is no time to waste. Unless greenhouse gases are cut dramatically today, economic growth and well‐being may be at risk (Stern 2006).

These statements are largely alarmist and misleading. Although climate change is a serious problem that deserves attention, society’s immediate behavior has an extremely low probability of leading to catastrophic consequences. The science and economics of climate change is quite clear that emissions over the next few decades will lead to only mild consequences. The severe impacts predicted by alarmists require a century (or two in the case of Stern 2006) of no mitigation. Many of the predicted impacts assume there will be no or little adaptation. The net economic impacts from climate change over the next 50 years will be small regardless. Most of the more severe impacts will take more than a century or even a millennium to unfold and many of these “potential” impacts will never occur because people will adapt. It is not at all apparent that immediate and dramatic policies need to be developed to thwart long‐range climate risks. What is needed are long‐run balanced responses.

#### Tech and adaptive advances prevent all climate impacts---warming won’t cause war

Dr. S. Fred Singer et al 11, Research Fellow at The Independent Institute, Professor Emeritus of Environmental Sciences at the University of Virginia, President of the Science and Environmental Policy Project, a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and a Member of the International Academy of Astronautics; Robert M. Carter, Research Professor at James Cook University (Queensland) and the University of Adelaide (South Australia), palaeontologist, stratigrapher, marine geologist and environmental scientist with more than thirty years professional experience; and Craig D. Idso, founder and chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, and Association of American Geographers, et al, 2011, “Climate Change Reconsidered: 2011 Interim Report,” online: <http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/FrontMatter.pdf>

Decades-long empirical trends of climate-sensitive measures of human well-being, including the percent of developing world population suffering from chronic hunger, poverty rates, and deaths due to extreme weather events, reveal dramatic improvement during the twentieth century, notwithstanding the historic increase in atmospheric CO2 concentrations.

The magnitude of the impacts of climate change on human well-being depends on society's adaptability (adaptive capacity), which is determined by, among other things, the wealth and human resources society can access in order to obtain, install, operate, and maintain technologies necessary to cope with or take advantage of climate change impacts. The IPCC systematically underestimates adaptive capacity by failing to take into account the greater wealth and technological advances that will be present at the time for which impacts are to be estimated.

Even accepting the IPCC's and Stern Review's worst-case scenarios, and assuming a compounded annual growth rate of per-capita GDP of only 0.7 percent, reveals that net GDP per capita in developing countries in 2100 would be double the 2006 level of the U.S. and triple that level in 2200. Thus, even developing countries' future ability to cope with climate change would be much better than that of the U.S. today.

The IPCC's embrace of biofuels as a way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions was premature, as many researchers have found "even the best biofuels have the potential to damage the poor, the climate, and biodiversity" (Delucchi, 2010). Biofuel production consumes nearly as much energy as it generates, competes with food crops and wildlife for land, and is unlikely to ever meet more than a small fraction of the world's demand for fuels.

The notion that global warming might cause war and social unrest is not only wrong, but even backwards - that is, global cooling has led to wars and social unrest in the past, whereas global warming has coincided with periods of peace, prosperity, and social stability.

#### No extinction from climate change

NIPCC 11 – the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, an international panel of nongovernment scientists and scholars, March 8, 2011, “Surviving the Unprecedented Climate Change of the IPCC,” online: http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a5.html

In a paper published in Systematics and Biodiversity, Willis et al. (2010) consider the IPCC (2007) "predicted climatic changes for the next century" -- i.e., their contentions that "global temperatures will **increase by 2-4°C** and possibly beyond, sea levels will rise (~1 m ± 0.5 m), and atmospheric CO2 will increase by up to 1000 ppm" -- noting that it is "widely suggested that the magnitude and rate of these changes will result in many plants and animals going extinct," citing studies that suggest that "within the next century, over 35% of some biota will have gone extinct (Thomas et al., 2004; Solomon et al., 2007) and there will be extensive die-back of the tropical rainforest due to climate change (e.g. Huntingford et al., 2008)."

On the other hand, they indicate that some biologists and climatologists have pointed out that "many of the predicted increases in climate have **happened before**, in terms of both **magnitude and rate of change** (e.g. Royer, 2008; Zachos et al., 2008), and yet biotic communities have **remained remarkably resilient** (Mayle and Power, 2008) and in some cases **thrived** (Svenning and Condit, 2008)." But they report that those who mention these things are often "placed in the 'climate-change denier' category," although the purpose for pointing out these facts is simply to present "a **sound scientific basis** for understanding biotic responses to the magnitudes and rates of climate change predicted for the future through using the **vast data resource** that we can exploit in fossil records."

Going on to do just that, Willis et al. focus on "intervals in time in the fossil record when atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased up to 1200 ppm, temperatures in mid- to high-latitudes increased by **greater than 4°C within 60 years**, and sea levels rose by up to 3 m higher than present," describing studies of past biotic responses that indicate "the scale and impact of the magnitude and rate of such climate changes on biodiversity." And what emerges from those studies, as they describe it, "is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another." And, most importantly in this regard, they report "there is **very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions** due to a warming world."

In concluding, the Norwegian, Swedish and UK researchers say that "based on such evidence we urge some **caution in assuming broad-scale extinctions** of species will occur due solely to climate changes of the magnitude and rate predicted for the next century," reiterating that "the fossil record indicates **remarkable biotic resilience** to wide amplitude fluctuations in climate."

### S

#### Economic consensus against winner picking---we have experts on our side---(only the CP addresses a specific market failure)

Van Doren and Taylor 8 Peter and Jerry, senior fellows at the Cato Institute, “The Case against Government Support for Alternative Energy” Google Knol, http://knol.google.com/k/jerry-taylor/should-there-be-a-system-of-federal/1adq09v7leuu4/3#

The final issue of disagreement that remains is the question of market failure. We have argued that government intervention to promote renewable energy only makes sense if market prices for energy are “wrong.” We follow with the contention that, if prices are found to be wrong for some reason (say, by not including the cost of the environmental damages associated with energy consumption), the best and most appropriate remedy is to correct the price and then leave markets alone. Joe responds by arguing that this is hard-line libertarian ideology disconnected from observable reality and that government can indeed make better decisions about what to invest in than can market actors left to their own devices … even when market prices are “correct.”

This, we believe, is the real nub of the disagreement between us and Joe. More accurately, this is the real nub of the disagreement between economists and Joe. Our contention that market actors, as a general matter, outperform government planners and that government cannot improve on market performance unless it is correcting an identifiable market failure is not a matter of hard-line libertarian ideology. It is a matter of broad agreement among economists everywhere. Even Nobel laureate and liberal economist par excellance Paul Krugman would not disagree. Hence, Joe is declaring intellectual war on an entire academic discipline – economics – not on libertarianism (which is, in fact, about other things).

#### The aff doesn’t correct a market failure

Van Doren and Taylor 8 Peter and Jerry, senior fellows at the Cato Institute, “The Case against Government Support for Alternative Energy” Google Knol, http://knol.google.com/k/jerry-taylor/should-there-be-a-system-of-federal/1adq09v7leuu4/3#

If prices were correct for energy, why would market actors disappoint in energy markets relative to Joe (or some collection of Joes)? Does Joe have information about renewable energy that others are not privy to? Almost certainly not. Is Joe quantitatively smarter than the intelligence manifested by “the wisdom of [market] crowds?” Probably not (although we admit to having conducted no IQ test on the matter). Does Joe have better incentives than market actors to discover information that might lead to economically optimal investments? Again, no. What Joes does have is evidence that market actors sometimes collectively get things wrong. They overinvested in technology stocks, for instance, in the late 1990s. They overinvested in housing in this decade. They took on derivative contracts without accurately assessing the risks associated with the same. All true. But does Joe have evidence that government can reliably invest in a less error-prone fashion? No. The fact that planned economies around the world have historically ended in smoldering ruin attests to the general superiority of markets. The manifest failure of government regulators to identify market errors and correct the same is likewise a testament to the observation that government is no better informed than the market when it comes to these things. For instance, it was investors – not regulators – who finally detected the rot behind Enron’s books and took that company down. It was the market – not the fiscal or monetary regulators – that finally grew impatient with returns from the technology sector and reallocated capital elsewhere. And it was the investor class – not government sanctioned credit reporting agencies like Moody’s – that finally woke up to the risks associated with sub-prime mortgages – risks that were oblivious to quasi-governmental institutions like Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae and to the balance of the Clinton and Bush regulatory brain trusts. But let’s move from generalities about government decisions in the marketplace as a whole to government decisions in the energy marketplace in particular. What is the track record of government when it comes to overriding market outcomes in the energy sector? Pretty bad. In the 1950s, the interventionists argued that, with a bit of government help, nuclear power would prove “too cheap to meter.” A half a century later, however, we find that nuclear power is “too costly to matter” – even with a stunning array of subsidy, it is still more expensive than conventional electricity.

#### Empirics

Van Doren and Taylor 8 Peter and Jerry, senior fellows at the Cato Institute, “The Case against Government Support for Alternative Energy” Google Knol, http://knol.google.com/k/jerry-taylor/should-there-be-a-system-of-federal/1adq09v7leuu4/3#

Ever since World War II, Washington has periodically promised that synthetic oil was on the horizon and that government could and should deliver what the market mysteriously would not. Again, a half century later, we’re still confronting claims that yet one more government stab at the synthetic energy wagon will produce affordable energy despite at least four separate mad crash programs coming to naught in the past.

In the 1970s, government preferences for solar energy were sold as a means of delivering us unto a low-cost solar energy economy. Now, solar has a trivial market share and has been all but forgotten in our rush to wind power despite a repeat of the same promises.

People like Joe were once head-over-heals in love with corn ethanol and attested to the need to move heaven-and-earth to deliver that fuel to the market. Today, the evidence has mounted that corn ethanol will never be economically competitive with oil, cannot displace oil in any significant manner, and is almost certainly a worse conventional air and greenhouse gas pollutant than even gasoline.

Over the past two decades, government has launch a dizzying array of frenetic programs to reinvent the car: first, to produce cars run largely upon battery electric power (California’s Zero Emission Vehicle program); then, to produce an auto fleet powered by conventional internal combustion engines that could get 70 or more miles per gallon (Clinton’s “Partnership for a New

Generation of Vehicles); then, to produce an auto fleet run on hydrogen powered fuel cells (Bush’s “Freedom Car” initiative); then, to produce an auto fleet powered by cellulosic ethanol (the so-called switch-grass initiative), and now, to produce an auto fleet made up of plug-in hybrid electric vehicles. Every year or two, either the Congress or the President can be reliably expected to come up with some bright new idea to redesign the car and launch a program to translate new wish into new reality. We’re sure more fads will come even while acknowledging that pure chance may eventually prove one of these investment frenzies to be worthwhile.

During the 1990s, state legislatures thought they knew best how to structure electricity markets. The result were game-able systems in California and elsewhere that bear no resemblance to the sort of market that might have arisen had government not dictated politically favored industry blueprints to power companies.

The above list could go on and on, but we must leave a comprehensive exegesis of government energy failure for another day. Suffice it to say that the observation that markets are not always right about what constitutes a “good” investment is correct but insufficient. One must also find that governments can be reliably expected to do better. And there is no evidence in theory or practice that this is the case … particularly in energy markets.

## 2NC

### Sepecific Links---PTC

#### PTC is winner picking---distorts market fundamentals

Edwards 7 Chris Edwards, Director of Tax Policy Studies @ Cato Institute, Statement before the Senate Committee on Finance, Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Infrastructure on May 24, http://www.cato.org/testimony/ct-ce05242007.html

Additional tax incentives, such as tax credits, probably could reduce U.S. energy consumption modestly.1 However, narrow incentives complicate the tax code, create distortions that reduce growth, and move down the **slippery slope of widespread social engineering** through the tax system. On the other hand, Congress should reform tax provisions that hinder new investments in energy production and conservation. Current business depreciation rules for energy and conservation investments are unfavorable compared to the rules in other countries. Congress should reform those rules, and it should pursue broader tax reforms to spur more rapid replacement of older structures and equipment with newer, more energy efficient infrastructure throughout the economy. Investment, Consumption, and the Income Tax Policymakers have long considered major reforms to the federal tax system. Some favor a broad-based consumption tax, while others favor a broad-based (or Haig-Simons) income tax. The difference between the two is the treatment of savings and investment. Consumption taxes apply one layer of tax to savings and investment, while income taxes apply two layers. The current federal "income tax" is a hybrid between the two systems. Reforms to move the current tax code toward a consumption-based system dovetail with the goals of those concerned about America's energy future. A consumption tax would limit current consumption, including energy consumption, while removing tax barriers to investment—including investment in energy production, energy technologies, and energy conservation. As discussed below, more favorable depreciation rules would be an important step in a consumption tax direction. Rising Tax Complexity The federal tax system has become enormously complicated in recent years. The anti-investment bias and high tax rates under the current system have encouraged the proliferation of narrow loopholes and special preferences. There seems to be more interest on Capitol Hill these days in creating new tax credits than in simplifying the tax code to provide fair and equal treatment of all taxpayers. By contrast, during the 1980s there was bipartisan agreement that the tax code should be reformed to have a broad and neutral base with low rates. One congressional leader on tax reform at the time, Richard Gephardt (D-MO), noted in 1985: The main argument for tax reform, I believe, is to achieve greater efficiency in the way the tax code works. When Congress gets into the business of figuring out $370 billion of tax breaks a year, the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee really are put in the business of trying, at least partially, to plan the American economy. ... I confess that I am not qualified to act as a central planner and I do not know anybody on either committee who is.2 The Reagan administration held similar views about tax reform. The Congressional Research Service noted that the administration opposed using the tax law to promote oil and gas development, energy conservation, or the supply of alternative fuels. The idea was to have a more neutral and less distortionary energy tax policy, which economic theory predicts would make energy markets work more efficiently and generate benefits to the general economy.3 The two parties came together and agreed on the landmark Tax Reform Act of 1986, which ended many narrow tax breaks and reduced rates.4 Unfortunately, "central planning" through the tax code has come back into vogue since then. The number of pages in the federal tax code, regulations, and related rules has increased from 40,500 in 1995 to 67,204 in 2007, an increase of two-thirds.5 The number of narrow provisions, or loopholes, in the tax code is rising. Figures 1 and 2 show the number of "tax expenditures" in the income tax, based on data from the Office of Management and Budget.6 The number of tax expenditures for energy jumped from 11 to 23 between 1996 and 2006. The total number of tax expenditures increased from 121 in 1996 to 161 in 2006. There are problems with these measures of tax expenditures. Some items, such as accelerated depreciation, are counted as loopholes under the income tax. But such pro-investment provisions would not be considered loopholes under a consumption tax. Nonetheless, the OMB's tally of tax expenditures shows that Congress is moving away from the ideal of a neutral tax base **toward micromanagement of the economy.** The rising number of narrow provisions in the tax code reduces economic efficiency. Such provisions distort market price and profit signals, which redirects capital and labor into less productive uses. That's why a tax code with a neutral base and low rates is preferable to one with narrow carve-outs and high rates. The economic cost of today's Swiss cheese tax base is large. U.S. output would be substantially higher if the tax base were reformed and effective tax rates across industries were equalized and reduced.7 Rising tax code complexity also Creates high compliance costs for record keeping, tax filing, and learning tax rules. Causes frequent tax filing errors by taxpayers and the Internal Revenue Service. Impedes economic decisionmaking by confusing taxpayers. Many taxpayers do not understand the tax rules for education incentives, retirement savings, and other items.8 Promotes an invasion of privacy by the government. With special breaks, such as those for education and energy, the IRS needs to hunt for volumes of added documentation to carry out its enforcement activities. Going forward, creating new tax incentives for energy and conservation would exacerbate these complexity problems. New tax incentives would add to the paperwork burden, create more errors in tax administration, further confuse economic decisionmaking, and provide further reason for the IRS to dig into personal affairs. Pandora's Box Current federal tax incentives for energy and conservation are not large. Total income tax expenditures for these items are valued at just $7 billion in 2007.9 That represents just 0.3 percent of total federal revenues. Thus, the discussion about tax incentives for energy and conservation is not a discussion about how high federal taxes ought to be. Instead, the important issue for policymakers is to consider the sort of tax code that America ought to have. Should we have a tax code that treats families and businesses as equally as possible? Or should we have a tax code full of special provisions that treat people differently as Congress micromanages family and business decisions? I favor the former. After all, equality under the law is a bedrock American principle. Proponents of tax incentives no doubt think that their favored activities deserve special attention. Many energy and environmental analysts argue that federal tax policies should be used to fix "externalities" in energy markets.10 But such an approach risks opening a Pandora's box of widespread social engineering through the code. Many interest groups, such as those promoting education, housing, and scientific research, argue that their favored activities are subject to externalities that need special tax code treatment. But, in theory, there are an endless number of externalities that governments could meddle in. At the risk of promoting bad ideas, tax lobbyists could champion tax credits for Obesity. This is a serious and growing problem that imposes negative externalities on nonobese Americans through the health system and elsewhere. How about a tax credit for membership costs at Gold's Gym? Neighborhood Beautification. Neat lawns and abundant greenery create positive externalities for neighborhoods. How about a tax credit for tree planting? Guns. Some analysts say that if more households owned guns it would reduce crime through deterrence. How about a tax credit for gun ownership because of this safety externality? I'm not advocating these tax credits, but they illustrate the slippery slope of social engineering if Congress wanted to fix every externality through the tax code. Just this year, the CRS finds that more than 150 bills on energy efficiency and renewable energy have been introduced, with many proposing narrow tax breaks. I hope Congress resists the temptation to create more tax loopholes. Conservation and Competitive Markets The Congressional Research Service noted that the "Reagan administration believed that the responsibility for commercializing conservation and alternative energy technologies rested with the private sector and that high oil prices ... would be ample encouragement for the development of alternative energy resources."11 I think Reagan got it right. Competitive markets have made a huge contribution toward America's energy security and conservation. Businesses, for example, have powerful market incentives to reduce energy consumption. They are relentless in cutting costs—labor costs, tax costs, production costs, fuel costs, heating costs, cooling costs, and lighting costs. Lower costs mean higher profits. That's why businesses strive continually to improve efficiency, including energy efficiency, particularly in today's competitive global economy. Market forces are behind huge improvements in U.S. energy efficiency in recent decades. The amount of energy consumed for each unit of gross domestic product has fallen dramatically since the 1970s. Economist Gilbert Metcalf found that if U.S. energy intensity were still at the level of 1970, the nation would be consuming 187 quadrillion BTUs annually.12 Instead, the United States consumes just 98 quadrillion BTUs annually, and thus we have cut our energy intensity almost in half since 1970. Some of this improvement stemmed from the changing structure of the U.S. economy. But Metcalf calculates that at least two-thirds of the improvements since 1970 came from rising energy efficiency. And much, perhaps most, of that I think is due to the natural competitive processes in the economy, not government policy.

### AT: Perm---2NC

#### Obviously links to all of our offense---the gov needs to set targets without picking winners---specific incentives undermine the purpose of a tech-neutral regime---the CP alone causes effici

Epstein 8 Max, “In Defense of Carbon Pricing: Why Clean RD&D Isn't Enough,” 7/21, http://www.thebreakthrough.org/blog/2008/07/guest\_post\_in\_defense\_of\_carbo.shtml

I once heard more money changes hands on global capital markets in a day than all the world's governments spend in a year. This illustrates, if not the inherent futility, at least the foolishness of trying to take on such a major and multifaceted investment exclusively with public sector financing. While public funds for deployment may spur private capital to some extent, it wouldn't do so nearly as much as further investments in research or infrastructure. Furthermore, the most effective way to motivate private capital to invest in both clean R&D and deployment is to set a price on carbon. A price on carbon literally makes pollution abatement a marketable asset. The 1990 SO2 Cap & Trade regime provides a valuable empirical example on the power of capitalist innovation in achieving emissions reduction goals. Ultimately, it shows that in achieving emissions reductions, government should set the target, but allow the market to find the means of getting there. The 1990 Acid Rain program achieved reductions in sulfur dioxide at far lower cost than even optimistic predictions. How? In large part due to two factors. First, before the program coal was classified as 'high sulfur' or 'low sulfur;' afterwards the sulfur content was rated with much more detail, as it got factored into the price of the coal itself (inverse relationship: low sulfur became more valuable). This allowed plenty of firms to make simple, relatively inexpensive reductions just by switching to a lower sulfur coal, and only to the extent that they needed (or extra if they felt they could profit by saving allowances and selling them). Flue gas scrubbers, the traditional means of sulfur dioxide mitigation, saw significant efficiency gains as well. First, increased competition drove down prices because they now had to compete with other emissions reductions methods, like low-sulfur coal, to stay in business. Second, scrubbers were able to be manufactured to remove fewer emissions, but at far lower cost. This led to more efficiency in reductions per dollar spent. Such a change developed specifically because every marginal reduction had a monetary value, i.e. because there was a price on pollution. The SO2 program holds real lessons for designing a carbon reduction policy. The solutions of tomorrow will not be simple linear improvements on the technologies of today. No one predicted that the acid rain problem would be solved by a new classification system for coal, and scrubbers that actually did less scrubbing. Then as now, we had proven emissions reductions technology available that the government could have mandated or deployed. Luckily, a market based solution was chosen instead. Picking winners, whether it's Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS), or targeted tax credits by technology, is a bad idea. It seems now like "investing in tomorrow's solutions," but it’s just as likely to actually bias the market against taking tomorrow's best solutions, which we likely haven't thought of yet. The competition point from scrubbers is especially relevant. RPS standards insulate listed renewable technologies from competition with cogeneration/CHP, Demand-Side Management (DSM), and again, the things we haven't thought of yet. Shellenberger and Nordhaus write in their criticism of Cap & Trade that we didn't get the PC revolution by regulating away typewriters. Aside from the obvious distinction that typewriters did not pose serious externalities to society, its important to note that we didn't achieve the PC revolution by subsidizing mass deployment of the IBM 5150 PC either. To bring the point closer to home, you don't get a breakthrough like Concentrated Solar Power (CSP) by mass deployment of more PV panels. The government should stick to targets and let the market figure out how to achieve them. Government action should be targeted to address specific market failures. Carbon pricing is the obvious and necessary first step due to its externality cost for society. Research and development is another role for government based on a similar dynamic - since research inevitably yields benefits that accrue to other firms beyond what the researcher can capture for profit, it provides an externality benefit for society. Thus, research would be undersupplied if left to individual profit-seeking firms. Ditto for large scale demonstration projects, which feel out technical, regulatory and supply stream issues, the resolutions of which benefit all firms that come afterwards.

#### The CP solves the case, their methodology is suspect, and the plan’s winner picking will cause a fannie and Freddie explosion in the energy sector

Boskin 12 Michael J. Boskin, is Professor of Economics at Stanford University and Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, and a former chairman of the US President's Council of Economic Advisers. "PICKING LOSERS, KILLING WINNERS" www.stanford.edu/~boskin/Publications/boskin%20wsj%2002%2015%202012%20industrial%20policy%20-%20long.pdf

Firms make mistakes and markets are not perfect, but it's a deeply dangerous conceit for anyone to conclude they can pick technology, firm, and industry winners and losers more successfully than the market. And a possible market failure won't necessarily be improved by government intervention. We must compare the imperfect government policies likely to be implemented with imperfect market outcomes; will they improve the situation AND merit the cost? Government failure, including crony capitalism, rent-seeking and dispensing, pork, and regulatory capture, is as pervasive as market failure due to monopoly, externalities, or information problems.

America certainly has energy security and potential environmental needs to diversify sources by type and by geography. The shale gas hydraulic fracturing revolution -credit due to Halliburton and Mitchell Energy; the government's role was minor is rapidly providing a piece of the intermediate-term solution.

Government should set sensible goals and enact even-handed policies to achieve them, then let entrepreneurs, investors, and consumers decide how best to do so. It should fund applicable, pre-competitive generic scientific and technological research, eliminate specific subsidies and lower tax rates for all with the proceeds.

The arguments mustered to promote industrial policy - infant industries; benefits of clustering and learning; and jobs, do not stand up to serious research and historical evidence. Echoing 1980s Japan-fear and envy, some claim we must enact industrial policies because other countries, e.g. China, do. Presidents Johnson and Nixon wanted the U.S. to build a supersonic transport (SST) plane because the British and French were doing so. The troubled Concorde was shut down after a brief run of subsidized travel for wealthy tourists and Wall Street types.

Our response instead should be 1) remove our own major competitive obstacles, e.g. more competitive corporate tax rates; more sensible regulation, improved K-12 education, and better job training for commercially demanded skills; (Mr. Obama's green jobs training program - added on top of four dozen federal training programs -- spent hundreds of millions; 3% of enrollees had the targeted jobs six months later). 2) Base policies on sound economics. If another country has a comparative cost advantage, we gain from exchanging such products for those we produce relatively more efficiently. If we tried to produce everything in America, our standard of living would plummet. 3) Pursue rapid redress for illegal subsidization and protectionism in appropriate venues, e.g. the WTO, and strengthen those processes.

Fortunately, there is some promising news. Ethanol subsidies and tariffs (but not the increasing use mandate) expired in the New Year and there is a growing consensus to kill California's high-speed rail boondoggle. The state-appointed High Speed Rail Authority recommended against the program, as cost projections tripled to almost $100 billion, ridership projections plummeted and potential startup delayed a decade or more. Yet Mr. Obama offers subsidies to induce Governor Brown to add funds the state doesn't have for a first stage between Fresno and Bakersfield that Californians don't want enough to pay for.

So pervasive is this new government intervention in so many sectors that a vast array of unsubsidized firms are competing for capital and customers with government-subsidized firms forced to make non-commercial decisions. The end result cannot be good; witness the damage wrought by Fannie and Freddie.

Industrial policy failed miserably in the 1970's and 1980's. Letting governments rather than marketplace competition pick specific winners and losers is just as bad an idea today.

#### CP alone solves, plan and perm screw it up

Stavins 12 Robert N. Stavins is the Albert Pratt Professor of Business and Government, Director of the Harvard Environmental Economics Program, and Chairman of the Environment and Natural Resources Faculty Group. "Can Market Forces Really be Employed to Address Climate Change?" May 26 2012 www.robertstavinsblog.org/2012/05/26/can-market-forces-really-be-employed-to-address-climate-change/

Harnessing Market Forces by Pricing Externalities

The pricing of externalities can promote cost-effective abatement, deliver efficient innovation incentives, avoid picking technology winners, and ameliorate, not exacerbate, government fiscal conditions.

By pricing carbon emissions (or, equivalently, the carbon content of the three fossil fuels – coal, petroleum, and natural gas), the government provides incentives for firms and individuals to identify and exploit the lowest-cost ways to reduce emissions and to invest in the development of new technologies, processes, and ideas that can mitigate future emissions. A fairly wide variety of policy approaches fall within the concept of externality pricing in the climate-policy context, including carbon taxes, cap-and-trade, and clean energy standards.

What About Conventional Regulatory Approaches?

In contrast, conventional approaches to environmental protection typically employ uniform mandates to protect environmental quality. Although uniform technology and performance standards have been effective in achieving some established environmental goals and standards, they tend to lead to non-cost-effective outcomes in which some firms use unduly expensive means to control pollution.

In addition, conventional technology or performance standards do not provide dynamic incentives for the development, adoption, and diffusion of environmentally and economically superior control technologies. Once a firm satisfies a performance standard, it has little incentive to develop or adopt cleaner technology. Indeed, regulated firms may fear that if they adopt a superior technology, the government will tighten the standard.

Given the ubiquitous nature of greenhouse gas emissions from diverse sources, it is virtually inconceivable that a standards-based approach could form the centerpiece of a truly meaningful climate policy. The substantially higher cost of a standards-based policy may undermine support for such an approach, and securing political support may require weakening standards and lowering environmental benefits.

How About Technology Subsidies?

Government support for lower-emitting technologies often takes the form of investment or performance subsidies. Providing subsidies for targeting climate-friendly technologies entails revenues raised by taxing other economic activities. Given the tight fiscal environment throughout the developed world, it is difficult to justify increasing (or even continuing) the subsidies that would be necessary to change significantly the emissions intensity of economic activity.

Furthermore, by lowering the cost of energy, climate-oriented technology subsidies can actually lead to excessive levels of energy supply and consumption. Thus, subsidies can undermine incentives for efficiency and conservation, and impose higher costs per ton abated than cost-effective policy alternatives.

In practice, subsidies are typically designed to be technology specific. By designating technology winners, such approaches yield special-interest constituencies focused on maintaining subsidies beyond what would be socially desirable. They also provide little incentive for the development of novel, game-changing technologies.

#### Economists all support the CP

Hsu 11 Shi-Ling Hsu Professor, Florida State University College of Law, "The Case for a Carbon Tax: Getting Past Our Hang-ups to Effective Climate Policy" Island Press, 2011 myweb.fsu.edu/shsu/HSU\_carbon\_tax\_precis4.pdf

Incentivizing innovation will require a broad price signal that ripples throughout the economy in order to take advantage of as many greenhouse gas reduction opportunities as possible. The strength of a carbon tax is it creates a broad, economy-wide price signal. Greenhouse gas reduction opportunities are diverse, and the only way to tap into all of them is to have a broad price signal. Pricing greenhouse gas emissions into energy prices sends a price signal that ripples throughout the entire economy, scrambling every single business in a search for a lower carbon footprint in the hopes that it can gain a price advantage over competitors.

Furthermore, because of the nature of regulating point sources of emissions, regulation of greenhouse gas emissions under the Clean Air Act can only be applied to a handful of facilities. Although this handful of facilities accounts for most of the greenhouse gas emissions, they are a small fraction of the number of facilities that emit. By regulating under the Clean Air Act, we miss the opportunity to tap into the entrepreneurial energies of that vast majority of emitting facilities.

Four: Deeper and steadier incentives to innovate. Many have already made the argument that command-and-control regulation is inefficient and ineffective. The most fundamental flaw of regulating greenhouse gas emissions command-and-control style under the Clean Air Act is that the price signal favoring low-carbon or non-carbon alternatives is one generated by an administrative process, rather than a market process. I do not revisit those arguments. The economists have won the debate, and almost everyone accepts that a price on carbon dioxide emissions is needed.

#### Cap and trade allows a portfolio of options---best approach

Taylor 8 Jerry and Peter Van Doren, CATO, The Case against Government Support for Alternative Energy, http://knol.google.com/k/jerry-taylor/should-there-be-a-system-of-federal/1adq09v7leuu4/3#

There are many ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Substituting wind and solar energy for coal or natural gas is one way. Substituting nuclear energy for the same is another. Sequestering carbon emissions from fossil fuel plants is another possibility. Using conventional energy sources at much reduced volumes – via energy efficiency and conservation – is yet another possibility. Beyond that, removing greenhouse gases from the atmosphere by expanding forests and other carbon sinks is a possible alternative to mitigation, as are geo-engineering possibilities that rely upon more direct human intervention in the atmosphere. What is the most cost-effective way to do what Joe proposes – that is, to stop global warming (or, more accurately, to reduce future warming)? Who knows? Government subsidies and/or regulatory preferences to produce “clean energy” (at least, as defined by Joe – nuclear energy seems pretty clean to us but probably isn’t what Joe is talking about) simply rigs the market to favor one approach over alternative approaches. Better to internalize the costs of climate change into the price of energy and let market actors figure out how best to reduce emissions. Since government has no comparative advantage in figuring out the most efficient way to go about this, government has no brief for dictating answers to the market.

### AT: Hurts Manufacturing---2NC

#### Nah---innovations and capital gains reform solve

Tucker 12 William, prominent published write on nuclear energy, "WILLIAM TUCKER: Should Nuclear Support a Carbon Tax?" Sept 4 www.nucleartownhall.com/blog/william-tucker-should-nuclear-support-a-carbon-tax/

But Morgan doesn’t stop there. He goes on to argue that a carbon tax would be a general tax on manufacturing, spreading across the entire nuts-and-bolts economy and reducing our international competitiveness.

The flaw in this argument is that it regards the current industrial situation as static. If a carbon tax makes electricity more expensive then things will stay that way forever. But the point of a carbon tax is to level the playing field for other forms of generation that do not produce carbon dioxide. Most prominent among these, of course, is nuclear power. If the increases costs of power can be temporarily offset by lower business and capital gains taxes, the overall impact on the industrial economy could be muted.

### AT: Electricity Prices---2NC

#### Incentives undermines cost-reduction---ensures higher energy prices if projects come online

Spencer 9 Jack Spencer, Research Fellow in Nuclear Energy in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies @ The Heritage Foundation, “The Problem with Increasing Energy Loan Guarantees,” 2/6 http://www.heritage.org/Research/EnergyandEnvironment/wm2277.cfm

They remove incentives to decrease costs. The loan guarantee discounts the cost to build a project, and this artificial price reduction allows the recipient's project to be market viable at a point where it otherwise would not be. The consumer will eventually have to pay for this artificial reduction either through higher prices once the subsidy is removed or by being denied access to the less expensive technology that the guarantee recipient displaced. Eventually, these inefficiencies will result in higher electricity prices for consumers.

#### Government can’t predict or plan technology implementation effectively

Morris et al 12 Adele C. Morris, Fellow and Deputy Director of the. Climate and Energy Economics project at Brookings, Pietro S. Nivola, Charles Schultze, Brookings Scholars, "CLEAN ENERGY:REVISITING THE CHALLENGES OF INDUSTRIAL POLICY" June 4 www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/6/04%20clean%20energy%20morris%20nivola%20schultze/04\_clean\_energy\_morris\_nivola\_schultze.pdf

All of which leads us to examine a little more fully the practical difficulties facing policymakers in the real world of American government as they struggle to choose and sustain the right enterprises.

Identifying plausible candidates might be a more dependable process if the commercial prospects of emerging technologies could be accurately predicted. Too often, however, the predictions have foundered. Decades ago the government launched robust programs to develop nuclear breeder reactors and to facilitate synthetic fuels.

These did not appear to be fanciful schemes in the contexts of their times. But they proved to be premised on unreliable forecasts. In the first instance, experts were anticipating continued explosive growth of domestic demand for electricity. (Instead, demand, especially for baseload capacity, settled onto a much slower trajectory.) In the second, the forecasters assumed that the price of petroleum would not plunge far below $40 a barrel, over $ 100 a barrel in today's money. (Instead, it collapsed by the mid-1980s.) Similar unexpected twists have bedeviled attempts to foretell the potential market for various forms of cleaner energy. When prices tumble, as they do periodically, the government's best-laid plans get stranded.

#### Market and political forces ruin the aff

Morris et al 12 Adele C. Morris, Fellow and Deputy Director of the. Climate and Energy Economics project at Brookings, Pietro S. Nivola, Charles Schultze, Brookings Scholars, "CLEAN ENERGY:REVISITING THE CHALLENGES OF INDUSTRIAL POLICY" June 4 www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/6/04%20clean%20energy%20morris%20nivola%20schultze/04\_clean\_energy\_morris\_nivola\_schultze.pdf

The caprice of the marketplace frustrates energy planning. So does the fact that public decisions regarding which producers to favor are all but impossible to insulate from political pressures. For the sake of argument, let us suppose that technocrats in highly competent government agencies were able to foresee and then objectively compare the lead-times for commercializing the multiple options under consideration. With that knowledge, one might think, only the most viable green businesses would be tapped to receive public funds. The power of the purse, however, lies with Congress—and the irresistible temptation there is to distribute resources widely and often injudiciously, not to concentrate them on just a few worthy targets.

Following the energy shocks of the 1970s, the Carter administration mounted the most concerted and sustained campaign to enact national energy laws that, it was hoped, would moderate the use of fossil fuels, especially oil. Scrambling to build the coalitions needed to pass these measures, Congress heard from stakeholders of nearly every conceivable kind seeking a piece of the action. The queue of claimants even included opponents of school integration, who lobbied to graft anti-busing amendments onto bills on the grounds that these would conserve fuel.26 In the end, not every supplicant got its appetite satisfied, of course, but the prospect of federal subsidies and dispensations had clearly invited a feeding frenzy by interest groups, many of whom would keep circling Washington for decades.

The political dynamics have been similar in nearly every subsequent effort to refine the nation's desultory energy agenda. Thanks to extensive logrolling, proposed legislation before Congress during the past decade has been rather indiscriminately stuffed with loans, loan guarantees, grants, procurement mandates, and tax advantages for seemingly all comers—small businesses, green-building retrofitters, railroads, bicyclists, and electric vehicle manufacturers, as well as renewable energy suppliers that include ethanol plants and planters, biodiesel producers, developers of hydrogen technology, and nuclear power.27 Even coal producers seek to qualify as a clean energy source on the theory that coal-fired electricity generators might someday be equipped for carbon sequestration.

In short, the American political system seldom sticks to sponsoring and sheltering only genuine industrial winners, green or otherwise. For as the late Senator William Roth of Delaware observed years ago, 'The trouble with picking winners is that each Congressman would want one for his district."28

Further complicating the situation is the role of new players who may learn to game a regime of subsidies or preferential regulations in unexpected ways. An example: "Tax equity" financiers profit by charging homeowners slightly below-market electricity prices in exchange for installing residential solar PV systems for which a 30% tax credit applies. Some environmentalists hail the development as buying down the up-front cost of solar systems and making firms, homeowners, and the environment better off. 29 Critics contend, however, that "solar-backed securities," which bundle the returns from such investments into assets sold to third parties, drive demand for Chinese PV panels, risk creating a new financial bubble and encumber properties with uncertain effects on housing markets.30 Whatever the case, policymakers should not be surprised if the consequences of industrial subsidies can wind up in unanticipated places or take unintended forms.

## 1NR

### OV

#### you called it --- Nuke war turns warming

Guardian 9 - By Duncan Clark, “The carbon footprint of nuclear war,” ½ http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/blog/2009/jan/02/nuclear-war-emissions

Almost 700m tonnes of CO2 would be released into the Earth's atmosphere by **even the smallest nuclear conflict**, according to a US study that compares the environmental costs of developing various power sources. Just when you might have thought it was ethically sound to unleash a nuclear attack on a nearby city, along comes a pesky scientist and points out that atomic warfare is bad for the climate. According to a new paper in the journal Energy & Environmental Science, **even a very limited nuclear exchange**, using just a thousandth of the weaponry of a full-scale nuclear war, would cause up to 690m tonnes of CO2 to enter the atmosphere – **more than UK's annual total.** The upside (kind of) is that the conflict would also generate as much as 313m tonnes of soot. This would stop a great deal of sunlight reaching the earth, creating a significant regional cooling effect in the short and medium terms – just like when a major volcano erupts. Ultimately, though, the CO2 would win out and crank up global temperatures an extra few notches. The paper's author, Mark Z Jacobson, **a professor** of civil and environmental engineering **at Stanford** University, calculated the emissions of such a conflict by totting up the burn rate and carbon content of the fabric of our cities. "Materials have the following carbon contents: plastics, 38–92%; tyres and other rubbers, 59–91%; synthetic fibres, 63–86%; woody biomass, 41–45%; charcoal, 71%; asphalt, 80%; steel, 0.05–2%. We approximate roughly the carbon content of all combustible material in a city as 40–60%."

### 2NC Will Pass

#### Will pass---Obama has momentum and the upper-hand

Cohen 11/9 Tom is a writer for CNN. “Obama calls on House to pass tax hikes for wealthy,” 2012, http://www.cnn.com/2012/11/09/politics/obama-fiscal-cliff/index.html?utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+rss%2Fcnn\_allpolitics+%28RSS%3A+Politics%29&utm\_content=Google+Reader

Washington (CNN) -- Flush with **re-election vigor**, President Barack Obama called Friday for House Republicans to immediately pass a bill already approved by the Senate to extend current tax rates for middle class Americans while allowing a tax hike for wealthier citizens.¶ In his first public comments since winning Tuesday's vote, Obama expressed openness to negotiate with Congress on how to deal with pending tax hikes and spending cuts that create the so-called fiscal cliff facing the economy at the end of the year.¶ However, he also repeated a longstanding demand from well before the election that Republican opponents to any kind of tax increase relent to the will of the White House and the Senate, and now the American people as well, on letting tax rates increase on income over $250,000.¶ Nobody in either party wants the middle class, identified as families making less than $250,000 a year, to see taxes increase at the end of the year when lower rates set during the administration of former President George W. Bush will expire, Obama said.¶ "That makes no sense. It would be bad for the economy," he told a White House gathering of what aides described as middle class Americans. "Let's extend middle class tax cuts right now. Let's do that right now. That one step would give millions of families, 98% of Americans, 97% of small businesses, the certainty that they need going into the new year."¶ Noting the Senate previously passed a bill to extend the tax cuts to the middle class, but not income over $250,000, Obama said "all we need is action from the House."¶ "I've got the pen," he said, reaching into his pocket to hold one up as the crowd applauded. "I'm ready to sign the bill right away. I'm ready to do it."¶ The president also announced he invited congressional leaders from both parties to the White House next week to launch talks on finding a solution to the fiscal cliff, as well as consensus on how to strike a comprehensive deal to reduce the nation's chronic federal deficits and debt.¶ While offering to consider unspecified reforms to costly entitlement programs sought by Republicans, Obama' s initial salvo in what will be a long and tough negotiation signaled **he was unwilling to back down** on the tax issue that was a central theme of his election campaign.¶ "Our job now is to get a majority in Congress to reflect the will of the American people," the president said.¶ Obama and House Speaker John Boehner are positioned as the lead negotiators in a showdown between Democrats and Republicans over the issue identified by voters as a top priority: reducing the chronic federal deficits and debt considered a threat to economic prosperity and national security.¶ Boehner, R-Ohio, signaled a willingness to deal on Friday but also maintained hard-line GOP opposition to any tax increase.¶ "Raising tax rates will slow down our ability to create the jobs everyone says they want," Boehner said at a news conference, noting that higher taxes on the wealthy will hit small business owners.¶ But he also said that "everything on the revenue side and on the spending side has to be looked at."¶ Boehner called on Obama to take the lead in offering a workable plan that Republicans can accept but stopped short of providing details, saying: "I don't want to limit the options available to me or limit the options that might be available to the White House."¶ Asked if tea party conservatives or others in his caucus might oppose an agreement they don't like, Boehner responded: "When the president and I have been able to come to an agreement, there has been no problem in getting it passed here in the House."¶ Obama was scheduled to deliver a statement on the economy at the White House later on Friday.¶ **Boehner's hand was weakened by the election results** Tuesday that returned Obama to the White House, broadened the Democratic majority in the Senate and slightly narrowed the Republican majority in the House.¶ Pawlenty: Fiscal cliff can be solved Consequences of failing to compromise¶ Retiring GOP Rep. Steve LaTourette of Ohio told CNN that a poll commissioned by centrist Republicans showed that voters wanted Congress to fix the nation's fiscal problems rather than cling to political orthodoxy.¶ "They didn't send the same bunch back to town in this election because they love what they're doing," LaTourette said. "They sent him back because they don't trust either side, but they do expect them to get this thing done."¶ While the result was another split Congress like the current session that has become a symbol of legislative dysfunction, both sides have signaled a possible new openness to an agreement that was unreachable in the past two years.¶ In the final days of the campaign, Vice President Joe Biden referred to private talks with members of Congress on the pending fiscal impacts of expiring tax cuts and mandatory budget cuts. This week, Boehner called on Obama to work with him to complete a comprehensive deficit reduction agreement -- the "grand bargain" that eluded them last year.

#### Passage is likely---Obama’s push will get it done---Republicans agree

Montgomery and Goldfarb 11/6 Lori and Zachary are writer for the Washington Post. “Fresh from reelection, president finds himself on edge of ‘fiscal cliff’,” 2012, http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/decision2012/fiscal-cliff-clock-starts-in-earnest-as-election-fades-to-background/2012/11/06/c4dfde6e-27b2-11e2-b2a0-ae18d6159439\_story.html

President Obama returns to Washington from the campaign trail Wednesday to face an epic year-end battle over taxes and spending that could ultimately tame the national debt and advance his ambitions for a second term.¶ The president, who won reelection late Tuesday, must now confront the “fiscal cliff,” nearly $500 billion in automatic tax hikes and spending cuts set to take effect in January that could throw the nation back into recession.¶ If Obama can engineer a compromise to avert the cliff with the freshly reelected Republican House, he could set the stage for progress on other second-term priorities, including immigration reform, climate change and investments in education and manufacturing. Such a compromise could also infuse fresh energy into an economic recovery that has suffered from uncertainty over the future of federal budget policies.¶ “Getting a deal on long-term fiscal soundness is paramount to move forward and to see the economy really keep improving,” said Bill Daley, Obama’s former chief of staff. It will also “give confidence that the political system can address a major issue.”¶ With Congress scheduled to return to Washington next week for a post-election legislative session**, policymakers will have just 49 days to reach consensus**. At stake is the fate of dozens of expiring tax breaks — including lower rates for all taxpayers adopted during the George W. Bush administration — and deep cuts to the Pentagon and other agency budgets.¶ Obama has threatened to veto legislation to avert the cliff that extends the Bush tax rates for the wealthy. After a campaign focused heavily on that pledge, Democrats say **the president is prepared to draw a firm line in the sand**, even if it means letting one of the largest tax hikes in U.S. history take effect on Jan. 1.¶ “Republicans face a choice, and the choice is theirs,” said Rep. Chris Van Hollen (Md.), the senior Democrat on the House Budget Committee. “If they want to drive off the fiscal cliff, that means they want to go into January demanding that people like Mitt Romney get a bonus tax break or nobody gets any tax relief.”¶ Despite the risks to the economy — and the potential disruption to the 2012 tax filing season — Democrats see a clear advantage to going over the cliff. In January, once the Bush tax cuts have expired, Democrats would be free to draft their own plan to cut taxes for the middle class, but not the wealthy, and dare Republicans to reject it.¶ “If you allow all the tax rates to revert, you’re talking about raising $5 trillion over 10 years,” Van Hollen said. “So Republicans will have to choose: Do they prefer $5 trillion in [new] revenue? Or something in the range of $2 trillion?” The latter revenue figure is the target amount set by the independent fiscal commission led by Democrat Erskine Bowles and former GOP senator Alan K. Simpson of Wyoming.¶ Obama’s most recent budget request called for more than $1.5 trillion in new revenue over the next decade, primarily by raising rates and limiting the value of deductions on annual income over $250,000. In the coming days, Democrats say, Obama is likely to launch a concerted public relations campaign in support of his budget plan, continuing his call for a “balanced approach” to debt reduction.¶ Republicans have long resisted any increase in taxes, and conservatives say they will not bend, even if it means letting tax rates rise across the board.¶ “It’s a difficult position to be in,” acknowledged Rep. Jim Jordan (R-Ohio), chairman of the conservative Republican Study Committee. “But just two years ago, the American people sent 65 new Republicans to the House of Representatives. And they said, ‘Don’t go there and compromise with Barack Obama. Go there and stop him.’ ”¶ House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio) took a similar stand late Tuesday after voters returned a Republican majority in the House. By renewing the GOP majority, he said during an event in Washington, “the American people have . . . made clear that there is no mandate for raising tax rates.”¶ Still, **faced with a** determined **Democratic president**, many Republicans on Capitol Hill and elsewhere say the GOP will have **few options but to compromise**.¶ ¶ “I love what John Boehner is saying, but **I have a hard time believing Republicans won’t cave**,” said GOP tax lobbyist Kenneth J. Kies. To resist Obama, “you have to be prepared to shoot the hostages. You have to be prepared to let it all expire. And it takes a lot of courage to do that.”

#### Will pass---momentum---Boehner will compromise---PC is key---also Obama won’t allow deal to be delayed

Chicago Tribune 11/7 “Obama wins but 'fiscal cliff' looms,” 2012, http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/politics/chi-obama-fiscal-cliff-20121107,0,7326267.story?page=1

Even before Obama gets to his second inaugural on Jan. 20, he must deal with the threatened "fiscal cliff." A combination of automatic tax increases and steep across-the-board spending cuts are set to take effect in January if Washington doesn't quickly reach a budget deal. Experts have warned that the economy could tip back into recession without an agreement.¶ The top Democrat in Congress called Wednesday for a quick solution to Washington's "fiscal cliff" in an upcoming post-election session of Congress.¶ At the same time, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid said that asking wealthier people to pay higher taxes needs to be part of any solution to the government's budget woes.¶ The Nevada Democrat told reporters in Washington he's "not for kicking the can down the road" and that any solution should include higher taxes on "the richest of the rich."¶ The fiscal cliff is the one-two punch of expiring Bush-era tax cuts and across-the-board spending cuts to the Pentagon and domestic programs that could total $800 billion next year, based on Congressional Budget Office estimates.¶ "The vast majority of the American people &#8212; rich, poor, everybody agrees &#8212; the richest of the rich have to help a little bit," Reid said.¶ A **rejuvenated Obama** still confronts a re-elected House GOP majority that stands in powerful opposition to his promise to raise tax rates on upper-bracket earners, although House Speaker John **Boehner**, R-Ohio, **has left the door open for** other forms of new revenue as part of **a deal** totackle the spiraling national debt.¶ "The American people have also made clear that there is no mandate for raising tax rates," Boehner said Tuesday night. "What Americans want are solutions that will ease the burden on small businesses, bring jobs home, and let our economy grow. **We stand ready to work** with any willing partner &#8212; Republican, Democrat, or otherwise &#8212; who shares a commitment to getting these things done."¶ The Ohio Republican is scheduled to address the issue Wednesday afternoon.¶ Reid also said he anticipates addressing the need to increase the government's borrowing cap early next year and not in the post-election session of Congress.¶ Newly elected Democrats signaled they want compromise to avoid the fiscal cliff.¶ Sen.-elect Tim Kaine, a former Virginia governor who defeated Republican George Allen, said on NBC's "Today" show that voters sent a message they want "cooperative government." But he also says the election results show that the public doesn't want "all the levers in one party's hands" on Capitol Hill.¶ From Massachusetts, Elizabeth Warren said on "CBS This Morning" that those who voted for her opponent, Republican Sen. Scott Brown, expressed a desire for lawmakers to work together. She says: "I heard that loud and clear."¶ Obama repeated his campaign slogan of moving "forward" repeatedly in a victory speech early Wednesday in his hometown of Chicago.¶ "We will disagree, sometimes fiercely, about how to get there," he said. "As it has for more than two centuries, progress will come in fits and starts. It's not always a straight line. It's not always a smooth path. By itself, the recognition that we have common hopes and dreams won't end all the gridlock, or solve all our problems, or substitute for the painstaking work of building consensus, and making the difficult compromises needed to move this country forward. But that common bond is where we must begin."¶ Former **Obama** adviser Anita Dunn told "CBS This Morning" that the president made it clear in his acceptance speech that he **will be reaching out,** and she warned GOP House leaders, representing Ohio, Virginia and Wisconsin, to keep in mind that their voters also wanted to keep Obama.¶ "Clearly there's a lot of momentum and a lot of incentive for people to work together to really find answers to the challenges," she said.¶ One of those lawmakers Dunn was referring to was GOP vice presidential nominee Paul Ryan, the Wisconsin congressman who said Wednesday that he plans to return as House Budget Committee chairman. He'll be involved in negotiations with the White House over fiscal policy, while keeping an eye on a possible presidential run in 2016.¶ Even though the tea party lost some ground with defeat of some of the movement-backed incumbents, Obama still will have to deal with a large faction of those lawmakers in the House and Senate. Republican Ted Cruz, who handily won his race for a Senate seat in Texas with tea party support, said he plans on compromising only if Obama does the same.

#### Boehner’s relaxing his hard stance

Caldwell 11/8 Leigh Ann Caldwell is a reporter for CBS News. “Top Democrat: Boehner's "fiscal cliff" remarks "a good first step",” 2012, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250\_162-57547214/top-democrat-boehners-fiscal-cliff-remarks-a-good-first-step/

As Washington turns its attention from the elections to the "fiscal cliff," a top Democratic senator said today that he is "heartened" by the remarks of House Speaker John Boehner about his willingness to increase revenue as part of deficit negotiations, calling it "a good first step."¶ "I was heartened, very heartened by the tone that Speaker Boehner showed yesterday in his remarks," said Sen. Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., according to The Hill newspaper. "He basically said the president won the election and he should lead. He basically said that he is open to revenues, which many in his own party disagree with." ¶ In a speech on Capitol Hill Wednesday, **Boehner** said he **is willing to work with** President **Obama** and his Democratic colleagues in the Senate **to avert the "fiscal cliff,"** which is a series of automatic budget cuts and tax hikes set to go into effect at the beginning of the year that would alter the structure of the economy too quickly, analysts say. Boehner said Congress should use the pending "fiscal cliff" as an opportunity for a down payment on broader budget reform to be enacted next year.¶ The House Speaker also signaled a slight shift from his previous position, Boehner also said he is "willing to accept some additional revenues" in a broader deficit reduction agreement that included tax reform.¶ "You can't expect the Speaker to turn on a dime in 24 hours and embrace everything, higher taxes, higher taxes on the wealthy, but I think privately that he's seen the handwriting on the wall and it makes me very hopeful that we can do something big in the next month and a half. **It's a good first step,**" Schumer said at a breakfast with reporters Thursday.

#### GOP will cave, but arm twisting is key

Macke 11/7 Jeff is a writer for Yahoo Finance, citing David Lutz, managing director of ETF trading at Stifel Nicolaus. “Obama Re-Elected! Now About That Fiscal Cliff…” 2012, http://finance.yahoo.com/blogs/breakout/obama-elected-now-fiscal-cliff-135809296.html

Lutz isn't expecting what he calls a "grand deal" but he does think the real horse trading and bargaining is going to begin now that the election is settled. He thinks the **Republicans are likely to give ground**, bringing higher taxes into play, but both sides will give a little bit to push the deadline back, if not come to a real resolution prior to the December 31st unofficial deadline.

#### Reelection gave Obama a mandate---he’ll use influence to forge a compromise

Hunter and Tiron 11/7 Kathleen and Roxana are writers at Bloomberg. “Obama Faces Pressure to Lead on ‘Fiscal Cliff’ After Win,” 2012, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-11-07/obama-faces-pressure-to-lead-on-fiscal-cliff-after-win.html>

President Barack Obama’s victory positions him to **claim a mandate** for pushing a proposal through Congress that would let tax cuts expire for top earners and avert $1.2 trillion in automatic spending reductions.¶ Obama now must decide how to contend with opposition from congressional Republicans who demand a tax-cut extension for all income levels.¶ Obama defeated Republican Mitt Romney to win a second term that will begin with the same balance of power in Congress: Democrats controlling the Senate and Republicans holding the majority in the House. Republicans were counting on a Romney victory or a Senate takeover to improve their negotiating posture.¶ Emboldened by the election results, Obama “will offer a brand-new plan of his own,” Steve Bell, senior director of the Economic Policy Project at the Bipartisan Policy Center, said in an interview.¶ Bell said one option the Obama administration is considering is pushing anew for a “balanced” plan to cut as much as $100 billion in spending as a deficit-reduction down payment while letting the George W. Bush-era tax cuts expire for top earners.¶ “In the coming weeks and months, I am looking forward to reaching out and working with leaders of both parties to meet the challenges we can only solve together: reducing our deficit; reforming our tax code; fixing our immigration system; freeing ourselves from foreign oil,” Obama said in his victory speech early today.¶ Call to Leaders¶ The president spoke by telephone with the Democratic and Republican leaders of the House and Senate after his victory. He told them the “message” sent by voters yesterday was that both parties “need to put aside their partisan interests and work with common purpose,” according to a White House statement.¶ Congressional aides have previously said that lawmakers in both parties are discussing fallback plans for $60 billion to $100 billion in deficit reduction.¶ Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus, a Montana Democrat, said this week that he expected Obama to call on Congress soon after the election to pass a deficit-reduction plan that includes revenue increases and spending cuts.¶ “There’s a mandate for a balanced approach, and that means it’s got to be a combination of revenue and cuts,” former Representative Tom Perriello, a Virginia Democrat, said in an interview. He said he would like to see Obama “put a very bold plan out there.”¶ Taxes, Entitlements¶ Unless Congress acts, automatic spending cuts, known as sequestration, will begin in January and the Bush tax cuts will expire Dec. 31. Obama and congressional Democrats want to let the tax cuts expire for top earners, while Republicans advocate extending them for all income levels. The spending reductions and tax increases, amounting to $607 billion in 2013, are known as the “fiscal cliff.”¶ To help bring Republicans to the table, Obama also may propose “minor changes” to entitlement programs, such as a temporary change in the formula used to calculate annual benefit adjustments, Bell said.¶ “Obama will certainly be very proactive,” he said.¶ A big question is the degree to which Republicans will back off from their opposition to tax increases.¶ House Defense¶ “For two years, our majority in the House has been the primary line of defense for the American people against a government that spends too much, taxes too much and borrows too much when left unchecked,” House Speaker John Boehner, who was one of the leaders Obama spoke with, said yesterday at an election event in Washington. “With this vote, the American people have also made clear that there is no mandate for raising tax rates.”¶ Boehner indicated before the election that the House may be willing to pass short-term legislation to make time for broader talks on reducing the deficit and averting automatic spending cuts over the next decade.¶ “The American people re-elected the president, and re- elected our majority in the House,” Boehner of Ohio said in a statement. “If there is a mandate, it is a mandate for both parties to find common ground and take steps together to help our economy grow and create jobs, which is critical to solving our debt.”¶ Boehner Statement¶ The speaker plans to make a statement on the fiscal cliff at 3:30 p.m. Washington time today, according to an e-mailed statement issued by his staff. He’ll make the statement after holding a conference call with House Republicans to discuss the fiscal cliff and the election results, according to a House Republican leadership aide, who spoke on condition of anonymity about the private meeting.¶ Eric Ueland, chief of staff to former Senator Bill Frist when the Tennessee Republican was majority leader, said Obama “has a responsibility to step forward quickly and express his specific interest in what he wants to see happen in December and then let Congress react to that.”¶ Ueland said Obama’s victory increases pressure on him to reach across the aisle.¶ “While he’ll have the ability to argue that he received an endorsement of his positions, he also has the responsibility of working with the Republicans in the House and Senate,” Ueland said.¶ Some congressional Republicans, especially in the Senate, have said they may be willing

to consider eliminating some tax breaks to help pay for eliminating automatic cuts to defense programs.

### Link

We’re the only one’s w/ a card that says pol cap and PTC in the same card --- even if some people like the plan it forces Obama to get involved in a draining, time consuming fight to secure the rest of the votes which kills his capital

their evidnce says that 3 GOP senators like the PTC which our evidence answers b/c support is ANECDOTAL but the link outweighs the turn b/c ON BALANCE the plan is more unpopular

#### Even if the plan’s net-popular, it still causes huge battles

Reuters 8/14 “White House hopeful on renewal of wind tax credit,” 2012, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/08/14/us-usa-obama-energy-idUSBRE87D0BI20120814

Renewing the tax break would likely face a tough battle in the Republican-led House of Representatives. After Solyndra and other government-backed alternative energy companies went bankrupt, many fiscally conservative lawmakers in the House have been hesitant to support renewable energy technologies.

#### Plan causes huge partisan fights

Dittloff 9/17 Dave Dittloff is the Regional Representative for National Wildlife Federation’s Northern Rockies and Prairies Regional Center. He has a Master’s Degree in Public Administration from the University of Montana and a BA in Political Science and Economics from the University of Wisconsin. “Three Reasons Congress Should Set Partisan Politics Aside for Renewables,” 2012, http://blog.nwf.org/2012/09/three-reasons-congress-should-set-partisan-politics-aside-for-renewables/

If you’ve watched just a little television in the last couple of weeks, you’ve undoubtedly been exposed to the super partisan rhetoric of this campaign season. This fixation with making the other party look like out-of-touch, self-serving simpletons isn’t relegated to your TV. Despite all of the incredibly important things this country needs to get done, **Congress has passed very few laws this session**. Instead, **it has been intent on focusing in on making the other party look bad**.¶ One example of an incredibly important piece of legislation that is languishing in the punch and counter-punch atmosphere of this Congress is the Production Tax Credit for Renewable Energy (PTC). The PTC is a 2.2 cent per kilowatt tax credit for the production of electricity from utility scale wind turbines for the first ten years of production. It has been on the books for twenty years, and has been an important incentive in getting the wind industry up and running. Unfortunately, the PTC is set to expire in December of 2012, and the chances of renewing it are getting smaller and smaller every day.

#### Massive GOP opposition---Solyndra

Reuters 9/24 “John Boehner Pressured By Conservatives To End Wind Production Tax Credit,” 2012, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/09/24/john-boehner-wind-production-tax-credit\_n\_1910687.html

WASHINGTON, Sept 24 (Reuters) - Forty-seven Republicans in the U.S. House of Representatives are pushing Speaker John Boehner to eliminate the wind production tax credit, a tax break that has split Republicans and drawn criticism from presidential hopeful Mitt Romney.¶ Democratic President Barack Obama has urged Congress to extend the credit, which dates to 1992 and has support from Republicans in states that are home to wind farms and manufacturing plants, such as Iowa and South Dakota.¶ The credit has other powerful proponents in big companies that buy wind energy. Heavyweights including Microsoft Corp, Sprint and Hewlett-Packard have urged renewal. The industry calls it vital to ensuring jobs, including wind turbine tower manufacturing in a broad swath of U.S. states.¶ Republican opposition to renewable energy tax breaks has been **galvanized** by anger over a failed solar project backed by the Obama administration. Republicans referred to that project, a start-up company called Solyndra, several times in the letter.¶ "The Obama administration has poured billions into subsidizing its favored green energy sources," reads the letter dated Sept. 21 from House Republicans to Boehner, also a Republican. "Twenty years of subsidizing wind is more than enough."

### XT Kills Hegemony

#### Sequestration ends US primacy---we’ll lose our advantage on land, sea, and air

Calvert 8/5 Ken is a writer at the Press Enterprise citing the House Armed Services Committee. "NATION: Obama, Congress must avert huge, automatic defense cuts," 2012, http://www.pe.com/opinion/local-views-headlines/20120805-nation-obama-congress-must-avert-huge-automatic-defense-cuts.ece

While the president has not instructed his administration to plan for sequestration, various government and private sector entities have conducted analysis of its impacts. Since it is hard to imagine what exactly $492 billion in national security cuts would mean, the House Armed Services Committee put the number into military capability terms. Sequestration would mean: a Navy fleet of 238 ships, **the lowest number since World War I**; 478 fewer Air Force fighters and significant cuts to our fifth-generation Joint Strike Fighter; 34 fewer strategic bombers and 157 strategic and tactical airlift aircraft, **limiting our ability to project power**; and 200,400 fewer soldiers and Marines, which would **impact our ability to conduct offensive, defense and humanitarian missions around the world**. In short, if sequestration goes into effect, America will compromise a legacy of superiority on the land, sea and in the air.

#### **Sequestration tanks heg---kills readiness, military modernization, flexibility, and perceptions of security assurances---our evidence is more qualified**

BPC 12 Bipartisan Policy Center's Task Force on Defense Budget and Strategy. Co-Chairs: Senator Pete Domenici, Former Chairman of the U.S. Senate Budget Committee and Senior Fellow at the BPC, Secretary Dan Glickman, Former U.S. Agricultural Secretary and Former Chairman of the U.S. House Select Intelligence Committee and Senior Fellow at the BPC, and General James Jones, Former National Security Advisor and Former Commander of U.S. European Command and Senior Fellow at the BPC. Members: Dr. Graham Allison, Director of the Belfer Center at Harvard, Ross Perot, General Peter Chiarelli, Former Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Major General Arnold Punaro, Senior Fellow of the Defense Business Board and Former Staff Director of the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee, Admiral Greg Johnson, Former Commander of U.S. Naval Forces in Europe, Dr. Abram Shulsky, Senior Fellow at the Hudson Institute, General George Joulwan, Former Commander of U.S. European Command, General Charles Wald, Former Deputy Commander of U.S. European Command, Read Admiral David Mercer, Former Commander of Navy Region Europe, Dr. Dov Zakheim, Former Under Secretary of Defense, and Dr. Michael O'Hanlon, Senior Fellow at the 21st Century Defense Initiative at the Brookings Institution. "Indefensible: The Sequester’s Mechanics and Adverse Effects on National and Economic Security," June, http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/6-7-12%20FINAL%20Sequester%20White%20Paper.pdf

Note: Charts omitted

The FY 2013 sequester will replace the ability of elected leaders to set defense policy with a procedure that will indiscriminately cut 15 percent from defense programs. Indeed, at a time when the military is reorienting its missions to new strategic priorities and seeking to modernize its forces as two major land wars wind down, **these across-the-board cuts will make it significantly more difficult to ensure** readiness**, procure** new weapons **systems, and invest in** new tech**nology to meet** emerging threats. ¶ The president is charged with defining the threats that the United States is likely to confront and a strategic vision for how to avoid or defeat them. The Pentagon contributes to formulating that strategy, and is responsible for ensuring that our forces are prepared and have the necessary equipment to enact it. Through the authorization and appropriations processes, lawmakers are able to modify that blueprint to best serve the security interests of the nation. But on January 2, 2013, the views of the president, Pentagon, and Congress will matter little. ¶ The sequester will deprive all three of these stakeholders of their power to shape the country’s defense policy. Instead, a mechanism that uniformly slashes 15 percent from most defense budget accounts will take the place of the best judgments of our elected representatives and their appointed officials about what is needed to keep us safe. ¶ Such cuts, **blind to strategic priorities**, will leave the U.S. military unable to implement effectively any credible national security strategy – whether President Obama’s or any other one – because arbitrary reductions will have taken the place of deliberative planning. Cuts made in this fashion will eliminate almost all of DoD’s discretion to preserve funding for the most important and efficient national security missions and capabilities. ¶ As an example, consider the administration’s Strategic Guidance issued in January 2012 and the capabilities that the Pentagon has deemed necessary. This new strategy highlights that “U.S. economic and security interests are inextricably linked to developments in the arc extending from the Western Pacific and East Asia into the Indian Ocean region and South Asia,” 17 and therefore, “we will of necessity rebalance toward the Asia-Pacific region.” Accomplishing this, according to the Pentagon, will require the military to shift toward a leaner, more agile force – one that can effectively project its power across the vast distances of the Pacific Ocean. Accordingly, military planners have identified the need for greater investment in technologically-superior air-, sea- and cyber-power at the cost of heavy ground forces. Additionally, after 10 years of war, military leaders have made it clear that our troops need to recover and aging equipment needs to be repaired. ¶ The Pentagon’s budget request for FY 2013 reflects these priorities – increasing funding for weapons platforms that support power projection and other missions critical to the new strategy, and cutting money for programs that military leaders no longer have deemed to be as critical. As Secretary Panetta told an Asian security conference on June 2, 2012: ¶ We are investing specifically in those kinds of capabilities – such as an advanced fifth-generation fighter, an enhanced Virginia-class submarine, new electronic warfare and communications capabilities, and improved precision weapons – that will provide our forces with freedom of maneuver in areas in which our access and freedom of action may be threatened. We recognize the challenges of operating over the Pacific’s vast distances. That is why we are investing in new aerial-refueling tankers, a new bomber, and advanced maritime patrol and anti-submarine warfare aircraft. 18 ¶ DoD’s budget request strives to meet the demands of the president’s new defense strategy while roughly abiding by the original BCA cap levels for defense spending, lowering the base defense budget by about $5 billion compared to FY 2012, but without accounting for the sequester’s further automatic cuts. ¶ Our analysis, however, indicates that the sequester will greatly constrain the Pentagon’s ability to execute any of these strategic shifts in its procurement, planning, and training. Without meaningful reforms, inefficiencies in the defense budget are already eroding funds needed to train, equip, and deploy our forces. Now, the combination of continued FY 2012 funding, which does not reflect the president’s new strategic priorities, and the indiscriminate 15 percent sequester cut mean that funds available to DoD on January 2, 2013, will differ greatly from those it requested. Indeed, some priority projects might receive as much as 75 percent less funding than the Pentagon determined was needed for FY 2013. Conversely, weapons systems for which DoD has requested reduced funding because of their lower priority in light of the new strategy could receive as much as nine times more funding than requested. ¶ More specifically, our calculations indicate that refurbishment of the nearly 25-year-old USS Abraham Lincoln aircraft carrier, development and purchases of a new aerial refueling tanker, and funding for resetting and retraining troops could be cut by 72, 57, and 42 percent, respectively, relative to the Pentagon’s FY 2013 request. Additionally, funding could fall roughly $1.7 billion short of the nearly $4 billion requested by DoD and Homeland Security for investments in the personnel, technology, and infrastructure needed to protect our sensitive computer networks by developing offensive cyber capabilities. Simultaneously, funding for Heavy Tactical Vehicles, the M-1 Abrams tank, and Stryker armored vehicles – all ground vehicles that serve little purpose in the Asia-Pacific region – could be increased by 934, 442, and 107 percent, respectively, over the Pentagon’s request for FY 2013. ¶ Thus, the sequester will leave military leaders with some combination of three options, each of which will increase risks and costs: ¶ • Indefinitely delay implementation of the new strategy, and accept the strategic risks that would flow from not moving to address the threats identified in the Strategic Guidance. ¶ • Attempt to pursue the new strategy with fewer of the new capabilities and weapons platforms than the Pentagon has deemed necessary, and accept the operational risks that come from not having enough of the right tools for the job and lower force readiness. ¶ • Make do with the older weapons systems that DoD already possesses, and accept the tactical and safety risks of using outdated technology that does not fulfill the requirements of current missions, and is also more likely to fail. ¶ The first two options cause contract delays, reductions, and renegotiations, contributing to increases in per-unit costs. The last option will result in increased maintenance costs, as antiquated planes, ships, and helicopters are pushed beyond their expected service lives. Either way, the military eventually will need some of the weapons that the sequester will keep us from purchasing today. Indeed, nearly one-quarter of our ships failed inspection last year. The average age of our fighter jets is 22 years, our bombers 35 years, and our aerial refueling tankers 47 years. The longer we put off modernizing our armed forces, the greater the risk to our troops and the greater the eventual procurement costs will be, defeating the very logic of deficit reduction. ¶ Meanwhile, although China’s military power is still inferior to that of the United States, Beijing’s actions – and fear of its intentions – have already led many regional countries to look to the United States for security guarantees and cooperation. **If U.S. commitment to these alliances is perceived to be weakening, or our ability to defend them waning, our partners could feel pressured to accommodate China’s growing ambitions.** ¶ At a time when the military is reconstituting itself as two major land wars wind down, being called upon to reorient its missions to new strategic priorities and seeking to modernize its forces, across-the-board cuts will make it significantly more difficult to properly ensure readiness, procure new weapons systems, and invest in new technology to meet emerging threats. As a result, **the U.S. military will be left in a holding pattern, trying to make do with yesterday’s military to fight tomorrow’s wars.**

#### Cuts make the US a paper-tiger

CBS 11 "How automatic defense cuts would hit U.S." www.cbsnews.com/8301-18563\_162-57329910/how-automatic-defense-cuts-would-hit-u.s/, 11/22

A lot of folks in the defense industry could lose their jobs. Congress' failure to bring the federal budget under control means that in a little more than a year, across-the-board cuts in federal spending would be automatic, and **half** of them **will come from the Defense Department**, CBS News national security correspondent David Martin reports.¶ To hear Defense Secretary Leon Panetta tell it, automatic spending cuts would be "devastating" to national defense.¶ "It's a ship without sailors," he said. "It's a brigade without bullets. It's an air wing without enough trained pilots. It's a paper tiger."¶ In a letter to Capitol Hill, Panetta provided specific examples of what he believes the cuts -- which would reduce defense spending by $1 trillion during the next 10 years -- might mean.¶ **The smallest ground force since the beginning of World War II¶ The smallest fleet since World War I¶** And what he says would be **the smallest fighter force in Air Force history.**

### AT: Winners Win---Top Level

#### The plan isn’t a win, it’s an ambush---Obama hasn’t been pushing it for a long time and our link proves it has no supporters

#### Obama’s Velcro---only blame sticks to him---means winners lose---healthcare proves

Nicholas & Hook 10 Peter and Janet, Staff Writers---LA Times, “Obama the Velcro president”, LA Times, 7-30, http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730/3

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack **Obama is made of Velcro**.¶ Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become **ensnared in blame**.¶ Hoping to better insulate Obama, White House aides have sought to give other Cabinet officials a higher profile and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public.¶ But Obama remains **the colossus of his administration** — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve.¶ The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape.¶ **What's not sticking to Obama is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. Political dividends from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill have been fleeting.¶** Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll.¶ "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations."

#### Winners lose---PC’s not renewable, is zero-sum, and diminishes fast

Ryan 9 Selwyn, Professor Emeritus and former Director, Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of the West Indies, “Obama and political capital,” 1/18 http://www.trinidadexpress.com/index.pl/article\_opinion?id=161426968

Like many, I expect much from Obama, who for the time being, is my political beast of burden with whom every other politician in the world is unfavourably compared. As a political scientist, I however know that given the structure of American and world politics, it would be **difficult for him to deliver half of what he has promised**, let alone all of it. Reality will **force him to make many "u" turns** and detours which may well land him in quick sand. Obama will, however, begin his stint with a **vast accumulation of political capital**, perhaps more than that held by any other modern leader. Seventy-eight per cent of Americans polled believe that his inauguration is one of the most historic the country will witness. Political capital is, however, a lumpy and **fast diminishing asset** in today's world of instant communication, which once misspent, is **rarely ever renewable**. The world is full of political leaders like George Bush and Tony Blair who had visions, promised a lot, and probably meant well, but who **did not know how to husband** the **political capital** with which they were provided as they assumed office. They squandered it as quickly as they emptied the contents of the public vaults. Many will be watching to see how Obama manages his assets and liabilities register. Watching with hope would be the white young lady who waved a placard in Obama's face inscribed with the plaintive words, "I Trust You." Despite the general optimism about Obama's ability to deliver, many groups have already begun to complain about being betrayed. Gays, union leaders, and women have been loud in their complaints about being by-passed or overlooked. Some radical blacks have also complained about being disrespected. Where and when is Joshua going to lead them to the promised land, they ask? When is he going to pull the troops out of Iraq? Civil rights groups also expect Obama to dis-establish Guantanamo as soon as he takes office to signal the formal break with Dick Cheney and Bush. They also want him to discontinue the policy which allows intelligence analysts to spy on American citizens without official authorisation. In fact, Obama startled supporters when he signalled that he might do an about-turn and continue this particular policy. We note that Bush is signalling Obama that keeping America safe from terrorists should be his top priority item and that he, Bush, had no regrets about violating the constitutional rights of Americans if he had to do so to keep them safe. Cheney has also said that he would do it again if he had to. The safety of the republic is after all the highest law. Other groups-sub-prime home owners, workers in the automobile sector, and the poor and unemployed generally all expect Obama to work miracles on their behalf, which of course he cannot do. Given the problems of the economy which has not yet bottomed out, **some promises have to be deferred** beyond the first term. Groups, however, expect that the promise made to them during the campaign must be kept. Part of the problem is that almost every significant social or ethnic group believes that it was instrumental in Obama's victory. White women felt that they took Obama over the line, as did blacks generally, Jews, Hispanics, Asians, rich white men, gays, and young college kids, to mention a few of those whose inputs were readily recognisable. Obama also has a vast constituency in almost every country in the world, all of whom expect him to save the globe and the planet. Clearly, he is the proverbial "Black Knight on a White Horse." One of the "realities" that Obama has to face is that **American politics is not a winner-take-all system**. It is pluralistic vertically and horizontally, and getting **anything done politically**, even when the President and the Congress are controlled by the same party, **requires groups to negotiate, bargain and engage in serious horse trading.** No one takes orders from the President who can only use moral or political suasion and promises of future support for policies or projects. The system was in fact deliberately engineered to prevent overbearing majorities from conspiring to tyrannise minorities. The system is not only institutionally diverse and plural, but socially and geographically so. As James Madison put it in Federalist No 10, one of the foundation documents of republicanism in America, basic institutions check other basic institutions, classes and interests check other classes and interests, and regions do the same. All are grounded in their own power bases which they use to fend off challengers. The coalitions change from issue to issue, and there is no such thing as party discipline which translated, means you do what I the leader say you do. Although Obama is fully aware of the political limitations of the office which he holds, he is fully aware of the vast stock of political capital which he currently has in the bank and he evidently plans to enlarge it by drawing from the stock held by other groups, dead and alive. He is clearly drawing heavily from the caparisoned cloaks of Lincoln and Roosevelt. Obama seems to believe that by playing the all-inclusive, multipartisan, non-ideological card, he can get most of his programmes through the Congress without having to spend capital by using vetoes, threats of veto, or appeals to his 15 million strong constituency in cyberspace (the latent "Obama Party").

#### PC is finite---fights on one issue make pushing others harder

Hayward 12 John is a writer at Human Events. “DON’T BE GLAD THE BUFFETT RULE IS DEAD, BE ANGRY IT EVER EXISTED,” 4/17, http://www.humanevents.com/2012/04/17/dont-be-glad-the-buffett-rule-is-dead-be-angry-it-ever-existed/

Toomey makes the excellent point that Obama’s class-warfare sideshow act is worse than useless, because it’s wasting America’s valuable time, even as the last fiscal sand runs through our hourglass. Politicians speak of “political capital” in selfish terms, as a pile of chips each party hoards on its side of the poker table, but in truth America has only a finite amount of political capital in total. When time and energy is wasted on pointless distractions, the capital expended---in the form of the public’s attention, and the debates they hold among themselves---cannot easily be regained. ¶ There is an “opportunity cost” associated with the debates we aren’t having, and the valid ideas we’re not considering, when our time is wasted upon nonsense that is useful only to political re-election campaigns. Health care reform is the paramount example of our time, as countless real, workable market-based reforms were obscured by the flaccid bulk of ObamaCare. The Buffett Rule, like all talk of tax increases in the shadow of outrageous government spending, likewise distracts us from the real issues.

### PC Key

#### PC key – 1nc ev says that GOP pushback means that Obama has to be involved in the trenches

#### PC is key

Gotlieb and Kergin 11/7 Allan and Michael are writers for The Globe and Mail. “America’s cliff is Canada’s priority,” 2012, http://www.theglobeandmail.com/commentary/the-us-electorate-has-spoken-sort-of/article5032433/

President Barack Obama has eked out a slim popular vote majority. This slender margin is not reflected in his somewhat stronger numbers in the Electoral College, an 18th-century holdover that brought George W. Bush to power in 2000 despite Al Gore's 545,000 plurality.¶ Interesting to the political scientist, perhaps, but more worrying for Canadians seeking concerted governance from their southern neighbour is the split in Congress between the Senate and the House of Representatives. The narrow Democratic majority in the Senate mirrors the divide with the stronger Republican House majority that has bedevilled Washington over the past two years and prevented any progress toward confronting the crippling U.S. deficit overhang.¶ Which brings us to the edge of the Congress mandated "fiscal cliff": dramatic rises in taxes, accompanied by large cuts in expenditures, half of which come from national defence. Termed a "suicide pact," and never intended to be implemented, Congress passed legislation designed to force reluctant politicians to make tough budget choices. This fiscal “abyss” arrives Jan. 1, unless Mr. **Obama can use his replenished political capital to muscle a compromise with the lame-duck Congress.**

#### Obama’s pushing and he needs to arm twist Congress---everyone agrees

Davis 11/7 Julie and Mike Dorning. “Obama Success on Fiscal Cliff May Hinge on Congress Ties,” 2012, http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-11-07/obama-success-on-fiscal-cliff-may-hinge-on-better-congress-ties

President Barack Obama, his re- election victory sealed, is reaching out to congressional leaders to revive bipartisan deficit-reduction negotiations whose failure was a defining disappointment of his first term.¶ **His chances of success, say Republicans and Democrats, depend on Obama’s willingness** in his second term **to build a rapport he has lacked with lawmakers** from both parties and **take a stronger role** than he has to date in steering negotiations on sweeping changes to entitlements, taxes and spending.¶ “He’s simply going to have to take a more active and forceful role,” said Democratic strategist Jim Manley, a former aide to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid of Nevada. “He never got involved in the nitty-gritty of the legislative process. In light of the hyper-partisanship that still surrounds Capitol Hill, he’s going to have to change, and he’s going to have to take more of a lead in breaking the logjam.”¶ There are already indications that Obama is ready to do so. The president, who said in his Nov. 6 victory speech that he was “looking forward to reaching out and working with leaders of both parties to meet the challenges we can only solve together,” spoke yesterday by telephone with the top congressional Democratic and Republican leaders of the House and Senate.

### Impacts to Laundry List

#### African instability goes global

Glick 7 – senior ME Fellow @ Center for Security Policy in Washington DC

Caroline B. Glick, the senior Middle East fellow at the Center for Security Policy in Washington, D.C., The Center for Security Policy is a non-profit, non-partisan national security organization. 12/11/2007. “Condi's African holiday”. http://www.carolineglick.com/e/2007/12/condis-african-holiday.php?pf=yes

The Horn of Africa is a dangerous and strategically vital place. Small wars, which rage continuously, can easily escalate into big wars. Local conflicts have regional and global aspects. All of the conflicts in this tinderbox, which controls shipping lanes from the Indian Ocean into the Red Sea, can potentially give rise to regional, and indeed global conflagrations between competing regional actors and global powers.