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#### Restrictions on production must mandate a decrease in the quantity produced

Anell 89 Lars is the Chairman of the WTO panel adopted at the Forty-Fifth Session of Contracting Parties on December 5, 1989. Other panel members: Mr. Hugh Bartlett and Mrs. Carmen Luz Guarda. “Canada – Import Restrictions on Ice Cream and Yoghurt,” http://www.wto.org/english/tratop\_e/dispu\_e/88icecrm.pdf

The United States argued that Canada had failed to demonstrate that it effectively restricted domestic production of milk. The differentiation between "fluid" and "industrial" milk was an artificial one for administrative purposes; with regard to GATT obligations, the product at issue was raw milk from the cow, regardless of what further use was made of it. The use of the word "permitted" in Article XI:2(c)(i) required that there be a limitation on the total quantity of milk that domestic producers were authorized or allowed to produce or sell. The provincial controls on fluid milk did not restrict the quantities permitted to be produced; rather dairy farmers could produce and market as much milk as could be sold as beverage milk or table cream. There were no penalties for delivering more than a farmer's fluid milk quota, it was only if deliveries exceeded actual fluid milk usage or sales that it counted against his industrial milk quota. At least one province did not participate in this voluntary system, and another province had considered leaving it. Furthermore, Canada did not even prohibit the production or sale of milk that exceeded the Market Share Quota. The method used to calculate direct support payments on within-quota deliveries assured that most dairy farmers would completely recover all of their fixed and variable costs on their within-quota deliveries. The farmer was permitted to produce and market milk in excess of the quota, and perhaps had an economic incentive to do so. 27. The United States noted that in the past six years total industrial milk production had consistently exceeded the established Market Sharing Quota, and concluded that the Canadian system was a regulation of production but not a restriction of production**.** Proposals to amend Article XI:2(c)(i) to replace the word "restrict" with "regulate" had been defeated; what was required was the reduction of production. The results of the econometric analyses cited by Canada provided no indication of what would happen to milk production in the absence not only of the production quotas, but also of the accompanying high price guarantees which operated as incentives to produce. According to the official publication of the Canadian Dairy Commission, a key element of Canada's national dairy policy was to promote self-sufficiency in milk production. The effectiveness of the government supply controls had to be compared to what the situation would be in the absence of all government measures.

#### Vote negative:

#### Including regulations is a limits disaster---undermines preparedness for all debates

Doub 76 William is a principal in the law firm of Doub and Muntzing. Previously he was a partner in LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby, and MacRae. He was a member of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission (1971-1974). He served as a member of the Executive Advisory Committee to the Federal Power Commission (1968-1971) and was appointed by the President to the President’s Air Quality Advisory Board. He is a past chairman of the U.S. National Committee of the World Energy Conference. “Energy Regulation: A Quagmire for Energy Policy,” http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.eg.01.110176.003435

FERS began with the recognition that federal energy policy must result from concerted efforts in all areas dealing with energy, not the least of which was the manner in which energy is regulated by the federal government. Energy self sufficiency is improbable, if not impossible, without sensible regulatory processes, and effective regulation is necessary for public confidence. Thus, the President directed that "a comprehensive study be undertaken, in full consultation with Congress, to determine the best way to organize all energy-related regulatory activities of the government." An interagency task force was formed to study this question. With 19 different federal departments and agencies contributing, the task force spent seven months deciphering the present organizational makeup of the federal energy regulatory system, studying the need for organizational improvement, and evaluating alternatives. **More than 40 agencies were found to be involved** with making regulatory decisions on energy. Although only a few deal exclusively with energy, most of the 40 could **significantly affect** the **availability and/or cost of energy**. For example, in the field of gas transmission, there are five federal agencies that must act on siting and land-use issues, seven on emission and effluent issues, five on public safety issues, and one on worker health and safety issues-all before an onshore gas pipeline can be built. The complexity of energy regulation is also illustrated by the case of Standard Oil Company (Indiana), which reportedly must file about 1000 reports a year with 35 different federal agencies. Unfortunately, this example is the rule rather than the exception.

#### And precision---only direct prohibition is a restriction---key to predictability

Sinha 6 S.B. Sinha is a former judge of the Supreme Court of India. “Union Of India & Ors vs M/S. Asian Food Industries,” Nov 7, http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/437310/

We may, however, notice that this Court in State of U.P. and Others v. M/s. Hindustan Aluminium Corpn. and others [AIR 1979 SC 1459] stated the law thus: "It appears that a distinction between regulation and restriction or prohibition has always been drawn, ever since Municipal Corporation of the City of Toronto v. Virgo. Regulation promotes the freedom or the facility which is required to be regulated in the interest of all concerned, whereas prohibition obstructs or shuts off, or denies it to those to whom it is applied. The Oxford English Dictionary does not define regulate to include prohibition so that if it had been the intention to prohibit the supply, distribution, consumption or use of energy, the legislature would not have contented itself with the use of the word regulating without using the word prohibiting or some such word, to bring out that effect."
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#### Hagel will be confirmed but it’s a huge fight---requires all of Obama’s political capital

Scott Wong and Manu Raju, 1-6-2013, “Hagel takes fire from Hill,” http://www.nj.com/us-politics/index.ssf/2013/01/hagel\_takes\_fire\_from\_hill.html

Senate Democrats and Republicans are far from sold on President Barack Obama's expected nomination of Chuck Hagel as secretary of defense. In fact, Obama's decision to tap the Vietnam veteran and outspoken former Republican senator is likely to spark another nasty fight with Congress right on the heels of the fiscal cliff showdown and just before another likely battle royal over the debt ceiling. Republicans on Sunday unleashed a fresh barrage of attacks amid reports Obama would nominate Hagel on Monday for the top job at the Pentagon. The new Senate minority whip, Texas Republican John Cornyn, said he's firmly against Hagel's nomination. Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), an Air Force reservist who serves on the Armed Services Committee that will consider the nod, said Hagel would hold the "most antagonistic" views toward Israel of any defense secretary in U.S. history. And despite heaping praise on Hagel when he retired from the Senate after the 2008 elections, Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) on Sunday failed to extend an olive branch to the Nebraska Republican, instead suggesting there would be "tough questions" ahead. Even Senate Democrats are privately signaling they're not yet on board with the Hagel pick, and that the White House has a lot of work to do to get him across the finish line. The nomination comes at a tricky time for the administration -- just as the fights over raising the debt ceiling and government appropriations are set to begin. And it could put a number of at-risk or pro-Israel Democrats in tough political spots -- especially if the nomination fight grows even more contentious. Democrats are also scratching their heads over why Obama appears willing to go to the mat for Hagel, while abandoning his push for a close friend and member of his inner circle, U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice, to become secretary of state. Rice, an unabashed Democrat, abandoned her bid after withering GOP criticism over the deadly attacks on the U.S. Consulate in Libya. Though different in substance, the controversy over Rice's remarks is not unlike the current pushback over Hagel's past foreign policy positions and controversial remarks. But Hagel lacks a natural constituency in the Senate, given that he's grown alienated from the GOP, yet Democrats are suspicious of his record. "It is a strange signal for the White House to send that they are willing to fight for Hagel but not Rice," one Senate Democratic aide said Sunday. "Democrats are not currently unified behind Hagel, and it will take some real work by the administration to get them there, if it's even possible." Senior Republicans agreed, noting that after Hagel infuriated Republicans and Democrats alike over the years, there isn't a natural base for him. "I can't imagine why [Obama] would choose to burn his political capital on this nomination. For what? There is no constituency for Chuck Hagel," one senior GOP aide said. "Obama will expend every ounce of political capital he has to get him across the finish line. Dems will hate this." On Sunday, the 66-year-old Hagel did receive an endorsement from Senate Majority Whip Dick Durbin (D-Ill.), a key Obama ally and No. 2 in Democratic Senate leadership. Durbin noted that Hagel is a Republican, recipient of two Purple Hearts from wounds he received in Vietnam, and did stints on the Senate Foreign Relations and Intelligence committees. "Yes, he is a serious candidate if the president chooses to name him," Durbin stated. Freshman Sen. Heidi Heitkamp (D-N.D.) called Hagel "a patriot" and said she was keeping an open mind. "Let's hear what the senator has to say," she said. And Democrats predicted last month that Hagel -- who served in the Senate from 1997 to 2009 -- would be confirmed. "We all know him up here, he'll be fine," Senate Armed Services Chairman Carl Levin (D-Mich.) said in mid-December.

#### Plan’s *massively* controversial---categorical exclusions are a political lightening rod

Till 6 Dustin is an associate at Marten Law. “CEQ Issues Proposed Guidance on NEPA Categorical Exclusions,” Oct 18, http://www.martenlaw.com/newsletter/20061018-nepa-exclusions

The White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) recently released draft guidance to clarify and promote the use of categorical exclusions under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).[1] 71 Fed. Reg. 54816 (Sept. 17, 2006). **Often a** lightning rod **for controversy and a constant source of litigation**, categorical exclusions allow agencies to exempt certain types of actions from NEPA’s environmental review requirements. According to CEQ, federal agencies have expressed both concern that categorical exclusions are too cumbersome to develop, and confusion over how to substantiate new categorical exclusions.[2] As part of its ongoing regulatory modernization process, CEQ hopes that its guidance will streamline review and encourage greater use of “appropriate categorical exclusions [to] promote[] the cost-effective use of agency NEPA related resources.”[3]¶ NEPA Categorical Exclusions¶ NEPA generally requires federal agencies to take a “hard look” at the environmental consequences of their proposed actions. Specifically, agencies must prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for any proposed major federal action that will significantly affect the human environment.[4] If an agency is uncertain whether its proposed action will have significant environmental impacts, it must prepare an environmental assessment (EA) to determine whether an EIS is necessary.[5] If the EA threshold determination concludes that an EIS is not required, the agency issues a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).[6]¶ Not all proposed federal actions are subject to assessment in an EIS or EA. CEQ’s NEPA regulations allow agencies to “categorically exclude” from further review those actions that experience has indicated will not have significant environmental effects, individually or cumulatively.[7] Because preparing an EA and/or an EIS can be time consuming and expensive, CEQ has encouraged agencies to develop and refine categorical exclusions to promote efficiency and cost effectiveness.[8]¶ The use of categorical exclusions is often controversial. For example, the United States Forest Service’s recently established categorical exclusions for hazardous fuel reduction projects and post-fire timber salvage projects have proven litigious.[9] Some commentators contend that categorical exclusions are over-used and permit agencies to ignore the cumulative impacts of numerous small projects.[10] Government officials, on the other hand, argue that categorical exclusions do not weaken NEPA, and that streamlining the categorical exclusion process is part of a comprehensive regulatory reform process that began during the Carter administration.[11]

#### Hagel’s key to foreign policy restraint that prevents unsustainable squandering of U.S. power---the alternative is Flournoy who would lock in a neocon foreign policy

Kelley Beaucar Vlahos 12-25, longtime political reporter for FoxNews.com and a contributing editor at The American Conservative, Washington correspondent for Homeland Security Today magazine, 12/25/12, “Give Us Chuck Hagel for Christmas,” <http://original.antiwar.com/vlahos/2012/12/24/give-us-hagel-for-christmas/>

Now a Democratic President is reportedly mulling him for defense secretary and the same Republican automatons and neoconservative harpies are pulling no punches to thwart it. They complain about his allegedly insufficient support of Israel (massaged, cajoled and translated for full-effect into charges of anti-Semitism), driven in part by his unwillingness to impose harsh economic sanctions or use of force against Iran. He also voted against designating Hezbollah a terrorist organization, and has encouraged open relations with Hamas in hopes of reanimating the corpse of the Middle East pace process.

Furthermore, Hagel’s flagrant disdain for the runaway MIC (military industrial complex), preemptive war, and senseless foreign occupation is such an aberration to the Washington establishment that when the bunker busters in Congress, American Israel supporters and rightwing 101st Keyboard Brigade heard he might be nominated, their attack was so immediate and vicious it’ll likely serve as a model for smear efficiency for years to come. If the U.S. Army had deployed these superlative tactics in say, Afghanistan, they might have actually won the so-called “war of perception” over the Taliban 10 years ago. Too bad most of Hagel’s critics prefer calling the shots from over here, rather than putting their rear-ends in harm’s way over there.

The War Against Hagel has hardly been decisive, however, at least as we near the end of the year, leaving some space for his supporters to mount a proper defense, which of this writing, is increasingly vigorous. There seems to be a common theme to every blog post and op-ed penned for his purpose: the man is a welcome independent thinker in the Era of the Borg — and he’s no phony, else he would have safely buzzed off with the rest of the political hive long ago. The Atlantic’s Jeffrey Goldberg, usually quite scornful of Realist foreign policy arguments — especially concerning Iran — said Thursday he worries about rightwing developments in Israel even more than Hagel’s purportedly soft approach on Iran, and suggested quite baldy that Hagel’s independence would be a help not a hindrance where it counts:

What we need are American officials who will speak with disconcerting bluntness to Israel about the choices it is making…Maybe the time has come to redefine the term “pro-Israel” to include, in addition to providing support against Iran (a noble cause); help with the Iron Dome system (also a noble cause); and support to maintain Israel’s qualitative military edge (ditto), the straightest of straight talk about Israel’s self-destructive policies on the West Bank. Maybe Hagel, who is not bound to old models, could be useful in this regard.

Many of us see Hagel’s impact in much broader terms than just the Israel question. We’ve had too many armchair generals and dutiful yes men at the levers of power, cleaving to an unsustainable post-9/11 orthodoxy that has militarized our foreign policy and politicized our military. The neoconservatism of the Bush years has bled literally into the so-called humanitarian interventionism of the Obama era, and for the first time, there is an opportunity to check that with the presence of a known Realist who, as Harvard’s Stephen Walt says, is “opposed to squandering U.S. power, prestige, and wealth on misbegotten crusades,” and is immune to the “threat inflation” both sides routinely engage in to justify lining the pockets of the defense industry. After nearly 12 years of constant war, Hagel’s references to Iraq and Afghanistan as a meat grinder to which we’ve wastefully sent too many of our own children, and his belief that he is the “the real conservative” because he actually calls for restraint, should be a refreshing prospect, and not feared by Americans conditioned to accept there is a military solution for every problem.

“In a town dominated by often-unexamined conventional wisdom, the appointment of Hagel to DoD would be a welcome relief,” wrote Michael Cohen for The Guardian last week. Reached on the phone, Cohen told me that Hagel would be a “transformational pick,” but acknowledged that the challenges loom large for a non-conformist now squared against not only members of his own party, but neoconservatives wielding their “long knives,” and the pro-war wing of the Democratic establishment, too. “Look, he is not one of them,” Cohen said, “he’s not a neoconservative nor a liberal hawk, he thinks there should be limits on American power.”

Although President Obama has, so far, not said a word about Hagel, the former senator who quietly spent the last four years chairing the moderate Atlantic Council, is enjoying an enthusiastic defense from myriad commentators across the mainstream, including Andrew Sullivan, Steve Clemons, Peter Beinart — even Jim Judis at The New Republic. Several ambassadors — including Bush-era Nick Burns and Ryan Crocker and three Israel representatives — signed on to a letter encouraging his nomination.

Meanwhile, The National Journal and The Washington Post have published biographical sketches emphasizing Hagel’s Vietnam War record and its impact on his post-war career and personal philosophy (this hardly makes up, however, for the Post’s incoherent broadside published by its editorial page on Dec. 19). And of course, The American Conservative’s Daniel Larison and Scott McConnell, not to mention our own Justin Raimondo, are astutely swatting away the haters at every turn of this increasingly torrid offensive.

Michele Flournoy

But while many of us here at Antiwar would like a Hagel nomination for Christmas, the biggest concern (aside from his Swift Boating) is that we might find Michele Flournoy under the tree instead. For those who never heard of her, she founded the Center for a New American Security in 2007 in anticipation of a new Democratic White House. The think tank was designed to promote a more muscular Democratic military policy, which meant its top people supported Hillary Clinton for president as well as the U.S. counterinsurgency in Iraq, and then Afghanistan, known then as the Petraeus Doctrine. Once Obama won, it became the go-to policy shop for the White House and a revolving door to the Pentagon and State Department for its senior fellows. Flournoy went on to take Doug Feith’s position as Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, the No. 3 job at the Pentagon. What she actually did in the fabled “E-Ring” to advance policy or to help extricate the military from an increasingly disastrous war in Afghanistan, is anyone’s guess. But the “hot policy wonk” and top COINdinista apparently made all the right friends and greased all the right skids, and is now the favored pick by the neocons, who see a kindred soul where Hagel is just heartburn ready to happen.

So buttressed is Flournoy by the Washington elite that people like Paul Wolfowitz, who in all reality should be ignored completely for his role in one of the worst war blunders in American history, are rolling out to defend her (in Wolfowitz’s case, maybe he should have cooled his wheels at home). After admitting he’s “not deeply familiar with Michele Flournoy’s record at the Defense Department or with her overall qualifications to be Secretary of Defense,” he says the fact 3,500 Afghan security forces have died this year (compared to 307 Americans) is proof enough she knows what she is doing. I say it’s proof enough that nothing has really changed since the Bush administration, except there are more troops in Afghanistan now (about 68,000) and the U.S. casualty count was much lower then —- 117 in 2007 to be exact.

When liberal flak Eleanor Clift wrote about the prospects of the “first female defense secretary” back in November, all she could muster in her favor was Flournoy’s Oxford pedigree, a stint in the lackluster Clinton Pentagon policy shop and quotes like these from former colleagues: “she has spent a great deal of time thinking how to deploy our military instruments economically and effectively.” Glad she was thinking about it before she left her post in February. Not much came out of if, however, if today’s accounts of continuing bloat, waste and mission creep are any indication.

Frankly, one hears a lot about Flournoy the “team player” but very little about her vision, ideas or actual accomplishments. The fact is, “the team” has been on a losing streak in Afghanistan since Obama took office, while her think tank, of which she continues to serve on the board of directors, has reaped all the benefits and influence as a conduit between the Pentagon, Foggy Bottom, the White House and greedy defense industry. “She’s a safe pick, she will carry the water — if you pick Hagel it would be saying ‘I want to push the envelope a little bit on foreign policy,’” said Cohen, “pushing it in a more realist direction than we have in the past.”

Perhaps that is why so many of us here are excited about the prospect. There are some areas where Hagel and the readers on this page might diverge, particularly on domestic issues. He’s a solid pro-life social conservative. He voted for the Patriot Act (he later fought for broader constitutional safeguards, saying he took an oath to protect the constitution, not “an oath of office to my party or my president”). We don’t know yet where he would stand on the controversial detention provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). We have no idea whether he would stanch the flow of U.S. personnel and weapons into Africa or how he would deal with a newly inherited drone war. As for the Pentagon labyrinth itself, as University of Texas professor (and expert COIN critic) Celeste Ward Gventer tells me, “the problems are systemic and largely exceed the decision or personality of one man, even if he is at the apex.”

Still, if a Flournoy pick would signal an endorsement of the status quo, a Hagel nod would serve to challenge it. This inclination to question policy is quite attractive to observers like us who are tired of living in a fake candy cane marshmallow bubble world when it comes to foreign policy and national security. As a senator, Hagel often addressed these issues realistically, with no regard to how it might hurt his chances for a presidential nomination, which turned out to be short-lived as a result (quite sad, considering the parade of ham-n-egger Republicans who ended up running, and losing, in the last two elections).

#### Restraint’s key to prevent war with Russia and China---defuses Georgia, Taiwan and the South China Seas

Paul K. MacDonald 11, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Williams College, and Joseph M. Parent, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami, November/December 2011, “The Wisdom of Retrenchment: America Must Cut Back to Move Forward,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 90, No. 6

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

Zoninsein 10 Manuela is a writer for Climatewire, New York Times. “Chinese Offshore Development Blows Past U.S.,” Sept 7, <http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2010/09/07/07climatewire-chinese-offshore-development-blows-past-us-47150.html?pagewanted=all>

As proposed American offshore wind-farm projects creep forward -- **slowed by** state legislative debates, **due diligence and environmental impact assessments** -- China has leapt past the United States, installing its first offshore wind farm. Several other farms also are already under construction, and even the Chinese government's ambitious targets seem low compared to industry dreaming. "What the U.S. doesn't realize," said Peggy Liu, founder and chairwoman of the Joint U.S.-China Collaboration on Clean Energy, is that China "is going from manufacturing hub to the clean-tech laboratory of the world." The first major offshore wind farm outside of Europe is located in the East China Sea, near Shanghai. The 102-megawatt Donghai Bridge Wind Farm began transmitting power to the national grid in July and signals a new direction for Chinese renewable energy projects and the initiation of a national policy focusing **not just on wind power, but increasingly on the offshore variety**. Moreover, "it serves as a showcase of what the Chinese can do offshore ... and it's quite significant," said Rachel Enslow, a wind consultant and co-author of the report "China, Norway and Offshore Wind Development," published in March by Azure International for the World Wildlife Fund Norway.

#### Chinese clean tech leadership is key to their economy, internal stability, and solves extinction

Paul Denlinger 10, consultant specializing in the China market who is based in Hong Kong, 7/20/10, “Why China Has To Dominate Green Tech,” http://www.forbes.com/sites/china/2010/07/20/why-china-has-to-dominate-green-tech/

On the policy level, the Chinese government has to perform a delicate balancing act, it has to balance the desire of many Chinese to live a Western lifestyle, together with its high energy consumption and waste, with the need to preserve the environment, since China, and the world, would suffer enormous damage if 1.3 billion people got all their energy needs from coal and oil, the two most widely used fossil fuels. China’s political and social stability depends on finding the right balance, since the party has an implicit mandate: it will deliver economic growth to the Chinese people. This is why the Chinese government has chosen to invest in developing new green energy technology. The country is very fortunate in that most of the discovered deposits of rare earths used in the development of new technologies are found in China. While these deposits are very valuable, up until recently, the industry has not been regulated much by the Chinese central government. But now that Beijing is aware of their importance and value, it has come under much closer scrutiny. For one, Beijing wants to consolidate the industry and lower energy waste and environmental damage. (Ironically, the rare earth mining business is one of the most energy-wasteful and highly polluting industries around. Think Chinese coal mining with acid.) At the same time, Beijing wants to cut back rare earth exports to the rest of the world, instead encouraging domestic production into wind and solar products for export around the world. With patents on the new technology used in manufacturing, China would control the intellectual property and licensing on the products that would be used all over the world. If Beijing is able to do this, it would control the next generation of energy products used by the world for the next century. That is the plan. It would be like if the oil-producing nations in the 1920s and 1930s said that they didn’t need Western oil exploration firms and refineries to distribute oil products; they would do all the processing themselves, and the Western countries would just order the finished oil products from them. This is how China obviously plans to keep most of the value-added profits within China’s borders. Before any Western readers snap into “evil Chinese conspiracy to take over the world” mode, it’s worth pointing out that Chinese rare earth experts and government officials have repeatedly warned Western visitors that this policy change would be introduced. Unfortunately, these warnings have gone largely unheeded and ignored by the Western media and politicians who, it seems, have been largely preoccupied by multiple financial crises and what to do about the West’s debt load. The debt crisis in the West means that it is very hard for Western green energy companies to find financing for their technologies, then to market them as finished products. New energy technologies are highly risky, and initial investments are by no means guaranteed. Because they are considered high-risk and require high capital expenditure (unlike Internet technologies which are very cheap and practically commoditized), banks are reluctant to finance them unless they are able to find government-secured financing. Because most U.S. banks are recapitalizing their businesses after the debt bubble burst, there are very few, if any western banks who will finance new green energy technologies. This has opened a window of opportunity for the Chinese government to finance, and for Chinese technology companies to develop, then manufacture these new green products. But just making these technologies is not enough; they need to be competitive against traditional fossil fuels. When it comes to the amount of energy released when coal or oil is burned, the new green technologies are still way behind. This means that, at least in the early stages of adoption, Chinese businesses will still be reliant on coal and oil to bridge that energy chasm before the new energy technologies become economically competitive. Much depends on how much the Chinese government is willing to spend to promote and incentivize these new technologies, first in China, then overseas. Because of China’s growing energy demands, we are in a race for survival. The 21st century will be remembered as the resurgent coal and oil century, or as the century humanity transitioned to green technologies for energy consumption. While China is investing heavily now in green tech, it is still consuming ever larger amounts of coal and oil to drive its economic growth. Right now, we all depend on China’s success to make the transition to green energy this century. For all practical purposes, we’re all in the same boat.

#### China’s economic rise is good --- they’re on the brink of collapse --- causes CCP instability and lashout --- also tubes the global economy, US primacy, and Sino relations

Mead 9 Walter Russell Mead, Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, “Only Makes You Stronger,” The New Republic, 2/4/9, http://www.tnr.com/story\_print.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8

The greatest danger both to U.S.-China relations and to American power itself is probably not that China will rise too far, too fast; it is that the current crisis might end China's growth miracle. In the worst-case scenario, the turmoil in the international economy will plunge China into a major economic downturn. The Chinese financial system will implode as loans to both state and private enterprises go bad. Millions or even tens of millions of Chinese will be unemployed in a country without an effective social safety net. The collapse of asset bubbles in the stock and property markets will wipe out the savings of a generation of the Chinese middle class. The political consequences could include dangerous unrest--and a bitter climate of anti-foreign feeling that blames others for China's woes. (Think of Weimar Germany, when both Nazi and communist politicians blamed the West for Germany's economic travails.) Worse, instability could lead to a vicious cycle, as nervous investors moved their money out of the country, further slowing growth and, in turn, fomenting ever-greater bitterness. Thanks to a generation of rapid economic growth, China has so far been able to manage the stresses and conflicts of modernization and change; nobody knows what will happen if the growth stops.

#### Chinese lashout goes nuclear

The Epoch Times, Renxing San, 8/4/2004, 8/4, http://english.epochtimes.com/news/5-8-4/30931.html

Since the Party’s life is “above all else,” it would not be surprising if the CCP resorts to the use of biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons in its attempt to extend its life. The CCP, which disregards human life, would not hesitate to kill two hundred million Americans, along with seven or eight hundred million Chinese, to achieve its ends. These speeches let the public see the CCP for what it really is. With evil filling its every cell the CCP intends to wage a war against humankind in its desperate attempt to cling to life. That is the main theme of the speeches. This theme is murderous and utterly evil. In China we have seen beggars who coerced people to give them money by threatening to stab themselves with knives or pierce their throats with long nails. But we have never, until now, seen such a gangster who would use biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons to threaten the world, that all will die together with him. This bloody confession has confirmed the CCP’s nature: that of a monstrous murderer who has killed 80 million Chinese people and who now plans to hold one billion people hostage and gamble with their lives.
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**Text: The United States Department of Interior should no longer require that decommissioned oil rigs in the Gulf of Mexico be removed. The Department of Interior should require decommissioned rigs to be capped and idle pipelines to be decommissioned.**

#### Solves their first advantage and avoids the link to politics

Alford 12, 1AC Author - Capitol Correspondent [Jeremy Alford, “Rig policy threatens wildlife,” Daily Comet, Published: Wednesday, July 11, 2012 at 10:24 p.m, pg. http://tinyurl.com/cfwoue6

BATON ROUGE — Associations that represent recreational fishermen, divers and conservationists are beginning to make noise again over the federal government’s so-called idle iron policy.¶ Opponents argue the policy would not only remove and plug 4,150 inactive wells and platforms in the Gulf of Mexico, but it would also destroy an underwater forest of living coral that supports a wide range of species.¶ Just a few months after the 2010 BP oil spill, the U.S. Interior Department issued the policy notifying “offshore operators of their legal responsibility to decommission and dismantle their facilities when production is completed.”¶ The policy stipulates that all wells, pipelines and platforms that are not servicing or supporting exploration must be unplugged, decommissioned, dismantled and relocated.¶ A major deadline for the first big wave of decommissions is coming in 2013, and the federal government is holding firm in its decision to regard aging energy structures as a form of risk, especially during hurricane season.¶ Earlier this week, the Louisiana chapter of the Coastal Conservation Association lobbied its members to write their elected representatives on Capitol Hill to ask them to support a temporary moratorium on the program.¶ “A typical four-legged platform becomes the equivalent of two to three acres of vibrant habitat in the Gulf and home to populations of fish, coral, shellfish, turtles and sea mammals,” according to the association’s appeal.¶ Chris John, president of the Louisiana Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, said the idle iron policy has added to the cost of doing business in the Gulf, and the related regulations are not well defined.¶ “I’m not sure where this policy came from,” John said. “We support further study, certainly, rather than a blanket decision to get rid of everything. There are a number of structures out there that are still somewhat active and somewhat producing that would technically fall under the definition of idle iron.”¶ Oil interests and conservationists said there is a solution in the Rigs to Reefs Habitat Protection Act, which is legislation that has been filed by Sen. David Vitter of Metairie and Rep. Steven Palazzo of Biloxi, Miss., both Republicans.¶ The bill wouldn’t allow any structures to be removed until there are assessments conducted to determine if there are coral populations and supported species in the area of the targeted rigs and platforms.¶ Both recreational and commercial fishing values would be part of the equation.¶ “I’ve fished these rigs before,” John said. “It’s just amazing to see the life they can support.”¶ Vitter said the legislation is still pending action on the committee level but added supporters are also looking at other bills where the rigs to reefs concept could possibly be attached as an amendment.¶ “Some of the highest quality marine resources are found around offshore rigs, and I’m hopeful we can build consensus for slowing their removal,” Vitter said. “**There’s a broad overlap of support between industry and conservation that these rigs and infrastructure shouldn’t be fully decommissioned,** and we’re looking to find a clear path to halt the Department of Interior’s pursuit of doing so this year.”¶ Gifford Briggs, vice president of the Louisiana Oil and Gas Association, said the issue simply needs a little balance.¶ He said there are certainly rigs and platforms that should be decommissioned for safety reasons, but the Interior Department has cast such a wide net that the issue has become confused.¶ “I believe both industry and conservationists appreciate the efforts of Sen. Vitter on this,” Briggs said. “Some of the infrastructure should be removed, but critical marine habitats should be protected as well.” CCA contends the rigs in the Gulf of Mexico make up the “largest man-made artificial reef in the world, providing habitat to dozens of species of fish and marine life, many of which are structure-dependent.”¶ The organization is backing the Palazzo-Vitter bill because it would halt decommissions until it can be determined that removing the rigs and platforms would not be harmful to the reef ecosystem.¶ The proposed legislation would likewise exempt companies from the idle iron requirements as long as the owner commits to converting the platform into an artificial reef either by initiating discussions with applicable state governments regarding potential sites for the artificial reef or by taking steps to provide for “reefing in place.”

### 1NC

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should interpret the National Environmental Protection Act to limit categorical exclusions and establish a substantive mandate requiring relevant federal agencies that conduct environmental impact statements to choose the most environmentally favorable outcome.

#### CP reinvigorates NEPA---creates perception of strong environmental law in the US---EIS’s are key

Weiland 97 (Paul S. Weiland, Land Use and Natural Resources Practice Group Leader at Nossaman LLP, worked in the Law and Policy Section, Environmental and Natural Resources Division of the U.S. Department of Justice helping agencies formulate policies to comply with the NEPA, JD at Harvard, Ph.D. at Indiana, Spring 97, "AMENDING THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT: FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY," Journal of Land Use & Environmental Law, 12 J. Land Use & Envtl. Law 275)

[\*292] Third, in light of judicial interpretation of NEPA, it is critical to link substance to procedure explicitly. In its present form, section 102(2)(C) of NEPA requires federal agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a **variety of alternative projects.** 127 Caldwell has suggested that the law as written has contributed to better decisionmaking, but **change is necessary** to realize the substantive goals set forth in section 101. 128 "The EIS **alone** cannot compel adherence to the principles of NEPA. The EIS is necessary but insufficient as an action-forcing procedure . . . ." 129 To further NEPA's substantive goals, the EIS requirement could be **supplemented with a mandate** that agencies adopt the project from among alternatives that "**maximizes environmental protection** and enhances environmental values" while maintaining the economic viability of the project. 130 Fourth, section 102(2)(C) mandates that "**every** recommendation or report on **proposals for legislation" include an EIS**. 131 Generally, this mandate has been ignored by Congress. 132 Grad notes that "there is little evidence that NEPA has had any significant effect on the legislative process . . . . Few impact statements have been filed in the context of legislation that may have substantially adverse effects on the environment . . . ." 133 Subjecting legislation to the procedural requirements that have been enforced by the judiciary up to this point would result in more fully informed, and perhaps better, decisionmaking. If substantive and procedural requirements are jointly implemented, notoriously inefficient and environmentally unsound laws, such as those governing grazing and mining on federal lands, would possibly be reformed. 134 In addition, appropriation bills, in which many decisions [\*293] that lead to the destruction of the environment are successfully hidden, would be subject to review. 135 Fifth, to the fullest extent possible, legislation should include provisions that force the President to fulfill his responsibility to appoint a council on environmental quality and to make that council a high priority. Up to this point, numerous presidents have failed to appoint a council, thus violating the Constitution which states in part that the President "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed." 136 Though this duty has been repeatedly ignored in the past, it need not be the case in the future. 137 Additionally, a clarification of congressional commitment to the CEQ may increase the likelihood that the President will fulfill the responsibility of chief executive. VI. CONCLUSION The amendment of NEPA is not likely to be an easy task. However, a reinvigorated NEPA may establish environmental protection among the nation's priorities when entering the twenty-first century. The need for an **explicit referent in statutory** or constitutional **law is essential to ensure strong and efficacious environmental law within the U**nited **S**tates.

#### Binding application of NEPA reinvigorates the international model of environmental impact assessment---solves all global environmental impacts---the plan’s exceptions undermine necessary political will

Caldwell 98 (Lynton K. Caldwell, Arthur F. Bentley Professor of Political Science Emeritis and Professor of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University, 98, "BEYOND NEPA: FUTURE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT," The Harvard Environmental Law Review, 22 Harv. Envtl. L. Rev. 203)

 [\*205] It is this prospective orientation that extends the relevance of NEPA to a world economy that has been expanding and accelerating beyond any historical precedent. Environmental protection policy has now attained global significance, and NEPA recognizes "the **worldwide** and long-range character of **environmental problems**." 7 In some respects, NEPA has already significantly influenced public policy in the United States and abroad. In particular, the procedural reform required by the EIS has improved the quality of public planning and decisionmaking and has been widely adopted in other countries and by international organizations. 8 **Despite its influence, however, NEPA has not come near to realizing its full potential** either at home or abroad. The international relevance of NEPA has been weakened by ambiguous interpretations in the federal courts and outright denial by some executive agencies. Domestically, NEPA's effectiveness has been hampered by insufficient funding and inconsistent application. The EIS requirement alone is insufficient to achieve the intent declared in NEPA. The research, oversight, and forecasting provisions of NEPA under Title II have yet to be fully implemented. The CEQ has done what it could with unduly limited resources, but has lacked the active presidential and congressional support needed to play its intended role. **Where the federal government has acted, its environmental decisions have often been inconsistent with NEPA's declared principles**. 9 The goals and principles declared in section 101 10 have been treated as noble rhetoric having little practical significance. In the absence of forceful White House action, the courts have been the principal interpreters of NEPA, although the [\*206] Supreme Court has limited their adjudication under the Act to purely procedural matters. 11 The failure of NEPA to fulfill its potential is of particular concern today, as the policy issues addressed in NEPA seem almost certain to reach a point of urgency early in the twenty-first century. Growing economic and social demands indicate environmental troubles ahead too clearly to be dismissed as "alarmist." In America's future, the quality of life will depend upon the extent to which the government and people of the United States make the principles declared in NEPA a practiced reality. Its principles **must be applied in actual public administration.**In order to revitalize NEPA as a true expression of national intent, it is first necessary to understand why it has not become a highly visible centerpiece of American environmental policy. Why has this statute, which has had worldwide influence and has been described as America's environmental Magna Carta, not achieved greater recognition in the United States? NEPA is perhaps no less understood than is any other federal statute--many of which are lengthy, complex, and subject to periodic reinterpretation by the judiciary. In fact, NEPA has the potential to be more easily grasped and readily applied because it is relatively short, straightforward and, as a policy act, neither vague nor ambiguous. There are at least four explanations for the difference between the policy declared by NEPA and what actually happens in government and the economy. The first is official marginalization of NEPA policy in deference to political priorities; the second is judicial misinterpretation; the third is popular indifference to matters of principle when no compelling event arouses concern; and the fourth is the lag between conventional perceptions of the environment and the world dynamics of environmental change. These explanations are generalizations and hence there are exceptions. It is the contention of this Essay that, in order to fulfill NEPA's potential, it may now be necessary to reaffirm the Act's declared congressional intent or to incorporate it into constitutional law. The anticipated challenges of the twenty-first century have enlarged the implications of NEPA for American public policy far beyond those [\*207] anticipated by the authors of the Act and the Congress that adopted it, although, in principle, the international relevance of NEPA was certainly recognized by Senator Henry M. Jackson and his staff. As the nation moves into the twenty-first century, and is confronted by problems now being forecast, the principles and goals declared by NEPA will need reinforcement to work toward the goal of attaining a sustainable future.

#### Expanding the domestic model of NEPA’s critical to US global environmental leadership

Lois **Schiffer 4**, partner at Baach Robinson & Lewis PLLC in Washington, D.C., was Assistant Attorney General for the Environment and Natural Resources Division at the U.S. Department of Justice from 1994-2001, adjunct professor of environmental law at Georgetown University Law Center, and for Spring 2004 was a Lecturer for an environmental policy course at Harvard Law School, 14 Duke Envtl. L. & Pol'y F. 325, Spring, 2004

So what is happening to NEPA as middle age wears on? This article will focus on two conditions of NEPA's advancing middle age. First, efforts by the Bush Administration to limit this important tool through statutory interpretation, litigation, and legislation to the detriment of the statute and to United States global leadership in environmental issues will be discussed. Then, the influence of NEPA beyond U.S. borders will be considered. NEPA's influence beyond U.S. borders, sometimes referred to as "extraterritorial application of NEPA," has long been contentious. It is a helpful case study of NEPA in an increasingly globalized world with growing concern about the United States' environmental leadership.¶ [continues 35 paragraphs later…]¶ IV. Conclusion ¶ So where has NEPA arrived in mature middle age? Inside the United States, it faces new and treacherous an obstacle from the Bush Administration, including **limiting regulations**, lack of funding, **and occasionally being jilted** at the courthouse door. Outside the United States, NEPA has taken on the status of role model to many countries and international organizations but may be shriveling behind this important role-model face. An example of obstacles inside the U.S. that affect its image outside the U.S. is the statute's application to agency decisions that cause impacts outside the U.S. or that cause impacts that flow across U.S. boundaries into other countries. This review reveals NEPA's narrowing over time, becoming particularly thin in the past several years. A better approach, particularly in a world that has globalized over NEPA's lifetime, is to interpret NEPA inside the U.S. so that it can present a proud face, backed by a strong body, as a role model throughout the world.

#### That’s key to heg

David H. **Carstens**, Chief of Operations, Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, Eighth US Army, Korea, Spring **1** (*Parameters*, http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/01spring/carstens.htm)

Dramatic events such as the end of the Cold War, the turn of the century, and now a new presidency offer opportunities for the United States to reconsider its national security policy.[1] The notion that the focus should be limited to defending against an emerging peer competitor or rogue state is flawed, however, and current analyses of emerging threats are generally too narrowly defined. **Internal regional strife,** **not power-projecting challengers to US primacy**, will likely spark the crises of the 21st century for which US strategy must be prepared. ¶ A tidal wave of public outcry over the deteriorating state of regional economies and the global environment is rushing toward the shores of the world's most powerful nations. In an era in which there are few imminent threats to US security, government as well as corporate leaders praise the superpower status of our nation. In such times it is not surprising that labor and **environmental reform issues** are often placed on the back burner. Nevertheless, these are the issues that **will take center stage** in the coming decades. From its current position of vast global power, the United States can either choose to meet this challenge head on, or be overcome by it. ¶ My intent is not to dismiss the current theories of strategy, but rather to add to them. Four such strategies (and many variations on these) compete for relevancy in the current public debate: neo-isolationism, selective engagement, cooperative security, and primacy.[2] The implications of each are normally outlined in a traditional analysis of foreign affairs in which there exists a constant competition for power between states. Although this tradition continues, the real danger the world now faces "stem[s] not from conflicts between countries but from conflicts within them."[3] Such internal strife over distribution of wealth, labor inequality, scarcity of resources, and declining environmental conditions will spill over into neighboring states, creating chaos. The new grand strategy of the United States, therefore, needs to respond to regional internal weaknesses, not to the external strengths of perceived rogue and competitor states. ¶ [continues]¶ With the rising inequality brought on by globalization comes a torrent of economic, labor, and environmental problems which, if left unchallenged, will fuel the fires of regional crisis in the 21st century. For the global market to survive, nations need to collectively establish and maintain economic, labor, and environmental policies that provide for the common good. Such standards also need to be collectively enforced with the same zeal as is currently reserved for defense against armed attack. ¶ In the eyes of the world, American leadership diminishes every time we choose not to act upon a potentially devastating human crisis. To the contrary, successful actions in support of regional economic and environmental well-being bolster confidence in American leadership at home and abroad. Further, immediate action today may prevent the wars of tomorrow, especially in those areas where imminent chaos is most pronounced. ¶ The United States cannot afford to look away from global economic and environmental despair, saving its strength for the "big fight." The future US grand strategy, if not entirely based on environmental and economic internationalism*,* should expand the definition of US interests to include global economic reform and environmental standards enforcement. The **greatest danger America faces is neither China nor Iraq. It is indifference to this emerging crisis.**

#### Heg solves great power war

Khalilzad 11 – Zalmay Khalilzad, the United States ambassador to Afghanistan, Iraq, and the United Nations during the presidency of George W. Bush and the director of policy planning at the Defense Department from 1990 to 1992, February 8, 2011, “The Economy and National Security; If we don’t get our economic house in order, we risk a new era of multi-polarity,” online: <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad>

We face this domestic challenge while other major powers are experiencing rapid economic growth. Even though countries such as China, India, and Brazil have profound political, social, demographic, and economic problems, their economies are growing faster than ours, and this could alter the global distribution of power. These trends could in the long term produce a multi-polar world. If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. The closing of the gap between the United States and its rivals could intensify geopolitical competition among major powers, increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, and undercut our will to preclude or respond to international crises because of the **higher risk of escalation.**¶ The stakes are high. In modern history, the longest period of peace among the great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership. By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars.¶ American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions.¶ As rival powers rise, Asia in particular is likely to emerge as a zone of **great-power competition**. Beijing’s economic rise has enabled a dramatic military buildup focused on acquisitions of naval, cruise, and ballistic missiles, long-range stealth aircraft, and anti-satellite capabilities. China’s strategic modernization is aimed, ultimately, at denying the United States access to the seas around China. Even as cooperative economic ties in the region have grown, China’s expansive territorial claims — and provocative statements and actions following crises in Korea and incidents at sea — have roiled its relations with South Korea, Japan, India, and Southeast Asian states. Still, the United States is the most significant barrier facing Chinese hegemony and aggression.

## Oceans Advantage

### AT: Kunich 5

#### Their author says ocean biodiversity collapse is inevitable

Kunich 5 – Professor of Law @ Roger Williams University School of Law [John Charles Kunich, “ARTICLE: Losing Nemo: The Mass Extinction Now Threatening the World's Ocean Hotspots,” Columbia Journal of Environmental Law, 2005, 30 Colum. J. Envtl. L. 1

A mass extinction now threatens much of life on Earth. We are currently in the midst of at least the sixth mass extinction in this [\*2] planet's history-catastrophic death spasms in which vast numbers of species and higher taxa swiftly disappear. n1 In this Article, I will examine the appalling extent to which **the Sixth Extinction has reached into the world's oceans,** and I will demonstrate that stacks of international and domestic laws have done nothing more to prevent this devastation than to act as a dangerous placebo. My conclusion will provide an antidote to this syndrome of law as the new opiate of the masses.

#### And he says that habitat destruction *unrelated to the aff* is the cause

-this article is written in 2005, far before the “idle iron” policy was ever invented

Kunich 5 – Professor of Law @ Roger Williams University School of Law [John Charles Kunich, “ARTICLE: Losing Nemo: The Mass Extinction Now Threatening the World's Ocean Hotspots,” Columbia Journal of Environmental Law, 2005, 30 Colum. J. Envtl. L. 1

There is evidence that human activities adversely affect the sea in a variety of ways, some more readily apparent than others. Ocean dumping, introduction of invasive species, development of coastal areas and the attendant discharge of materials into the waters, sedimentation and eutrophication from agriculture and silviculture, and over-harvesting in a particular area may well have severe impacts on life in that immediate region and often beyond. n61 Within a given marine locality, in terms of depth, proximity to major currents, ambient temperature, and the like, living things are interdependent in much the same way as are the denizens of any terrestrial ecosystem. When there is a major perturbation of that ecosystem, whether by chemical pollution (organic or inorganic), noise pollution, underwater detonation of explosives, over-harvesting, n62 introduction of exotic species, trawling, dredging, sedimentation from run-off, climate change, or any other stressor, a significant decimation of one species will affect other species with a nexus to it in the food web and in the broader array of ecological relationships. n63 In the marine realm, the term "ripple effect" thus has special relevance.

### 1NC---Ocean Defense

#### Oceans resilient

Kennedy 2 - Environmental science prof, Maryland. Former Director, Cooperative Oxford Laboratory. PhD. (Victor, Coastal and Marine Ecosystems and Global Climate Change, http://www.pewclimate.org/projects/marine.cfm)

There is evidence that marine organisms and ecosystems are resilient to environmental change. Steele (1991) hypothesized that the biological components of marine systems are tightly coupled to physical factors, allowing them to respond quickly to rapid environmental change and thus rendering them ecologically adaptable. Some species also have wide genetic variability throughout their range, which may allow for adaptation to climate change.

#### No impact to biodiversity

Sagoff 97  Mark, Senior Research Scholar – Institute for Philosophy and Public policy in School of Public Affairs – U. Maryland, William and Mary Law Review, “INSTITUTE OF BILL OF RIGHTS LAW SYMPOSIUM DEFINING TAKINGS: PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE FUTURE OF GOVERNMENT REGULATION: MUDDLE OR MUDDLE THROUGH? TAKINGS JURISPRUDENCE MEETS THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT”, 38 Wm and Mary L. Rev. 825, March, L/N

Note – Colin Tudge - Research Fellow at the Centre for Philosophy at the London School of Economics. Frmr Zoological Society of London: Scientific Fellow and tons of other positions. PhD. Read zoology at Cambridge.

Simon Levin = Moffet Professor of Biology, Princeton. 2007 American Institute of Biological Sciences Distinguished Scientist Award 2008 Istituto Veneto di Scienze Lettere ed Arti 2009 Honorary Doctorate of Science, Michigan State University 2010 Eminent Ecologist Award, Ecological Society of America 2010 Margalef Prize in Ecology, etc… PhD

Although one may agree with ecologists such as Ehrlich and Raven that the earth stands on **the brink of** an episode of **massive extinction, it may not follow** from this grim fact **that human** being**s will suffer** as a result. On the contrary, skeptics such as science writer Colin Tudge have challenged biologists to explain **why we need more than a tenth of the 10 to 100 million species that grace the earth**. Noting that "cultivated systems often out-produce wild systems by 100-fold or more," Tudge declared that "the argument that humans need the variety of other species is, when you think about it, a theological one." n343 Tudge observed that "the elimination of all but a tiny minority **of our fellow creatures does not affect the material well-being of humans** one iota."n344 This skeptic challenged ecologists to list more than 10,000 species (other than unthreatened microbes) that are essential to ecosystem productivity or functioning. n345 "**The human species could survive just as well** if 99.9% of our fellow creatures went extinct, provided only that we retained the appropriate 0.1% that we need." n346   [\*906]   The monumental Global Biodiversity Assessment ("the Assessment") identified two positions with respect to redundancy of species. "At one extreme is the idea that each species is unique and important, such that its removal or loss will have demonstrable consequences to the functioning of the community or ecosystem." n347 The authors of the Assessment, a panel of eminent ecologists, endorsed this position, saying it is "unlikely that there is much, if any, ecological redundancy in communities over time scales of decades to centuries, the time period over which environmental policy should operate." n348 These eminent ecologists rejected the opposing view, "the notion that species overlap in function to a sufficient degree that removal or loss of a species will be compensated by others, with negligible overall consequences to the community or ecosystem." n349  Other biologists believe, however, that species are so fabulously redundant in the ecological functions they perform that the life-support systems and processes of the planet and ecological processes in general will function perfectly well with fewer of them, certainly fewer than the millions and millions we can expect to remain **even if** **every threatened organism becomes extinct**. n350 Even the kind of sparse and miserable world depicted in the movie Blade Runner could provide a "sustainable" context for the human economy as long as people forgot their aesthetic and moral commitment to the glory and beauty of the natural world. n351 The Assessment makes this point. "Although any ecosystem contains hundreds to thousands of species interacting among themselves and their physical environment, the emerging consensus is that the system is driven by a small number of . . . biotic variables on whose interactions the balance of species are, in a sense, carried along." n352   [\*907]   To make up your mind on the question of the functional redundancy of species, consider an endangered species of bird, plant, or insect and ask how the ecosystem would fare in its absence. The fact that the creature is endangered suggests an answer: it is already in limbo as far as ecosystem processes are concerned. What crucial ecological services does the black-capped vireo, for example, serve? Are any of the species threatened with extinction necessary to the provision of any ecosystem service on which humans depend? If so, which ones are they?  Ecosystems and the species that compose them have changed, dramatically, continually, and totally in virtually every part of the United States. There is little ecological similarity, for example, between New England today and the land where the Pilgrims died. n353 In view of the constant reconfiguration of the biota, **one may wonder why Americans have not suffered more as a result of ecological catastrophes**. The cast of species in nearly every environment changes constantly-local extinction is commonplace in nature-but the crops still grow. Somehow, it seems, property values keep going up on Martha's Vineyard in spite of the tragic disappearance of the heath hen.  One might argue that the sheer number and variety of creatures available to any ecosystem buffers that system against stress. Accordingly, we should be concerned if the "library" of creatures ready, willing, and able to colonize ecosystems gets too small. (Advances in genetic engineering may well permit us to write a large number of additions to that "library.") In the United States as in many other parts of the world, however, the number of species has been increasing dramatically, not decreasing, as a result of human activity. This is because the hordes of exotic species coming into ecosystems in the United States far exceed the number of species that are becoming extinct. Indeed, introductions may outnumber extinctions by more than ten to one, so that the United States is becoming more and more species-rich all the time largely as a result of human action. n354 [\*908] Peter Vitousek and colleagues estimate that over 1000 non-native plants grow in California alone; in Hawaii there are 861; in Florida, 1210. n355 In Florida more than 1000 non-native insects, 23 species of mammals, and about 11 exotic birds have established themselves. n356 Anyone who waters a lawn or hoes a garden knows how many weeds desire to grow there, how many birds and bugs visit the yard, and how many fungi, creepy-crawlies, and other odd life forms show forth when it rains. All belong to nature, from wherever they might hail, but not many homeowners would claim that there are too few of them. Now, not all exotic species provide ecosystem services; indeed, some may be disruptive or have no instrumental value. n357 This also may be true, of course, of native species as well, especially because all exotics are native somewhere. Certain exotic species, however, such as Kentucky blue grass, establish an area's sense of identity and place; others, such as the green crabs showing up around Martha's Vineyard, are nuisances. n358 Consider an analogy [\*909] with human migration. Everyone knows that after a generation or two, immigrants to this country are hard to distinguish from everyone else. The vast majority of Americans did not evolve here, as it were, from hominids; most of us "came over" at one time or another. This is true of many of our fellow species as well, and they may fit in here just as well as we do. It is possible to distinguish exotic species from native ones for a period of time, just as we can distinguish immigrants from native-born Americans, but as the centuries roll by, species, like people, fit into the landscape or the society, changing and often enriching it. Shall we have a rule that a species had to come over on the Mayflower, as so many did, to count as "truly" American? Plainly not. When, then, is the cutoff date? Insofar as we are concerned with the absolute numbers of "rivets" holding ecosystems together, extinction seems not to pose a general problem because a far greater number of kinds of mammals, insects, fish, plants, and other creatures thrive on land and in water in America today than in prelapsarian times. n359 The Ecological Society of America has urged managers to maintain biological diversity as a critical component in strengthening ecosystems against disturbance. n360 Yet as Simon Levin observed, "much of the detail about species composition will be irrelevant in terms of influences on ecosystem properties." n361 [\*910] He added: "For net primary productivity, as is likely to be the case for any system property, **biodiversity matters only up to a point**; above a certain level, increasing biodiversity is likely to make **little difference**." n362 What about the use of plants and animals in agriculture? There is no scarcity foreseeable. "Of an estimated 80,000 types of plants [we] know to be edible," a U.S. Department of the Interior document says, "only about 150 are extensively cultivated." n363 About twenty species, not one of which is endangered, provide ninety percent of the food the world takes from plants. n364 Any new food has to take "shelf space" or "market share" from one that is now produced. Corporations also find it difficult to create demand for a new product; for example, people are not inclined to eat paw-paws, even though they are delicious. It is hard enough to get people to eat their broccoli and lima beans. It is harder still to develop consumer demand for new foods. This may be the reason the Kraft Corporation does not prospect in remote places for rare and unusual plants and animals to add to the world's diet. Of the roughly 235,000 flowering plants and 325,000 nonflowering plants (including mosses, lichens, and seaweeds) available, farmers ignore virtually all of them in favor of a very few that are profitable. n365 To be sure, any of the more than 600,000 species of plants could have an application in agriculture, but would they be preferable to the species that are now dominant? Has anyone found any consumer demand for any of these half-million or more plants to replace rice or wheat in the human diet? There are reasons that farmers cultivate rice, wheat, and corn rather than, say, Furbish's lousewort. There are many kinds of louseworts, so named because these weeds were thought to cause lice in sheep. How many does agriculture really require? [\*911] The species on which agriculture relies are domesticated, not naturally occurring; they are developed by artificial not natural selection; they might not be able to survive in the wild. n366 This argument is not intended to deny the religious, aesthetic, cultural, and moral reasons that command us to respect and protect the natural world. These spiritual and ethical values should evoke action, of course, but we should also recognize that they are spiritual and ethical values. We should recognize that ecosystems and all that dwell therein compel our moral respect, our aesthetic appreciation, and our spiritual veneration; we should clearly seek to achieve the goals of the ESA. There is no reason to assume, however, that these goals have anything to do with human well-being or welfare as economists understand that term. These are ethical goals, in other words, not economic ones. Protecting the marsh may be the right thing to do for moral, cultural, and spiritual reasons. We should do it-but someone will have to pay the costs. In the narrow sense of promoting human welfare, protecting nature often represents a net "cost," not a net "benefit." It is largely for moral, not economic, reasons-ethical, not prudential, reasons- that we care about all our fellow creatures. They are valuable as objects of love not as objects of use. What is good for   [\*912]  the marsh may be good in itself even if it is not, in the economic sense, good for mankind. The most valuable things are quite useless.

### 1NC---AT: Southeast Asia Scenario

#### Their internal link evidence is a joke---it’s from “RTSea blog”---not qualified to discuss geopolitics

#### And they isolate multiple alt causes

RT Sea 12 [“The Coral Triangle: scientists warn of social & economic implications,” Tuesday, July 10, 2012, pg. http://tinyurl.com/9lnekkq

Overfishing, pollution, coastal development, climate change and ocean acidification are endangering the coral reefs of Southeast Asia and Western Pacific, which could lead to conflicts, food insecurity, and political instability in the region.

Jamaluddin Jompa, director of the Coral Reef Research at the Hasanuddin University in Indonesia, said: “All the pressures are going up and up...We need to do something to bring these down.”

#### This scenario makes no sense---the way they solve is by developing US domestic resources so we don’t have to import from Southeast Asia, but the *reason* the reef is key to Indonesian stability is because those exports are key to their economy.

#### Their Dibb evidence is about the *separatist* breakup of Indonesia, not just generic instability---they don’t have an internal link

#### **And the risk of Indonesian state breakup has already been solved**

Kurlantzick 11 Josh is currently a Fellow for Southeast Asia at the Council on Foreign Relations. “Middle East revolutions only aspire to Indonesia's success,” Feb 20, <http://www.thenational.ae/thenationalconversation/comment/middle-east-revolutions-only-aspire-to-indonesias-success>

On the surface, looking to Indonesia makes sense. No developing nation over the past decade has enjoyed such a dramatic turnaround, from a nearly failed state to a vibrant and stable democracy. In the late 1990s, after the fall of the longtime dictator Suharto, Indonesia appeared on the verge of collapse. Newly empowered Islamist organisations seized on the post-Suharto chaos to build networks and launch major terrorist attacks in Jakarta and Bali. Like Yemen, Indonesia had many outlying regions that sought to secede, and in the early days of democracy some almost did. East Timor gained independence in 1999 after bloody fighting. Some Indonesian observers predicted the country was turning into an Asian version of ungovernable Nigeria. It appeared that Suharto's contention that only he could hold the nation together - a boast similar to Hosni Mubarak's - might prove true. About a decade later, look again. **The Indonesian government has resolved nearly every secessionist issue and stability has allowed for renewed growth**. The country's economy grew by more than 6 per cent last year and likely will grow faster in 2011. Indonesia's Islamists have been blunted and secular parties dominate the legislature. The country has held multiple free and fair elections, and remained a close partner of western democracies even after the end of its strongman rule.

### AT: Islands

#### Cooperation and lack of motivation prevents conflict

Pradt ’12 – PhD candidate at the Freie Universität of Berlin (Tilman, “ASIA'S NEW GREAT GAME? THE GEOPOLITICS OF THE SOUTH CHINA SEA,” Political Reflection, Vol. 3, No. 1)

Hence, are we attending the beginning of a new round of The Great Game in Asia, this time in the location of the SCS? As this text briefly surveyed, there are various interests at stake and several big and great powers involved, arguably too many for such a small area (especially, when concentrating on the bottleneck of the SCS, the Strait of Malac-ca). But by analyzing the motivations behind the big players’ engagement (i.e., the United States, China, and India) there is reason to believe that a potentially tragic zero-sum Great Game is still avoidable.¶ First, the US has not a real interest in permanently (and substantially) upgrading its military presence in the region. Given the still severing US budget situation and the persistent security situation in the Middle East and Central Asia, policy-makers in Washington are trying to reduce its forces de-ployed to foreign areas not to enlarge them by opening up a new theatre. Plus, the US is mainly interested in the security of the sea lanes and its guaranteed free passage, therefore President Obama’s push on the littoral states to solve their SCS disputes. The US is not interested in confront-ing China directly but to put pressure on Beijing to be more conciliatory in case of the SCS dis-putes. The deployment of US Marines to Darwin is merely presenting the stick not using it (imagine Beijing’s reactions to the US establishing a mili-tary base in Vietnam).¶ Beijing, on the other hand, will now take pains to somehow ease the situation in the SCS and to regain trust among its neighbours of the ASEAN. China has to accept that the US will now sit at the table of future rounds of territorial discussions and China no longer can use its relative power in bilateral negotiations with small ASEAN states. This is probably hard to swallow for Chinese policy-makers given their repeatedly stated premise that the SCS disputes shall be solely discussed among the regional states con-cerned. But in this changed situation, the contin-ued refusal to accept multilateral discussions will provoke further military build-up and confronta-tion in the SCS.¶ Finally, India got only involved because of perceived Chinese assertiveness in the Indian Ocean. India’s military build-up and assumed ambitions towards the SCS is a response to Chi-na’s actions in what India perceives as its territori-al waters. A reciprocal withdrawal will avoid fu-ture naval confrontations among the two Asian heavyweights.

## China Adv

### 1NC---No Coop

#### No impact to U.S.-China cooperation---it’s impossible to sustain

Aaron L. Friedberg 12, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, September/October 2012, “Bucking Beijing,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 91, No. 5, p. 48-58

Recent events have raised serious doubts about both elements of this strategy. Decades of trade and talk have not hastened China's political liberalization. Indeed, the last few years have been marked by an intensified crackdown on domestic dissent. At the same time, the much-touted economic relationship between the two Pacific powers has become a major source of friction. And despite hopes for enhanced cooperation, Beijing has actually done very little to help Washington solve pressing international problems, such as North Korea's acquisition of nuclear weapons or Iran's attempts to develop them. Finally, far from accepting the status quo, China's leaders have become more forceful in attempting to control the waters and resources off their country's coasts. As for balancing, the continued buildup of China's military capabilities, coupled with impending cuts in U.S. defense spending, suggests that the regional distribution of power is set to shift sharply in Beijing's favor.

WHY WE CAN'T ALL JUST GET ALONG

TODAY, CHINA'S ruling elites are both arrogant and insecure. In their view, continued rule by the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) is essential to China's stability, prosperity, and prestige; it is also, not coincidentally, vital to their own safety and comfort. Although they have largely accepted some form of capitalism in the economic sphere, they remain committed to preserving their hold on political power.

The CCP'S determination to maintain control informs the regime's threat perceptions, goals, and policies. Anxious about their legitimacy, China's rulers are eager to portray themselves as defenders of the national honor. Although they believe China is on track to become a world power on par with the United States, they remain deeply fearful of encirclement and ideological subversion. And despite Washington's attempts to reassure them of its benign intentions, Chinese leaders are convinced that the United States aims to block China's rise and, ultimately, undermine its one-party system of government.¶ Like the United States, since the end of the Cold War, China has pursued an essentially constant approach toward its greatest external challenger. For the most part, Beijing has sought to avoid outright confrontation with the United States while pursuing economic growth and building up all the elements of its "comprehensive national power," a Chinese strategic concept that encompasses military strength, technological prowess, and diplomatic influence. Even as they remain on the defensive, however, Chinese officials have not been content to remain passive. They have sought incremental advances, slowly expanding China's sphere of influence and strengthening its position in Asia while working quietly to erode that of the United States. Although they are careful never to say so directly, they seek to have China displace the United States in the long run and to restore China to what they regard as its rightful place as the preponderant regional power. Chinese strategists do not believe that they can achieve this objective quickly or through a frontal assault. Instead, they seek to reassure their neighbors, relying on the attractive force of China's massive economy to counter nascent balancing efforts against it. Following the advice of the ancient military strategist Sun-tzu, Beijing aims to "win without fighting," gradually creating a situation in which overt resistance to its wishes will appear futile.

The failure to date to achieve a genuine entente between the United States and China is the result not of a lack of effort but of a fundamental divergence of interests. Although limited cooperation on specific issues might be possible, the ideological gap between the two nations is simply too great, and the level of trust between them too low, to permit a stable modus vivendi. What China's current leaders ultimately want -- regional hegemony -- is not something their counterparts in Washington are willing to give. That would run counter to an axiomatic goal of U.S. grand strategy, which has remained constant for decades: to prevent the domination of either end of the Eurasian landmass by one or more potentially hostile powers.

The reasons for this goal involve a mix of strategic, economic, and ideological considerations that will continue to be valid into the foreseeable future.

### 1NC---No Clean Tech Coop (with China DA)

#### There’s no internal link---their Conrad evidence is about investment in the Chinese wind-sector---no reason opening up US land for development is necessary or sufficient for that to occur

#### Their author concludes that Chinese wind cooperation is impossible

Conrad 11 – Research associates with the Global Public Policy Institute [Björn Conrad (PhD candidate @ University of Trier. His research focuses on China’s domestic climate policy. MA in Chinese Studies, Political Science and Economics from the University of Trier and a Master in Public Policy from Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government.) & Mirjam Meissner (MA in Chinese Studies, Political Science and Economics from the Free University), “Catching a Second Wind Changing the Logic of International Cooperation in China’s Wind Energy Sector,” Global Public Policy Institute, GPPi Policy Paper No. 12, February 2011

The evolution of China’s wind energy market is neither a success story for foreign business interests **nor for** efforts to establish mutually beneficial structures of **cooperation between** Chinese and **international players**. Initially, the dynamic development of China’s wind sector seemed to offer ample incentives for both sides, favoring significant involvement of foreign companies. However, the sharp drop in foreign companies’ market share after 2000 and the insignificance of international joint ventures due to further development of China’s wind market painted a very different picture. Evidently, the **incentives for** the establishment of sustainable **collaborative structures were superseded by interfering considerations that** effectively **prevented** the creation of a mutually beneficial model of **international cooperation.** The potential deal, offering quick technological advancement in return for market access, did not materialize.

#### Alt cause---Chinese regulations---their author

Conrad 11 – Research associates with the Global Public Policy Institute [Björn Conrad (PhD candidate @ University of Trier. His research focuses on China’s domestic climate policy. MA in Chinese Studies, Political Science and Economics from the University of Trier and a Master in Public Policy from Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government.) & Mirjam Meissner (MA in Chinese Studies, Political Science and Economics from the Free University), “Catching a Second Wind Changing the Logic of International Cooperation in China’s Wind Energy Sector,” Global Public Policy Institute, GPPi Policy Paper No. 12, February 2011

Market access¶ The Chinese government’s attempts to balance the protection of its domestic industry from foreign competition against the positive effects of foreign companies’ involvement have shaped the regulatory framework of China’s wind power market. During the infant stage of China’s wind sector development, when wind power had not been elevated to an issue of high political priority, international engagement represented a cost and time effective way of expanding installed capacity and introducing new wind power technologies in China. With the growing importance of wind energy as a strategic technology of China’s long-term economic planning, the objective of fostering domestic innovation capacity and technological independence moved to the center of its strategy. As a result, the corresponding regulations, from high local content rates to the different pricing models as delineated above, created a highly uneven competitive environment. **This effectively excluded foreign-owned companies from direct market participation.** The protective market structures represent one of the central impediments to the emergence of collaborative structures in China’s wind energy sector.¶ After 2000, the tightly regulated avenues for international entry into China’s wind sector were effectively limited to technology licensing and joint ventures. The latter was **utterly unsuccessful**, primarily due to foreign companies’ reluctance to engage in the comprehensive sharing of intellectual property with Chinese partners. Yet the former became the most common model of international cooperation in China’s wind energy sector. Under licensing agreements, Chinese manufacturers produce wind power equipment with a foreign company’s technological design and pay royalties to the license giver. However, foreign companies only license older designs to Chinese manufacturers, whilst withholding the distribution of cuttingedge technology. The contribution of licensing agreements to the advancement and dissemination of effective climate technologies and the corresponding positive effects for global climate protection are accordingly limited. In addition, given the technological advancement of Chinese wind power equipment companies, the returns for China’s business actors from licensing agreements are **quickly diminishing**, making this only remaining form of international cooperation on China’s wind market increasingly obsolete.

#### Alt cause---IPR concerns---their author

Conrad 11 – Research associates with the Global Public Policy Institute [Björn Conrad (PhD candidate @ University of Trier. His research focuses on China’s domestic climate policy. MA in Chinese Studies, Political Science and Economics from the University of Trier and a Master in Public Policy from Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government.) & Mirjam Meissner (MA in Chinese Studies, Political Science and Economics from the Free University), “Catching a Second Wind Changing the Logic of International Cooperation in China’s Wind Energy Sector,” Global Public Policy Institute, GPPi Policy Paper No. 12, February 2011

Intellectual property rights

The vast potential for profit-making ensures the continuous attractiveness of China’s wind market for foreign companies despite setbacks and disappointments. As Lie Huihan of Suzlon Energy (China) put it: “Whatever the circumstances are, not being here is just not an option.” 30 However, the necessity to protect their innovative edge puts limits on international companies’ willingness to engage in comprehensive partnerships with Chinese counterparts. Especially in a relatively young business sector like wind energy, where international competition is shaped by rapid technology improvements and large competitive advantages through innovation, cutting-edge technology represents the basis for success. Therefore, concerns about IPR infringements (see box 1) have significant influence on international companies’ business decisions when it comes to entry into the Chinese wind market. Foreign firms cautiously avoid introducing sensible and up-to-date technology to China and have been reluctant to locate R&D activities in China. More recently, concerns about safeguarding technological advantages have been intensified by the prospects of Chinese manufacturers starting to export to markets outside China, making them global competitors. In light of these concerns, joint R&D projects between foreign and Chinese wind firms are exceedingly rare thus far. Given the Chinese side’s strong focus on technology advancement as the primary benefit of international cooperation, **this dynamic significantly limits the scope of workable international collaboration in China’s wind sector.**

### 1NC---Clean Tech Coop =/= Solve War

#### Clean tech cooperation can’t solve war---mutual military distrust

Sandalow and Lieberthal 9 David Sandalow is an Energy and Environment Scholar and a senior fellow at Brookings. Kenneth Lieberthal is a Professor of Political Science at the University of Michigan. “Overcoming Obstacles to U.S.-China Cooperation on Climate Change,” Jan, Brookings Institute, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2009/1/climate%20change%20lieberthal%20sandalow/01\_climate\_change\_lieberthal\_sandalow

To be sure, there are **numerous points of friction** between the United States and China, and that is hardly surprising in view of America’s global position and China’s rapid rise. Perhaps because the two countries’ economies are now tightly interdependent, there are various concerns on each side regarding pertinent policies and actual practices on the ground. As China’s military grows rapidly and the U.S. military continues to invest heavily to improve its capabilities, **inevitably those focused on future security issues in both countries harbor doubts about the intentions of the other.** In these and other spheres, **greater familiarity** has produced better capacities to manage the immediate relationship but **has not decreased concerns about longer-term intentions** and potential consequences.¶ In fact, U.S.-China relations currently face a paradox: even as the relationship has become relatively mature and effective across a broad spectrum of issues, underlying distrust of the long-term intentions of each toward the other has nevertheless actually increased. Many Chinese believe that the United States is too zero-sum in its view of the world to accept China’s rise as a beneficent development. They assume that the United States will at some point take serious steps to constrain that rise and preserve America’s leadership position globally, and they tend to interpret American blandishments on everything from currency values to reducing carbon emissions **as part of this underlying American objective to hold China back** and disrupt its progress. Many Americans assume that a strong, wealthy China will naturally seek to marginalize the United States in Asia. But since Asia is the most important and dynamic region of the world, having China marginalize America in that region would strike directly at America’s most vital long-term national interests.

### 1NC---No Climate Deal

#### Domestic issues block successful climate cooperation

Hale 11—PhD Candidate in the Department of Politics at Princeton University and a Visiting Fellow at LSE Global Governance, London School of Economics (Thomas, © 2011 Center for Strategic and International Studies, The Washington Quarterly, 34:1 pp. 89-101, “A Climate Coalition of the Willing,” http://www.twq.com/11winter/docs/11winter\_Hale.pdf)

Intergovernmental efforts to limit the gases that cause climate change have all but failed. After the unsuccessful 2010 Copenhagen summit, and with little progress at the 2010 Cancun meeting, it is hard to see how major emitters will agree any time soon on mutual emissions reductions that are **sufficiently ambitious** to prevent a substantial (greater than two degree Celsius) increase in average global temperatures. It is not hard to see why. No deal excluding the United States and China, which together emit more than 40 percent of the world’s greenhouse gases (GHGs), is worth the paper it is written on. But **domestic politics in both countries effectively block ‘‘G-2’’ leadership on climate**. In the United States, the Obama administration has basically given up on national cap-and-trade legislation. Even the relatively modest Kerry-Lieberman-Graham energy bill remains dead in the Senate. The Chinese government, in turn, faces an even harsher constraint. Although the nation has adopted important energy efficiency goals, the Chinese Communist Party has staked its legitimacy and political survival on raising the living standard of average Chinese. **Accepting international commitments that stand even a small chance of reducing the country’s GDP** growth rate below a crucial threshold **poses an unacceptable risk to the stability of the regime**. Although the G-2 present the largest and most obvious barrier to a global treaty, **they also provide a convenient excuse for other governments to avoid aggressive action**. Therefore, the international community should not expect to negotiate a worthwhile successor to the Kyoto Protocol, at least not in the near future.

### 1NC---AT: Arctic War

#### No conflict – arctic cooperation is increasing

Fries 12 [Tom Fries, Nonresident Senior Fellow at the Arctic Institute, Apr 18 2012, “Perspective Correction: How We Misinterpret Arctic Conflict,” http://www.thearcticinstitute.org/2012/04/perspective-correction-how-we.html]

War and conflict sell papers -- the prospect of war, current wars, remembrance of wars past. Accordingly, a growing cottage industry devotes itself to writing about the prospect of conflict among the Arctic nations and between those nations and non-Arctic states, which is mostly code for “China.” As a follower of Arctic news, I see this every day, all the time: eight articles last week, five more already this week from the Moscow Times, Scientific American or what-have-you. Sometimes this future conflict is portrayed as a political battle, sometimes military, but the portrayals of the states involved are cartoonish, Cold-War-ish...it’s all good guys and bad guys.

I’m convinced that this is nonsense, and I feel vindicated when I see the extent to which these countries' militaries collaborate in the high North. From last week's meeting of all eight Arctic nations' military top brass (excepting only the US; we were represented by General Charles Jacoby, head of NORAD and USNORTHCOM) to Russia-Norway collaboration on search & rescue; from US-Canada joint military exercises to US-Russia shared research in the Barents...no matter where you look, the arc of this relationship bends towards cooperation.

### 1NC---No Warming Impact

#### 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.

## Solvency

### 1NC---Squo Solves (Only v. NEPA)

#### The status quo solves---the EIS process has been streamlined---vote neg on presumption because they can’t isolate a meaningful differential between the aff and the squo

-doesn’t take out the NEPA DA because EIS is still required, it’s just streamlined now

Donnelly-Shores 12 Patrick is a writer at the Berkeley Energy and Resource Collaborative. “OFFSHORE WIND FARMS MAKE POLITICAL HEADWAY IN U.S.,” Feb 16, http://berc.berkeley.edu/offshore-wind-makes-political-headway-in-us/

First, in the most dramatic new renewable energy policy announcement of the year, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) announced that it had certified an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as revealing “no significant environmental or socioeconomic impacts” associated with developing offshore wind farms, **paving the way for a set of Wind Energy Areas (WEAs)** off of the mid-Atlantic Coast. The WEAs (a map of which can be seen here, courtesy of the Christian Science Monitor) are located off the shores of southern New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, and would be over a half million acres in total size.¶ The BOEM’s announcement means that **future leasing of wind power sites** in the area **will be informed and streamlined by the existing EIS**. While any specific developments within the area will require their own environmental assessments, the process will move along much quicker as a result of this decision. They hope to have wind farm development commencing in the area as soon as the end of 2012.

### 1NC---No Installation

#### No ships for installation

**Hopkins 12** – Partner @ Duane Morris LLP w/ with a concentration on transportation, [products liability](http://www.duanemorris.com/practices/productsliabilityandtoxictorts.html) and [commercial](http://www.duanemorris.com/practices/commerciallitigation.html) litigation [[Robert B. Hopkins, Duane Morris LLP](http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/u/robert-hopkins), “Offshore Wind Farms in US Waters Would Generate Both US and Foreign Maritime Jobs,” Renewable Energy World, July 12, 2012, pg. http://tinyurl.com/9sbj8k6

Customs and Border Protection (CBP), the federal agency that enforces the Jones Act, has issued a number of rulings that conclude that the Jones Act in certain situations does not apply to the actual installation of wind turbines by large-scale vessels known as jack-up lift vessels. Moreover, there has been some debate on whether the Jones Act would apply to vessels travelling to an established wind farm located over 3 miles off the coastline in the OCS for such things as maintenance and repair. A bill clarifying that the Jones Act would apply in this maintenance/repair scenario (HR 2360) has recently passed the U.S. House of Representatives and is now awaiting a vote in the U.S. Senate. Thus, at present, from a purely legal standpoint, foreign-flagged vessels would likely be able to participate in the installation of the proposed wind farms, but there is some uncertainty as to whether foreign-flagged vessels would be able to participate in maintenance/repair work. Complicating all of this is the dearth of U.S.-flagged jack-up lift vessels capable of undertaking much of the very heavy work involved in the installation of offshore wind turbines. To further confound matters, with a boom in offshore wind farm construction in Europe and China, many foreign-flagged jack-up lift vessels capable of such work are now booked for the next several years.

### 1NC---Not Cost Competitive

#### Offshore wind’s not cost competitive---their projections are wrong

Howland 12 Caitlin holds an honors degree in economics from the University of Maine. Advisors for this thesis include Gary Hunt, PhD in Economics, Jeff Thaler, J.D. Yale, Andrew Goupee, PhD in Mechanical Engineering, Sharon Tisher, J.D. Harvard, Sharon Wagner, PhD in Engineering and Public Policy. “The Economics of Offshore Wind Energy,” May, <http://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1060&context=honors>

**Offshore wind will not be viable** in the coming years **without a carbon tax and** a potential government **subsidy.** If no developers invest in a farm, learning curve effects will be stunted and not be able to take the course of action predicted. The effect of learning-by-doing over time is crucial to decreasing costs. If an aggressive pricing scheme on carbon is adopted, it is possible deepwater offshore wind energy could become competitive in less than two decades.

# 2NC

## CP

### 1NC

**Text: The United States Department of Interior should no longer require that decommissioned oil rigs in the Gulf of Mexico be removed. The Department of Interior should require decommissioned rigs to be capped and idle pipelines to be decommissioned.**

#### Solves their first advantage and avoids the link to politics

Alford 12, 1AC Author - Capitol Correspondent [Jeremy Alford, “Rig policy threatens wildlife,” Daily Comet, Published: Wednesday, July 11, 2012 at 10:24 p.m, pg. http://tinyurl.com/cfwoue6

BATON ROUGE — Associations that represent recreational fishermen, divers and conservationists are beginning to make noise again over the federal government’s so-called idle iron policy.¶ Opponents argue the policy would not only remove and plug 4,150 inactive wells and platforms in the Gulf of Mexico, but it would also destroy an underwater forest of living coral that supports a wide range of species.¶ Just a few months after the 2010 BP oil spill, the U.S. Interior Department issued the policy notifying “offshore operators of their legal responsibility to decommission and dismantle their facilities when production is completed.”¶ The policy stipulates that all wells, pipelines and platforms that are not servicing or supporting exploration must be unplugged, decommissioned, dismantled and relocated.¶ A major deadline for the first big wave of decommissions is coming in 2013, and the federal government is holding firm in its decision to regard aging energy structures as a form of risk, especially during hurricane season.¶ Earlier this week, the Louisiana chapter of the Coastal Conservation Association lobbied its members to write their elected representatives on Capitol Hill to ask them to support a temporary moratorium on the program.¶ “A typical four-legged platform becomes the equivalent of two to three acres of vibrant habitat in the Gulf and home to populations of fish, coral, shellfish, turtles and sea mammals,” according to the association’s appeal.¶ Chris John, president of the Louisiana Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, said the idle iron policy has added to the cost of doing business in the Gulf, and the related regulations are not well defined.¶ “I’m not sure where this policy came from,” John said. “We support further study, certainly, rather than a blanket decision to get rid of everything. There are a number of structures out there that are still somewhat active and somewhat producing that would technically fall under the definition of idle iron.”¶ Oil interests and conservationists said there is a solution in the Rigs to Reefs Habitat Protection Act, which is legislation that has been filed by Sen. David Vitter of Metairie and Rep. Steven Palazzo of Biloxi, Miss., both Republicans.¶ The bill wouldn’t allow any structures to be removed until there are assessments conducted to determine if there are coral populations and supported species in the area of the targeted rigs and platforms.¶ Both recreational and commercial fishing values would be part of the equation.¶ “I’ve fished these rigs before,” John said. “It’s just amazing to see the life they can support.”¶ Vitter said the legislation is still pending action on the committee level but added supporters are also looking at other bills where the rigs to reefs concept could possibly be attached as an amendment.¶ “Some of the highest quality marine resources are found around offshore rigs, and I’m hopeful we can build consensus for slowing their removal,” Vitter said. “**There’s a broad overlap of support between industry and conservation that these rigs and infrastructure shouldn’t be fully decommissioned,** and we’re looking to find a clear path to halt the Department of Interior’s pursuit of doing so this year.”¶ Gifford Briggs, vice president of the Louisiana Oil and Gas Association, said the issue simply needs a little balance.¶ He said there are certainly rigs and platforms that should be decommissioned for safety reasons, but the Interior Department has cast such a wide net that the issue has become confused.¶ “I believe both industry and conservationists appreciate the efforts of Sen. Vitter on this,” Briggs said. “Some of the infrastructure should be removed, but critical marine habitats should be protected as well.” CCA contends the rigs in the Gulf of Mexico make up the “largest man-made artificial reef in the world, providing habitat to dozens of species of fish and marine life, many of which are structure-dependent.”¶ The organization is backing the Palazzo-Vitter bill because it would halt decommissions until it can be determined that removing the rigs and platforms would not be harmful to the reef ecosystem.¶ The proposed legislation would likewise exempt companies from the idle iron requirements as long as the owner commits to converting the platform into an artificial reef either by initiating discussions with applicable state governments regarding potential sites for the artificial reef or by taking steps to provide for “reefing in place.”

### CP =/= Link Politics

#### Counterplan doesn’t link---ending “Idle Iron” isn’t controversial

Olander 12 Doug is Editor-in-Chief of Sport Fishing Magazine. “Federal Destruction of Gulf Oil Rigs: Keeping the Pressure On,” July 27, http://www.sportfishingmag.com/blogs/top-shots/federal-destruction-gulf-oil-rigs-keeping-pressure

In a show of **bipartisan** concern for the health of the Gulf of Mexico, 20 members of the U.S. House of Representatives this week signed a letter from the Congressional Sportsmen’s Caucus calling on the Department of Interior (DOI) to declare a moratorium on its “idle iron” policy, currently in the process of removing hundreds of coral-covered, decommissioned oil rigs from the Gulf.¶ I salute all these men, from 10 different states, for taking this action. Read that letter here and note which 20 congressmen signed on. They certainly deserve our thanks for joining Rep. Steve Palazzo (R-Miss.) in signing the letter to Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar, citing their concern that the DOI’s idle iron directive “is having an adverse impact on critical marine habitat in the Gulf of Mexico.”¶ “We request that your Department enact a temporary moratorium on the removal of structures related to that Directive,” the letter states, “until a stakeholder process can be developed to determine both the best methods to properly dismantle rigs that have cause to be removed, and to protect those structures that are shown to harbor thriving marine ecosystems.”¶ I’m particularly heartened by the fact that **this is not an isolated plea**, but in fact is yet another in a series of actions that makes increasingly clear the **widespread concern** at federal, state and local levels over the DOI’s idle-iron policy.¶ In the past year or so, U.S. Sen. David Vitter (R-La.) has filed the Rigs to Reefs Habitat Protection Act; Salazar has received letters of concern from Texas Gov. Rick Perry and U.S. Rep. Blake Farenthold (R-Texas); a coalition of marine-conservation, fishing- and boating-industry groups has called on Salazar to halt the idle-iron rig removals; and a committee on the Sportfishing and Boating Partnership Council has called on Salazar to enact a two-year moratorium on rig removals. Additionally the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council is working to list these rigs as Essential Fish Habitat. And at least one environmental group is actively calling for a moratorium.¶ We also were able to obtain a response to our concerns over the idle-iron mandate from Ken Salazar’s boss, President Obama, which you can read here. That answer may not satisfy those of us who think an immediate moratorium should be declared (more rigs are being destroyed and removed all the time). We have tried repeatedly to get comments from Mitt Romney without success, so we can't be sure what he would do if he were in charge of the DOI.¶ In any event**, the pressure is clearly building**. I wonder how much longer Salazar can continue to oversee the removal of these living reefs without ever really justifying his policy or answering to critics. Meantime, those of us who care about the Gulf and its fisheries need to keep up that pressure.

#### There’s sufficient support for the CP to diffuse controversy

Sikes 12 David is a writer for The Caller. “Attempts to save rich Gulf ecosystems mount,” June 20, http://www.caller.com/news/2012/jun/20/attempts-to-save-rich-gulf-ecosystems-mount/?print=1

CORPUS CHRISTI — The federal government's aggressive and systematic destruction of fish habitat in the Gulf of Mexico is now being **challenged on multiple fronts**.¶ I'm talking about the Department of Interior's misguided Idle Iron policy that results in the use of explosives and other means to completely remove retired oil and gas platforms at or below the ocean floor at the rate of about 150 rigs a year. When explosives are used — about 65 percent of the rigs are removed by explosives — the blasts can kill tens of thousands of red snapper annually, along with myriad other marine life.¶ Keep in mind that if you fished every day of this year's 40 day snapper season you would be allowed to legally kill 80 fish in federal waters. Harvest 81 snapper and you break the law and pay a fine.¶ It's time we recognize these rich artificial reefs for what they are and protect them accordingly. Properly handled they are not Gulf debris or pollutants. They provide hundreds of acres of rich reef habitat and are home to thousands of fish, including 49 species of federally managed fish and 25 species of protected invertebrates such as corals and sponges, according to Steve Kolian, a marine scientist with the nonprofit group EcoRigs which has connections with Louisiana University Marine Consortium. Kolian has conducted extensive research on the ecological and economic benefits of maintaining retired rigs alternate uses such as artificial reefs.¶ Soon after the government ramped up its rig removal policy in 2010 there was a modest **public outcry**, most notably from the Port Aransas Boatmen Association, Apache Oil in Houston and Black Elk Energy's John Hoffman and his nonprofit organization Save the Blue. They pushed for capped decommissioned rigs to be left in place, with specific plans for maintenance, insurance and funding.

#### There’s growing support for the CP

CCA 6/19/12 [Coastal Conservation Association, “Rep. Palazzo Calls For Moratorium On Rig Removals,” http://www.joincca.org/articles/579]

WASHINGTON, DC – At a breakfast briefing hosted by the Congressional Sportsmen’s Foundation this morning, Rep. Steven Palazzo (R-Miss.) presented the concerns of the recreational angling community over the Department of Interior’s controversial Idle Iron directive and closed by inviting fellow Congressmen to sign onto a letter requesting a moratorium on rig removals.¶ “A temporary moratorium on rig removals related to the Idle Iron Policy is needed to evaluate those structures and keep as many as safely possible in the water,” he said. “That iron wasn’t put there to become habitat, but that’s what it has become, and it certainly is not ‘idle.’ It is an irreplaceable, living asset that should be protected. And as a sportsman from a Gulf state, I feel an obligation to protect that habitat.”¶ Coastal Conservation Association worked with Rep. Palazzo on the call for a moratorium on the Idle Iron policy and pledged to engage its membership to encourage their elected officials to add their signatures to the letter.¶ “Rep. Palazzo clearly appreciates the value of those structures as artificial habitat and understands the concerns of the recreational angling community,” said Pat Murray, CCA president. “His call for a moratorium is the latest in a growing chorus of concerns from other elected officials, marine scientists and other state and federal agencies. It is time for the Department of Interior to heed those concerns and take a more precautionary approach to these structures.”¶ In a misguided response to the 2010 Gulf oil spill, the U.S. Department of Interior issued the Idle Iron directive in October of 2010 ordering that all non-producing wells be plugged and any associated structures removed within five years of the issuance of that directive. Since then, CCA has worked on and supported a number of actions to derail the Policy, including the RIGS TO REEFS HABITAT PROTECTION ACT filed by U.S. Sen. David Vitter (R-La.) and Rep. Palazzo; language implementing strict review and reporting requirements on removals in the SPORTSMEN’S ACT OF 2012; the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council’s decision to begin the process of classifying rigs and other vital artificial reefs as ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT (EFH), and letters from both TEXAS GOVERNOR RICK PERRY and U.S. REP. BLAKE FARENTHOLD (R-Texas) to U.S. Department of Interior Secretary Ken Salazar urging him to reconsider the policy.

### 2NC Solvency

#### Their only other internal link card is also talking about the CP

Gaskill 12 [[Melissa Gaskill](http://www.psmag.com/author/mgaskill/), “Gulf Coast Oil Platforms: Save the Rigs?,” Pacific Standard, June 13, 2012 • pg. http://tinyurl.com/dyhu26w

This year, it’s likely more than 100 offshore structures in the Gulf of Mexico will be removed as part of a Department of the Interior plan. There are 650 nonproducing oil and gas platforms, known in the industry as “idle iron,” listed for removal “as soon as possible”—i.e. within five years of the end of production or a year of losing the lease—under Interior’s directive. Historically, companies seldom removed an idle structure until the lease for the area where it was located expired.¶ Having companies clean up after themselves sounds like a good idea, but many recreational fishermen, scuba divers, scientists, and fishery managers aren’t happy about it. Turns out, some of the 2,500 multileg platforms that pepper the Gulf of Mexico have become [de facto artificial reefs](http://www.psmag.com/environment/after-the-oil-runs-out-rigs-to-reefs-19272/). According to [Bob Shipp](http://www.usouthal.edu/marinesciences/shipp.html), University of South Alabama’s Department of Marine Sciences, the platforms have transformed the entire ecosystem. Some marine species are attracted to platforms for shelter or food, but others—sea fans, sponges, algae, and reef fish—spend their entire life cycle on these structures. What’s more, some species have increased in number because of the platforms.¶ Typically, platform removal involves using explosives on each of the support legs. These blasts kill fish and other marine life, says Clint Moore, a vice president for corporate development at [ION Geophysical Corporation](http://www.iongeo.com/) and former oil and gas representative to the [Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council](http://flowergarden.noaa.gov/advisorycouncil/memberlist.html). The [federal Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement](http://www.bsee.gov/) estimates that removing a platform kills 800 fish on average. Fishermen put the number in the tens of thousands.

#### CP solves the advantage

CCA 11 [Coastal Conservation Association, Sep 14 2011, “CCA Applauds Louisiana Senator For Effort To Avert Rig Removals,” http://www.joincca.org/articles/144]

Coastal Conservation Association is applauding Sen. David Vitter (R-La) for legislation filed today that will prevent rigs and other structures from being summarily removed from the Gulf of Mexico. In a knee-jerk response to the Gulf oil spill, the U.S. Department of Interior issued a directive in October of 2010 ordering that all non-producing rigs be plugged and any remaining structure removed within five years of the issuance of that directive. Sen. Vitter’s Rigs to Reefs Habitat Protection Act of 2011 seeks to allow those structures to remain in the Gulf as vibrant artificial reefs. “More than ever we need to create habitat for marine life in the Gulf, not dispose of it,” said Sen. Vitter. “These idle rigs are serving a valuable purpose by supporting our fisheries, and it just doesn’t make sense to remove them. I appreciate the Coastal Conservation Association for bringing this issue to my attention so we can reach a reasonable outcome that benefits the fish and the fishermen.” “The structures are generally regarded as the largest man-made artificial reef in the world, providing habitat to dozens of species of fish and marine life, many of which are structure-dependent,” said Chester Brewer, chairman of CCA’s National Government Relations Committee. “Sen. Vitter, like all fishermen, realizes the critical connection between habitat and healthy fisheries, and we are grateful for his efforts to have those structures stay in the water as habitat and as popular fishing destinations for recreational anglers.” There are approximately 3,500 offshore structures in the Gulf of Mexico and the directive, known as the Idle Iron Policy, would impact roughly 650 structures that have not produced oil or gas within five years of the directive issue date of Oct. 15, 2010. “If nothing is done, a tremendous amount of habitat will be lost and the negative impact would be massive,” said Brewer. “In the aftermath of the oil spill disaster, it is understandable that the federal government felt the need to be seen taking action, but this directive could create far more problems than it solves. Sen. Vitter’s legislation serves as a reasonable approach to address the Administration’s concerns while maintaining this vital habitat.”

## China DA

### Impact Calculus

#### Chinese economic decline accesses every impact --- destabilizes Asia and draws multiple states into conflict --- overstretches the US military and crushes an export base for US companies --- threats to the CCP means they lashout with nukes and biological weapons --- that outweighs and causes extinction

Ochs 2 | Past president of the Aberdeen Proving Ground Superfund Citizens Coalition, Member of the Depleted Uranium Task force of the Military Toxics Project, and M of the Chemical Weapons Working Group [Richard Ochs, , June 9, 2002, “Biological Weapons Must Be Abolished Immediately,” <http://www.freefromterror.net/other_articles/abolish.html>]

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a “nuclear winter,” resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control. Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE. Ironically, the Bush administration has just changed the U.S. nuclear doctrine to allow nuclear retaliation against threats upon allies by conventional weapons. The past doctrine allowed such use only as a last resort when our nation’s survival was at stake. Will the new policy also allow easier use of US bioweapons? How slippery is this slope?

#### Turns the case---Delinger says Chinese competitiveness in the green sector is key to solve their emissions which is key to solve---biggest internal link.

#### Obviously turns Asian stability if China starts lashing out

#### Turns the environment

Ethan Goffman 11, Associate Editor of the journal Sustainability: Science, Practice, & Policy, May 2011, “China’s Surge in Renewable Energy,” <http://www.csa.com/discoveryguides/renewable/review.pdf>

Global pressure to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is part of the reason for China’s turn to renewables. Officially, China has long denied responsibility, claiming, along with many developing countries, that since it “came late to the industrialization game, the core economies, with their significantly greater historical greenhouse gas contributions, must pay for a global transformation away from fossil fuels” (Economy). Even today, as the largest greenhouse gas emitter, China “adamantly refuses to commit to any binding, international carbon emissions reduction targets” (Ma), arguing that it is in many ways still a poor country, and not historically responsible for the climate crisis. There is some substance to this argument, as each Chinese is responsible for only 1/5 the emissions of the average American (Ma) (the U.S. currently has 313 million people while China has over 1.3 billion, according to the CIA World Fact Book). Yet China is now the world’s largest emitter of greenhouse gases, and future projections are that the situation will only get worse. Despite clean energy efforts, China is expected to “nearly double its coal-fired power capacity from 350 gigawatts (GW) in 2006 to 950 GW in 2030 and . . . will account for 74 percent of the total increase in the world's coal-related carbon dioxide emissions during that period” (Ma). Clearly, such an increase would put tremendous stress on the world’s ecosystems.

#### China growth key to preventing Taiwan invasion

Lewis 7 Dan, Director of the Economic Research Council, “The Nightmare of a Chinese Economic Collapse,” World Finance, 4-19-07, http://www.worldfinance.com/news/137/ARTICLE/1144/2007-04-19.html

According to Professor David B. Smith, one of the City’s most accurate and respected economists in recent years, potentially far more serious though is the impact that Chinese monetary policy could have on many Western nations such as the UK. Quite simply, China’s undervalued currency has enabled Western governments to maintain artificially strong currencies, reduce inflation and keep interest rates lower than they might otherwise be. We should therefore be very worried about how vulnerable Western economic growth is to an upward revaluation of the Chinese yen. Should that revaluation happen to appease China’s rural poor, at a stroke, the dollar, sterling and the euro would quickly depreciate, rates in those currencies would have to rise substantially and the yield on government bonds would follow suit. This would add greatly to the debt servicing cost of budget deficits in the USA, the UK and much of Euro land. A reduction in demand for imported Chinese goods would quickly entail a decline in China’s economic growth rate. That is alarming. It has been calculated that to keep China’s society stable – ie to manage the transition from a rural to an urban society without devastating unemployment - the minimum growth rate is 7.2 percent. Anything less than that and unemployment will rise and the massive shift in population from the country to the cities becomes unsustainable. This is when real discontent with communist party rule becomes vocal and hard to ignore. It doesn’t end there. That will at best bring a global recession. The crucial point is that communist authoritarian states have at least had some success in keeping a lid on ethnic tensions – so far. But when multi-ethnic communist countries fall apart from economic stress and the implosion of central power, history suggests that they don’t become successful democracies overnight. Far from it. There’s a very real chance that China might go the way of Yugoloslavia or the Soviet Union – chaos, civil unrest and internecine war. In the very worst case scenario, a Chinese government might seek to maintain national cohesion by going to war with Taiwan – whom America is pledged to defend. Today, people are looking at Chang’s book again. Contrary to popular belief, foreign investment has actually deferred political reform in the world’s oldest nation. China today is now far further from democracy than at any time since the Tianneman Square massacres in 1989. Chang’s pessimistic forecast for China was probably wrong. But my fear is there is at least a chance he was just early.

#### China war causes extinction

Straits Times 2k (The Straits Times (Singapore), “No one gains in war over Taiwan”, June 25, 2000, L/N)

The doomsday scenario THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -- horror of horrors -- raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -- truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation. There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of a nuclear Armaggedon over Taiwan might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else.

### No Wind

#### Wind use is tiny and falling now

Goldenberg 12/1 Suzanne is a writer for The Guardian. “US government announces opening of Atlantic coast for offshore windfarms,” 2012, http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/dec/01/us-government-offshore-wind-farms-atlantic

If any turbines do actually go up, they would constitute the first offshore wind projects in the US. Over the last few years vast wind farms, with hundreds of turbines, have been built across the country – although wind power still makes up only 3% of energy use. However, the wind industry is expected to slow down or even come to a halt at the end of the year, with the expiry of tax credits.

#### Wind’s declining--- our ev is future predictive

Kachan 12/5 Dallas is a guest writer for the Christian Science Monitor. “Cleantech on the decline? Predictions for 2013,” 2012, http://www.csmonitor.com/Environment/2012/1205/Cleantech-on-the-decline-Predictions-for-2013

Long term risk emerges for solar and wind – The solar and wind markets suffer today from margin erosion, allegations of corruption, international trade impropriety and other challenges. In 2013, we think poor progress in grid-scale power storage technology will also start to put downward pressure on solar and wind growth figures. Prices per kilowatt hour are falling, yes, but the cost of flow batteries, molten salt, compressed air, pumped hydro, moving mass or other storage technology needs to be factored in to make intermittent clean energies reliable and available 24/7. When also considering continued progress in cleaner baseload power from new, emerging nuclear technologies, natural gas and cleaner coal power, the growth rates for solar and wind appear increasingly at risk.

### 2NC---L---Clean Tech Zero-Sum

#### Zoninstein

#### China’s ahead in clean tech development now and it’s zero sum---key to their economic growth

Bennhold 10 Katrin is a writer for the New York Times. “Race Is on to Develop Green, Clean Technology,” Jan 29, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/30/business/global/30davos.html?dbk&\_r=0

DAVOS, SWITZERLAND — It is shaping up to be **the Great Game of the 21st century**. To top officials and business executives here at the World Economic Forum, Topic A this year was the race to develop greener, cleaner technology, which is emerging as one of the critical factors in reshaping the world economy as emerging powers snap at the heels of battered Western economies. With the United States and China sizing each other up across the Pacific and Europe seeking to maintain its economic stature, it is a battle for potentially millions of jobs and trillions of dollars in export revenues. The outcome — which pits a venture capital-driven market approach relying on government subsides against a top-down system of state capitalism — has the potential to influence how economic and political systems evolve. Concern that China may be edging ahead in potentially lucrative growth sectors like renewable energy was palpable here, where senior officials from the United States and Europe warned that the West could not afford to be complacent. “Six months ago my biggest worry was that an emissions deal would make American business less competitive compared to China,” said Senator Lindsay Graham, a Republican from South Carolina who has been deeply involved in climate change issues in Congress. “Now my concern is that every day that we delay trying to find a price for carbon is a day that China uses to dominate the green economy.” He added: “China has made a long-term strategic decision and **they are going gang-busters**.” Christine Lagarde, the French finance minister, agreed. “**It’s a race and whoever wins that race will dominate economic development**,” she said. “The emerging markets are well-placed.”

### 2NC---L---OSW K2 Chinese Clean Tech

#### Offshore wind is key---only tech that can meet China’s needs

Martinot 10 Eric Martinot is research director with the Institute for Sustainable Energy Policies in Tokyo, Japan. “Renewable power for China: Past, present, and future,” Frontiers of Energy and Power Engineering in China Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 287-294, http://www.martinot.info/Martinot\_FEPE4-3.pdf

It appears reasonable to expect that the proposed renewable energy development targets for 2020 introduced at the beginning of this paper will be achieved, perhaps even before 2020. However, prospects for renewables development through 2020 and beyond hinge on the degree to which renewable power technologies can be integrated into power systems on increasing scales, at both centralized and distributed levels, with managed and coordinated approaches among utilities, project developers, consumers, enterprises, and local governments. Wind power **appears to exhibit the most promise for China**. Wind resources in China total at least 250 GW onshore and 750 GW offshore [14,15]. Thus, there is considerable scope for further development for at least another 15 to 20 years. However, offshore wind turbine technology and development planning will become increasingly important as the best onshore sites are used up. The main constraints to wind power development do not appear to be resources or costs, but rather power transmission constraints (between windy regions and population centers) and energy storage constraints. To approach 1000 GW of wind power in the long term would require significant amounts of electricity storage capacity to even out the variations in wind power output on minute-by-minute, hourly, daily, and even seasonal scales.

### 2NC---L---Wind K2 Clean Tech Leadership

#### Wind is symbolically key to clean tech leadership

Asmus 11 Peter Asmus, president of Pathfinder Communications, is an internationally known expert on energy and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) matters. “Wind: Leader of the renewable power pack,” Oct 24, <http://www.fierceenergy.com/story/wind-leader-renewable-power-pack/2011-10-24>

As the most affordable renewable-energy choice, **wind power has emerged as an** icon **of green technology.** With more than 200 GW of capacity currently up and running, and large companies such as General Electric, Vestas, Siemens, Mitsubishi and BP all investing in the sector, it is clear **this technology has a bright future.** While the North American wind energy industry lags in key areas compared to Europe and Asia, many key industry players are optimistic about the North American market as turbine costs continue to drop dramatically. A total of 5,784 MW of wind capacity was added in North America in 2010, according to Pike Research's report, Wind Energy Outlook for North America. Wind has been tapped as a source of mechanical powers for centuries. Between the 14th and 19th centuries, for example, windmills of various kinds provided as much as a quarter of Europe's total energy needs. Before the advent of the Industrial Revolution, windmills ranked second only to wood fuel as a source of power. Wind, of course, also provided the "fuel" for the sailing vessels of the Age of Discovery. Until the past three decades, its variability and potentially destructive nature have hampered any comprehensive long-term program to convert free and abundant wind power into a major source of electricity. Utilities face challenges Variability of wind power is probably the prime challenge for utilities. Energy company officials worry about maintaining stability of the grid once wind power reaches 10 or 20 percent of total supply. However, smart grid technology as well as a variety of advanced storage devices, will help address those issues. Another challenge for utilities is accessing the best remaining wind resources. This will require investment in new transmission lines. Current regulatory and policy frameworks governing transmission may be a bottleneck for future growth. Grid operators, meanwhile, are changing scheduling protocols and placing a greater emphasis on new wind forecasting technologies as wind becomes a larger and larger portion of total supply. Wind resources are actually a form of solar energy. The uneven heating of the Earth's surface by the sun results in air movements as the atmosphere continuously tries to reach equilibrium. The tilt of the Earth and its daily rotation around the sun are the primary elements shaping wind patterns. However, large bodies of water and the geographic contours of mountain, forest, and desert landscapes (as well as other factors) also contribute to creating regions of the planet where winds blow frequently enough to be harnessed as fuel to generate electricity. The determination of whether potential wind resources can be developed into an economic source of electricity depends upon numerous infrastructure choices, among them the following: Selection of wind turbine technology Affordable interconnections to the transmission grid Siting issues that include concerns of nearby human populations about scenic views and diminished land values Environmental concerns regarding potential collisions of federally protected species of birds and bats with the spinning wind turbine blades Historically, wind power has been one of the lowest cost renewable technologies. This is one reason wind power has led the pack among renewable energy technologies in terms of new capacity additions over the past decade. The diversity in scale -- with wind turbines ranging from less than 1 kW for remote or residential applications all the way up to designs of 10 or even 15 MW for offshore sites -- has allowed wind power to meet the needs of a variety of applications around the world. Indeed, more efficient wind turbine technology has enabled operators to capture more power more of the time, contributing to the wind industry's 21st century growth. The next frontier **Offshore wind power is the next frontier.** The vast majority of existing capacity is utility-scale wind farms deployed on land. The best wind resources, however, are largely untapped because they are located at marine sites that cannot be owned or controlled in the traditional way. These sites are located offshore, typically in shallow ocean waters relatively close to urban population centers.

### 2NC---UQ---China Leading Wind Now

#### China’s leading the globe in clean tech competitiveness---wind’s key---and it’s key to offset their reliance on coal---turns the case because Chinese leadership drives U.S.-China energy cooperation

Yu 12-28 Hongyuan, professor and deputy director of the Institute for Comparative Politics and Public Policy, Shanghai Institutes for International Studies, 12/28/12, “A revolution is here, and clean energy is the spark,” http://europe.chinadaily.com.cn/epaper/2012-12/28/content\_16065380.htm

Technological innovation is critical in the energy structure and, furthermore, next-generation energy will determine not only the future of the international economic system but shifts in political power.

Since the modern international system was set up, the energy chain has undergone two important changes. The first was during the Industrial Revolution in the 1860s, ushered in by Britain, which was marked by a transition from the era of fuel-wood, or the bio-fuel era, to the era of coal. The second change was the second industrial revolution, in the United States in the 1920s, which saw a transition from the era of coal to the era of oil. Today we are in the midst of a third revolution, a transition to an era of clean and low-carbon energy.

Under the long-cycle theory, the ownership and use of new energy is closely related to national technological and institutional advances. Countries with a dominant position in new energy must have an institutional and technical advantage stemming from their possession and use of new energy. They have to break through constraints imposed by previous economic structures, which leads to big changes in the global industrial chain, allocation of resources and national competitiveness.

There is every reason to believe that those new-energy powerhouses will ultimately change the global distribution of power through international competition. As history shows, every significant structural change in the international system has been due to a revolution in energy. The country or non-state entity that seized a new energy chain or part of it was challenging the status quo.

As the world debates collective action against climate change, most countries have found that economies based on new and clean energy and on low-carbon and clean energy hold the keys to the future.

The European Union's carbon aviation tax aimed at boosting the bloc's competitiveness and promoting climate negotiations could also boost its creativity and competitive edge. The Low Carbon Economy Report by the Royal Institute of International Affairs says that the EU promoted climate negotiations not just because it was a pioneer in low-carbon economics, but because it also wanted to predominate in global governance and lay the foundations for the future economy.

Considering China's huge economy and the rapid growth in its emissions, it clearly matters when it comes to energy and climate change. China is developing many energy resources, and putting in place a system that supplies stable, economic and clean energy. It is working hard to develop a recycling economy so it can garner the highest possible economic and social benefits using the least energy possible. Since the late 1990s China has been promoting clean, renewable energy to try to balance growth and environmental concerns and ultimately to reduce its reliance on coal.

In 2010 it set the goal of meeting 15 percent of its primary energy consumption through non-fossil fuels by 2020. It is targeting the development of non-fossil energy including wind power, solar power, biomass energy, solar energy, and thermal and nuclear power equivalent to 480 million metric tons of standard coal by the end of 2015, according to the 12th Five-Year Plan (2011-15) for the renewable energy industry issued recently by the National Energy Administration.

Hydropower is the leading source of renewable energy. It provides more than 97 percent of all electricity generated by renewable sources. The dams and hydropower plants also play an important role in water resource planning, in preventing flooding, making rivers navigable, solving irrigation problems and creating recreation areas. During the 12th Five-Year Plan China will begin building more than 60 key hydropower projects, and the aim is to have 430 GW of total hydropower installed capacity in the country by 2020. However, debate about the negative impacts of dams and hydropower plants is heated, most of it focused on environmental problems.

By the end of 2015 the country's wind power capacity is expected to reach 100 million kW, with annual electricity output of 190 billion kW/h, the plan says. China's wind power will reach 100 million kilowatts by 2015 and annual wind power generation will be 190 billion kilowatt hours. Of that, offshore wind power will account for 5 million kilowatts; solar power will be 15 million kilowatts and annual solar power generation will hit 20 billion kilowatt hours.

China enjoys many advantages in developing solar energy. It has become a world leader in photovoltaic cell production. The demand in the country for new solar modules could be as high as 232 mW each year from now until 2012. The government has announced plans to expand the installed capacity to 1,800 mW by 2020. If Chinese companies manage to develop low-cost, reliable solar modules, then the sky is the limit for a country that is desperate to reduce its dependence on coal and oil imports as well as the pressure on its environment by using renewable energy.

China has overtaken the US to become the largest producer of zero-carbon energy. The US is the hegemony and China is the rising power, but clean energy will create a new paradigm for relations between the US and China in energy. Cooperation between the two on clean energy is noteworthy, and both countries are leading the world in investing in renewable energy and should seek to resolve trade disputes and eliminate protectionist trade policies. The US should closely look at sales of Chinese renewable energy products in the US market and seek to reduce trade barriers.

The difficulty lies not in new ideas, but in escaping from old ones. Whatever the outcomes and motivations, in order to deal with the energy-water-food nexus, China should understand it is in its economic and national interest to move ahead with clean and zero-carbon energy development. Together with recently announced plans, China's clean energy development marks a sea change in the reform of the international system.

#### China’s leading the global race for wind now---long term strategy

Bozzato 6/4 Fabrizio Bozzato is a Researcher Assistant at the Centre for International and Regional Affairs of the University of Fiji. He is a PhD candidate at the Graduate Institute of International Affairs and Strategic Studies – Tamkang University, Taiwan. “The Wind Dragon: a Chinese tale of wind power,” 2012, <http://chinaforesight.net/2012/06/04/the-wind-dragon-a-chinese-tale-of-wind-power/>

Because of the hectic pace of China’s economic and social development, Chinese energy demand will continue to grow rapidly in next 40 years. Beijing appears determined to pursue a low-carbon development strategy, and wind energy is going to be one of the main resources for achieving China’s low carbon goals. According to figures released in March 2012 by the China Wind Energy Association, last year **China consolidated its position as the global wind power leader** in both newly and cumulative installed capacities, deploying an impressive 17.6 gigawatts of wind turbines. Notably, by the end of 2011, the added production capability took the national cumulative installed wind power electrical generation to 62.4 gigawatts, up 39.4 percent from the previous year. In December 2011, Longyuan Power, China’s largest wind power developer, connected 99.3 megawatts of wind turbines to the grid in a pilot intertidal wind farm in the Eastern province of Jiangsu. Meanwhile, deep inland, the desert province of Gansu is becoming the frontline of the country’s efforts toward a greener energy mix by massively investing in renewable energy, which includes the erection of wind turbines at the rate of more than one per hour. As impressive as these figures and developments are, so far wind power generation accounts only for 1.5 percent of national power generation. However, China has a grand vision for wind energy. Such a long-term “big plan” is outlined into China’s Wind Power Development Roadmap 2050, a key-document recently issued by the Energy Research Institute of National Development and Reform Commission. The Roadmap foresees Chinese wind power capacity reaching 200 GW by 2020, 400 GW by 2030 and 1 000 GW by 2050, making up 17 percent of the country’s electricity consumption.

#### China’s on track for an offshore wind boom now

Xinhua 12 “Project paves way for offshore wind power boom,” 1/3, <http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/bizchina/2012-01/03/content_14373319.htm>

BEIJING -- China has made **substantial progress** in boosting its burgeoning offshore wind power by launching its largest intertidal wind farm at the end of 2011. On December 28, Longyuan Power, China' s largest wind power developer, connected 99.3 megawatts (MW) of wind turbines to the grid in a pilot intertidal wind farm in Rudong county in eastern province of Jiangsu. Taking into account the existing 32MW turbines, which went into operation in September 2010, Longyuan has 131.3MW turbines integrated to the grid in the pilot wind farm in Rudong. This has made the Rudong intertidal project China's largest offshore wind farm. Intertidal wind farms are a unique form to tap offshore wind power. Intertidal areas cover vast sea regions that are submerged in rising tide and heaved out in ebb tide. According to China's Wind Power Development Roadmap 2050, recently issued by the energy research institute of National Development and Reform Commission, until 2021, China will focus on onshore wind development. Overall, China plans to have 1,000 gigawatts (GW) of installed wind capacity by 2050, making up 17 percent of the country's electricity consumption. So far, wind power generation accounts for 1.5 percent of national power generation. China's only offshore wind farm in commercial operation is the Shanghai East Sea Bridge Offshore Wind Farm, totaling 102 MW. It went into operation in June 2010, using 34 Sinovel 3MW turbines. Longyuan started to construct the Rudong intertidal wind farm in June 2009. The first stage of the pilot project, set to be 150 MW in installation, involves an investment of 2.5 billion yuan ($397 million). It will be fully completed in March 2012, said Zhang Gang, general manager of Longyuan Jiangsu Offshore Wind Power. Zhang said the wind farm will annually generate 330 million kWh of electric power for the grid, saving 97,000 tonnes of standard coal. It can reduce emissions of 267,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide and 1,940 tonnes of sulfur dioxide. Xie Changjun, general manager of Longyuan, said "Our construction of the Rudong pilot intertidal wind farm will lead the way for China to develop offshore wind power, particularly in site selection, planning and design, installation and maintenance." "We will supply a test platform for Chinese offshore wind turbines to go mature. In brief, we will accumulate valuable experiences for China to develop offshore wind power on a large scale," Xie said. INSTALLATION COSTS DROP High installation cost is a major factor restricting the boom of China' s offshore wind power. Industry officials say that offshore wind farm construction costs are mainly wind farm facilities and installations. Wind farm facilities, such as wind turbines, foundations and electric cables, make up 79 percent of the total wind farm construction costs. Installation constitutes 15 percent of total costs. Among the installation costs, installation of turbines and foundations makes up 9 percent and submarine cable pavement 6 percent. Zhang said Longyuan has overcome problems in offshore wind farm construction. It has reached the European advanced level in technology for offshore wind farm construction, while also lowering offshore wind installation costs to 16,000 yuan/kw, about 60 percent of the European level. Zhang said the secret for lower installation costs include improved technology for single pile foundation forms, which Longyuan applied to install 17 turbines, and multi-pile jacket foundation forms, applied to install 21 turbines. "According to the current installation costs and interest rates on loans, we may keep the production costs of offshore wind power to about 0.8 yuan/kwh. We may profit this way," Zhang said.

### 2NC---L---AT: OSW is Small

#### The link is unique but large---there are a huge number of OSW projects planned now---the aff causes them to be built---massively increases clean energy generation

NREL 10 National Renewable Energy Laboratory. “Large-Scale Offshore Wind Power in the United States,” http://www.nrel.gov/wind/pdfs/40745.pdf

Although the United States has built no offshore wind projects so far, about 20 projects representing more than 2,000 MW of capacity are in the planning and permitting process. Most of these activities are in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic regions, although projects are being considered along the Great Lakes, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Pacific Coast. The deep waters off the West Coast, however, pose a technology challenge for the near term. Untested regulatory and permitting requirements in federal waters (outside the three-nauticalmile state boundary) have posed major hurdles to development, but recent progress is clarifying these processes. Most notably, after 9 years in the permitting process, the Cape Wind project off of Massachusetts was offered the first commercial lease by the Department of Interior in April 2010.The U.S. Department of the Interior bears responsibility for reducing the uncertainties and potential risks to the marine environment and making the federal permitting process more predictable under the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (In June 2010, the Minerals and Management Service [MMS] was reorganized and renamed Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement [BOEM]). Some states have been proactive in promoting offshore wind demonstration projects in their own waters close to shore, which may provide a more efficient regulatory path to meet their renewable energy obligations, while jumpstarting a new locally grown industry. 1.3 A Powerful U.S. Resource Offshore winds tend to blow harder and more uniformly than on land, providing the potential for increased electricity generation and smoother, steadier operation than land-based wind power systems. The availability of these high offshore winds close to major U.S. coastal cities significantly reduces power transmission issues. The offshore wind resource in the United States has been sufficiently documented at a gross level to suggest **an** **abundance of potential offshore wind** **sites** as shown in Figure 1-2. The gross resource has been quantified by state, water depth, distance from shore, and wind class throughout a band extending out to 50 nautical miles from the U.S. coastline. This total gross wind resource is estimated at more than 4,000 GW, or roughly four times the generating capacity currently carried on the U.S. electric grid. This estimate assumes that one 5-MW wind turbine could be placed on every square kilometer of water with an annual average wind speed above 7.0 meters per second (m/s). As shown in Figure 1-2, this gross resource is distributed across three main depth categories, increasing from 1,071 GW over shallow water (30 meters), to 628 GW over transitional waters (between 30 and 60 meters in depth), and to 2,451 GW over deep water (deeper than 60 meters). However, this wind mapping effort does not currently account for a range of siting restrictions and public concerns. These gross resource values will likely shrink by 60% or more after all environmental and socioeconomic constraints have been taken into account. Further study is also required to determine optimal spacing of turbines based on array effects, which could reduce the density of the potential offshore wind development.

### 2NC---L---AT: Plan is Coop

#### The plan would definitively not be cooperative---this is a yes/no question---their evidence is all normative and says we *should* cooperate but *not one* of their cards actually says we would and *nothing about the plan* would change that. Their Hopkins evidence only says we would hire foreign ships to install the turbines---that’s not the same thing as a cooperative project that their impact evidence is talking about.

**I’ll extend our “no cooperation” evidence from the China advantage here---it’s all from their 1AC Conrad author---he says that even though cooperation would be good it can’t happen because of political tensions---they don’t want us to get ahead. The second and third piece of Conrad evidence say Chinese market structures and concerns about intellectual property theft mean it’s functionally impossible for companies to cooperate.**

#### Here’s the paragraph *right after* their Conrad card---he says companies in both countries say no and recommends something that’s not the plan

Conrad 11 – Research associates with the Global Public Policy Institute [Björn Conrad (PhD candidate @ University of Trier. His research focuses on China’s domestic climate policy. MA in Chinese Studies, Political Science and Economics from the University of Trier and a Master in Public Policy from Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government.) & Mirjam Meissner (MA in Chinese Studies, Political Science and Economics from the Free University), “Catching a Second Wind Changing the Logic of International Cooperation in China’s Wind Energy Sector,” Global Public Policy Institute, GPPi Policy Paper No. 12, February 2011

Seizing the opportunity to change the logic of international cooperation in China’s wind energy sector does not come without risk. Business actors on both sides will be reluctant to enter into comprehensive partnerships fearing that their engagement will follow the familiar unsustainable pattern of cooperation. Foreign companies will be concerned about sharing technological expertise without getting significant market entry in return. At the same time, skepticism about foreign companies’ willingness to share the latest technology and cooperate on an equal footing will result in Chinese companies being reluctant to provide entry points into the domestic market. Newly emerging incentive structures are currently opening a window of opportunity for breaking this vicious cycle, but **change will not occur without** decisive action. Both sides will have to credibly signal **a fundamental change in approach** in order to prepare the ground for new models of cooperation. In addition, governmental actors on both sides will have to play an active role in facilitating this development by providing additional incentives and minimizing possible risks for those companies willing to take the cooperative logic to the next level.

#### Even if joint ventures are successfully set up, they won’t last because of disappointment---their author

Conrad 11 – Research associates with the Global Public Policy Institute [Björn Conrad (PhD candidate @ University of Trier. His research focuses on China’s domestic climate policy. MA in Chinese Studies, Political Science and Economics from the University of Trier and a Master in Public Policy from Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government.) & Mirjam Meissner (MA in Chinese Studies, Political Science and Economics from the Free University), “Catching a Second Wind Changing the Logic of International Cooperation in China’s Wind Energy Sector,” Global Public Policy Institute, GPPi Policy Paper No. 12, February 2011

Technology transfer¶ The approach to international cooperation by Chinese wind power equipment companies has been narrowly focused on the acquisition of advanced technology. Therein, China’s business actors have been as thoroughly disappointed as foreign companies with regards to gaining sustained access to China’s domestic wind power market. Due to the IPR concerns described above, international companies have been avoiding the setup of joint ventures with Chinese partners and the few attempts at joint ventures between Chinese and foreign wind turbine manufacturers have been unsuccessful. Even the original advantages of joint ventures formed under the “Riding the Wind Program” **were not enough to bring about effective partnerships**. The inability to establish a sustained market presence pointed to the ultimately disappointing yield of such partnerships for both sides.¶ In absence of alternatives, licensing agreements became the only viable and legal way for Chinese firms to attain technology from foreign companies. In the earlier stages of their development, Chinese companies such as Sinovel and Goldwind based their success on a combination of licensed foreign technology and an ability to produce at low manufacturing costs. However, foreign companies have been extremely careful not to provide cutting-edge technology to Chinese counterparts, protecting their innovation advantage at all times. Furthermore, China’s capabilities in onshore wind technology are rapidly catching up with those in Europe -- capabilities supported by public investments in technology development and R&D. This trend renders traditional licensing agreements increasingly obsolete as a form of international cooperation in China’s wind sector.¶ China’s disappointment with the quality of transferred technology is one of the central reasons for its lack of enthusiasm in facilitating international cooperation. China’s disdains also reflected in lackluster wind-related efforts under the Kyoto Protocol’s Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). While over 250 CDM wind energy projects have been conducted in China between 2006 and 2010 31 , these projects failed to meet Chinese stakeholders’ expectations regarding the introduction of advanced technologies to the Chinese market. As Gao Guangsheng, director general of climate change at Beijing’s National Development and Reform Commission explained, “CDM was making only a small difference to the attractiveness of wind power in China” 32 . The perceived low transfer rate of high-end technology through the CDM framework added to China’s tendency towards innovative self-reliance. Chinese officials are now expecting to fund 90% of the necessary investment to allow self-achievement of renewable energy targets.

#### Conrad says China’s government needs to change policies---the aff doesn’t cause that

Conrad 11 – Research associates with the Global Public Policy Institute [Björn Conrad (PhD candidate @ University of Trier. His research focuses on China’s domestic climate policy. MA in Chinese Studies, Political Science and Economics from the University of Trier and a Master in Public Policy from Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government.) & Mirjam Meissner (MA in Chinese Studies, Political Science and Economics from the Free University), “Catching a Second Wind Changing the Logic of International Cooperation in China’s Wind Energy Sector,” Global Public Policy Institute, GPPi Policy Paper No. 12, February 2011

China’s political leadership

Paradigm shift: An adjustment of the regulatory framework of domestic competition is an essential prerequisite for the emergence of a new cooperation model. Thus far, the **rules of competition have effectively shut out international actors from large segments of China’s wind market**. But China’s strategy of protecting domestic industry at all costs in order to grow national champions produces diminishing returns. Chinese manufacturers need less protection; they will have to face global competition in the future and can increasingly benefit from advanced technology cooperation with international partners. At the same time, profit-making opportunities in China’s domestic wind market remain the main incentive for international companies to engage in these partnerships. Therefore, China’s leadership will have to make a credible effort to change regulatory practices in order to provide a more level playing field and convince European companies that advanced cooperation with Chinese partners will indeed open improved business opportunities in the Chinese domestic market.

#### By the way, Conrad’s about China and the EU, not the US

Conrad 11 – Research associates with the Global Public Policy Institute [Björn Conrad (PhD candidate @ University of Trier. His research focuses on China’s domestic climate policy. MA in Chinese Studies, Political Science and Economics from the University of Trier and a Master in Public Policy from Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government.) & Mirjam Meissner (MA in Chinese Studies, Political Science and Economics from the Free University), “Catching a Second Wind Changing the Logic of International Cooperation in China’s Wind Energy Sector,” Global Public Policy Institute, GPPi Policy Paper No. 12, February 2011

Based on the analysis of past mistakes as well as present opportunities, this paper outlines ways in which the emergence of a new model of international cooperation in China’s wind power sector can be facilitated by all parties involved. The recommendations specifically address four groups of actors: China’s political leadership, Chinese companies active in the wind sector, the European Union (EU) as a political actor 1 and European companies involved in the development, manufacturing and trade of wind energy equipment. The required change in the logic of international technology cooperation can only be achieved if all of these groups alter their current behavior with regards to three interlinked dimensions:

#### Even if they win we’d cooperate, the plan still increases US market share in wind which means it still links---they have no evidence the plan would help China develop wind at all.

### Enviro Impact

#### Coal to renewables switch key to global ecosystems

Ethan Goffman 11, Associate Editor of the journal Sustainability: Science, Practice, & Policy, May 2011, “China’s Surge in Renewable Energy,” <http://www.csa.com/discoveryguides/renewable/review.pdf>

Global pressure to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is part of the reason for China’s turn to renewables. Officially, China has long denied responsibility, claiming, along with many developing countries, that since it “came late to the industrialization game, the core economies, with their significantly greater historical greenhouse gas contributions, must pay for a global transformation away from fossil fuels” (Economy). Even today, as the largest greenhouse gas emitter, China “adamantly refuses to commit to any binding, international carbon emissions reduction targets” (Ma), arguing that it is in many ways still a poor country, and not historically responsible for the climate crisis. There is some substance to this argument, as each Chinese is responsible for only 1/5 the emissions of the average American (Ma) (the U.S. currently has 313 million people while China has over 1.3 billion, according to the CIA World Fact Book). Yet China is now the world’s largest emitter of greenhouse gases, and future projections are that the situation will only get worse. Despite clean energy efforts, China is expected to “nearly double its coal-fired power capacity from 350 gigawatts (GW) in 2006 to 950 GW in 2030 and . . . will account for 74 percent of the total increase in the world's coal-related carbon dioxide emissions during that period” (Ma). Clearly, such an increase would put tremendous stress on the world’s ecosystems.

Ecosystem destruction causes extinction---this card toasts all their defense

Johan Rockström et al 9 is a Environmental Professor in natural resource management at Stockholm University, and the Executive Director of the Stockholm Environment Institute and the Stockholm Resilience Centre, along with 27 other members of the SEI and SRC, A safe operating space for humanity, Nature 461, 472-475 (24 September 2009), www.nature.com/nature/journal/v461/n7263/full/461472a.html

Crossing certain biophysical thresholds could have disastrous consequences for humanity

Three of nine interlinked planetary boundaries have already been overstepped

Although Earth has undergone many periods of significant environmental change, the planet's environment has been unusually stable for the past 10,000 years 1, 2, 3. This period of stability — known to geologists as the Holocene — has seen human civilizations arise, develop and thrive. Such stability may now be under threat. Since the Industrial Revolution, a new era has arisen, the Anthropocene4, in which human actions have become the main driver of global environmental change5. This could see human activities push the Earth system outside the stable environmental state of the Holocene, with consequences that are detrimental or even catastrophic for large parts of the world.

During the Holocene, environmental change occurred naturally and Earth's regulatory capacity maintained the conditions that enabled human development. Regular temperatures, freshwater availability and biogeochemical flows all stayed within a relatively narrow range. Now, largely because of a rapidly growing reliance on fossil fuels and industrialized forms of agriculture, human activities have reached a level that could damage the systems that keep Earth in the desirable Holocene state. The result could be irreversible and, in some cases, abrupt environmental change, leading to a state less conducive to human development6. Without pressure from humans, the Holocene is expected to continue for at least several thousands of years7.

To meet the challenge of maintaining the Holocene state, we propose a framework based on 'planetary boundaries'. These boundaries define the safe operating space for humanity with respect to the Earth system and are associated with the planet's biophysical subsystems or processes. Although Earth's complex systems sometimes respond smoothly to changing pressures, it seems that this will prove to be the exception rather than the rule**.** Many subsystems of Earth react in a nonlinear, often abrupt, way, and are particularly sensitive around threshold levels of certain key variables. If these thresholds are crossed, then important subsystems, such as a monsoon system, could shift into a new state, often with deleterious or potentially even disastrous consequences for humans8, 9.

Most of these thresholds can be defined by a critical value for one or more control variables, such as carbon dioxide concentration. Not all processes or subsystems on Earth have well-defined thresholds, although human actions that undermine the resilience of such processes or subsystems — for example, land and water degradation — can increase the risk that thresholds will also be crossed in other processes, such as the climate system.

We have tried to identify the Earth-system processes and associated thresholds which, if crossed, could generate unacceptable environmental change. We have found nine such processes for which we believe it is necessary to define planetary boundaries: climate change; rate of biodiversity loss (terrestrial and marine); interference with the nitrogen and phosphorus cycles; stratospheric ozone depletion; ocean acidification; global freshwater use; change in land use; chemical pollution; and atmospheric aerosol loading (see Fig. 1 andTable).

The inner green shading represents the proposed safe operating space for nine planetary systems. The red wedges represent an estimate of the current position for each variable. The boundaries in three systems (rate of biodiversity loss, climate change and human interference with the nitrogen cycle), have already been exceeded.

In general, planetary boundaries are values for control variables that are either at a 'safe' distance from thresholds — for processes with evidence of threshold behaviour — or at dangerous levels — for processes without evidence of thresholds. Determining a safe distance involves normative judgements of how societies choose to deal with risk and uncertainty. We have taken a conservative, risk-averse approach to quantifying our planetary boundaries, taking into account the large uncertainties that surround the true position of many thresholds. (A detailed description of the boundaries — and the analyses behind them — is given in ref. 10.)

Humanity may soon be approaching the boundaries for global freshwater use, change in land use, ocean acidification and interference with the global phosphorous cycle (see Fig. 1). Our analysis suggests that three of the Earth-system processes — climate change, rate of biodiversity loss and interference with the nitrogen cycle — have already transgressed their boundaries. For the latter two of these, the control variables are the rate of species loss and the rate at which N2 is removed from the atmosphere and converted to reactive nitrogen for human use, respectively. These are rates of change that cannot continue without significantly eroding the resilience of major components of Earth-system functioning**.** Here we describe these three processes.

## Oceans Advantage

### AT: Kunich 5

#### Their author says ocean biodiversity collapse is inevitable

Kunich 5 – Professor of Law @ Roger Williams University School of Law [John Charles Kunich, “ARTICLE: Losing Nemo: The Mass Extinction Now Threatening the World's Ocean Hotspots,” Columbia Journal of Environmental Law, 2005, 30 Colum. J. Envtl. L. 1

A mass extinction now threatens much of life on Earth. We are currently in the midst of at least the sixth mass extinction in this [\*2] planet's history-catastrophic death spasms in which vast numbers of species and higher taxa swiftly disappear. n1 In this Article, I will examine the appalling extent to which **the Sixth Extinction has reached into the world's oceans,** and I will demonstrate that stacks of international and domestic laws have done nothing more to prevent this devastation than to act as a dangerous placebo. My conclusion will provide an antidote to this syndrome of law as the new opiate of the masses.

#### And he says that habitat destruction *unrelated to the aff* is the cause

-this article is written in 2005, far before the “idle iron” policy was ever invented

Kunich 5 – Professor of Law @ Roger Williams University School of Law [John Charles Kunich, “ARTICLE: Losing Nemo: The Mass Extinction Now Threatening the World's Ocean Hotspots,” Columbia Journal of Environmental Law, 2005, 30 Colum. J. Envtl. L. 1

There is evidence that human activities adversely affect the sea in a variety of ways, some more readily apparent than others. Ocean dumping, introduction of invasive species, development of coastal areas and the attendant discharge of materials into the waters, sedimentation and eutrophication from agriculture and silviculture, and over-harvesting in a particular area may well have severe impacts on life in that immediate region and often beyond. n61 Within a given marine locality, in terms of depth, proximity to major currents, ambient temperature, and the like, living things are interdependent in much the same way as are the denizens of any terrestrial ecosystem. When there is a major perturbation of that ecosystem, whether by chemical pollution (organic or inorganic), noise pollution, underwater detonation of explosives, over-harvesting, n62 introduction of exotic species, trawling, dredging, sedimentation from run-off, climate change, or any other stressor, a significant decimation of one species will affect other species with a nexus to it in the food web and in the broader array of ecological relationships. n63 In the marine realm, the term "ripple effect" thus has special relevance.

### 1NC---Ocean Defense

#### *Oceans resilient*

Kennedy 2 - Environmental science prof, Maryland. Former Director, Cooperative Oxford Laboratory. PhD. (Victor, Coastal and Marine Ecosystems and Global Climate Change, http://www.pewclimate.org/projects/marine.cfm)

There is evidence that marine organisms and ecosystems are resilient to environmental change. Steele (1991) hypothesized that the biological components of marine systems are tightly coupled to physical factors, allowing them to respond quickly to rapid environmental change and thus rendering them ecologically adaptable. Some species also have wide genetic variability throughout their range, which may allow for adaptation to climate change.

#### Marine life resilient

Dulvy 3 – Professor of Marine Science and Technology, Newcastle (Nicholas, Extinction vulnerability in marine populations, Fish and Fisheries 4.1)

Marine fish populations are more variable and resilient than terrestrial populations Great natural variability in population size is sometimes invoked to argue that IUCN Red List criteria, as one example, are too conservative for marine fishes (Hudson and Mace1996; Matsuda et al.1997; Musick 1999; Powles et al. 2000; Hutchings 2001a). For the (1996) IUCN list, a decline of 20% within 10 years or three generations (whichever is longer) triggered a classification of 'vulnerable', while declines of 50 and 80% led to classifications of 'endangered' and 'critically endangered', respectively. These criteria were designed to be applied to all animal and plant taxa, but many marine resource biologists feel that for marine fishes 'one size does not fit all' (see Hutchings 2001a). They argue that percent decline criteria are too conservative compared to the high natural variability of fish populations. Powles et al. (2000) cite the six-fold variation of the Pacific sardine population (Sardinopssagax, Clupeidae) and a nine-fold variation in northern anchovy (Engraulis mordax, Clupeidae) over the past two millennia to suggest that rapid declines and increases of up to 10-fold are relatively common inexploitedfish stocks. It should, however, be borne in mind that the variation of exploited populations must be higher than unexploited populations because recruitment fluctuations increasingly drive population fluctuations when there are few adults (Pauly et al. 2002).

#### No impact to biodiversity - our Sagoff evidence says that 99.9% of species could be eliminated and it would not affect overall ecosystems at all because of mass redundancy in the system – we control uniqueness because the number of species is increasing now.

#### No impact to species or ecosystem loss---it doesn’t destroy the overall environment or cause a domino effect---claims of low resiliency are stupid

Ben Ridder 8, Phd School of Geography and Environmental Studies, University of Tasmania, “Questioning the ecosystem services argument for biodiversity conservation” Biodiversity and conservation yr:2008 vol:17 iss:4 pg:781

#### \*ES = environmental services

The low resilience assumption

Advocates of the conservation of biodiversity tend not to acknowledge the distinction between resilient and sensitive ES. This ‘low resilience assumption’ gives rise to, and is reinforced by the almost ubiquitous claim within the conservation literature that ES depend on biodiversity.

An extreme example of this claim is made by the Ehrlichs in Extinction. They state that “all [ecosystem services] will be threatened if the rate of extinctions continues to increase” then observe that attempts to artificially replicate natural processes “are no more than partially successful in most cases. Nature nearly always does it better. When society sacrifices natural services for some other gain… it must pay the costs of substitution” (Ehrlich and Ehrlich 1982, pp. 95–96). This assertion—that the only alternative to protecting every species is a world in which all ES have been substituted by artificial alternatives—is an extreme example of the ‘low resilience assumption’. Paul Ehrlich revisits this flawed logic in 1997 i nhis response (with four co-authors) to doubts expressed by Mark Sagoff regarding economic arguments for species conservation (Ehrlich et al. 1997, p. 101).

The claim that ES depend on biodiversity is also notably present in the controversial Issues in Ecology paper on biodiversity and ecosystem functioning (Naeem et al. 1999) that sparked the debate mentioned in the introduction. This appears to reflect a general tendency among authors in this field (e.g., Hector et al. 2001; Lawler et al. 2002; Lyons et al. 2005). Although such authors may not actually articulate the low resilience assumption, presenting such claims in the absence of any clarification indicates its influence.

That the low resilience assumption is largely false is apparent in the number of examples of species extinctions that have not brought about catastrophic ecosystem collapse and decline in ES, and in the generally limited ecosystem influence of species on the cusp of extinction. These issues have been raised by numerous authors, although given the absence of systematic attempts to verify propositions of this sort, the evidence assembled is usually anecdotal and we are forced to trust that an unbiased account of the situation has been presented. Fortunately a number of highly respected people have discussed this topic, not least being the prominent conservation biologist David Ehrenfeld. In 1978 he described the ‘conservation dilemma’, which “arises on the increasingly frequent occasions when we encounter a threatened part of Nature but can find no rational reason for keeping it” (Ehrenfeld 1981, p. 177). He continued with the following observation:

Have there been permanent and significant ‘resource’ effects of the extinction, in the wild, of John Bartram’s great discovery, the beautiful tree Franklinia alatamaha, which had almost vanished from the earth when Bartram first set eyes upon it? Or a thousand species of tiny beetles that we never knew existed before or after their probable extermination? Can we even be certain than the eastern forests of the United States suffer the loss of their passenger pigeons and chestnuts in some tangible way that affects their vitality or permanence, their value to us? (p. 192)

Later, at the first conference on biodiversity, Ehrenfeld (1988) reflected that most species “do not seem to have any conventional value at all” and that the rarest species are “the ones least likely to be missed… by no stretch of the imagination can we make them out to be vital cogs in the ecological machine” (p. 215). The appearance of comments within the environmental literature that are consistent with Ehrenfeld’s—and from authors whose academic standing is also worthy of respect—is uncommon but not unheard of (e.g., Tudge 1989; Ghilarov 1996; Sagoff 1997; Slobodkin 2001; Western 2001).

The low resilience assumption is also undermined by the overwhelming tendency for the protection of specific endangered species to be justified by moral or aesthetic arguments, or a basic appeal to the necessity of conserving biodiversity, rather than by emphasising the actual ES these species provide or might be able to provide humanity. Often the only services that can be promoted in this regard relate to the ‘scientific’ or ‘cultural’ value of conserving a particular species, and the tourism revenue that might be associated with its continued existence. The preservation of such services is of an entirely different order compared with the collapse of human civilization predicted by the more pessimistic environmental authors**.**

The popularity of the low resilience assumption is in part explained by the increased rhetorical force of arguments that highlight connections between the conservation of biodiversity, human survival and economic profit. However, it needs to be acknowledged by those who employ this approach that a number of negative implications are associated with any use of economic arguments to justify the conservation of biodiversity.

#### Err negative - there's an artificial bias towards alarmist biodiversity impacts

Kaleita 7 Amy Kaleita is an Environmental Studies Fellow and Assistant Professor of agricultural and biosystems engineering at Iowa State University. She holds a PhD in agricultural engineering from the University of Illinois. "Hysteria's History: Environmental Alarmism in Context," Pacific Research Institute, http://www.pacificresearch.org/docLib/20070920\_Hysteria\_History.pdf

But the hysteria lives on. Al Gore claims, “More species of animals and plants are now vanishing than at any time in the past 65 million years.” 11 The American Museum of Natural History asserts, “Scientists rate biodiversity loss as a more serious environmental problem than the depletion of the ozone layer, global warming, or pollution and contamination… This mass extinction is the fastest in earth’s 4.5-billion-year history and, unlike prior extinctions, is mainly the result of human activity and not of natural phenomena.”

12 The lack of any reliable metric for assessing biodiversity hampers attempts to understand its true state nationally and globally. 13 As a result, the most alarmist projections are made without any supporting evidence, and not surprisingly these receive the most media attention.

### 1NC---AT: Southeast Asia Scenario

#### *Their internal link evidence is a joke---it’s from “RTSea blog”---not qualified to discuss geopolitics*

#### *And they isolate multiple alt causes*

RT Sea 12 [“The Coral Triangle: scientists warn of social & economic implications,” Tuesday, July 10, 2012, pg. http://tinyurl.com/9lnekkq

Overfishing, pollution, coastal development, climate change and ocean acidification are endangering the coral reefs of Southeast Asia and Western Pacific, which could lead to conflicts, food insecurity, and political instability in the region.

Jamaluddin Jompa, director of the Coral Reef Research at the Hasanuddin University in Indonesia, said: “All the pressures are going up and up...We need to do something to bring these down.”

#### *This scenario makes no sense---the way they solve is by developing US domestic resources so we don’t have to import from Southeast Asia, but the reason the reef is key to Indonesian stability is because those exports are key to their economy.*

#### *Their Dibb evidence is about the separatist breakup of Indonesia, not just generic instability---they don’t have an internal link*

#### ***And the risk of Indonesian state breakup has already been solved***

Kurlantzick 11 Josh is currently a Fellow for Southeast Asia at the Council on Foreign Relations. “Middle East revolutions only aspire to Indonesia's success,” Feb 20, <http://www.thenational.ae/thenationalconversation/comment/middle-east-revolutions-only-aspire-to-indonesias-success>

On the surface, looking to Indonesia makes sense. No developing nation over the past decade has enjoyed such a dramatic turnaround, from a nearly failed state to a vibrant and stable democracy. In the late 1990s, after the fall of the longtime dictator Suharto, Indonesia appeared on the verge of collapse. Newly empowered Islamist organisations seized on the post-Suharto chaos to build networks and launch major terrorist attacks in Jakarta and Bali. Like Yemen, Indonesia had many outlying regions that sought to secede, and in the early days of democracy some almost did. East Timor gained independence in 1999 after bloody fighting. Some Indonesian observers predicted the country was turning into an Asian version of ungovernable Nigeria. It appeared that Suharto's contention that only he could hold the nation together - a boast similar to Hosni Mubarak's - might prove true. About a decade later, look again. **The Indonesian government has resolved nearly every secessionist issue and stability has allowed for renewed growth**. The country's economy grew by more than 6 per cent last year and likely will grow faster in 2011. Indonesia's Islamists have been blunted and secular parties dominate the legislature. The country has held multiple free and fair elections, and remained a close partner of western democracies even after the end of its strongman rule.

#### Indonesia is resilient—small disruptions self-correct

Asmoro 9 [Andry Asmoro, economist at Bahana Securities and writer @ Jakarta Post “Political Stability and Economic Resilience Go Hand in Hand,” July 29 http://www.embassyofindonesia.org/news/2009/07/news134.htm]

The satisfaction rate with the 2009 presidential election is high. Based on the Indonesia Survey Institute's (LSI) latest exit-poll survey, 33 percent of respondents stated the presidential election was very honest and fair. Another 59 percent of those surveyed conceded the election was indeed honest and reasonably fair. Thus, at least 92 percent of total respondents agreed incumbent President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY) won the presidential election fair and square, compared to a 67 percent satisfaction rate with the April legislative elections. An overwhelming satisfaction rate is imperative to give legitimacy to the ruling government for the next five years. At least 90 percent of the respondents who voted for the Megawati-Prabowo pair stated the presidential election was honest and fair slightly more than the 89 percent of Kalla-Wiranto voters who expressed a similar view, but lower than the 95 percent of SBY-Boediono voters who found the election fair. In our view, these results show the threat of political instability going forward is minimal. As politics and economics go hand in hand, we believe the current stable political climate witnessed during this presidential election will support and strengthen Indonesia's future economic growth. This is particularly important given the recent political instability in places such as Thailand and Iran. The double bombings at the JW Marriott and Ritz-Carlton hotels have served as a reminder of the importance of political stability to a country's prospects for prosperity. It is thus misguided to say Indonesia will emerge entirely unscathed from the recent bombings, as the tourism and hotel industry will be hard hit. Fortunately, our tourism industry, which consists mainly of the hotel and restaurant sector, only contributed to 3.1 percent of Indonesia's real GDP in the first quarter of 2009. At the macroeconomic level, domestic consumption, which accounts for some 60 percent of Indonesia's total GDP, remains the backbone of the country's economic growth. We expect year-end private spending growth will reach 5.27 percent as it will be supported by low inflation, a higher absorption of the fiscal stimulus into infrastructure projects, the upcoming fasting month and Lebaran or Idul Fitri. We expect the year-on-year inflation rate to reach just 3.9 percent by year end 2009, before rising to 5.5 percent in 2010. Our estimate for the year-end economic growth remains at 4.1 percent, higher than the 3.4 percent we earlier estimated. We also expect investment will grow 3.7 percent year-on-year, higher than our initial 1.6 percent estimate.

### AT: Islands

#### *Cooperation and lack of motivation prevents conflict*

Pradt ’12 – PhD candidate at the Freie Universität of Berlin (Tilman, “ASIA'S NEW GREAT GAME? THE GEOPOLITICS OF THE SOUTH CHINA SEA,” Political Reflection, Vol. 3, No. 1)

Hence, are we attending the beginning of a new round of The Great Game in Asia, this time in the location of the SCS? As this text briefly surveyed, there are various interests at stake and several big and great powers involved, arguably too many for such a small area (especially, when concentrating on the bottleneck of the SCS, the Strait of Malac-ca). But by analyzing the motivations behind the big players’ engagement (i.e., the United States, China, and India) there is reason to believe that a potentially tragic zero-sum Great Game is still avoidable.¶ First, the US has not a real interest in permanently (and substantially) upgrading its military presence in the region. Given the still severing US budget situation and the persistent security situation in the Middle East and Central Asia, policy-makers in Washington are trying to reduce its forces de-ployed to foreign areas not to enlarge them by opening up a new theatre. Plus, the US is mainly interested in the security of the sea lanes and its guaranteed free passage, therefore President Obama’s push on the littoral states to solve their SCS disputes. The US is not interested in confront-ing China directly but to put pressure on Beijing to be more conciliatory in case of the SCS dis-putes. The deployment of US Marines to Darwin is merely presenting the stick not using it (imagine Beijing’s reactions to the US establishing a mili-tary base in Vietnam).¶ Beijing, on the other hand, will now take pains to somehow ease the situation in the SCS and to regain trust among its neighbours of the ASEAN. China has to accept that the US will now sit at the table of future rounds of territorial discussions and China no longer can use its relative power in bilateral negotiations with small ASEAN states. This is probably hard to swallow for Chinese policy-makers given their repeatedly stated premise that the SCS disputes shall be solely discussed among the regional states con-cerned. But in this changed situation, the contin-ued refusal to accept multilateral discussions will provoke further military build-up and confronta-tion in the SCS.¶ Finally, India got only involved because of perceived Chinese assertiveness in the Indian Ocean. India’s military build-up and assumed ambitions towards the SCS is a response to Chi-na’s actions in what India perceives as its territori-al waters. A reciprocal withdrawal will avoid fu-ture naval confrontations among the two Asian heavyweights.

#### Zero chance of war in the SCS

Gupta 11 [Rukmani Gupta, Associate Fellow at the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, “South China Sea Conflict? No Way,” <http://the-diplomat.com/2011/10/23/south-china-sea-conflict-no-way/2/>]

Despite what opinion pieces in the Global Times may say, there’s reason to suspect that China doesn’t want to escalate conflict in the region. Although commentary from the United States has suggested that China considers the South China Sea a ‘core interest,’ no official Chinese writing can be found to corroborate this. In addition, China’s caution can also be seen as a reflection on Chinese military capabilities, which aren’t seen as strong enough to win a war over the South China Sea. In fact, the China National Defence News, published by the Chinese People’s Liberation Army’s General Political Department, has likened the use of force by China in the South China Sea to shooting one’s own foot. Not only would the use of force bring ASEAN together on the issue, it could conceivably involve the United States and Japan, derail China’s plans for continued economic growth and undo China’s diplomacy. Chinese declarations on the South China Sea can therefore be seen as attempts to exaggerate claims so as to secure a better negotiating stance.

#### High tensions just mean higher chance for cooperation

Gupta 11 [Rukmani Gupta, Associate Fellow at the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, “South China Sea Conflict? No Way,” <http://the-diplomat.com/2011/10/23/south-china-sea-conflict-no-way/2/>]

These suggestions to recalibrate Indian policy towards the South China Sea and its relationship with Vietnam are premature at best. Despite the rhetoric, conflict in the South China Sea may well not be inevitable. If the history of dialogue between the parties is any indication, then current tensions are likely to result in forward movement. In the aftermath of statements by the United States, and skirmishes over fishing vessels, ASEAN and China agreed upon the Guidelines on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea at the Bali Summit in July 2010. And recent tensions may well prod the parties towards a more binding code of conduct. This isn’t to suggest that territorial claims and sovereignty issues will be resolved, but certainly they can become more manageable to prevent military conflict.¶ There’s a common interest in making the disputes more manageable, essentially because, nationalistic rhetoric notwithstanding, the parties to the dispute recognize that there are real material benefits at stake. A disruption of maritime trade through the South China Sea would entail economic losses – and not only for the littoral states. No party to the dispute, including China, has thus far challenged the principle of freedom of navigation for global trade through the South China Sea. The states of the region are signatories to the UNCLOS, which provides that ‘Coastal States have sovereign rights in a 200-nautical mile exclusive economic zone (EEZ) with respect to natural resources and certain economic activities, and exercise jurisdiction over marine science research and environmental protection’ but that ‘All other States have freedom of navigation and over flight in the EEZ, as well as freedom to lay submarine cables and pipelines.’ The prospect of threats to SLOCS thus seems somewhat exaggerated.

## China Adv

### Already Extended Majority of Answers About Coop

### Friedman

#### *No impact to U.S.-China cooperation---it’s impossible to sustain*

Aaron L. Friedberg 12, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, September/October 2012, “Bucking Beijing,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 91, No. 5, p. 48-58

Recent events have raised serious doubts about both elements of this strategy. Decades of trade and talk have not hastened China's political liberalization. Indeed, the last few years have been marked by an intensified crackdown on domestic dissent. At the same time, the much-touted economic relationship between the two Pacific powers has become a major source of friction. And despite hopes for enhanced cooperation, Beijing has actually done very little to help Washington solve pressing international problems, such as North Korea's acquisition of nuclear weapons or Iran's attempts to develop them. Finally, far from accepting the status quo, China's leaders have become more forceful in attempting to control the waters and resources off their country's coasts. As for balancing, the continued buildup of China's military capabilities, coupled with impending cuts in U.S. defense spending, suggests that the regional distribution of power is set to shift sharply in Beijing's favor.

WHY WE CAN'T ALL JUST GET ALONG

TODAY, CHINA'S ruling elites are both arrogant and insecure. In their view, continued rule by the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) is essential to China's stability, prosperity, and prestige; it is also, not coincidentally, vital to their own safety and comfort. Although they have largely accepted some form of capitalism in the economic sphere, they remain committed to preserving their hold on political power.

The CCP'S determination to maintain control informs the regime's threat perceptions, goals, and policies. Anxious about their legitimacy, China's rulers are eager to portray themselves as defenders of the national honor. Although they believe China is on track to become a world power on par with the United States, they remain deeply fearful of encirclement and ideological subversion. And despite Washington's attempts to reassure them of its benign intentions, Chinese leaders are convinced that the United States aims to block China's rise and, ultimately, undermine its one-party system of government.¶ Like the United States, since the end of the Cold War, China has pursued an essentially constant approach toward its greatest external challenger. For the most part, Beijing has sought to avoid outright confrontation with the United States while pursuing economic growth and building up all the elements of its "comprehensive national power," a Chinese strategic concept that encompasses military strength, technological prowess, and diplomatic influence. Even as they remain on the defensive, however, Chinese officials have not been content to remain passive. They have sought incremental advances, slowly expanding China's sphere of influence and strengthening its position in Asia while working quietly to erode that of the United States. Although they are careful never to say so directly, they seek to have China displace the United States in the long run and to restore China to what they regard as its rightful place as the preponderant regional power. Chinese strategists do not believe that they can achieve this objective quickly or through a frontal assault. Instead, they seek to reassure their neighbors, relying on the attractive force of China's massive economy to counter nascent balancing efforts against it. Following the advice of the ancient military strategist Sun-tzu, Beijing aims to "win without fighting," gradually creating a situation in which overt resistance to its wishes will appear futile.

The failure to date to achieve a genuine entente between the United States and China is the result not of a lack of effort but of a fundamental divergence of interests. Although limited cooperation on specific issues might be possible, the ideological gap between the two nations is simply too great, and the level of trust between them too low, to permit a stable modus vivendi. What China's current leaders ultimately want -- regional hegemony -- is not something their counterparts in Washington are willing to give. That would run counter to an axiomatic goal of U.S. grand strategy, which has remained constant for decades: to prevent the domination of either end of the Eurasian landmass by one or more potentially hostile powers.

The reasons for this goal involve a mix of strategic, economic, and ideological considerations that will continue to be valid into the foreseeable future.

### 1NC---Clean Tech Coop =/= Solve War

#### Clean tech cooperation can’t solve war---mutual military distrust

Sandalow and Lieberthal 9 David Sandalow is an Energy and Environment Scholar and a senior fellow at Brookings. Kenneth Lieberthal is a Professor of Political Science at the University of Michigan. “Overcoming Obstacles to U.S.-China Cooperation on Climate Change,” Jan, Brookings Institute, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2009/1/climate%20change%20lieberthal%20sandalow/01\_climate\_change\_lieberthal\_sandalow

To be sure, there are **numerous points of friction** between the United States and China, and that is hardly surprising in view of America’s global position and China’s rapid rise. Perhaps because the two countries’ economies are now tightly interdependent, there are various concerns on each side regarding pertinent policies and actual practices on the ground. As China’s military grows rapidly and the U.S. military continues to invest heavily to improve its capabilities, **inevitably those focused on future security issues in both countries harbor doubts about the intentions of the other.** In these and other spheres, **greater familiarity** has produced better capacities to manage the immediate relationship but **has not decreased concerns about longer-term intentions** and potential consequences.¶ In fact, U.S.-China relations currently face a paradox: even as the relationship has become relatively mature and effective across a broad spectrum of issues, underlying distrust of the long-term intentions of each toward the other has nevertheless actually increased. Many Chinese believe that the United States is too zero-sum in its view of the world to accept China’s rise as a beneficent development. They assume that the United States will at some point take serious steps to constrain that rise and preserve America’s leadership position globally, and they tend to interpret American blandishments on everything from currency values to reducing carbon emissions **as part of this underlying American objective to hold China back** and disrupt its progress. Many Americans assume that a strong, wealthy China will naturally seek to marginalize the United States in Asia. But since Asia is the most important and dynamic region of the world, having China marginalize America in that region would strike directly at America’s most vital long-term national interests.

### 1NC---No Climate Deal

#### Domestic issues block successful climate cooperation

Hale 11—PhD Candidate in the Department of Politics at Princeton University and a Visiting Fellow at LSE Global Governance, London School of Economics (Thomas, © 2011 Center for Strategic and International Studies, The Washington Quarterly, 34:1 pp. 89-101, “A Climate Coalition of the Willing,” http://www.twq.com/11winter/docs/11winter\_Hale.pdf)

Intergovernmental efforts to limit the gases that cause climate change have all but failed. After the unsuccessful 2010 Copenhagen summit, and with little progress at the 2010 Cancun meeting, it is hard to see how major emitters will agree any time soon on mutual emissions reductions that are **sufficiently ambitious** to prevent a substantial (greater than two degree Celsius) increase in average global temperatures. It is not hard to see why. No deal excluding the United States and China, which together emit more than 40 percent of the world’s greenhouse gases (GHGs), is worth the paper it is written on. But **domestic politics in both countries effectively block ‘‘G-2’’ leadership on climate**. In the United States, the Obama administration has basically given up on national cap-and-trade legislation. Even the relatively modest Kerry-Lieberman-Graham energy bill remains dead in the Senate. The Chinese government, in turn, faces an even harsher constraint. Although the nation has adopted important energy efficiency goals, the Chinese Communist Party has staked its legitimacy and political survival on raising the living standard of average Chinese. **Accepting international commitments that stand even a small chance of reducing the country’s GDP** growth rate below a crucial threshold **poses an unacceptable risk to the stability of the regime**. Although the G-2 present the largest and most obvious barrier to a global treaty, **they also provide a convenient excuse for other governments to avoid aggressive action**. Therefore, the international community should not expect to negotiate a worthwhile successor to the Kyoto Protocol, at least not in the near future.

### 2NC---No Climate Deal

#### Partisan fights destroy the signal of US commitment to a climate deal---makes agreement impossible

ICTSD 10 (International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development, “Republican Victory Dims Prospects for Climate Action at Federal Level in US,” 2010, 11-11, <http://ictsd.org/i/news/bridgesweekly/95340/>)

The Democratic Party’s big losses in last week’s congressional vote in the US have all but snuffed out prospects for meaningful nation-wide legislation to curb greenhouse gas emissions over the next two years. Most Republicans have fiercely opposed past climate change initiatives by Congressional Democrats and President Barack Obama’s administration. With the balance of power in the House of Representatives shifting decisively to the Republicans as of January, legislation would need considerable support from both parties to pass. The election comes as countries gear up for a UN climate summit in Cancun, Mexico at the end of the month. But with most countries insisting that a **clear commitment from the US government** about tackling greenhouse gas emissions is crucial to reaching a global climate pact, **hopes for such a deal have been scuppered** for now.

#### Mutual distrust means neither side will cut emission---destroys cooperation

Foot 9 (Rosemary, Professor of International Relations at Oxford, 11/24/09 “China and the United States: Between Cold and Warm Peace” Survival, 51:6, pg 123-14)

At the same time, the United States and China are in many respects at the heart of the problem: they are the world’s two largest energy consumers and the two largest producers of greenhouse gases, together accounting for over 40% of all global emissions.14 According to one 2009 report, whereas the United States has been responsible for approximately 29% of energy-related carbon-dioxide (CO2) emissions since 1850 (and China for only 8% over the same period), some estimates show China’s annual emissions in 2007 to have been 14% higher than those of America, and growing four to six times as fast.15 Whereas China’s per capita emissions are only a quarter of America’s, they are nevertheless above the world average.16 The American and Chinese positions have also been significantly (and for the most part negatively) influenced over the past two decades by the stances the other has taken in climate-change negotiations. **Each side has been reluctant to play a substantive if differentiated role in strengthening its commitment to reducing CO2 emissions unless the other also accepts that it too must play its pa**rt. Particularly during the George W. Bush administration, but also under previous administrations, the arguments that tended to dominate in the United States with regard to Beijing were three-fold.17 Firstly, there was the matter of effectiveness: some in the United States argued that without China’s agreement to reduce its own absolute level of emissions any efforts that the United States made would be rendered meaningless. Secondly, others asserted that any US effort to control emissions would lead manufacturers to move operations to states like China where controls were fewer, with a consequent negative impact on US employment rates.18 Thirdly, there were those who stated that unilateral efforts on America’s part would reduce its negotiating leverage with China. **China’s reluctance to participate more actively has also partially been built on suspicions of US motives and the potentially negative outcomes associated with American policy stances**. Firstly, China has long refused to move beyond some voluntary national constraints on the grounds of equity, since the industrialised world and especially the United States have been the chief culprits in creating the problem of global warming. To give up this argument would not only mean acceptance of this lack of fairness, but also serve to reduce the pressure on the United States to adopt mandatory emissions targets. Moreover, Beijing argues that, for it to become at least a middle-income country by 2030, its aim since the reform era, it has to be allowed to continue to grow and thus to emit. **Chinese also often voice suspicions that the US government’s real aim in calling for China’s participation in post-Kyoto emissions targets is to increase its economic costs and thus constrain its rise**. Finally, Beijing has sometimes suspected that any US attempt to deal with China on climate-change issues on a bilateral basis, outside the Kyoto framework, is part of an attempt to break down solidarity within the developing world, solidarity from which China has benefited and which has been important in keeping attention directed away from China and on to the United States, particularly after the George W. Bush administration withdrew from the Kyoto process.

#### Specifically, China’s derailing climate deals now

Fiona Harvey 12, environment correspondent, Guardian, “Republican presidential win would lose US ground to China – UN climate chief”, 3/9http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/mar/09/republican-climate-change-us-president-china?newsfeed=true

Figueres faces a difficult year, as at last year's UN climate conference in Durban, countries pledged to produce a new draft treaty on climate change by 2015, to come into force by 2020. But in order to do so, governments must agree to substantially reduce emissions from 2020, and the gulfs between countries loom large.¶ This week, China submitted its draft proposals to the UN, which indicated that **developed, not developing, countries** **should carry the burden of cutting emissions.** That was regarded by some developed countries as a backward step.¶ There are also **doubts among some prominent players** as to whether the process agreed in Durban can succeed. But Figueres insisted that the process was "on track", with a meeting scheduled for May at which countries would agree a "workplan" and timetable for the rest of the negotiations. She said countries were already meeting in many informal groups that would push the negotiations forward.

#### US domestic politics will block any deal

Hale, 11 - PhD Candidate in the Department of Politics at Princeton University and a Visiting Fellow at LSE Global Governance, London School of Economics (Thomas, “A Climate Coalition of the Willing,” Washington Quarterly, Winter,<http://www.twq.com/11winter/docs/11winter_Hale.pdf>

One might think that, with the Democrats in control of both Congress and the White House for the last two years, political conditions in the United States have been optimal for climate legislation. **But that is wishful thinking**, for two reasons. First, climate is not just a partisan issue. Although Republicans are almost unanimous in their opposition to firm caps on carbon reductions, Democrats face dissent within their ranks from members representing conservative, energyintensive, or agricultural states. This imbalance is rooted in the Constitution of the United States. Although Senate action is required to ratify any international treaty, Senate votes are awarded equally to the 50 states, not weighted by population, meaning that less populated, carbon-dependent rural interests tend to disproportionately dominate. 2 And even in the House, climate legislation passed by only seven votes, with 43 Democrats joining the Republican opposition.¶ Second, on top of this structural bias, the U.S. political system has recently showed little capacity for far-reaching change. A culture of partisan obstructionism has brought public business to a standstill. Because the Obama administration needs to spend vast amounts of political capital to get anything through Congress, it has prioritized health care and job creation over climate change. The locus of this dysfunction is, again, the Senate, where a de facto super-majoritarian rule and a 59 —41 partisan divide have made it impossible to pass ambitious legislation. With Republicans taking control of the House, climate legislation is unlikely to surface for at least two years.

### 1NC---AT: Arctic War

#### *No conflict – arctic cooperation is increasing*

Fries 12 [Tom Fries, Nonresident Senior Fellow at the Arctic Institute, Apr 18 2012, “Perspective Correction: How We Misinterpret Arctic Conflict,” http://www.thearcticinstitute.org/2012/04/perspective-correction-how-we.html]

War and conflict sell papers -- the prospect of war, current wars, remembrance of wars past. Accordingly, a growing cottage industry devotes itself to writing about the prospect of conflict among the Arctic nations and between those nations and non-Arctic states, which is mostly code for “China.” As a follower of Arctic news, I see this every day, all the time: eight articles last week, five more already this week from the Moscow Times, Scientific American or what-have-you. Sometimes this future conflict is portrayed as a political battle, sometimes military, but the portrayals of the states involved are cartoonish, Cold-War-ish...it’s all good guys and bad guys.

I’m convinced that this is nonsense, and I feel vindicated when I see the extent to which these countries' militaries collaborate in the high North. From last week's meeting of all eight Arctic nations' military top brass (excepting only the US; we were represented by General Charles Jacoby, head of NORAD and USNORTHCOM) to Russia-Norway collaboration on search & rescue; from US-Canada joint military exercises to US-Russia shared research in the Barents...no matter where you look, the arc of this relationship bends towards cooperation.

#### Past trends prove – cooperation is more likely

Fries 12 [Tom Fries, Nonresident Senior Fellow at the Arctic Institute, Apr 18 2012, “Perspective Correction: How We Misinterpret Arctic Conflict,” http://www.thearcticinstitute.org/2012/04/perspective-correction-how-we.html]

It’s not only the handcuffs of many colors worn by the Arctic states that will keep them from getting aggressive, it is also the good precedents that exist for cooperation here. Russia and Norway recently resolved a forty year-old dispute over territory in the Barents. There are regular examples of military cooperation among the four littoral NATO states and between Norway and Russia. Even the US and Russia are finding opportunities to work together. Meanwhile, the need to develop search-and-rescue capabilities is making cross-border cooperation a necessity for all Arctic actors. There are numerous international research and private-sector ventures, even in areas other than hydrocarbons. These will only grow in importance with time. In fact, it would seem that for many of these countries, the Arctic is a welcome relief - a site where international collaboration is comparatively amicable.

#### Stability and coop check conflict

Wezeman 12 (Siemon, Senior Fellow with the SIPRI Arms Transfers Programme, “Increased military capabilities in the Arctic reflect border demarcations, says SIPRI”, 3/26, http://www.sipri.org/media/pressreleases/26-mar-increased-military-capabilities-in-the-arctic-region-reflect-territorial-consolidation)

Although some tensions have emerged in the region, cooperation, not conflict, is more visible in the Arctic. Norway and Russia have settled a 40-year border dispute in the Barents Sea and Arctic states are enjoying stable and peaceful bilateral relations. Meanwhile, the Arctic Council is coming into its own as an important sub-regional organization.

The so-called ‘scramble for the Arctic’, whereby Arctic states compete for the region's resources, has not proven to be a military affair. Rather, the littoral states remain committed to follow existing legal frameworks to settle border issues and claims on Arctic exclusive economic zones (EEZs) and continental shelves.

### 1NC---No Warming Impact

#### *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.

# 1NR

## OV

#### Obama’s current foreign policy is a holdover from the Bush neocon era---it’s unsustainable---only Hagel shifts it towards a more effective realist orientiation---key to restraint and preventing multiple nuclear wars---Hagel nomination is coming now but political capital is key---the plan saps it

#### It’s immediate---nomination is happening now---it sends an international signal---countries will perceive belligerence and a shitty foreign policy

#### The environment is resilient but nuclear war turns it

Schweickart 10 – David Schweickart 10 is Professor at Loyola University Chicago. He holds a Ph.D. in Mathematics (University of Virginia), and a Ph.D. in Philosophy (Ohio State University). “Is Sustainable Capitalism Possible?” Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 41 (2010) 6739–6752

It is not true either that the various ecological crises we are facing will bring about “the end of the world.” Consider the projections of the Stern Review, the recently released report commissioned by the British Government. If nothing is done, we risk “major disruption to economic and social activity, later in this century and the next, on a scale similar to those associated with the great wars and economic depression of the first half of the 20th century.”¶ This is serious. Some sixty million people died in World War Two. The Stern Review estimates as many as 200 million people could be permanently displaced by rising sea level and drought. But this is not “the end of the world.” Even if the effects are far worse, resulting in billions of deaths—a highly unlikely scenario—there would still be lots of us left. If three-quarters of the present population perished, that would still leave us with 1.6 billion people—the population of the planet in 1900. ¶ I say this not to minimize the potentially horrific impact of relentless environmental destruction, but to caution against exaggeration. We are not talking about **thermonuclear war**—which could have extinguished us as a species. (It still might.) And we shouldn’t lose sight of the fact that millions of people on the planet right now, caught up in savage civil wars or terrorized by U.S. bombers (which dropped some 100,000 lbs. of explosives on a Baghdad neighborhood during one ten-day period in January 2008—the amount the fascists used to level the Basque town of Guernica during the Spanish Civil War), are faced with conditions more terrible than anyone here is likely to face in his or her lifetime due to environmental degradation.

#### Turns island disputes---their Teo evidence says US neutrality and restraint is key to prevent de-escalation

#### Turns Asia war---Teo says aggressive China rise intrudes into ASEAN and jacks multilateral diplomacy

#### Turns China relations---Hagel creates cooperation not competition---key to prevent great power war

#### Turns Russia---US is more likely to increase military investment in NATO and missile defense without Hagel

#### Turns disease---war causes terrible living conditions without infrastructure

## AIPAC

#### Hagel confirmation key to dilute the legislative power of AIPAC---failure makes any future effort to reform Middle East policy impossible

Stephen M. Walt 12-26, the Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international relations at Harvard University, 12/26/12, “What’s at stake in the Hagel affair,” http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/12/26/whats\_at\_stake\_in\_the\_hagel\_affair

The real meaning of the Hagel affair is what it says about the climate inside Washington. Simply put, the question is whether supine and reflexive support for all things Israeli remains a prerequisite for important policy positions here in the Land of the Free. Given America's track record in the region in recent decades, you'd think a more open debate on U.S. policy would be just what the country needs, both for its own sake and for Israel's. But because the case for the current "special relationship" of unconditional support is so weak, the last thing that hardliners like Bill Kristol or Elliot Abrams want is an open debate on that subject. If Hagel gets appointed, it means other people in Washington might realize they could say what they really think without fear that their careers will be destroyed. And once that happens, who knows where it might lead? It might even lead to a Middle East policy that actually worked! We wouldn't want that now, would we?

At this point, if Obama picks someone other than Hagel, he won't just be sticking a knife in the back of a dedicated public servant who was wounded twice in the service of his country. Obama will also be sending an unmistakable signal to future politicians, to young foreign policy wonks eager to rise in the Establishment, and to anyone who might hope to get appointed to an important position after 2016. He will be telling them that they either have to remain completely silent on the subject of U.S. Middle East policy or mouth whatever talking points they get from AIPAC, the Weekly Standard, or the rest of the Israel lobby, even though it is palpably obvious that the policies these groups have defended for years have been a disaster for the United States and Israel alike.

Instead of having a robust and open discourse about U.S. Middle East policy inside official Washington, we will continue to have the current stilted, one-sided, and deeply dishonest discussion of our actions and interests in the region. And the long list of U.S. failures -- the Oslo process, the settlements, the Iraq War, the rise of al Qaeda, etc. -- will get longer still.

#### Strong AIPAC locks in global terrorism and jacks U.S. relations with the Muslim world

Medea Benjamin 12, cofounder of both CODEPINK and the international human rights organization Global Exchange, 2/28/12, “Ten reasons why AIPAC is so dangerous,” <http://mondoweiss.net/2012/02/ten-reasons-why-the-israel-lobby-aipac-is-so-dangerous.html>

3. AIPAC's call for unconditional support for the Israeli government threatens our national security. The United States' one-sided support of Israel, demanded by AIPAC, has significantly increased anti-American sentiment throughout the Middle East, thus endangering our troops and sowing the seeds of more possible terrorist attacks against us. Gen. David Petraeus on March 16, 2010 admitted that the U.S./Palestine conflict "foments anti-American sentiment, due to a perception of U.S. favoritism for Israel." He also said that "Arab anger over the Palestinian question limits the strength and depth of U.S. partnerships with governments and peoples in the [region] and weakens the legitimacy of moderate regimes in the Arab world. Meanwhile, al-Qaeda and other militant groups exploit that anger to mobilize support."

#### Improved Muslim relations are key to prevent nuclear escalation in every global hotspot

Ziad Asali 9, President and Founder of the American Task Force on Palestine, et al., “Changing Course: A New Direction for U.S. Relations with the Muslim World”, February, p. 9-16

Improving relations with Muslim majority countries and communities is one of the most important foreign policy and national security challenges facing the United States. In the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, the U.S. sought to strengthen its own security. Despite our leaders' insistence that we had no conflict with Islam or Muslims, and despite a long history of U.S. action to protect and aid Muslims affected by war or natural disaster, our responses to 9/11 have sparked fear, mistrust, and hostility among many Muslims. Antipathy toward the U.S. has risen not only in the countries most directly affected by U.S. military action (Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran, and Pakistan), but in many others around the world. In turn, violent extremist groups that claim to act in the name of Islam have used the climate of distrust to gain support for further attacks on U.S. assets and allies. Though majorities in both the U.S. and Muslim countries around the world want to reverse this spiral of violence, many fear that it will continue to escalate. The extremists who seek to harm and destroy the U.S. represent a very small minority of Muslims, operating, for the most part, independent of governments, through loose networks of social, financial, and logistical support. Given their strong convictions, and the limited ability of the U.S. and its allies to identify and target them, they are difficult to dissuade or deter. Were an extremist group to use a nuclear, chemical, or biological weapon, or sabotage a hazardous facility in a populated area in the U.S., it could kill tens of thousands or more.1 This Report begins with the premise that the U.S. must work with Muslim counterparts who share our interest in improving mutual security to minimize the risk of such a scenario. Responsibility for peaceful coexistence rests equally with U.S. and Muslim leaders worldwide. For the U.S., counterterrorism operations are a necessary part of the strategy to keep Americans safe. However, these operations treat the symptoms rather than the causes of conflict. There is a deep reservoir of grievances against the U.S. among Muslims around the world. Whether or not these grievances are justified, the climate of hostility makes it possible for extremist groups to recruit and operate with relative ease in many countries and communities. To reduce the risk of conflict, now and in the future, the U.S. must not only defend itself against attacks, but also build more positive relations with key countries and counterparts across the Muslim world. Today, the U.S. stands at a crossroads in its relations with the global Muslim community There is still a strong set of shared values and interests among American and Muslim leaders and publics. Together, we can rebuild trust and address the core causes of tension. There are numerous diplomatic, political, economic, and people-to-people initiatives on which to build. But if we continue on our current course, time is not on our side. The U.S. government, in concert with business, faith, education, and civic leaders, needs to undertake major initiatives to address the causes of tension. Working with Muslim counterparts, we can achieve substantial joint gains in peace and security, political and economic development, and respect and understanding. The alternative is to increase our reliance on military action and counterterrorism in alliance with unpopular authoritarian governments. Doing so will raise the risk that our wrorst fears will be realized. For the sake of our own national security, values, and aspirations, and those of more than a billion Muslims around the world, we must forge a new approach. The Leadership Group and the U.S.-Muslim Engagement Project This Report presents the consensus of 34 American leaders in the fields of foreign and defense policy, politics, business, religion, education, public opinion, psychology, philanthropy, and conflict resolution. We come from different walks of life, faiths, political perspectives, and professional disciplines. Our shared goal is to develop and work to implement a wise, widely supportable strategy to make the U.S. and the world safer, by responding to the primary causes of tension with Muslims around the world. We believe that a strategy that builds on shared and complementary interests with Muslims in many countries is feasible, desirable, and consistent with core American values. The Report also reflects dialogue with hundreds of American leaders and counterparts in Muslim countries, and research on the views of millions of citizens in the U.S. and in Muslim countries whose perspectives and preferences we have explored. We have used the process of dialogue and public opinion research not only to build a leadership consensus, but also to craft a strategy that can win broad public and political support in the U.S., and build partnerships with Muslim leaders and people across the world. This project was convened, facilitated, and supported by two organizations with expertise in building consensus on difficult public issues: Search for Common Ground and the Consensus Building Institute. In addition, more than a dozen foundations, corporations and individuals have generously funded our work. Why Are U.S. Relations with Muslim Countries and Communities Important? U.S. relations with Muslim countries and communities are critically important for several reasons: the size of the global Muslim population; the geopolitical significance of key Muslim countries and regions; the persistence of conflict in these strategically important regions over several decades; the dramatic rise in tension and violence between the U.S. and a number of Muslim countries and groups during the past decade, and the risk of further conflict escalation; and the potential for both the U.S. and Muslim countries to prosper from improved relations and new partnerships. Roughly one-fifth of the world's population, or about 1.3 billion people, is Muslim. Muslims form the majority in 56 countries across North Africa; the Middle East; Asia Minor; and Central, South and Southeast Asia.' That geography spans major oil producing regions, key land and sea trade routes, and areas of high political sensitivity and instability. Muslims also form important minority communities in countries across Europe, North America, Sub-Saharan Africa, Australia, and parts of Asia. As with all major religious and ethnic communities, there is great diversity in beliefs, values, cultures, political systems, and living standards among the world's Muslim communities. Given this broad range of circumstances and the equally broad range of U.S. interests and relations with Muslim countries, Muslims' views about U.S. policy have traditionally varied widely. There is, however, a clear trend. Since the 1940s, and more rapidly since the first Gulf War in the early 1990s, more Muslims have become concerned about the U.S. role in supporting authoritarian governments. More have become angry at the U.S. and its allies for their presence in Muslim lands. More feel resentful over the U.S. role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and more feel humiliated by the sense that Americans do not understand or respect Islamic values or cultures. During the past six years, this set of concerns has become even more widespread, consistent and intense. Today, the U.S. faces an extraordinarily strong and widely shared set of negative perceptions among Muslim peoples and their leaders.' From a security standpoint, the primary U.S. focus is on armed extremist groups in Iraq, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran, Lebanon, Syria, and Palestine.' However, the U.S. must also consider how our policies and actions in those countries, their neighbors, and other Muslim countries around the world shape the ability of extremists to recruit, operate and destabilize governments and societies. Addressing not only the immediate threat of terrorist and insurgent groups, but also their broader bases of support and sympathy, should be a top national priority\* for four reasons: • Muslim public hostility" toward the U.S. is generating resources, recruits, and operational opportunities for extremist groups that seek to harm the U.S., Its allies, and assets. It is also undermining mainstream Muslim leaders who seek tolerance, nonviolence, and constructive change in relations with the U.S.\* • Most Muslims' primary grievances and concerns are about "what the U.S. does," rather than "who we are." At the same time, the U.S. has options for meeting its own interests in ways that are more compatible with most Muslims1 Interests and values. It is possible to change our relationships to enhance mutual security, meet shared and complementary political goals, generate joint economic gains, and demonstrate mutual respect for each others' core values. • By adopting a comprehensive strategy and implementing it now, it is likely that the U.S. can significantly change perceptions and behavior among mainstream and politically activist Muslims in key countries before attitudes and beliefs become "locked in" for a generation. On the other hand, failure to act soon will likely lead to a hardening of attitudes, reinforcing extremists' claims that violent resistance to the U.S. is the best path to autonomy, respect, and justice. • Fighting a long-term conflict with extremists in many Muslim countries will demand continued sacrifice from the U.S. military, carry high economic costs, continue the political acrimony that has divided the country for the past several years, and require the U.S. to use much of Its international political capital to maintain alliances. As a result, the U.S. will have fewer resources to address pressing needs at home or other critical challenges abroad.

## AT: Can’t Solve

#### Hagel solves---that’s Vlahos---he’s a check on conflict and will refuse aggressive military decisions---even if that’s not true, he’s infinitely better than Flournoy who will cause lashout

#### Hagel’s key to restrain militarism—no alternative would stand up to the DC consensus.

Greenwald 13—Glenn Greenwald, The Guardian, 1/5/13, Chuck Hagel and liberals: what are the priorities? http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/jan/05/hagel-liberals-gays-israel-democrats

All of the Democratic alternatives to Hagel who have been seriously mentioned are nothing more than standard foreign policy technocrats, fully on-board with the DC consensus regarding war, militarism, Israel, Iran, and the Middle East. That's why Kristol, the Washington Post and other neocons were urging Obama to select them rather than Hagel: because those neocons know that, unlike Hagel, these Democratic technocrats pose no challenge whatsoever to their agenda of sustaining destructive US policy in the Middle East and commitment to endless war.

## AT: Confirmation Not Happening

#### Their CNN evidence is an aff card---says confirmation is happening now but POLITICAL LANDMINES could derail the effort---proves the political capital link

#### Hagel will be confirmed but it’s a fight---Obama’s clearing the agenda of other issues

Julie Pace 1-7, AP White House Correspondent, 1/7/13, “Obama digs in for a fight on Hagel, Brennan picks,” http://www.mercurynews.com/breaking-news/ci\_22324209/obama-nominate-chuck-hagel-defense-secretary

Digging in for a fight, President Barack Obama riled Senate Republicans and some Democrats, too, on Monday by nominating former senator and combat veteran Chuck Hagel to lead the Pentagon and anti-terrorism chief John Brennan as the next director of the Central Intelligence Agency.¶ Hagel and Brennan, in separate Senate confirmation hearings, will face sharp questions on a range of contentious issues, including U.S. policy about Israel and Iran, targeted drone attacks and harsh interrogation tactics. Of the two men, Hagel is expected to face a tougher path, though both are likely to be confirmed.¶ Hagel would be the first enlisted soldier and first Vietnam veteran to head the Pentagon.¶ "These two leaders have dedicated their lives to protecting our country," Obama said, standing alongside them and the men they would succeed during a ceremony in the White House East Room. "I urge the Senate to confirm them as soon as possible so we can keep our nation secure and the American people safe."¶ For Obama, a pair of combative confirmation hearings could turn into a distraction as he opens his second term. But the president signaled he was ready to take that risk.

#### Enough votes for confirmation now but it’s a game of inches---PC’s key---zero margin for error

Chuck Todd et al 1-8, MSNBC anchor, 1/8/13, “First Thoughts: No margin for error in Hagel nomination,” http://firstread.nbcnews.com/\_news/2013/01/08/16412788-first-thoughts-no-margin-for-error-in-hagel-nomination?lite

\*\*\* No margin for error in Hagel nomination: Yesterday’s official rollout of Chuck Hagel for defense secretary went about as well as it could have for the Obama White House. Statements of praise for Hagel by folks like Colin Powell and Robert Gates? Check. A statement of past praise from John McCain (who said in 2006 Hagel would make a “great secretary of state”), even though McCain is now taking a skeptical look at the nominee? Check. And getting Chuck Schumer, perhaps the Democratic senator with the most reservations about Hagel, to issue a non-committal statement? Check. So the White House feels pretty good about where things stand, although this won’t be an easy fight. Yet what Team Obama can’t afford is any new negative information, any other shoe to drop. Bottom line: There is no margin for error from this point onward. Hagel’s support, at best, in the Senate is an inch deep and that “inch” would get him the votes he needs. But it wouldn’t take much for the bottom to, well, fall out. This is going to be a precarious few weeks. Very few senators are in D.C. right now, so the interest groups will be front and center. Hagel needs his confirmation hearing sooner, rather than later, but right now, it’s unclear when those hearings will be scheduled. Hagel also needs FACE time with senators, and he won’t have that opportunity for a good week or so. ¶ \*\*\* Obama’s confidence -- 2009 vs. 2013: As we wrote yesterday, Obama is clearly projecting a level of confidence at the start of this second term than he did four years ago, in particular, on foreign policy. Just look at the initial comfort level with his picks for his second-term national security team (Hagel, John Kerry, John Brennan) vs. the first-term team (Hillary Clinton, Bob Gates, Leon Panetta, Jim Jones). At the start of his first term, the president was no less confident about his foreign policy judgment but he made the calculation that he needed to placate the Washington establishment so he stuck with the Republican Gates at Defense, brought in Hillary to State, brought in a former general, Jim Jones, as his National Security Adviser. Gates and Clinton worked out, but Jones didn’t. ¶ \*\*\* Amplifying his views, using political capital: Now? The president is using his national security choices to amplify his views in a way that was missing four years ago. Kerry, Hagel, Brennan and keeping Tom Donilon as NSA (even potentially elevating Deputy NSA Denis McDonough to White House chief of staff) indicates the president is not just interested in running foreign policy out of the White House, but he wants to leave an Obama imprint on Defense, CIA, State etc. But it may be more than that -- Obama is displaying a confidence that he didn’t necessarily show after 2008. Much of this is what you get with a second-term president who got more than 51% of the popular vote (for the second-straight time). He may NOT be saying it the same way Bush did in 2004-05 after winning a second term, but he’s, so far, displaying the following notion: Obama believes he’s earned political capital, and he’s going to use it.

## AT: No Agenda

#### No agenda is answered above---nomination is happening now---it only says that Obama is vague about his agenda---no impact

## Thumpers

#### All this evidence is terrible---framing issue---their evidence talks about other items, yes, but doesn’t say it’s top of the docket or that they cost capital

#### Hagel will get the nom, but it will be close – PC is key, Obama is pushing, it’s top of the docket

Maggie Haberman, 1-7-2013, “GOP sees political payback in Hagel pick,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/gop-sees-political-payback-in-hagel-pick-85867.html?hp=t1\_3

For Democrats, there’s a peril of crossing a re-elected president – but also the risk of backing someone who their pro-Israel and gay supporters, along with some donors, aren’t entirely comfortable with. At minimum, senators will be under pressure to extract as much from Hagel as they can before saying they’ll support him. For the White House, the choice of Hagel gives the president a post-Susan Rice opportunity to show he’ll stick by his principles as well as offering proof that White House aides have learned the lesson of leaving appointees undefined in the current political climate. But it also embroils the president, who had capital to spend after a lopsided electoral win in November, in a potentially ugly and, some Senate Democratic aides say privately, unnecessary fight given other elements of his agenda. And across Washington, while the conventional wisdom seems to slightly favor Hagel being confirmed, many in both parties are hedging their bets to see how the next few weeks play out. “It’s going to be a classic Beltway fight where the opponents on both sides are waging a classic [publicity] war against him,” said one Republican operative. There are few other recent examples of a former senator – and member of an exclusive club – facing stiff opposition in confirmation hearings. One exception to the rule: John Ashcroft, who was appointed Attorney General by George W. Bush in 2000 after losing his Missouri Senate race. “The president’s determined to have the nominee he wants in the position he wants and not…get caught up in trivial politics that don’t amount to a hill of beans,” said Democratic strategist Jonathan Prince. But the hill of beans facing Hagel could be unusually steep. Given Hagel’s status as a former senator with no natural constituency in either party, each senator has parochial concerns related to their own races to consider as they weigh a confirmation vote. Many of them didn’t like Hagel personally, not just politically, two Republican operatives pointed out. The White House knows “this is an in-your-face pick,” said Republicans strategist Curt Anderson. “To Republicans, he’s not just a moderate Republican…it’s that he’s an apostate Republican.” One Republican operative put it more bluntly: “Republicans are looking for a fight…It’s a rare gift.” Another said, “It’s bound to help people in 2014 if they’re seen as being aggressive.”

## AT: Energy

**-Energy.**

**Weber 1/1** Fox News Analyst [Joseph Weber, Guns, immigration, fiscal issues emerge as top priorities for Obama, new Congress, http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/01/01/gun-control-immigration-reform-fiscal-issues-emerge-as-top-issues-for-new/]

The president on Sunday said energy issues are also on his high-priority list, specifically how the country can produce more energy in environmentally conscious ways, and mentioned 15 times in an interview with NBC News the need for further deficit reduction.

Congressional leaders appeared reluctant over the lame duck session to say what will be their top priorities.

A spokesman for House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, whose office plays a major role in setting the agenda, said lawmakers were focused on solving the fiscal crisis.

## AT: PTC

#### PTC was already resolved---it was part of the fiscal cliff and didn’t cost political capital

## AT: Budget Fights

**-Budget fights.**

**LA Times 12/31** Obama wins 'fiscal cliff' victory, but at high cost, [http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-fiscal-cliff-analysis-20130101,0,6417926.story?fb\_ref=fb\_widget](http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-fiscal-cliff-analysis-20130101%2C0%2C6417926.story?fb_ref=fb_widget)

The announcement Monday night of Senate agreement on a compromise to avert part of the "fiscal cliff" meant that for the first time in two decades, Republicans in Congress were preparing to vote in favor of a bill that raised taxes, an extraordinary concession to the nation's fiscal woes and the president's reelection.

But Obama's victory fell short of what he had campaigned for, and came at a high cost. Even if the House later Tuesday or Wednesday musters the votes to approve the bill that the Senate was to vote on in the wee hours of Tuesday morning, the terms of this compromise guarantee another pitched battle over spending and taxes within months.

Whether the agreement announced Monday evening turns out to be truly a victory for Obama or a lost opportunity, as many of his liberal critics feared, will depend heavily on how that next battle turns out.

The agreement to freeze income tax rates for most Americans while allowing them to rise for the wealthiest dealt only with the most pressing elements of the fiscal storm Congress and the president created last year. A newly elected Congress will begin work in a few days and **immediately will need to start negotiating yet another deal.** That next fight will be aimed at further reducing the long-term deficit and raising the debt ceiling before the government runs out of money to pay its bills — a deadline that will hit sometime in late February or March.

The persistent battle over spending, which already has consumed Washington for two years, threatens to block Obama's other major legislative priorities, including immigration reform and gun control.

## AT: Gun Control

**-Gun control.**

**Nye 12/31** [JAMES NYE and MIKE JACCARINO, Daily Mail, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2254868/Obama-Gun-control-President-opens-Meet-Press-Newtown-massacre.html?ito=feeds-newsxml]

Obama book ended his revelation with **vows to put his 'full weight' behind the push for new gun control legislation** aimed at avoiding another massacre of the like that robbed 20 first graders' - and six adults - of the their lives at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut on Dec. 14.

'It is not enough for us to say, 'This is too hard so we're not going to try,' Obama said. 'So what I intend to do is I will call all the stakeholders together. I will meet with Republicans. I will meet with Democrats. I will talk to anybody.'

When Gregory expressed skepticism he could galvanize Americans on the the issue of gun control, Obama referenced an iconic Oval Office predecessor who also confronted entrenched and accepted traditions that many felt had to change in the interest of the public good.

'This is not going to be simply a matter of me spending political capital,' Obama said. 'One of the things you learn, having now been in this office for four years, is the old adage of Abraham Lincoln's. That with public opinion there's nothing you can't do and without public opinion there's very little you can get done in this town.

'So I'm going to be putting forward a package and I'm going to be putting my full weight behind it. And I'm going to be making an argument to the American people about why this is important and why we have to do everything we can to make sure that something like what happened at Sandy Hook Elementary does not happen again.'

Obama's comments come as the schoolroom shooting has elevated the issue of gun violence to the forefront of public attention.

Authorities say the shooter, Adam Lanza, killed himself and also killed his mother at their home.

The slayings have prompted renewed calls for greater gun controls. The National Rifle Association has resisted those efforts vociferously, arguing instead that schools should have armed guards for protection.

'I am skeptical that the only answer is putting more guns in schools,' Obama said. 'And I think the vast majority of the American people are skeptical that that somehow is going to solve our problem.'

Obama said he intended to press the issue with the public.

**'Will there be resistance? Absolutely there will be resistance,**' he said.

## AT: No PC

**No PC.**

**Gillespie 1/2** Editor in chief of Reason.com and Reason TV [Nick Gillespie, Fiscal Cliff Deal Raises Taxes, Delays Sequestration...And Will Cut Spending!, <http://reason.com/blog/2013/01/02/fiscal-cliff-deal-raises-taxes-delays-se>]

Obama got his bump up during his first year or so in office. Part of it was due to George W. Bush greasing the skids by bailing out the big banks and GM and Chrysler, part of it due to Obama's decisive win over John McCain. But even his re-election **hasn't given him political capital** to spend after a first term spent pushing through a still-unpopular health-care plan that's gonna be a total bear to implement over the next couple of years. And **everyone knows he's got no second-term agenda** (if he had, we would have heard about it sometime during last year's campaign, wouldn't we have?).

Anything can happen of course. You can't underestimate the lack of vision and leadership represented by Mitch McConnell and John Boehner and Harry Reid. But we can now estimate what federal tax rates are gonna be for the next several years, so we know

## AT: Winners Win

### 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."

#### Can’t win on energy

Eisler 12 Matthew is a Researcher @ the Chemical Heritage Foundation. “Science, Silver Buckshot, and ‘All of The Above’” April 2, http://scienceprogress.org/2012/04/science-silver-buckshot-and-%E2%80%9Call-of-the-above%E2%80%9D/

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

#### 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.

#### Fights destroy momentum---stimulus proves

Harris and Lee 10 John and Carol are writers for Politico. “Obama's first year: What went wrong,” Jan 20, http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=4DF829C9-18FE-70B2-A8381A971FA3FFC9

• Obama believed that early success would be self-reinforcing, building a powerful momentum for bold government action. This belief was the essence of the White House’s theory of the “big bang” — that success in passing a big stimulus package would lead to success in passing health care, which in turn would clear the way for major cap-and-trade environmental legislation and “re-regulation” of the financial services sector — all in the first year. ¶ This proved to be a radical misreading of the dynamics of power. The massive cost of the stimulus package and industry bailouts — combined with the inconvenient fact that unemployment went up after their passage — meant that Obama spent the year bleeding momentum rather than steadily increasing public confidence in his larger governing vision. That vision was further obscured for many Americans by the smoke from the bitter and seemingly endless legislative battle on Capitol Hill over health care.

#### Capital is finite---even if he does rebuild it that takes too long

Lashof 10 (Dan, Director of the National Resource Defense Council’s Climate Center, “Coula, Shoulda, Woulda: Lessons from the Senate Climate Fail,” 7-28, <http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/dlashof/coulda_shoulda_woulda_lessons.html>)

Lesson 2: Political capital is not necessarily a renewable resource. Perhaps the most fateful decision the Obama administration made early on was to move healthcare reform before energy and climate legislation. I’m sure this seemed like a good idea at the time. Healthcare reform was popular, was seen as an issue that the public cared about on a personal level, and was expected to unite Democrats from all regions. White House officials and Congressional leaders reassured environmentalists with their theory that success breeds success. A quick victory on healthcare reform would renew Obama’s political capital, some of which had to be spent early on to push the economic stimulus bill through Congress with no Republican help. Healthcare reform was eventually enacted, but only after an exhausting battle that eroded public support, drained political capital and created the Tea Party movement. Public support for healthcare reform is slowly rebounding as some of the early benefits kick in and people realize that the forecasted Armageddon is not happening. But this is occurring too slowly to rebuild Obama’s political capital in time to help push climate legislation across the finish line.

#### Empirical statistics and studies prove PC finite and zero sum---winners don’t win

Matthew N. Beckmann and Vimal Kumar 11, Profs Department of Political Science, @ University of California Irvine "How Presidents Push, When Presidents Win" Journal of Theoretical Politics 2011 23: 3 SAGE

Speciﬁ- cally, we deﬁne presidents’ political capital as the **class of tactics White House ofﬁcials employ to induce changes in lawmakers’ behavior.** Importantly, this conception of presidents’ positive power as persuasive bargaining not only **meshes with previous scholarship** on lobbying (see, e.g., Austen-Smith and Wright (1994), Groseclose and Snyder (1996), Krehbiel (1998: ch. 7), and Snyder (1991)), but also **presidential practice.** For example, Goodwin recounts how President Lyndon Johnson routinely allocated ‘rewards’ to ‘cooperative’ members: The rewards themselves (and the withholding of rewards) . . . might be something as unobtrusive as receiving an invitation to join the President in a walk around the White House grounds, knowing that pictures of the event would be sent to hometown newspapers . . . [or something as pointed as] public works projects, military bases, educational research grants, poverty projects, appointments of local men to national commissions, the granting of pardons, and more. (Goodwin, 1991: 237) Of course, **presidential political capital is a scarce commodity with a ﬂoating value.** Even a favorably situated president enjoys only a **ﬁnite supply of political capital**; **he can only promise or pressure so much**. What is more, this capital **ebbs and ﬂows as realities and/or perceptions change**. So, similarly to Edwards (1989), we believe presidents’ bargaining resources cannot fundamentally alter legislators’ predispositions, but rather operate ‘at the margins’ of US lawmaking, **however important those margins may be** (see also Bond and Fleisher (1990), Peterson (1990), Kingdon (1989), Jones (1994), and Rudalevige (2002)). Indeed, our aim is to explicate those margins and show how **presidents may systematically inﬂuence them.**

#### PC is zero sum and finite---winners don’t win

Thomas Hale 11 is a PhD Candidate in the Department of Politics at Princeton University and a Visiting Fellow at LSE Global Governance, London School of Economics, “A Climate Coalition of the Willing” The Washington Quarterly, 2011, Google Scholar

Second, on top of this structural bias, the U.S. political system has recently showed little capacity for far-reaching change. A culture of partisan obstructionism has brought public business to a standstill. Because the Obama administration needs to spend vast amounts of political capital to get anything through Congress, it has prioritized health care and job creation over climate change. The locus of this dysfunction is, again, the Senate, where a de facto super-majoritarian rule and a 59 —41 partisan divide have made it impossible to pass ambitious legislation. With Republicans taking control of the House, climate legislation is unlikely to surface for at least two years.

### AT: Winners Win---XT Takes Too Long

#### PC isn’t renewable fast enough---the link outweighs the turn on timeframe

Joe Walsh 9 award-winning energy and environmental law scholar, recipient of the Suffolk University Jurisprudence Award for Outstanding Scholarship in Environmental Law, former research assistant on Westlaw’s definitive energy regulation reference "Is ‘Political Capital’ Fungible?" blog.cleantechies.com/2009/06/12/is-political-capital-fungible/

In the past week, I have seen mainstream media stories explaining that the Obama White House plans to use the President’s “political capital” to deliver on the climate change bill, health care reform, and the Sotomayor confirmation. As I noted in a previous post, one of the reasons that these initiatives require him to expend any capital at all in a majority Dem Congressional session is the **breakneck speed with which he claims to want it all done**. Add the arm-twisting he has already had to perform to get the stimulus bill through, and more recently to get what fragile buy-in he has for his auto bailout, and there must be **a lot of sore shoulders in the Capitol.** The question is, how much capital does he have and can it be meted out judiciously enough to be **effective and not exhausted**? Also, you have to ask where the capital derives from. He has disappointed many on the far left with his moves on Afghanistan, privacy/security policy, detention and interrogation, and even gay rights with “don’t ask don’t tell.” Organizing for America is pushing the base hard on all of these issues; but, as the saying goes, **when you have many priorities, you have none**. Getting back to energy, these political capital competitors have to give pause because there are **real political fractures** in the Dem coalition on renewables, carbon cap-and-trade and other key policy proposals. Health care is a war in and of itself---one that Clinton couldn’t win. Then there are the REAL wars: in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Mideast peace process, the North Korean escalation and all the other balls in play. Maybe the White House thinks that because real capital (over $1T in spending) has been so available no matter how many times they seem to go back to the well, the same will be true of the political equivalent. But, Ben **Bernanke can’t just crank up the presses and print more of that once Obama spends it.**

## Politics Links

### 1NC---Offshore Wind Link

#### Plan’s massively unpopular---triggers public and Congressional backlash---tied into the broader green energy debate

Sperry 12 Todd is a writer for CNN. “Wind farm gets US approval despite controversy,” Aug 16, http://www.cnn.com/2012/08/16/us/wind-farm-faa/index.html

Washington (CNN) -- A massive offshore wind farm planned for Cape Cod that has generated fierce political and legal controversy has cleared all federal and state regulatory hurdles.¶ The Federal Aviation Administration said Wednesday the Cape Wind project, the first of its kind in the United States, would not interfere with air traffic navigation and could proceed with certain conditions.¶ Previous agency approvals were challenged in court, including a ruling last year that forced the latest FAA safety evaluation. A leading opposition group said another legal challenge was possible.¶ The Obama administration first approved the power generating project, which has now been on the books for more than a decade, in April 2010 despite opposition from residents. Opponents over the years have included the late Sen. Edward Kennedy, a Democrat of Massachusetts whose family compound is in Hyannis Port.¶ 125 years of wind power¶ Critics claim the wind farm with its 130 turbines would threaten wildlife and aesthetics of Nantucket Sound. Some local residents also fear it will drive down property values.¶ The administration has pushed a "green energy" agenda nationally as a way to create jobs and lessen U.S. dependence on oil imports. That effort, however, has been sharply criticized by congressional Republicans who have said certain high-profile projects are politically driven.¶ They also have skewered certain Energy Department programs that extended millions in taxpayer loans and other aid to alternative energy companies or projects that faltered or did not meet expectations.¶ The Republican-led House Oversight and Government Reform Committee is investigating the political assertions around Cape Wind as part of a broader review of "green energy" projects supported by the administration.

### 2NC---Offshore Wind Links

#### Offshore wind empirically triggers massive controversy

DiMugno 12 Laura is a writer for North American Wind Power. “With latest FAA ruling, is it full steam ahead for Cape Wind?” Aug 17, http://www.wind-watch.org/news/2012/08/17/with-latest-faa-ruling-is-it-full-steam-ahead-for-cape-wind/

Despite this latest decision, it remains to be seen whether the controversy surrounding the proposed offshore wind farm will finally come to a close.¶ Several groups still oppose the project – the most vocal of which has been APNS – and aviation concerns are only one component of their argument against Cape Wind. Recently, APNS went so far as to claim that there were political motivations behind the FAA’s decision.¶ “Cape Wind continues to face serious and growing problems, with investigations being launched into the project’s political maneuvering, four federal lawsuits pending, and a recent federal court decision to revoke Cape Wind’s aviation safety permit,” the group stated on its website. (The last claim has been negated with this latest FAA decision.)

#### Obama will get blame for the plan and it will sap capital

Delamaide 10 Darrell is a writer at Oil Price.com. “U.S. Approval of Cape Cod Offshore Wind Project Will Not End Controversy,” April 30, http://oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Wind-Power/U.S.-Approval-Of-Cape-Cod-Offshore-Wind-Project-Will-Not-End-Controversy.html

The Obama administration approved the controversial Cape Wind project, which calls for a wind farm of 130 turbines in Nantucket Sound and will be the first offshore wind project in the country.¶ The announcement Wednesday was not a complete surprise after President Barack Obama on Tuesday toured the factory in Iowa that will supply the blades for the Cape Wind turbines.¶ But it is sure to generate more controversy as opposition was voiced by everyone from environmental groups to Native American tribes to Cape Cod residents, who are disturbed at the prospect that they will see the wind turbines as specks on the horizon. The turbines will be five miles from shore at their closest point, and 14 miles and their most distant.

#### Plan causes controversy---empirically proven---GOP will accuse Obama of cheating

Colman 12 Zack is a writer for The Hill. “Long-delayed offshore wind farm gets approval despite political pushback,” 8/16, <http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/243979-offshore-wind-farm-gets-approval-despite-political-pushback>

A large proposed wind farm off the Massachusetts coast gained regulatory approval Wednesday amid complaints from GOP lawmakers that the White House inappropriately pushed for its acceptance.¶ The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) determined the 130-turbine Cape Wind project, located in the Nantucket Sound, posed no danger to air travel. The project has been in the planning process for more than a decade.¶ “This FAA Determination of No Hazard is extremely robust, comprehensive and complete,” Mark Rodgers, spokesman for Cape Wind, told The Hill on Thursday. “We are pleased that the FAA was able to ignore political pressure of project opponents and that they did their job in a professional way reaching the same decision they have on three other occasions including twice under the Bush Administration to approve this project.”¶ Rodgers said the FAA ruling means Cape Wind is now fully permitted. He noted it is the only U.S. offshore wind farm with federal and state approval, a commercial lease and a construction and operations plan. It also has power purchase agreements with Massachusetts electric utilities.¶ But whether FAA’s ruling quiets some GOP lawmakers is uncertain. They want to investigate possible administration pressure on the agency to approve the project despite safety concerns from some FAA employees.¶ Republicans Sen. Scott Brown (Mass.), House Oversight and Government Reform Committee Chairman Darrell Issa (Calif.) and Cliff Stearns (Fla.), a subcommittee chairman on the House Energy and Commerce Committee, all have called for a probe of Cape Wind.¶ They say internal FAA documents show hesitancy about the project’s ability to avoid interfering with low-flying planes. The lawmakers allege the Obama administration used its influence to hush those fears.

### 1NC---EIS/NEPA Link

#### Plan’s *massively* controversial---categorical exclusions are a political lightening rod

Till 6 Dustin is an associate at Marten Law. “CEQ Issues Proposed Guidance on NEPA Categorical Exclusions,” Oct 18, http://www.martenlaw.com/newsletter/20061018-nepa-exclusions

The White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) recently released draft guidance to clarify and promote the use of categorical exclusions under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).[1] 71 Fed. Reg. 54816 (Sept. 17, 2006). Often a lightning rod for controversy and a constant source of litigation, categorical exclusions allow agencies to exempt certain types of actions from NEPA’s environmental review requirements. According to CEQ, federal agencies have expressed both concern that categorical exclusions are too cumbersome to develop, and confusion over how to substantiate new categorical exclusions.[2] As part of its ongoing regulatory modernization process, CEQ hopes that its guidance will streamline review and encourage greater use of “appropriate categorical exclusions [to] promote[] the cost-effective use of agency NEPA related resources.”[3]¶ NEPA Categorical Exclusions¶ NEPA generally requires federal agencies to take a “hard look” at the environmental consequences of their proposed actions. Specifically, agencies must prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for any proposed major federal action that will significantly affect the human environment.[4] If an agency is uncertain whether its proposed action will have significant environmental impacts, it must prepare an environmental assessment (EA) to determine whether an EIS is necessary.[5] If the EA threshold determination concludes that an EIS is not required, the agency issues a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).[6]¶ Not all proposed federal actions are subject to assessment in an EIS or EA. CEQ’s NEPA regulations allow agencies to “categorically exclude” from further review those actions that experience has indicated will not have significant environmental effects, individually or cumulatively.[7] Because preparing an EA and/or an EIS can be time consuming and expensive, CEQ has encouraged agencies to develop and refine categorical exclusions to promote efficiency and cost effectiveness.[8]¶ The use of categorical exclusions is often controversial. For example, the United States Forest Service’s recently established categorical exclusions for hazardous fuel reduction projects and post-fire timber salvage projects have proven litigious.[9] Some commentators contend that categorical exclusions are over-used and permit agencies to ignore the cumulative impacts of numerous small projects.[10] Government officials, on the other hand, argue that categorical exclusions do not weaken NEPA, and that streamlining the categorical exclusion process is part of a comprehensive regulatory reform process that began during the Carter administration.[11]

### 2NC---EIS/NEPA Links

#### The plan links to politics but the counterplan doesn’t---exemptions from EIS cause massive backlash to the plan

Hutchinson and Bryan 96 – Ralph Hutchinson, & Mary Bryan, @ Oak Ridge Environmental Peace Alliance, The Continuing Assault: How the Department of Energy Avoids the National Environmental Policy Act, http://getsustainablenow.org/orepa/nepaorep.html

NEPA seeks to guarantee that environmental impacts are given full consideration in the decision-making processes of the federal government through public participation. NEPA envisions this decision-making process as a consultative process with regularly scheduled conversations between government officials and the general public each time an activity which might have an environmental impact is being considered by the government. NEPA requires that the public be involved in environmental studies for three reasons:  The public may have more information about the local environmental conditions than federal officials. For instance, the existence of caves, springs, sinkholes, or other unusual natural formations may not be readily apparent to federal officials. Having local residents who have tramped through, hunted over, lived or farmed on land in the past identify geologic peculiarities may save the government time and money. In other instances, the public may have information about past uses of land-for mining, for a waste disposal area, for burial of human remains-which federal officials would not be expected to know. Disclosure in a scoping hearing can significantly impact the eventual decisions about the proposed project.  The public may have suggestions and comments which contribute to a better decision. NEPA presumes that federal officials and their contractors do not exhaust the potential for good ideas; NEPA believes that two heads are better than one. By its very nature-requiring officials to thoroughly consider and respond to public comments-NEPA encourages the public to participate in creating the best possible decisions.  Public participation can streamline the decision-making process. The public is engaged early in the decision-making process through scoping hearings in an effort to elicit those issues which are of most concern to the public. NEPA then directs the agency to give primary consideration to these concerns. The law approaches efficiency in a very practical way-don't waste time on things that nobody thinks is a big deal and pay attention to the things people care about. When a federal agency fails to engage the public appropriately in a NEPA process it runs the real risk of making a decision that is not the best it could make. It is likely to be less efficient in its decision-making process. What's more, the final decision is less likely to enjoy the support of the public and, in the case of controversial projects, may therefore not receive the funding support necessary from Congress for the project to proceed.

### AT: Obama Doesn’t Push Plan

#### Plan requires Obama to push it---their solvency evidence

Giddings 11 – JD Candidate @ The George Washington University Law School [Nathaniel C. Giddings, “Go Offshore Young Man! The Categorical Exclusion Solution to Offshore Wind Farm Development on the Outer Continental Shelf,” JOURNAL OF ENERGY & ENVIRONMENTAL LAW, Winter 2011

In his speech on the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, Presi­dent Barack Obama declared that increased production of alternative energy sources was necessary to prevent future environmental disasters of this nature.155 Instead of wait­ing for Congress to act, which seems unlikely to occur in the foreseeable future, the President can encourage federal agencies to create incentives for the development of clean energy resources right now.156 In particular, the President could encourage BOEMRE to create a categorical exclusion for development of offshore wind farms on the Outer Conti­nental Shelf—a decision that would likely withstand judicial review.¶ The current approval process, requiring two environ­mental reviews, is redundant and unnecessary. Not only do offshore wind farms have a proven track record of being envi­ronmentally sound, measures in current federal law already ensure environmental protection. In particular, the consulta­tion provisions of environmental statutes such as the ESA require oversight where threatened or endangered species are potentially impacted. Moreover, the CER process would ensure that where there are extraordinary circumstances, an EA would be completed to ensure that environmental impacts are properly assessed. Requiring two environmen­tal reviews with these protective measures already in place is unnecessary and needlessly slows down the development of offshore wind farms on the Outer Continental Shelf.¶ A categorical exclusion for offshore wind farms would allow the United States to tap a resource that could provide large amounts of power to high-demand centers, create jobs, and protect the environment. Moreover, if the concerns asso­ciated with global climate change are in fact a reality, the need to reduce our reliance on greenhouse gas emitting sources of energy is of pressing importance. Offshore wind promises to deliver clean energy to the areas that need it most while hav­ing minimal environmental impacts. The only question that remains is whether the Obama administration has the politi­cal willpower to turn words into action.

## AT: Vote No

#### Counter-interpretation---the judge is deciding whether or not Congress should debate and pass the plan. Otherwise the negative never gets to defend the status quo and the aff could read losers lose as an advantage.

**Politics disads are good:**

* **Key to current events education that’s useful immediately and promotes political engagement**
* **They’re a vital neg generic on this topic because there’s no limiting word in the resolution**
* **Most real world---politicians must always assess political consequences of advocating any bill---the real inherent barrier to the plan is political opposition**

## AT: PC

#### Political scientists and experts agree

Beckman 10 Matthew N. Beckman, Professor of Political Science @ UC-Irvine, 2010, “Pushing the Agenda: Presidential Leadership in U.S. Lawmaking, 1953-2004,” pg. 50

However, many **close observers** of the presidential–congressional relationship have **long cited prevoting bargaining** across Pennsylvania Avenue **as being substantively important**. For example, discussing President Eisenhower’s legislative record in 1953, CQ staffers issued a caveat they have often repeated in the years since:¶ The **President’s leadership** often was tested beyond the glare spotlighting roll calls. . . . Negotiations off the floor and action in committee sometimes are **as important as the recorded votes**. (CQ Almanac 1953, 77)¶ **Many a political scientist has agreed**. Charles Jones (1994), for one, wrote, “However they are interpreted, roll call votes cannot be more than they are: one form of floor action on legislation. If analysts insist on scoring the president, concentrating on this stage of lawmaking can provide no more than a partial tally” (195). And Jon Bond and Richard Fleisher (1990) note that even if they ultimately are reflected in roll-call votes, “many important decisions in Congress are made in places other than floor votes and recorded by means other than roll calls . . . ” (68).

## AT: INtrinsicness

#### The disad is intrinsic---announcement of the plan necessarily would cause backlash.

#### Intrinsicness is a voting issue---makes the aff a moving target and kills all neg link ground because the USFG could take action to solve almost any disad.

**Politics disads are good:**

* **Key to current events education that’s useful immediately and promotes political engagement**
* **They’re a vital neg generic on this topic because there’s no limiting word in the resolution**
* **Most real world---politicians must always assess political consequences of advocating any bill---the real inherent barrier to the plan is political opposition**

## AT: Secretary of Defense Not Key

**Secretary of Defense doesn’t matter**

**WALT 12 – 26 – 12 The Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international relations at Harvard University** [Stephen M. Walt, What's at stake in the Hagel affair, <http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/12/26/whats_at_stake_in_the_hagel_affair>]

Second, let's not lose sight of what is at stake here. Contrary to what some suggest, the choice of SecDef isn't going to make any difference in U.S. policy toward Israel or the "peace process." Policy on those issues will be set by the White House and Congress, with AIPAC et al. breathing down both their necks. The Israeli government has no interest in a two-state solution, the Palestinians are too weak and divided to persuade Israel to rethink its present course, and the United States is incapable of mounting the sort of sustained pressure that might force both sides to compromise. Which means the two-state solution is dead, and it won't matter whether Hagel gets the nod or not. The $3-4 billion annual aid package won't be affected, and I'll bet the United States continues to wield its U.N. Security Council veto whenever it is asked.

This appointment could affect U.S. policy toward Iran, insofar as Hagel's been skeptical about the wisdom of using military force in the past. He's hardly a dove or an appeaser, of course; he just recognizes that military force may not be a very good way to deal with this problem. (Well, duh.) If Obama wants to pursue diplomacy instead of preventive war -- and he should -- the combination of Hagel at Defense and Kerry at State would give him two respected, articulate, and persuasive voices to help him make that case. But if Obama were to decide that force was a good idea, neither Kerry nor Hagel would stand in his way. So in terms of overall Middle East policy in the next couple of years, this appointment may matter less than most people think.

## Disease

#### It’s inevitable, no timeframe

#### No extinction

Posner 5—Senior Lecturer, U Chicago Law. Judge on the US Court of Appeals 7th Circuit. AB from Yale and LLB from Harvard. (Richard, Catastrophe, http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi\_0199-4150331/Catastrophe-the-dozen-most-significant.html)

Yet the fact that Homo sapiens has managed to survive every disease to assail it in the 200,000 years or so of its existence is a source of genuine comfort, at least if the focus is on extinction events. There have been enormously destructive plagues, such as the Black Death, smallpox, and now AIDS, but none has come close to destroying the entire human race. There is a biological reason. Natural selection favors germs of limited lethality; they are fitter in an evolutionary sense because their genes are more likely to be spread if the germs do not kill their hosts too quickly. The AIDS virus is an example of a lethal virus, wholly natural, that by lying dormant yet infectious in its host for years maximizes its spread. Yet there is no danger that AIDS will destroy the entire human race. The likelihood of a natural pandemic that would cause the extinction of the human race is probably even less today than in the past (except in prehistoric times, when people lived in small, scattered bands, which would have limited the spread of disease), despite wider human contacts that make it more difficult to localize an infectious disease.

#### No mutation to a more virulent strain – more likely to develop into a less dangerous strain

Avian Flu Diary 11, 1/10/11, “Egyptian MOH:`No Mutation’ Of Flu”, <http://afludiary.blogspot.com/2011/01/egyptian-mohno-mutation-of-flu.html>

Invariably, when a new or novel influenza virus makes an appearance on the world stage, the concern is that over time it will mutate to a more formidable viral foe.   Mutating is, after all, what viruses do. And influenza viruses are particularly adept at acquiring changes – either through small incremental changes (called `drift’), or via a reassortment or swapping of genetic material with another virus, called `shift’. And as any virologist will tell you, Shift Happens. Yet, despite the stigma attached to the word`mutation’, viruses can also mutate into a less dangerous strains. Over the past few days we are seeing public reassurances from some public health agencies that the swine flu virus has not `mutated’ into a more virulent strain.   Last week, scientists from the UK’s [HPA](http://www.hpa.org.uk/), writing in [Eurosurveillance](http://www.eurosurveillance.org/) (see [Eurosurveillance: Analysis Of Fatal H1N1 Cases In The UK](http://afludiary.blogspot.com/2011/01/eurosurveillance-analysis-of-fatal-h1n1.html)) stated that: so far no unique mutations have been associated with severe or fatal cases of influenza A(H1N1)2009, but further comprehensive analysis is required.   That isn’t to say that mutations haven’t shown up.  They have, and will no doubt continue to do so.     But so far, none of these changes is viewed by these HPA researchers as particularly alarming, linked to fatal cases, or indicative of a fundamental change in the H1N1 virus.

#### Intervening actors check

Zakaria 9**—**Editor of Newsweek, BA from Yale, PhD in pol sci, Harvard. He serves on the board of Yale University, The Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission, and Shakespeare and Company. Named "one of the 21 most important people of the 21st Century" (Fareed, “The Capitalist Manifesto: Greed Is Good,” 13 June 2009, http://www.newsweek.com/id/201935)

Note—Laurie Garrett=science and health writer, winner of the Pulitzer, Polk, and Peabody Prize

It certainly looks like another example of crying wolf. After bracing ourselves for a global pandemic, we've suffered something more like the usual seasonal influenza. Three weeks ago the World Health Organization declared a health emergency, warning countries to "prepare for a pandemic" and said that the only question was the extent of worldwide damage. Senior officials prophesied that millions could be infected by the disease. But as of last week, the WHO had confirmed only 4,800 cases of swine flu, with 61 people having died of it. Obviously, these low numbers are a pleasant surprise, but it does make one wonder, what did we get wrong? Why did the predictions of a pandemic turn out to be so exaggerated? Some people blame an overheated media, but it would have been difficult to ignore major international health organizations and governments when they were warning of catastrophe. I think there is a broader mistake in the way we look at the world. Once we see a problem, we can describe it in great detail, extrapolating all its possible consequences. But we can rarely anticipate the human response to that crisis. Take swine flu. The virus had crucial characteristics that led researchers to worry that it could spread far and fast. They described—and the media reported—what would happen if it went unchecked. But it did not go unchecked. In fact, swine flu was met by an extremely vigorous response at its epicenter, Mexico. The Mexican government reacted quickly and massively, quarantining the infected population, testing others, providing medication to those who needed it. The noted expert on this subject, Laurie Garrett, says, "We should all stand up and scream, 'Gracias, Mexico!' because the Mexican people and the Mexican government have sacrificed on a level that I'm not sure as Americans we would be prepared to do in the exact same circumstances. They shut down their schools. They shut down businesses, restaurants, churches, sporting events. They basically paralyzed their own economy. They've suffered billions of dollars in financial losses still being tallied up, and thereby really brought transmission to a halt." Every time one of these viruses is detected, writers and officials bring up the Spanish influenza epidemic of 1918 in which millions of people died. Indeed, during the last pandemic scare, in 2005, President George W. Bush claimed that he had been reading a history of the Spanish flu to help him understand how to respond. But the world we live in today looks nothing like 1918. Public health-care systems are far better and more widespread than anything that existed during the First World War. Even Mexico, a developing country, has a first-rate public-health system—far better than anything Britain or France had in the early 20th century.

### 1NC---Afghanistan/Iran

#### PC’s key in the short-term---Obama has just enough left after the fiscal cliff---Hagel’s the top priority above the debt ceiling and the sequester

CSM 1-7 – Christian Science Monitor, “Chuck Hagel: why Obama is using political capital on Pentagon pick (+video),” 1/7/13, http://www.csmonitor.com/layout/set/print/USA/Politics/2013/0107/Chuck-Hagel-why-Obama-is-using-political-capital-on-Pentagon-pick-video

In a way, Mr. Hagel is a man without a party. Many Washington analysts predict a tough confirmation fight in the Senate.

But to President Obama, who announced Hagel’s selection Monday, he is someone worth fighting for.

“Chuck Hagel is the leader that our troops deserve,” Mr. Obama said. “He is an American patriot.”

Hagel would be the first enlisted man, and the first Vietnam veteran, to head the Pentagon. He “bears the scars and the shrapnel” from his military service, Obama noted. The president takes the “man without a party” argument and turns it on its head, returning to his first-term promise to rise above party politics.

“Chuck represents the bipartisan tradition that we need more of in Washington,” Obama said. “For his independence and commitment to consensus, he's earned the respect of national security and military leaders, Republicans and Democrats, including me.”

Some Senate Democrats have endorsed Hagel, and at least three Republican senators have come out against him, while others of both parties have expressed skepticism. Democrats have a 55-45 majority in the Senate, but Republicans could decide to filibuster – which would require 60 votes to overcome. And there’s no guarantee that all the Democrats vote with the president.

So why is Obama willing to have this fight, after watching one of his top prospects for secretary of State – UN Ambassador Susan Rice – remove her name from contention over what would have been a contentious confirmation battle, had she been nominated? (Her combative style and in particular misstatements about the Sept. 11 attack on the US mission in Benghazi, Libya, riled Republicans.)

Administration officials say Obama had not necessarily settled on Ambassador Rice for State, but her withdrawal left the impression that the president’s choice had been preemptively defeated. So it may, in fact, be partly because of Rice that Obama is proceeding with Hagel. The president does not want to look weak again.

He also expressed clear personal affection for Hagel in his statement Monday. As Senate colleagues, the two had traveled together in Iraq and Afghanistan. Hagel is also close to Vice President Biden, a longtime Senate colleague. Hagel has already served the Obama administration in other capacities, including as co-chair of the president's Intelligence Advisory Board.

Now that Hagel has been nominated for the Pentagon, it is crucial that the next stage – courtesy calls to key Senate members – goes well. It is especially imperative that he reassure senators on his commitment to Israel.

On Sunday, senior White House officials reached out to key American Jewish interest groups and sought to address any concerns about Hagel, according to CNN. And on Monday, various Jewish groups put out statements of support for Hagel. However the biggest and most powerful of the pro-Israel groups – the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, or AIPAC – so far has not put out a statement.

Other aspects of the timing of Hagel’s nomination also matter. Obama just burned some political capital in getting through the Jan. 1 “fiscal cliff” deadline, in which he got the Republicans to concede on tax hikes for the wealthy. Three more fiscal cliffs loom – on spending cuts, the debt ceiling, and on short-term federal spending – and he will have less leverage than he did last week. So it may seem curious that he has chosen to embark on a tough confirmation fight amid all these other battles.

#### Hagel will get confirmed now, but capital is key – he’s key to build bipartisan support for quick Afghanistan withdrawal and preventing Iran strikes

Mark Thompson, 1-7-2013, “President Obama To Tap Ex-GOP Senator Chuck Hagel to Run Pentagon,” Time, <http://nation.time.com/2013/01/07/president-obama-to-tap-ex-gop-senator-chuck-hagel-to-run-pentagon/>

For the third time in 15 years, a Democratic president will turn to a member of the Republican Party to run his Pentagon. Monday afternoon, President Obama is expected to nominate former Republican senator Chuck Hagel of Nebraska to serve as secretary of defense. Senate approval – where Hagel served for 12 years before retiring in 2008 – is likely, but not guaranteed, given his pedigree. He follows in the footsteps of Bill Cohen, Clinton, 1997-2001 and Robert Gates, Obama, 2009-2011. Cohen, a one-time GOP senator from Maine, embraces the idea of a Republican defense secretary in a Democratic president’s cabinet, especially when military spending cuts are looming. “You’re picking the best person to handle the job who can build a consensus on Capitol Hill, basically,” he says of the key challenge Hagel faces. “Having a Republican when you’re downsizing sends the message that we’re going to do this on a non-partisan basis, with this man who has a military background, a war hero, Purple Hearts, et cetera.” Yet unlike Cohen and Gates – who could fairly be described as centrists — Hagel is decidedly more contrarian. He’ll bring his own baggage to the Pentagon on everything ranging from the U.S. role in the world, the size and purpose of the U.S. military, and striking the proper relationship with Israel. The nomination comes a month after Administration officials floated Hagel’s name, only to see it batted around like a piñata by those opposed to the pick. It’s apparent that the White House, already smarting over the pre-emptive derailment of UN Ambassador Susan Rice for secretary of state, wasn’t about to let that happen a second time. Ash Carter, the deputy defense secretary, and Michèle Flournoy – who stepped down as the Pentagon’s No. 3 civilian last year and would be the first woman to hold the post – were also-rans. Hagel has already run into a buzzsaw of opposition, even from the members of his own party. “I like Chuck Hagel,” Senator Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., told CNN on Sunday. “He served with distinguish in Vietnam as an enlisted man, two Purple Hearts, but, quite frankly, Chuck Hagel is out of the mainstream of thinking I believe on most issues regarding foreign policy.” If confirmed, Hagel “would be the most antagonistic secretary of defense towards the state of Israel in our nation’s history,” Graham said. Foreign-policy heavyweights are lining up on both sides of the nomination. Supporting Hagel are heavyweights including Bush 41 national security adviser Brent Scowcroft, Reagan defense secretary Frank Carlucci, and Ryan Crocker, the highly-regarded former U.S. ambassador to both Afghanistan and Iraq. Opponents include at least three GOP senators – Dan Coats of Indiana, Tom Coburn of Oklahoma and John Cornyn of Texas – as well as vocal critics including Josh Block, who heads the Israel Project, a Washington-based, pro-Israel group, and William Kristol, editor of The Weekly Standard, a conservative opinion magazine. “The next secretary of defense should be a well-respected mainstream national security leader,” Kristol wrote last week, “not an out-of-the-mainstream mediocrity.” On the deployment side of the ledger, Hagel is likely to push back against U.S. military commanders who want to pull the remaining 66,000 U.S. troops in Afghanistan out as slowly as possible before all U.S. combat forces are due home by 2015. There’s one Hagel quote already ricocheting around the Pentagon, concerning President George W. Bush’s plan to dispatch 30,000 additional U.S. troops to Iraq in 2007 to try to quell a nascent civil war there. Hagel called it The most dangerous foreign-policy blunder in this country since Vietnam, if it’s carried out. Well, it was carried out, and by most accounts the so-called “surge” calmed things down in Iraq. “I’ll have a hard time voting for anybody to be secretary of defense who believes that the surge was a foreign-policy blunder,” Graham said Sunday. How much such comments will dent Hagel’s time as an decorated infantryman in Vietnam remains an open question. But more important than his service in Vietnam more than 40 years ago is the time he and Obama shared in the Senate from 2004 to 2008, when they served together on the foreign relations committee and traveled to overseas hotspots. Hagel would be the first defense secretary since the late Caspar Weinberger, defense chief in the Reagan Administration, to have worn a U.S. military uniform in combat – and the first enlisted man. That’ll instantly give him credibility. Hagel “led an infantry squad in Vietnam during the bloody fighting following the Tet Offensive,” Defense Secretary Leon Panetta said of his likely successor at a Memorial Day service last May. “Like millions of our generation, he demonstrated bravery, patriotism, and heroism on the battlefield.” With his Hagel pick following Panetta’s Democratic interregnum, Obama gets Republican cover to try to retool the Pentagon. That will include its missions as well as its business dealings. If he wants to, with Hagel in charge of the Defense Department, Obama will be able to press for more substantial changes than he could with a Democrat sitting in that huge E-ring office (Atlantic contributing editor Yochi Dreazen recently wrote about this strange state of affairs.) But Hagel has never seemed to harbor a sense that is the mission of America – nor its military – to spread democracy around the world. “Militaries are built to fight and win wars, not bind together failing nations,” he wrote in 2006. “We are once again learning a very hard lesson in foreign affairs: America cannot impose a democracy on any nation — regardless of our noble purpose.” That echoes Obama’s own thinking on the topic. Former Maine GOP senator William Cohen applauds Obama’s pick, and dismisses concerns that he’ll make bad policy. “You want a secretary of defense to be strong-minded,” Cohen says. “But he has to understand that this is not about Chuck Hagel because he is not going to determine policy in the Middle East or with Iran – that’s the call of the President.” Cohen says that while the Democratic Party is unfairly portrayed as being weak on defense, the Hagel nomination gives Obama some political cover. “Having a Republican there when you’re downsizing really takes away the issue of `There go the Democrats again,’” he says. The nod could generate some opposition from Jewish groups, who don’t see him as fervent enough when it comes to supporting Israel. Hagel has criticized loose U.S. talk about military strikes against Iran for its nuclear program. Iran, for its part, has been paying close attention to Hagel and his new assignment. Hagel’s lack of traditional GOP ideology might give him an edge when it comes to weaning the U.S. military off the hundreds of billions of dollars in added funding Congress gave it following 9/11. The libertarian Cato Institute suggests he would preside over a slimmed-down, stay-at-home military.

#### Political signal of commitment to fast withdrawal’s key to successful Taliban negotiations---builds in U.S. leverage---and no offense, maintaining presence inevitably fails

Daniel Serwer 12, professorial lecturer and senior fellow at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies and a scholar at the Middle East Institute, 3/13/12, “Time to Go,” http://www.peacefare.net/?p=7801

Is there anyone still out there who thinks we can achieve our goals in Afghanistan? Yes is the short answer. Michael O’Hanlon for example. So I’ll try to reiterate why I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that we need to get out as quickly as possible, without however destabilizing the situation.

Far be it from me to suggest that the homicidal behavior of a single American staff sergeant should determine what we do, or don’t do, in Afghanistan. The fact however is that incidents like the one Sunday, in which 16 Afghans appear to have been murdered by a single American, really do have a broader significance. It is just no longer possible for many–perhaps most–Afghans to support the effort we have undertaken supposedly for their benefit. The Afghan parliament has said plainly that patience is running out. Wait until they realize how long it will take before the alleged perpetrator is tried and punished!

Of course we left Afghanistan to its own devices once before, after the Soviet withdrawal in 1989. That did not work out well, for us or for them. The risks are great that the scenario will be repeated. I’m not sure President Karzai will last as long the Soviet-installed President Najibullah, who managed three years. But I trust Karzai will not stay on in Kabul if the Taliban appear at its gates, as Najibullah did. The Taliban castrated him and dragged him to death with a truck, then hung his body on a lamp post.

I doubt the Taliban, who would certainly gain control of at least parts of Afghanistan upon American withdrawal, would again make the mistake of inviting in al Qaeda. There isn’t much in it for them: al Qaeda is a pan-national movement with pretensions to uniting all Muslims in a revived caliphate.

As Rory Stewart notes, we are not going to be able to get the support we need from Pakistan or create the kind of government in Afghanistan that can gain the confidence of the Afghans. The only thing we’ve got going for us is that the Afghans hate the Taliban more than they hate us, but that is cold comfort.

It may also be in some doubt: the Taliban are having at least some success in governing areas they control. Their courts dispense justice, private and even state schools use their curriculum, and some nongovernmental organizations are allowed to operate. The Taliban district and provincial governors operate with increasing visibility and some degree of legitimacy.

To combat this kind of capillary presence of the Taliban, we would need to continue to distribute Americans widely in the countryside. It just isn’t going to be possible. With U.S. troops already withdrawing, the risk to Americans embedded in Afghan villages and ministries is going to rise sharply. Last month’s attacks on advisors embedded in the Interior Ministry, and the rising frequency of Afghan security force attacks on Americans, make that clear.

Like many Iraqis, at least some Afghans will come to regret U.S. withdrawal. The Pushtuns will not like dealing with the Northern Alliance, which defeated the Taliban in 2001 with help from the U.S., better than dealing with us, and many in the Northern Alliance would already prefer that we stay. Women–still not treated equally with men–stand to lose some of the enormous gains that they have made since the Taliban’s fall.

It would be a mistake to await the outcome of the negotiations with the Taliban, which could drag on for a long time. Better to go into these negotiations stating a willingness to withdraw–by the end of this year if feasible, or shortly thereafter–provided a satisfactory political solution can be agreed. That could actually accelerate the diplomacy rather than hinder it. And in any event the Taliban will know full well that public and political support for the war is fading in the United States.

#### Effective negotiations key to Afghan stability

Stefan Wolff 11, Professor of International Security at the University of Birmingham, England, UK, 6/19/11, “Negotiating with the Taliban: A Promising Exit Strategy?,” http://www.stefanwolff.com/notebook/negotiating-with-the-taliban

In this sense, the strategy of negotiating with the Taliban is right. It is also correct in insisting on conditions as to who can participate in negotiations without closing the door to those who may not (yet) meet them—this is the precise meaning of the ‘listing’ and ‘delisting’ in UN Security Council Resolution 1989(2011). As with the Northern Ireland peace process where participation in the negotiations that led to the 1998 Good Friday/Belfast Agreement were conditional upon acceptance of the Mitchell Principles of Non-violence, demanding that those Taliban who want be part of a future peaceful Afghanistan renounce violence is only logical. Similarly, the Sunni insurgency in Iraq was brought to an end, in part, because those supporting and participating in it were simultaneously pressured and incentivised to turn away from, and on, al-Qaeda and encouraged to participate in a political process. While a comparison between Taliban insurgents in Afghanistan with Sunni insurgents in Iraq, let alone Republicans (and Loyalists) in Northern Ireland, is not straightforward, and perhaps not even sensible, the particular strategy of dealing with the problem that they pose(d) makes sense: the demands of these groups are to a significant degree negotiable (which fundamentally distinguishes them from al-Qaeda and its affiliates).

Clearly, not all among the Taliban will easily and quickly warm to the compromises and concessions that will be necessary for a settlement to be possible, nor will all in the current Afghan political establishment necessarily do so either. The more negotiations progress, the more spoilers will come to the fore—groups and individuals who will benefit more from a continuation of the conflict than from its end. That is why ISAF must stay the course and continue fighting its counter-insurgency campaign against those unwilling to participate in a genuine search for a political settlement and demonstrate to them the futility of pursuing the illusion a military victory over the Afghan government and its international supporters. International support must also continue to build a local Afghan security capacity that can eventually lead this campaign as necessary. Yet in the same way in which there can be no unconditional negotiations with the Taliban, there cannot be unconditional support of an Afghan government which presides over unbelievable levels of corruption and whose president lacks democratic legitimacy.

A political settlement will only be possible with international support for its negotiation and implementation. It will only be sustainable if both sides, the Afghan government and the Taliban alike, commit to it credibly and if institutions are put in place that offer transparent, participatory, and accountable mechanisms for dealing with the multitude of challenges that will undoubtedly face Afghanistan on the way to and after the negotiations have succeeded. Such success may seem rather far-fetched at present, but not to give good-faith negotiations a fair chance now would block any kind of exit for the foreseeable future.

#### Afghan success prevents global nuclear war

Carafano 10 – James Jay is a senior research fellow for national security at The Heritage Foundation and directs its Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies, “Con: Obama must win fast in Afghanistan or risk new wars across the globe,” Jan 2 http://gazettextra.com/news/2010/jan/02/con-obama-must-win-fast-afghanistan-or-risk-new-wa/

We can expect similar results if Obama’s Afghan strategy fails and he opts to cut and run. Most forget that throwing South Vietnam to the wolves made the world a far more dangerous place. The Soviets saw it as an unmistakable sign that America was in decline. They abetted military incursions in Africa, the Middle East, southern Asia and Latin America. They went on a conventional- and **nuclear-arms spending spree**. They stockpiled enough smallpox and anthrax to **kill the world several times over**. State-sponsorship of terrorism came into fashion. Osama bin Laden called America a “paper tiger.” If we live down to that moniker in Afghanistan, odds are the world will get a lot less safe. Al-Qaida would be back in the game. Regional terrorists would go after both Pakistan and India—potentially **triggering a nuclear war** between the two countries. Sensing a Washington in retreat, Iran and North Korea could shift their nuclear programs into overdrive, hoping to save their failing economies by selling their nuclear weapons and technologies to all comers. Their nervous neighbors would want nuclear arms of their own. The resulting nuclear arms race could be far more dangerous than the Cold War’s two-bloc standoff. With multiple, independent, nuclear powers cautiously eyeing one another, the world would look a lot more like Europe in 1914, when precarious shifting alliances **snowballed into a very big, tragic war**. The list goes on. There is no question that countries such as Russia, China and Venezuela would rethink their strategic calculus as well. That could produce all kinds of serious regional challenges for the United States. Our allies might rethink things as well. Australia has already hiked its defense spending because it can’t be sure the United States will remain a responsible security partner. NATO might well fall apart. Europe could be left with only a puny EU military force incapable of defending the interests of its nations.

#### Iran strikes cause nuclear World War III

Patrick Henningsen 12, communications consultant and Managing Editor of the 21st Century Wire online journal, 1/4/12, “Why Attacking Iran Will Not Work in 2012. Failure could Result in a US-Israel Military and Economic Tailspin,” http://www.irishpublic.com/2012/01/why-attacking-iran-will-not-work-in-2012/

Neither the US or Israel has engaged in a bona fide naval conflict in decades. In the case of the US, owner of the world’s largest navy, its last true naval military affair was WWII. As Great Britain painfully discovered during its costly Falkland Island War adventure, even one rudimentary French-made Exocet Missile launched by Argentina below radar, was enough to not only cripple a major piece of its naval fleet, but also enough of a black eye to nearly derail majority public support for their ill-conceived war effort from the opposition and back-benchers home in London.

Similarly, the Iranian defense has the capability to sink not one, but many US Naval ships currently flexing their muscles on the periphery of Iranian territorial waters. Such an event would register with shock and horror in the US public mind, but worse, may be used by Washington hawks to justify a revenge nuclear strike against Iranian civilians. Both Washington and Tel Aviv have already raised the talking point of deploying “tactical nukes” against Iran. Such foreshadowing should not be ignored, as it is often a clear indicator of things to come.

Any nuclear conflagration by the US or Israel would most certainly result in a global backlash against the West – at its worst acting as a procession into the hot stages of World War III – or at its very least, re-balkanizing the geopolitical scene into a New Cold War, with the West on one side and Iran, China, Pakistan, and Russia on the other.

**PC theory is wrong.**

**Dickinson 9** [Matthew, Professor of Political Science at Middlebury College, Previously Taught at Harvard University under the supervision of Presidential Scholar Richard Neustadt, *Presidential Power: A NonPartisan Analysis of Presidential Politics*, May 26th, http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/]

As for Sotomayor, from here the path toward almost certain confirmation goes as follows: the Senate Judiciary Committee is slated to hold hearings sometime this summer (this involves both written depositions and of course open hearings), which should lead to formal Senate approval before Congress adjourns for its summer recess in early August. So Sotomayor will likely take her seat in time for the start of the new Court session on October 5. (I talk briefly about the likely politics of the nomination process below). What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a **misleading** gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an **outcome** with actual **evidence** of presidential influence. Once we **control** for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda setting – **not arm-twisting**. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost **nothing** to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee. If we want to measure Obama’s “power”, then, we need to know what his real preference was and why he chose Sotomayor. My guess – and it is only a guess – is that after conferring with leading Democrats and Republicans, he recognized the overriding practical political advantages accruing from choosing an Hispanic woman, with left-leaning credentials. We cannot know if this would have been his ideal choice based on judicial philosophy alone, but presidents are never free to act on their ideal preferences. Politics is the art of the possible. Whether Sotomayer is his first choice or not, however, her nomination is a reminder that the power of the presidency often resides in the president’s ability to dictate the alternatives from which Congress (or in this case the Senate) must choose. Although Republicans will undoubtedly attack Sotomayor for her judicial “activism” (citing in particular her decisions regarding promotion and affirmative action), her comments regarding the importance of gender and ethnicity in influencing her decisions, and her views regarding whether appellate courts “make” policy, they run the risk of alienating Hispanic voters – an increasingly influential voting bloc (to the extent that one can view Hispanics as a voting bloc!) I find it very hard to believe she will not be easily confirmed. In structuring the alternative before the Senate in this manner, then, Obama reveals an important aspect of presidential power that **cannot be measured** through legislative box scores. Of perhaps greater significance – not one of you predicted Sotomayor’s nomination, and thus no one is the recipient of an “It’s the Fundamentals, Stupid!” T-Shirt. I am deeply, deeply disappointed in all of you. If it were in my power, those diplomas that were handed out in the pouring rain would be rescinded. What kind of an education did you pay for? I’m shocked…SHOCKED!
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#### Hagel will be confirmed but it’s a huge fight---requires all of Obama’s political capital

Scott Wong and Manu Raju, 1-6-2013, “Hagel takes fire from Hill,” http://www.nj.com/us-politics/index.ssf/2013/01/hagel\_takes\_fire\_from\_hill.html

Senate Democrats and Republicans are far from sold on President Barack Obama's expected nomination of Chuck Hagel as secretary of defense. In fact, Obama's decision to tap the Vietnam veteran and outspoken former Republican senator is likely to spark another nasty fight with Congress right on the heels of the fiscal cliff showdown and just before another likely battle royal over the debt ceiling. Republicans on Sunday unleashed a fresh barrage of attacks amid reports Obama would nominate Hagel on Monday for the top job at the Pentagon. The new Senate minority whip, Texas Republican John Cornyn, said he's firmly against Hagel's nomination. Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), an Air Force reservist who serves on the Armed Services Committee that will consider the nod, said Hagel would hold the "most antagonistic" views toward Israel of any defense secretary in U.S. history. And despite heaping praise on Hagel when he retired from the Senate after the 2008 elections, Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) on Sunday failed to extend an olive branch to the Nebraska Republican, instead suggesting there would be "tough questions" ahead. Even Senate Democrats are privately signaling they're not yet on board with the Hagel pick, and that the White House has a lot of work to do to get him across the finish line. The nomination comes at a tricky time for the administration -- just as the fights over raising the debt ceiling and government appropriations are set to begin. And it could put a number of at-risk or pro-Israel Democrats in tough political spots -- especially if the nomination fight grows even more contentious. Democrats are also scratching their heads over why Obama appears willing to go to the mat for Hagel, while abandoning his push for a close friend and member of his inner circle, U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice, to become secretary of state. Rice, an unabashed Democrat, abandoned her bid after withering GOP criticism over the deadly attacks on the U.S. Consulate in Libya. Though different in substance, the controversy over Rice's remarks is not unlike the current pushback over Hagel's past foreign policy positions and controversial remarks. But Hagel lacks a natural constituency in the Senate, given that he's grown alienated from the GOP, yet Democrats are suspicious of his record. "It is a strange signal for the White House to send that they are willing to fight for Hagel but not Rice," one Senate Democratic aide said Sunday. "Democrats are not currently unified behind Hagel, and it will take some real work by the administration to get them there, if it's even possible." Senior Republicans agreed, noting that after Hagel infuriated Republicans and Democrats alike over the years, there isn't a natural base for him. "I can't imagine why [Obama] would choose to burn his political capital on this nomination. For what? There is no constituency for Chuck Hagel," one senior GOP aide said. "Obama will expend every ounce of political capital he has to get him across the finish line. Dems will hate this." On Sunday, the 66-year-old Hagel did receive an endorsement from Senate Majority Whip Dick Durbin (D-Ill.), a key Obama ally and No. 2 in Democratic Senate leadership. Durbin noted that Hagel is a Republican, recipient of two Purple Hearts from wounds he received in Vietnam, and did stints on the Senate Foreign Relations and Intelligence committees. "Yes, he is a serious candidate if the president chooses to name him," Durbin stated. Freshman Sen. Heidi Heitkamp (D-N.D.) called Hagel "a patriot" and said she was keeping an open mind. "Let's hear what the senator has to say," she said. And Democrats predicted last month that Hagel -- who served in the Senate from 1997 to 2009 -- would be confirmed. "We all know him up here, he'll be fine," Senate Armed Services Chairman Carl Levin (D-Mich.) said in mid-December.

#### Plan’s *massively* controversial---categorical exclusions are a political lightening rod

Till 6 Dustin is an associate at Marten Law. “CEQ Issues Proposed Guidance on NEPA Categorical Exclusions,” Oct 18, http://www.martenlaw.com/newsletter/20061018-nepa-exclusions

The White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) recently released draft guidance to clarify and promote the use of categorical exclusions under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).[1] 71 Fed. Reg. 54816 (Sept. 17, 2006). Often a lightning rod for controversy and a constant source of litigation, categorical exclusions allow agencies to exempt certain types of actions from NEPA’s environmental review requirements. According to CEQ, federal agencies have expressed both concern that categorical exclusions are too cumbersome to develop, and confusion over how to substantiate new categorical exclusions.[2] As part of its ongoing regulatory modernization process, CEQ hopes that its guidance will streamline review and encourage greater use of “appropriate categorical exclusions [to] promote[] the cost-effective use of agency NEPA related resources.”[3]¶ NEPA Categorical Exclusions¶ NEPA generally requires federal agencies to take a “hard look” at the environmental consequences of their proposed actions. Specifically, agencies must prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for any proposed major federal action that will significantly affect the human environment.[4] If an agency is uncertain whether its proposed action will have significant environmental impacts, it must prepare an environmental assessment (EA) to determine whether an EIS is necessary.[5] If the EA threshold determination concludes that an EIS is not required, the agency issues a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).[6]¶ Not all proposed federal actions are subject to assessment in an EIS or EA. CEQ’s NEPA regulations allow agencies to “categorically exclude” from further review those actions that experience has indicated will not have significant environmental effects, individually or cumulatively.[7] Because preparing an EA and/or an EIS can be time consuming and expensive, CEQ has encouraged agencies to develop and refine categorical exclusions to promote efficiency and cost effectiveness.[8]¶ The use of categorical exclusions is often controversial. For example, the United States Forest Service’s recently established categorical exclusions for hazardous fuel reduction projects and post-fire timber salvage projects have proven litigious.[9] Some commentators contend that categorical exclusions are over-used and permit agencies to ignore the cumulative impacts of numerous small projects.[10] Government officials, on the other hand, argue that categorical exclusions do not weaken NEPA, and that streamlining the categorical exclusion process is part of a comprehensive regulatory reform process that began during the Carter administration.[11]

#### Hagel’s key to foreign policy restraint that prevents unsustainable squandering of U.S. power---the alternative is Flournoy who would lock in a neocon foreign policy

Kelley Beaucar Vlahos 12-25, longtime political reporter for FoxNews.com and a contributing editor at The American Conservative, Washington correspondent for Homeland Security Today magazine, 12/25/12, “Give Us Chuck Hagel for Christmas,” <http://original.antiwar.com/vlahos/2012/12/24/give-us-hagel-for-christmas/>

Now a Democratic President is reportedly mulling him for defense secretary and the same Republican automatons and neoconservative harpies are pulling no punches to thwart it. They complain about his allegedly insufficient support of Israel (massaged, cajoled and translated for full-effect into charges of anti-Semitism), driven in part by his unwillingness to impose harsh economic sanctions or use of force against Iran. He also voted against designating Hezbollah a terrorist organization, and has encouraged open relations with Hamas in hopes of reanimating the corpse of the Middle East pace process.

Furthermore, Hagel’s flagrant disdain for the runaway MIC (military industrial complex), preemptive war, and senseless foreign occupation is such an aberration to the Washington establishment that when the bunker busters in Congress, American Israel supporters and rightwing 101st Keyboard Brigade heard he might be nominated, their attack was so immediate and vicious it’ll likely serve as a model for smear efficiency for years to come. If the U.S. Army had deployed these superlative tactics in say, Afghanistan, they might have actually won the so-called “war of perception” over the Taliban 10 years ago. Too bad most of Hagel’s critics prefer calling the shots from over here, rather than putting their rear-ends in harm’s way over there.

The War Against Hagel has hardly been decisive, however, at least as we near the end of the year, leaving some space for his supporters to mount a proper defense, which of this writing, is increasingly vigorous. There seems to be a common theme to every blog post and op-ed penned for his purpose: the man is a welcome independent thinker in the Era of the Borg — and he’s no phony, else he would have safely buzzed off with the rest of the political hive long ago. The Atlantic’s Jeffrey Goldberg, usually quite scornful of Realist foreign policy arguments — especially concerning Iran — said Thursday he worries about rightwing developments in Israel even more than Hagel’s purportedly soft approach on Iran, and suggested quite baldy that Hagel’s independence would be a help not a hindrance where it counts:

What we need are American officials who will speak with disconcerting bluntness to Israel about the choices it is making…Maybe the time has come to redefine the term “pro-Israel” to include, in addition to providing support against Iran (a noble cause); help with the Iron Dome system (also a noble cause); and support to maintain Israel’s qualitative military edge (ditto), the straightest of straight talk about Israel’s self-destructive policies on the West Bank. Maybe Hagel, who is not bound to old models, could be useful in this regard.

Many of us see Hagel’s impact in much broader terms than just the Israel question. We’ve had too many armchair generals and dutiful yes men at the levers of power, cleaving to an unsustainable post-9/11 orthodoxy that has militarized our foreign policy and politicized our military. The neoconservatism of the Bush years has bled literally into the so-called humanitarian interventionism of the Obama era, and for the first time, there is an opportunity to check that with the presence of a known Realist who, as Harvard’s Stephen Walt says, is “opposed to squandering U.S. power, prestige, and wealth on misbegotten crusades,” and is immune to the “threat inflation” both sides routinely engage in to justify lining the pockets of the defense industry. After nearly 12 years of constant war, Hagel’s references to Iraq and Afghanistan as a meat grinder to which we’ve wastefully sent too many of our own children, and his belief that he is the “the real conservative” because he actually calls for restraint, should be a refreshing prospect, and not feared by Americans conditioned to accept there is a military solution for every problem.

“In a town dominated by often-unexamined conventional wisdom, the appointment of Hagel to DoD would be a welcome relief,” wrote Michael Cohen for The Guardian last week. Reached on the phone, Cohen told me that Hagel would be a “transformational pick,” but acknowledged that the challenges loom large for a non-conformist now squared against not only members of his own party, but neoconservatives wielding their “long knives,” and the pro-war wing of the Democratic establishment, too. “Look, he is not one of them,” Cohen said, “he’s not a neoconservative nor a liberal hawk, he thinks there should be limits on American power.”

Although President Obama has, so far, not said a word about Hagel, the former senator who quietly spent the last four years chairing the moderate Atlantic Council, is enjoying an enthusiastic defense from myriad commentators across the mainstream, including Andrew Sullivan, Steve Clemons, Peter Beinart — even Jim Judis at The New Republic. Several ambassadors — including Bush-era Nick Burns and Ryan Crocker and three Israel representatives — signed on to a letter encouraging his nomination.

Meanwhile, The National Journal and The Washington Post have published biographical sketches emphasizing Hagel’s Vietnam War record and its impact on his post-war career and personal philosophy (this hardly makes up, however, for the Post’s incoherent broadside published by its editorial page on Dec. 19). And of course, The American Conservative’s Daniel Larison and Scott McConnell, not to mention our own Justin Raimondo, are astutely swatting away the haters at every turn of this increasingly torrid offensive.

Michele Flournoy

But while many of us here at Antiwar would like a Hagel nomination for Christmas, the biggest concern (aside from his Swift Boating) is that we might find Michele Flournoy under the tree instead. For those who never heard of her, she founded the Center for a New American Security in 2007 in anticipation of a new Democratic White House. The think tank was designed to promote a more muscular Democratic military policy, which meant its top people supported Hillary Clinton for president as well as the U.S. counterinsurgency in Iraq, and then Afghanistan, known then as the Petraeus Doctrine. Once Obama won, it became the go-to policy shop for the White House and a revolving door to the Pentagon and State Department for its senior fellows. Flournoy went on to take Doug Feith’s position as Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, the No. 3 job at the Pentagon. What she actually did in the fabled “E-Ring” to advance policy or to help extricate the military from an increasingly disastrous war in Afghanistan, is anyone’s guess. But the “hot policy wonk” and top COINdinista apparently made all the right friends and greased all the right skids, and is now the favored pick by the neocons, who see a kindred soul where Hagel is just heartburn ready to happen.

So buttressed is Flournoy by the Washington elite that people like Paul Wolfowitz, who in all reality should be ignored completely for his role in one of the worst war blunders in American history, are rolling out to defend her (in Wolfowitz’s case, maybe he should have cooled his wheels at home). After admitting he’s “not deeply familiar with Michele Flournoy’s record at the Defense Department or with her overall qualifications to be Secretary of Defense,” he says the fact 3,500 Afghan security forces have died this year (compared to 307 Americans) is proof enough she knows what she is doing. I say it’s proof enough that nothing has really changed since the Bush administration, except there are more troops in Afghanistan now (about 68,000) and the U.S. casualty count was much lower then —- 117 in 2007 to be exact.

When liberal flak Eleanor Clift wrote about the prospects of the “first female defense secretary” back in November, all she could muster in her favor was Flournoy’s Oxford pedigree, a stint in the lackluster Clinton Pentagon policy shop and quotes like these from former colleagues: “she has spent a great deal of time thinking how to deploy our military instruments economically and effectively.” Glad she was thinking about it before she left her post in February. Not much came out of if, however, if today’s accounts of continuing bloat, waste and mission creep are any indication.

Frankly, one hears a lot about Flournoy the “team player” but very little about her vision, ideas or actual accomplishments. The fact is, “the team” has been on a losing streak in Afghanistan since Obama took office, while her think tank, of which she continues to serve on the board of directors, has reaped all the benefits and influence as a conduit between the Pentagon, Foggy Bottom, the White House and greedy defense industry. “She’s a safe pick, she will carry the water — if you pick Hagel it would be saying ‘I want to push the envelope a little bit on foreign policy,’” said Cohen, “pushing it in a more realist direction than we have in the past.”

Perhaps that is why so many of us here are excited about the prospect. There are some areas where Hagel and the readers on this page might diverge, particularly on domestic issues. He’s a solid pro-life social conservative. He voted for the Patriot Act (he later fought for broader constitutional safeguards, saying he took an oath to protect the constitution, not “an oath of office to my party or my president”). We don’t know yet where he would stand on the controversial detention provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). We have no idea whether he would stanch the flow of U.S. personnel and weapons into Africa or how he would deal with a newly inherited drone war. As for the Pentagon labyrinth itself, as University of Texas professor (and expert COIN critic) Celeste Ward Gventer tells me, “the problems are systemic and largely exceed the decision or personality of one man, even if he is at the apex.”

Still, if a Flournoy pick would signal an endorsement of the status quo, a Hagel nod would serve to challenge it. This inclination to question policy is quite attractive to observers like us who are tired of living in a fake candy cane marshmallow bubble world when it comes to foreign policy and national security. As a senator, Hagel often addressed these issues realistically, with no regard to how it might hurt his chances for a presidential nomination, which turned out to be short-lived as a result (quite sad, considering the parade of ham-n-egger Republicans who ended up running, and losing, in the last two elections).

#### Restraint’s key to prevent war with Russia and China---defuses Georgia, Taiwan and the South China Seas

Paul K. MacDonald 11, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Williams College, and Joseph M. Parent, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami, November/December 2011, “The Wisdom of Retrenchment: America Must Cut Back to Move Forward,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 90, No. 6

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