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Energy prices are just low enough that they’re not derailing the economy yet

Hargreaves 1/31 (Steve, KCCI 9 Des Moines, “Energy Prices on the rise again,” http://www.kcci.com/news/project-economy/Energy-prices-on-the-rise-again/-/9356884/18334390/-/nik312z/-/index.html)

Energy prices have been rising fast. But not enough to derail the economic recovery. Not yet anyway. Over the last month, crude oil prices have risen over 4% and are approaching $100 a barrel. Analysts think they'll soon trade in the triple digits. Gasoline futures are up even more, rising 8% over the last 30 days. At the pump, drivers are now paying 14 cents more a gallon than they were in mid December. The only outlier is natural gas, which is used to heat homes, among other things. Natural gas prices have fluctuated widely based on the weather, and have fallen about 4% this month as the cold snap gripping much of the country was expected to ease. Energy analysts say prices are rising partly because the cyclical nature of energy prices -- they often rise ahead of strong summer demand -- is happening earlier and earlier each year. But they're also rising because there's a sense the economy is getting better. When that happens, higher gas prices can lead people to pull back spending on other things -- a self-defeating prophecy that crimps any economic recovery in progress. "Higher energy prices act as a tax increase," said Chris Lafakis, a senior economist at Moody's Analytics, noting that they're also coming on the heels of another tax increase -- the expiration of the payroll tax holiday -- at the start of the year. "That sets us up for weakness." Lafakis said that every penny that gasoline prices rise costs consumers a billion dollars over the course of the year. But he doesn't think the drag will have a noticeable effect on economic growth quite yet. Oil and gas prices were, after all, at this level just a couple of months ago. Oil prices were substantially higher at the start of last year. "We've withstood $100 a barrel before, and we can do it again," said Beth Ann Bovino, deputy chief economist at Standard & Poor's. If prices went considerable higher -- Bovino mentioned $150 a barrel -- that might not be the case. Fortunately for drivers and the economy at large, no one is predicting record prices this year. Largely thanks to an oil and gas production boom in this country, gasoline prices are expected to top out somewhere between $3.50 a gallon and $3.90 a gallon this year, according to Tom Kloza, chief oil analyst at the Oil Price Information Service. Last year's record high was $3.94 a gallon, set in early April.

Renewable energy skyrockets electricity prices – cost of production and transmission lines

Bryce 2012 (Robert, Senior Fellow @ Center for Energy Policy and the Environment - Manhattan Institute, "The High Cost of Renewable Energy Mandates," http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/eper\_10.htm)

Although supporters of renewable energy claim that the RPS mandates will bring benefits, their contribution to the economy is problematic because they also impose costs that must be incorporated into the utility bills paid by homeowners, commercial businesses, and industrial users. And those costs are or will be substantial. Electricity generated from renewable sources generally costs more—often much more—than that produced by conventional fuels such as coal and natural gas. In addition, large-scale renewable energy projects often require the construction of many miles of high-voltage transmission lines. The cost of those lines must also be incorporated into the bills paid by consumers.¶ These extra costs amount to a "back-end way to put a price on carbon," says Suedeen Kelly, a former member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.[5] Indeed, with Congress unwilling to approve national carbon dioxide restrictions or renewable-energy quotas, the RPS mandates have become a sprawling state system of de facto carbon-reduction taxes.

Electricity price spikes crush every sector of the economy

Tverberg 2012 (Gail, Actuary in Oil and Climate Change, “High Prices Fuel Syndrome,” September 26, http://ourfiniteworld.com/2012/09/26/high-priced-fuel-syndrome/)

While oil is the biggest culprit in high-priced fuel syndrome, high-priced fuels of other sorts can play a role as well. Natural gas is recently high-priced in Europe and Japan, but not the USA. The higher natural gas price contributes to a higher average energy cost level for these countries. High-priced renewables, such as off-shore wind and solar photovoltaic, can be expected to act in a similar fashion, because they add to the price challenge customers face. At this point, Europe is hardest-hit by high-priced fuel syndrome. In part this is because Europe is a big importer of both oil and gas, and both are high-priced. European countries have also encouraged the use of high-priced renewables, adding to their difficulties. While many people have laughed at the issue of the world “running out of oil” (or natural gas, or some other substitute fuel), it seems to me that they have basically missed the point. There is always lots of fuel in the ground, or available through devices we create that produce “renewable” fuel. The major issue is that the fuel becomes too expensive for the economy to afford. The United States, Europe, and Japan were industrialized back when fuels were cheap, in the pre-1972 era (Figure 1, above). The cost structure of government welfare programs (such as Social Security, Medicare, unemployment) also assume that the economy will continue as it did with low-priced fuels. Substituting ever more-expensive fuels can be expected to push a country toward economic contraction, reduction in programs that the economy can no longer afford, and the symptoms listed above. When companies begin extracting oil (or natural gas, or coal), they start with the easiest, cheapest-to-extract first. In Figure 2, oil (or natural gas or coal) extraction starts at the top of the triangle, and gradually works down the triangle. As we require more and more fuel, we gradually seek out less-desirable sources of fuels. These fuels tend to be slower to extract, and are more expensive for what we get. They are often more polluting as well. Oil is the fuel that we recently have had a problem with easy-to-extract supply running low. We had a somewhat similar problem in the mid 1970s and early 1980s. At that point there was still plenty of cheap oil left in areas where we had not yet drilled (Alaska, North Sea and Mexico, for example), so the problem was temporary, lasting only until we could drill more oil. This time, the problem seems to be permanent. The chief executives of oil companies Total and Shell have been quoted as saying, “The days of so-called ‘easy oil’ are over, making it harder to meet demand without complicated and expensive projects.”([Voss, 2007](http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=aH57.uZe.sAI)). Examples of such expensive-to-extract oil include deep-water oil and tight oil that must be “fracked”. The fact that the cheap oil is mostly gone is the major reason why oil prices are higher than they were five or ten years ago. If oil prices had not risen, it is likely that the amount of oil extracted each year would be declining. There are alternative fuels such as ethanol and biodiesel, but they also tend to be expensive. Natural gas and coal aren’t immediate substitutes for oil. For example, they won’t act as fuels in most of today’s cars, trucks and airplanes. While there are long-term possibilities for substitution, the high-priced fuel syndrome is today’s problem, not a future problem. Rising Fuel Costs Cause the Economy to Contract There are a number of ways rising fuel costs can cause the economy to contract. The problem is that consumers’ incomes don’t rise, just because oil prices rise. If consumers are required to pay more for a necessity, they will cut back on discretionary goods and services. A few examples: Food prices. If oil prices rise, the price of food tends to rise as well, because oil is used in many ways in producing food: cultivation of fields, planting fields, chemical sprays (herbicides, pesticides), transporting soil amendments, harvesting fields, and transporting food to market. Oil prices are monthly average Brent Oil spot prices, as published by the US Energy Information Administration. Low-income customers tend to be disproportionately affected by rising food prices. They especially tend to cut back on discretionary spending, such as buying a car or going out to a restaurant, in order to be able to afford enough food. As a result, workers in discretionary industries are laid off. Commuting cost. If oil cost rises, the price of auto travel rises. Some auto travel, particularly commuting, is a necessity. Consumers, particularly lower-income consumers, tend to cut back on discretionary spending, such as vacation trips, to afford essential trips. Businesses. Businesses are affected in multiple ways by rising oil prices. First, businesses in discretionary industries find that their “unit-sales” are down, because customers are spending more on food and commuting, as a result, need to cut back elsewhere. Lower unit-sales are likely to lead to lay-offs. In many instances, businesses also use oil directly in the products they sell. For example, airlines use jet fuel. If oil prices rise, they have they either face lower profits, or need to raise prices to recoup their higher costs. This type of price increase further stresses customers’ budgets. Electricity. While the current US problem is oil prices, rising electricity prices would be expected to have a similar effect. Every business today uses electricity in various ways–electric lights, running computers, running elevators, operating tools of various sorts. If electricity costs rise because of higher natural gas prices or because of greater renewable surcharges, it will raise the cost of the product produced. Businesses again have the choice of raising the price to consumers, or facing declining profits. If they raise prices, they will be less competitive with suppliers from other countries, who may not be facing rising electricity costs, if their source of electricity (perhaps coal or nuclear) is not rising in price as fast. If electricity prices rise, consumers’ budgets will be stressed in a similar way to the way that they are stressed by rising oil prices. This, too, can be expected to lead to a cutback in discretionary expenditures. Follow-on effects. Laid-off workers may move in with relatives and cut back on driving to save on costs. This helps reduce demand for both homes and automobiles. With less demand for homes, housing prices may decline, especially in parts of the country with significant layoffs and plentiful housing supply. Laid-off workers may default on loans, creating financial distress for banks. Even people who still have jobs may find the hours they work reduced, so that their take-home pay is lower. They too may cut back on discretionary expenditures. Impact on Governments Governments suffering from high-priced energy syndrome can expect a number of negative impacts: 1. Laid-off workers expect to collect unemployment benefits. If there are other kinds of benefits that they might collect under some other program (disability, retirement, low-income assistance), they will want them as well. 2. If citizens are working fewer hours or laid off, the amount of taxes they pay is lower. 3. Banks and other industries are likely to need bailing out, as borrowers default on loans. 4. The government will be faced with direct increases in costs, because the government uses oil to fuel its autos and jets. 5. The government will face increasing costs on products it buys that use oil, such as asphalt for highway projects. 6. Local governments may face reduced tax revenue because of declining home and business property values. Figure 4 below shows US Federal Government Income and Outlays, in recent years: It is clear from Figure 4 that income had dropped at the same time outlay has risen. Even though the crisis is supposedly past, there is still a huge gap between income and outlays. Outlays in recent years are higher than would be expected based on pre 2005 trends, while revenues are lower than would be expected. Revenue would need to be more than 50% higher, to match outgo, for 2009 through 2012 fiscal years. The amounts shown in Figure 4 are consolidated, so include programs such as Social Security and Medicare, besides “on budget” spending. How many readers could afford to contribute 50% more than they currently pay for the sum of (Federal Income Taxes + Social Security + Medicare funding)? If the government were to actually raise taxes this much, there would be a huge new round of lay-offs, because consumers would find their after-tax income much reduced, leading to even more cuts in discretionary spending. Needless to say, the US government will do everything in its power to cover up its problems. In a later section, we will discuss how this huge deficit is being hidden. Note that the only years during which US Federal Government income exceeded outgo in Figure 4 are 1998 through 2001. These years approximately coincide with the time period when historical oil prices were at the lowest level in recent years (Figure 5, below).

Nuclear war.

Friedberg and Schoenfeld ‘8 - Professor of politics and international relations at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School, Aaron, Visiting scholar at the Witherspoon Institute in Princeton, N.J, Gabriel, “The Dangers of a Diminished America”, The Wall Street Journal, 10/21, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj

Pressures to cut defense spending, and to dodge the cost of waging two wars, already intense before this crisis, are likely to mount. Despite the success of the surge, the war in Iraq remains deeply unpopular. Precipitous withdrawal -- attractive to a sizable swath of the electorate before the financial implosion -- might well become even more popular with annual war bills running in the hundreds of billions. Protectionist sentiments are sure to grow stronger as jobs disappear in the coming slowdown. Even before our current woes, calls to save jobs by restricting imports had begun to gather support among many Democrats and some Republicans. In a prolonged recession, gale-force winds of protectionism will blow. Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario **there are shades of the** **1930s, when global trade and finance ground** nearly **to a halt**, the peaceful **democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers** led by the remorseless fanatics who **rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions**. Today we run the risk that **rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys**, just **at our moment of maximum vulnerability**. The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity. None of this is good news if the **authoritarian leaders** of these countries **seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures**.
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Energy consumption represents the peak of our manipulation of the environment. Rather than revealing the ontological beauty of nature, it stores it for human utilization. This is the pinnacle of standing reserve logic that obviates our relation to the power of the Earth.

Beckman, Emeritus Professor of Philosophy, 2000 [Tad, Harvey Mudd College, Martin Heidegger and Environnmental Ethics, page @ http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/HEIDART.HTML]

Heidegger clearly saw the development of "energy resources" as symbolic of this evolutionary path; while the transformation into modern technology undoubtedly began early, the first definitive signs of its new character began with the harnessing of energy resources, as we would say. [(7)](http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/HEIDART.HTML#N_7_) As a representative of the old technology, the windmill took energy from the wind but converted it immediately into other manifestations such as the grinding of grain; the windmill did not unlock energy from the wind in order to store it for later arbitrary distribution. Modern wind-generators, on the other hand, convert the energy of wind into electrical power which can be stored in batteries or otherwise. The significance of storage is that it places the energy at our disposal; and because of this storage the powers of nature can be turned back upon itself. The storing of energy is, in this sense, the symbol of our over-coming of nature as a potent object. "...a tract of land is challenged into the putting out of coal and ore. The earth now reveals itself as a coal mining district, the soil as a mineral deposit." {[7], p. 14} This and other examples that Heidegger used throughout this essay illustrate the difference between a technology that diverts the natural course cooperatively and modern technology that achieves the unnatural by force. Not only is this achieved by force but it is achieved by placing nature in our subjective context, setting aside natural processes entirely, and conceiving of all revealing as being relevant only to human subjective needs. The essence of technology originally was a revealing of life and nature in which human intervention deflected the natural course while still regarding nature as the teacher and, for that matter, the keeper. The essence of modern technology is a revealing of phenomena, often far removed from anything that resembles "life and nature," in which human intrusion not only diverts nature but fundamentally changes it. As a mode of revealing, technology today is a challenging-forth of nature so that the technologically altered nature of things is always a situation in which nature and objects wait, standing in reserve for our use. We pump crude oil from the ground and we ship it to refineries where it is fractionally distilled into volatile substances and we ship these to gas stations around the world where they reside in huge underground tanks, standing ready to power our automobiles or airplanes. Technology has intruded upon nature in a far more active mode that represents a consistent direction of domination. Everything is viewed as "standing-reserve" and, in that, loses its natural objective identity. The river, for instance, is not seen as a river; it is seen as a source of hydro-electric power, as a water supply, or as an avenue of navigation through which to contact inland markets. In the era of techne humans were relationally involved with other objects in the coming to presence; in the era of modern technology, humans challenge-forth the subjectively valued elements of the universe so that, within this new form of revealing, objects lose their significance to anything but their subjective status of standing-ready for human design. [(8)](http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/HEIDART.HTML#N_8_)

Nuclear war is survivable but reducing nature to a source of energy production destroys the environment making extinction inevitable

Michael Zimmerman [[Biologist](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biologist) and Vice President for Academic Affairs / Provost at [The Evergreen State College](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Evergreen_State_College) in Olympia, Washington. Former Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Butler University in Indianapolis and Dean of the College of Letters and Science at the [University of Wisconsin–Oshkosh](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_of_Wisconsin%E2%80%93Oshkosh)for 14 years. Spent 12 years at Oberlin College as a professor of biology and associate dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Prior to that he worked at The College of William and Mary as well as Hampshire College. Zimmerman holds an A.B. degree in [Geography](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geography) from the [University of Chicago](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_of_Chicago) and a Ph.D. in [Ecology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ecology) from [Washington University in St. Louis](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Washington_University_in_St._Louis).] 1994 (Contesting Earth's Future, p. 119-120)

Heidegger asserted that human self-assertion, combined with the eclipse of being, threatens the relation between being and human Dasein. Loss of this relation would be even more dangerous than a nuclear war that might "bring about the complete annihilation of humanity and the destruction of the earth." This controversial claim is comparable to the Christian teaching that it is better to forfeit the world than to lose one's soul by losing one's relation to God. Heidegger apparently thought along these lines: it is possible that after a nuclear war, life might once again emerge, but it is far less likely that there will ever again occur an ontological clearing through which such life could manifest itself. Further, since modernity's one-dimensional disclosure of entities virtually denies them any "being" at all, the loss of humanity's openness for being is already occurring. Modernity's background mood is horror in the face of nihilism, which is consistent with the aim of providing material "happiness" for everyone by reducing nature to pure energy. The unleashing of vast quantities of energy in nuclear war would be equivalent to modernity's slow-motion destruction of nature: unbounded destruction would equal limitless consumption. If humanity avoided nuclear war only to survive as contented clever animals, Heidegger believed we would exist in a state of ontological damnation: hell on earth, masquerading as material paradise. Deep ecologists might agree that a world of material human comfort purchased at the price of everything wild would not be a world worth living in, for in killing wild nature, people would be as good as dead. But most of them could not agree that the loss of humanity's relation to being would be worse than nuclear omnicide, for it is wrong to suppose that the lives of millions of extinct and unknown species are somehow lessened because they were never "disclosed" by humanity.

The role of the ballot is a focus on Ontological questioning – this focus precedes politics proper because Ontology determines action

Dillon 1999 (Lancaster Politics Lecturer, Moral Spaces, pp. 97-8)

Heirs to all this, we find ourselves in the turbulent and now globalized wake of its confluence. As Heidegger-himself an especially revealing figure of the deep and mutual implication of the philosophical and the political4-never tired of pointing out, the relevance of ontology to all other kinds of thinking is fundamental and inescapable. For one cannot say anything about any­thing that is, without always already having made assumptions about the “is” as such. Any mode of thought, in short, always already carries an ontology sequestered within it. What this ontological turn does to other-regional-modes of thought is to challenge the ontology within which they operate. The implications of that review reverberate through­out the entire mode of thought, demanding a reappraisal as fundamen­tal as the reappraisal ontology has demanded of philosophy. With ontology at issue, the entire foundations or underpinnings of any mode of thought are rendered problematic. This applies as much to any modern discipline of thought as it does to the question of moder­nity as such, with the exception, it seems, of science, which, having long ago given up the ontological questioning of when it called itself natural philosophy, appears now, in its industrialized and corporatized form, to be invulnerable to ontological perturbation. With its foundations at issue, the very authority of a mode of thought and the ways in which it characterizes the critical issues of freedom and judgment (of what kind of universe human beings inhabit, how they inhabit it, and what counts as reliable knowledge for them in it) is also put in question. The very ways in which Nietzsche, Heidegger, and other continental philosophers challenged Western ontology, simultaneously, therefore reposed the fun­damental and inescapable difficulty, or aporia, for human being of de­cision and judgment. In other words, whatever ontology you subscribe to, knowingly or unknowingly, as a human being you still have to act. Whether or not you know or acknowledge it, the ontology you subscribe to will con­strue the problem of action for you in one way rather than another. You may think ontology is some arcane question of philosophy, but Nietz­sche and Heidegger showed that it intimately shapes not only a way of thinking, but a way of being, a form of life. Decision, a fortiori political decision, in short, is no mere technique. It is instead a way of being that bears an understanding of Being, and of the fundaments of the human way of being within it. This applies, indeed applies most, to those mock ­innocent political slaves who claim only to be technocrats of decision making.
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Immigration Reform will pass—STRONG bipartisan support but drawn out and contentious debates are still to come—

Graham 2-7-13. DAVID A. GRAHAM - David Graham is an associate editor at The Atlantic, where he writes and edits for the Politics Channel. He previously reported for Newsweek, The Wall Street Journal, and The National. “Why Immigration-Reform Advocates Feel Good About Their Chances” [http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/02/why-immigration-reform-advocates-feel-good-about-their-chances/272977/]

The way John McCain and Michael Bennet talk about it, you'd be surprised immigration reform hasn't passed already.

"We have the opportunity to pass a broad-based bill that deals not just with one problem or two problem but takes on the entire of array in ways this touches our economy," said Bennet, a Democratic U.S. senator from Colorado, at an Atlantic conference in Washington Thursday. (Bennet is the brother of Atlantic Editor in Chief James Bennet.) "I do think you've got two parties that've got reasons to get this done."

And McCain, as usual, was colorful and blunt. A veteran of several failed attempts at reform, he offered one big explanation for why this time would be different.

"The climate has changed, American opinion has changed, elections have changed ... and I'm working with people who are effective," he said. "Chuck Schumer is effective. I hate him! But he's effective."

Of course, there's more to it, especially for Republicans like McCain, who along with Bennet is a member of the "Gang of Eight" senators working on a bipartisan proposal. The Arizonan pinpointed three reasons this is the time to get reform done. One is simple political math: As many Republicans seem to be realizing, the GOP will find it harder and harder to win elections if it continues to alienate Latino voters. A second is technological, he said, repeatedly citing drones and other technological advances developed to fight the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan as useful tools for policing the border with Mexico more effectively.

But much of it comes down to fairness, he concluded.

"Can we leave 11 million people in the shadows forever?" McCain asked, referring to the estimated number of illegal immigrants in the country. "The people that wash our dishes, cut our lawns, take care of our children -- is it right to leave them in the shadows forever? I don't think so."

Intriguingly, the two Democratic senators who bookended McCain's appearance -- Bennet and Minnesota's Amy Klobuchar -- offered economic rationales for reform, while the Republican made the compassionate case. But what's interesting is how views often associated with one party or the other seem to have been pushed aside, if not totally dispensed with. Bennet said it was reasonable to expect immigrants to learn English, and he said it was fine to make legislation contingent upon border security as long as employee verification, the standard Democratic priority, was part of a comprehensive bill. Bennet would offer only oblique criticism of GOP hardliners like David Vitter and Ted Cruz, saying, "There are some people that are better at putting themselves in other people's shoes that others."

Meanwhile, the occasionally cranky McCain was all smiles and jokes, with praise for both Klobuchar and Bennet; he saved his fire for budgetary matters. Asked about the sequester -- which he voted for -- he said, "It's insane, and it's unacceptable." And he criticized his 2008 rival Barack Obama's campaign-style strategy of barnstorming the country to drum up grassroots backing for his side. The real solution, McCain said, was to invite legislators to the White House to hash out a compromise. "There's no point in going out and giving another speech."

There should be no illusion that the road forward on immigration reform will be smooth. Panelists identified two big ones. First is the already-cliched "path to citizenship" for illegal immigrants, which McCain pointed out was likely to disappoint some advocates -- it won't be a walk in the park. The second sticking point is likely to be a guest-worker program. While lawmakers in both parties seem to agree that the country should lift caps on visas for highly skilled workers, the fate of agricultural and other low-skill workers seems certain to provoke acrimonious debate.

Political capital is key to RESOLVING these fights and getting it passed—

Foley 1-15 Elise is a writer @ Huff Post Politics. “Obama Gears Up For Immigration Reform Push In Second Term,” 2013, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/15/obama-immigration-reform\_n\_2463388.html

Obama has repeatedly said he will push hard for immigration reform in his second term, and administration officials have said that other contentious legislative initiatives -- including gun control and the debt ceiling -- won't be allowed to get in the way. At least at first glance, he seems to have politics on his side. GOP lawmakers are entering -- or, in some cases, re-entering -- the immigration debate in the wake of disastrous results for their party's presidential nominee with Latino voters, who support reform by large measures. Based on those new political realities, "it would be a suicidal impulse for Republicans in Congress to continue to block [reform]," David Axelrod, a longtime adviser to the president, told The Huffington Post.¶ Now there's the question of how Obama gets there. While confrontation might work with Republicans on other issues -- the debt ceiling, for example -- the consensus is that the GOP is serious enough about reform that the president can, and must, play the role of broker and statesman to get a deal.¶ It starts with a lesson from his first term. Republicans have demanded that the border be secured first, before other elements of immigration reform. Yet the administration has been by many measures the strictest ever on immigration enforcement, and devotes massive sums to policing the borders. The White House has met many of the desired metrics for border security, although there is always more to be done, but Republicans are still calling for more before they will consider reform. Enforcing the border, but not sufficiently touting its record of doing so, the White House has learned, won't be enough to win over Republicans.¶ In a briefing with The Huffington Post, a senior administration official said the White House believes it has met enforcement goals and must now move to a comprehensive solution. The administration is highly skeptical of claims from Republicans that immigration reform can or should be done in a piecemeal fashion. Going down that road, the White House worries, could result in passage of the less politically complicated pieces, such as an enforcement mechanism and high-skilled worker visas, while leaving out more contentious items such as a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants.¶ "Enforcement is certainly part of the picture," the official said. "But if you go back and look at the 2006 and 2007 bills, if you go back and look at John McCain's 10-point 'This is what I've got to get done before I'm prepared to talk about immigration,' and then you look at what we're actually doing, it's like 'check, check, check.' We're there. The border is as secure as it's been in a generation or two, so it's really time."¶ One key in the second term, advocates say, will be convincing skeptics such as Republican Sen. John Cornyn of Texas that the Obama administration held up its end of the bargain by proving a commitment to enforcement. The White House also needs to convince GOP lawmakers that there's support from their constituents for immigration reform, which could be aided by conservative evangelical leaders and members of the business community who are pushing for a bill.¶ Immigrant advocates want more targeted deportations that focus on criminals, while opponents of comprehensive immigration reform say there's too little enforcement and not enough assurances that reform wouldn't be followed by another wave of unauthorized immigration. The Obama administration has made some progress on both fronts, but some advocates worry that the president hasn't done enough to emphasize it. The latest deportation figures were released in the ultimate Friday news dump: mid-afternoon Friday on Dec. 21, a prime travel time four days before Christmas.¶ Last week, the enforcement-is-working argument was bolstered by a report from the nonpartisan Migration Policy Institute, which found that the government is pouring more money into its immigration agencies than the other federal law-enforcement efforts combined. There are some clear metrics to point to on the border in particular, and Doris Meissner, an author of the report and a former commissioner of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, said she hopes putting out more information can add to the immigration debate.¶ "I've been surprised, frankly, that the administration hasn't done more to lay out its record," she said, adding the administration has kept many of its metrics under wraps.¶ There are already lawmakers working on a broad agreement. Eight senators, coined the gang of eight, are working on a bipartisan immigration bill. It's still in its early stages, but nonmembers of the "gang," such as Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) are also talking about reform.¶ It's still unclear what exact role the president will play, but sources say he does plan to lead on the issue. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.), the top Democrat on the House immigration subcommittee, said the White House seems sensitive to the fact that Republicans and Democrats need to work out the issue in Congress -- no one is expecting a fiscal cliff-style arrangement jammed by leadership -- while keeping the president heavily involved.

The plan derails that—

Bill Opalka, Editor-and-chief, 12 [“Groups Want to Stop Politicizing Green Energy,” EnergyBiz, June 24, http://www.energybiz.com/article/12/06/groups-want-stop-politicizing-green-energy]

The U.S. Partnership for Renewable Energy Finance (US PREF) released a series of white papers at the American Council On Renewable Energy (ACORE)'s Renewable Energy Finance Forum - Wall Street in New York on June 19.¶ The groups say the effort is to rebalance the debate about renewable energy toward a fact-based business analysis instead of the politicized rhetoric that dominates discussions currently.¶ PREF members provided analyses that show how crucial renewable energy is as part of the nation's overall energy mix.¶ “There's never been a more important time for our country to adopt a genuine all-of-the-above energy strategy,” said Neil Auerbach, co-managing partner of Hudson Clean Energy Partners, a private equity firm that invests exclusively in clean energy. “We have the opportunity now to cultivate American business and innovation, support long-term job growth, fortify national security, decrease energy costs, and realize a host of environmental benefits.”¶ A common, bemoaned refrain at renewable energy gatherings is to hear reference to “Republican electrons” from coal and nuclear power and “Democratic electrons” from wind and solar.¶ US PREF cites international competition as a threat to continued U.S. innovation and global leadership.¶ The U.S. invested $48.1 billion in clean energy in 2011. “We are working with the renewable energy, power and technology industry leaders to pursue continued development of the U.S. renewable energy sector. This is an important opportunity to underscore U.S. leadership as we seek technologies to power future global growth and redefine our national energy strategy,” said Jeff Holzschuh, vice chairman at Morgan Stanley.¶ The white papers released by US PREF illustrate how large-scale deployment of renewable electricity sources has produced dramatic cost reductions, while fostering innovation that has increased efficiency across entire supply chains. State and federal policies are working in concert to drive this large-scale deployment and innovation. While federal incentives such as the production and investment tax credits bolster the supply of renewable energy, support for renewable energy demand has been augmented by state renewable portfolio standards (RPS). RPS “demand pull" is now reaching a plateau, however, of 3.25 GW per year of new renewable generating capacity through 2030.¶ To publicize the renewables message, ACORE on June 20 launched EnergyFactCheck.org and @EnergyFactCheck, two new resources designed to address the imbalance in the American debate.¶ “Clean and renewable energy is popular, productive, growing and essential to America’s economy, energy independence and national security.” said ACORE President and CEO Vice Admiral Dennis McGinn. “Unfortunately, misperceptions of clean and renewable energy abound, and opponents of renewables are pushing the occasional bad news as if it’s the only news. They are dominating the conversation through misrepresentation, exaggeration, distraction and millions of dollars in lobbying and advertising.”

CIR is key to food security and ag competitiveness

ACIR 07 THE AGRICULTURE COALITION FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM, December 4, 2007, http://www.aila.org/content/fileviewer.aspx?docid=24034&linkid=169473

Dear Member of Congress: The Agriculture Coalition for Immigration Reform (ACIR) is deeply concerned with pending immigration enforcement legislation known as the ‘Secure America Through Verification and Enforcement Act of 2007' or ‘SAVE Act’ (H.R.4088 and S.2368). While these bills seek to address the worthy goal of stricter immigration law enforcement, they fail to take a comprehensive approach to solving the immigration problem. History shows that a one dimensional approach to the nation’s immigration problem is doomed to fail. Enforcement alone, without providing a viable means to obtain a legal workforce to sustain economic growth is a formula for disaster. Agriculture best illustrates this point. Agricultural industries that need considerable labor in order to function include the fruit and vegetable, dairy and livestock, nursery, greenhouse, and Christmas tree sectors. Localized labor shortages have resulted in actual crop loss in various parts of the country. More broadly, producers are making decisions to scale back production, limit expansion, and leave many critical tasks unfulfilled. Continued labor shortages could force more producers to shift production out of the U.S., thus stressing already taxed food and import safety systems. Farm lenders are becoming increasingly concerned about the stability of affected industries. This problem is aggravated by the nearly universal acknowledgement that the current H-2A agricultural guest worker program does not work. Based on government statistics and other evidence, roughly 80 percent of the farm labor force in the United States is foreign born, and a significant majority of that labor force is believed to be improperly authorized. The bills’ imposition of mandatory electronic employment eligibility verification will screen out the farm labor force without providing access to legal workers. Careful study of farm labor force demographics and trends indicates that there is not a replacement domestic workforce available to fill these jobs. This feature alone will result in chaos unless combined with labor-stabilizing reforms. Continued failure by Congress to act to address this situation in a comprehensive fashion is placing in jeopardy U.S. food security and global competitiveness. Furthermore, congressional inaction threatens the livelihoods of millions of Americans whose jobs exist because laborintensive agricultural production is occurring in America. If production is forced to move, most of the upstream and downstream jobs will disappear as well. The Coalition cannot defend of the broken status quo. We support well-managed borders and a rational legal system. We have worked for years to develop popular bipartisan legislation that would stabilize the existing experienced farm workforce and provide an orderly transition to wider reliance on a legal agricultural worker program that provides a fair balance of employer and employee rights and protections. We respectfully urge you to oppose S.2368, H.R.4088, or any other bills that would impose employment-based immigration enforcement in isolation from equally important reforms that would provide for a stable and legal farm labor force.

That solves extinction

Lugar 04 (Richard G., former U.S. Senator – Indiana and Former Chair – Senate Foreign Relations Committee, “Plant Power”, Our Planet, 14(3), http://www.unep.org/ourplanet/imgversn/143/lugar.html)

In a world confronted by global terrorism, turmoil in the Middle East, burgeoning nuclear threats and other crises, it is easy to lose sight of the long-range challenges. But we do so at our peril. One of the most daunting of them is meeting the world’s need for food and energy in this century. At stake is not only preventing starvation and saving the environment, but also world peace and security. History tells us that states may go to war over access to resources, and that poverty and famine have often bred fanaticism and terrorism. Working to feed the world will minimize factors that contribute to global instability and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. With the world population expected to grow from 6 billion people today to 9 billion by mid-century, the demand for affordable food will increase well beyond current international production levels. People in rapidly developing nations will have the means greatly to improve their standard of living and caloric intake. Inevitably, that means eating more meat. This will raise demand for feed grain at the same time that the growing world population will need vastly more basic food to eat. Complicating a solution to this problem is a dynamic that must be better understood in the West: developing countries often use limited arable land to expand cities to house their growing populations. As good land disappears, people destroy timber resources and even rainforests as they try to create more arable land to feed themselves. The long-term environmental consequences could be disastrous for the entire globe. Productivity revolution To meet the expected demand for food over the next 50 years, we in the United States will have to grow roughly three times more food on the land we have. That’s a tall order. My farm in Marion County, Indiana, for example, yields on average 8.3 to 8.6 tonnes of corn per hectare – typical for a farm in central Indiana. To triple our production by 2050, we will have to produce an annual average of 25 tonnes per hectare. Can we possibly boost output that much? Well, it’s been done before. Advances in the use of fertilizer and water, improved machinery and better tilling techniques combined to generate a threefold increase in yields since 1935 – on our farm back then, my dad produced 2.8 to 3 tonnes per hectare. Much US agriculture has seen similar increases. But of course there is no guarantee that we can achieve those results again. Given the urgency of expanding food production to meet world demand, we must invest much more in scientific research and target that money toward projects that promise to have significant national and global impact. For the United States, that will mean a major shift in the way we conduct and fund agricultural science. Fundamental research will generate the innovations that will be necessary to feed the world. The United States can take a leading position in a productivity revolution. And our success at increasing food production may play a decisive humanitarian role in the survival of billions of people and the health of our planet.

### Off

The Fifty States of the United States and all relevant territories should create a set-aside for Central Appalachia in the Rural Energy for America Program to increase financial incentives for energy production of wind power. Revenue for the policy should be raised by spending reductions and leasing state toll roads and lottery systems.

Solves and avoids politics.

Sklar 9-17-12— President, The Stella Group, Ltd & Adjunct Professor GWU, Scott, Divesting Authority Out of Washington, National Journal, 9-17, http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/09/tackling-energys-biggest-hurdl.php?comments=expandall#comments

In the United States, the federal government has a limited set of tools to drive energy policy - federal leasing rules, interstate commerce via FERC, environmental regulation, and then tax and procurement policies. In reality, there has been little change at the national level in energy policies between the Democratic and Republican presidencies, aside from all the chest pounding to the contrary. State and Local governments have far more clout and involvement in energy policies - including siting and permitting rules, setting electric rates, tax incentives and waivers, codes and standards, environmental protection including greenhouse gas emissions reductions. "Mayors have single-handedly taken action on climate protection efforts and in many cases, creatively launched local energy efficiency programs to help reduce our carbon footprint in American cities." declared Tom Cochran, CEO & Executive Director, U.S. Conference of Mayors. Mayors are on the front lines of impacting human behavior - from their work on recycling, to the 1054 mayors who joined The U.S. Conference of Mayors' Climate Protection Agreement, vowing to reduce carbon emissions in their cities below 1990 levels, in line with the Kyoto Protocol. For instance, a climate guidebook will become part of ICLEI’s (International Council of Local Environmental Initiatives) Climate Resilient Communities program, which is administered by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). ICLEI’s Climate Resilient Communities program is also helping Miami-Dade County to concoct its own strategies for climate change adaptation , and in Arlington County, Va. the Fresh AIRE (Arlington Initiative to Reduce Emissions) Campaign includes a goal that the Arlington County government will reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by 10 percent from 2000 to 2012. Sarasota County, Fla. recently became the nation’s first county to adopt the American Institute of Architects’ 2030 Challenge. The challenge calls for the reduction of fossil fuel use in renovated and new buildings by 60 percent in 2010, 70 percent in 2015, 80 percent in 2020 and 90 percent in 2025. The ultimate goal is to design county buildings to be carbon-neutral by the year 2030. All of these activities driven by local governments, are totally outside of the federal agenda. California is ready to implement a “cap and trade,” a system that aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions generated in the state by capping the amount of the emissions businesses may produce whose goal is to reduce carbon emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, then cut them another 80 percent by 2050. Starting this November the state will begin auctioning carbon permits to companies that surpass the emissions limit. Because the national government, frankly, is cowtowing to it’s biggest funders from the depth and breadth of the energy industries, not much will happen in these energy mega-issue battles. But State and local governments are actually leading the way with 29 States implementing renewable energy portfolio standards and 42 states having interconnection standards for renewable and alternative energy distributed generation and net-metering. And that is the one hope for energy progress, which would make former President and Governor Ronald Reagan proud, by divesting authority out of Washington and let State and local governments meet the energy needs and aspirations of their populations.

### Advantage 1

Multiple drawbacks to wind power design – much research still needed before it is viable

Gresham 10 **(Robert, PhD in Organic Chemistry from Emory, Dr. Gresham is currently Director of Professional Development, January 2010, “How Truly Viable is Wind Energy?”, Tribiology & Lubrication Technology,** [**http://www.stle.org/assets/document/Lubrication\_Fundamentals\_January\_2010.pdf**](http://www.stle.org/assets/document/Lubrication_Fundamentals_January_2010.pdf)**, vh)**

The recent STLE-ASME-sponsored international Joint tribology conference featured another special session on the technical problems associated with wind energy. To put it in perspective, we are talking about electricity generation. electricity can’t be stored and needs to be transferred to points where it is needed. So when we talk about wind supplying some percentage of the nation’s energy, we are talking only about its electrical-energy needs—still an enormous number but not as daunting as replacing all forms of our energy needs. According to Greg Ziegler with SKF, electricity sourcing in the U.S. breaks down as follows: • Coal: 50% • Gas: 22% • Nuclear: 20% • Hydro: 7% • Wind 2%. The U.S. goal is to increase wind to ~20% by 2015. That is a pretty impressive growth industry by any standard. According to Sandy Butterfield with the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Boulder, Colo., the cost of installation is as follows: wind $1,900 per kw vs. $1,800 for coal and $9,000 for nuclear. So the cost of installation at least keeps wind technology in the game. Indeed, the largest supplier of wind turbines in the world, Vesta, a German company, cranks out a new turbine every 45 minutes. GE and Siemens also are key players. So clearly there is a global business commitment to the wind industry. The next key issue is that we already have an electricity transmission grid pretty much in place, although it is a little antiquated and, more important, not oriented toward locations where there is consistent wind. So there needs to be a significant upgrade of the grid system if wind is to become a larger contributor to our energy needs. That will be expensive. Finally, where is there consistent wind? Turns out the region of the country encompassing western Washington, Montana and the Dakotas south through to north Texas has pretty consistent wind. But this isolation increases maintenance costs, especially in winter. When one thinks a little deeper on the location of wind and the need for electricity, Mr. Butterfield makes the point that we need most of our electricity on the coasts where most people are. So it is actually more logical to have most of our wind farms in the oceans where there is plenty of open space, in fact, two-thirds of the earth’s surface. Ocean-based wind turbines have a lot of advantages and a few disadvantages. First, the water has to be relatively shallow (<20M), or we have to invent huge floating wind farms. This is doable, based on technology learned from off-shore drilling, but surely will add to the cost. Thinking globally, there is less of a negative environmental impact, at least once these floating farms are built. As any sailor knows, there are many areas on the oceans where there is almost always plenty of wind such as the trade wind belts. If far enough out to sea, wind farms are not an aesthetic problem except to the passing yacht or cruise ship. ENGINEERING ISSUES What about the engineering issues? First, we have not yet optimized the designs, although they generally fit the schematic, as shown in Figure 1. Indeed, I think we actually have a long way to go. We know that by varying the blade pitch, we can run the fan blades at a constant speed with tip speeds ~80 feet per sec. This greatly reduces noise and results in a relatively slow-speed (~20-30 rpm), high-torque machine, which results in a relatively constant electrical output and reduces stresses on the hardware. Next, we haven’t optimized the size of these machines. They are getting larger and larger, with individual arms commonly on the order of 120 meters. The trend, especially for ocean wind farm turbines, is toward colossally large machines. Given that we haven’t optimized the size of these machines, what are some of the other engineering issues? This is one of the areas where life is not what we would prefer. The design goal for wind turbines is a lifespan of 20-30 years. From an investment standpoint, we are looking at a goal of a 6-7-year payback. The reality is that we are having maintenance problems in the 3-5 year period. As we heard at the 2008 STLE Annual Meeting in Cleveland, blade design and control has evolved to a pretty high level, allowing for very efficient capturing of the wind’s power as well as helping to control speed and torque. For the most part the blades seem to be working pretty well, although the blade pitch control bearings and the attendant control system are still experiencing premature wear problems. Recognize that these bearings are on the order of six feet or more in diameter, which poses severe manufacturing problems in terms of maintaining tolerances and surface finishes readily achievable in much smaller bearings. The yaw bearings and their control system have similar problems. These bearings are much larger yet. Fortunately, we find that the electrical generator also is not a major problem, but we are concerned with stray electrical currents leading to wear and micropitting of gears and bearings in the rest of the system due to electro-corrosion mechanisms. The main rotor bearings, pitch and yaw bearings and generator bearings often are grease-lubricated. These bearings, depending on location, can see temperatures from -30 C to as high as 100 C. The grease, specially blended for this application, is based on a VG 460 oil. An additional weak spot in the overall design are the gearboxes. Additionally, the design direction for the gearboxes are toward progressively higher ratios to a high of 100:1. That is, the rotor blade shaft goes into the gearbox at ~20-30 rpm and the output shaft spins at ~1,800 rpm or more. Further, the goal is toward less massive gearboxes. Current gearboxes, similar to the one shown in Figure 2, can be larger than a Volkswagen. All this adds more and more stress to the system. So how are we going to deal with these problems? In April, the U.S. National Wind Technology Center held a workshop on micro-pitting of gears and bearings in wind turbine gearboxes. ST LE-members Drs. Ali Erdemir, Argonne National Laboratory, and Mike Kotzalas, The Timken Co., represented not only their employers but also the newly formed Wind Energy Tribology (WET) Committee of the ASME Tribology Division. The outcome of the meeting was to have the WET Committee continue the work started at the workshop. Dan Brake from NextEra Energy, the largest wind turbine operator in the U.S., spoke at the 2009 IJTC meeting. He mentioned that while gearboxes may represent a large monetary issue in terms of reliability, the most unreliable of the subsystems are pitch and yaw systems. The exact issues in pitch and yaw causing the problems had not been analyzed through NextEra’s data. We need a better understanding of these problems before solutions can be developed. Micropitting appears to signal the onset of failure in both bearings and gears. However, the general operating parameters involved in causing micropitting, as well as the possible solutions or mitigation methods, are expected to be different. Therefore, two WET Committee teams have been formed to: 1. Define micropitting in terms of this project. 2. Define the causes and onset of micropitting on the gear or bearing components in terms of operating conditions or design parameters. 3. Discuss potential solutions or mitigation methods. Finally, we need to understand and define application specific lubricant fluid management for the components of wind turbines. this last issue is surely stLe’s turf, and we will respond. some of the issues we need to address include: 1. understanding the causes and onset of micropitting in each of the systems. 2. defining the correct lubricant tests to detect the early onset of both component and lubricant failure. 3. defining the frequency of tests and also considering real-time condition monitoring via remote sensing technology. 4. to avoid paralysis by analysis, defining a decision-tree protocol to guide thOe turbine operator with viable, cost-effective corrective actions. existing and future turbines could greatly benefit from a proactive maintenance program that includes rigorous attention to contamination control and a sophisticated condition monitoring program involving remote sensing and transmission to wind farm control centers. all stuff we (stLe kind of folks) pretty much know how to do. to further put the problems into perspective, Dan Brake mentioned that the cost of bringing in a 400-ton crane to service the turbine would cost about as much as replacing the entire gearbox. clearly, this needs to be avoided or at least delayed well beyond today’s current problems. in other words, we really need to get to the goal of 20-30-year lifetimes for the turbines. A daunting challenge.

No solvency – transmission grid is a prerequisite to wind

NYT 8 **(8/26/08, “Wind Energy Bumps Into Power Grid’s Limits”, http://www.nytimes.com/2008/08/27/business/27grid.html?pagewanted=all, vh)**

That is a symptom of a broad national problem. Expansive dreams about renewable energy, like Al Gore’s hope of replacing all fossil fuels in a decade, are bumping up against the reality of a power grid that cannot handle the new demands. The dirty secret of clean energy is that while generating it is getting easier, moving it to market is not. The grid today, according to experts, is a system conceived 100 years ago to let utilities prop each other up, reducing blackouts and sharing power in small regions. It resembles a network of streets, avenues and country roads. “We need an interstate transmission superhighway system,” said Suedeen G. Kelly, a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. While the United States today gets barely 1 percent of its electricity from wind turbines, many experts are starting to think that figure could hit 20 percent. Achieving that would require moving large amounts of power over long distances, from the windy, lightly populated plains in the middle of the country to the coasts where many people live. Builders are also contemplating immense solar-power stations in the nation’s deserts that would pose the same transmission problems. The grid’s limitations are putting a damper on such projects already. Gabriel Alonso, chief development officer of Horizon Wind Energy, the company that operates Maple Ridge, said that in parts of Wyoming, a turbine could make 50 percent more electricity than the identical model built in New York or Texas. “The windiest sites have not been built, because there is no way to move that electricity from there to the load centers,” he said. The basic problem is that many transmission lines, and the connections between them, are simply too small for the amount of power companies would like to squeeze through them. The difficulty is most acute for long-distance transmission, but shows up at times even over distances of a few hundred miles. Transmission lines carrying power away from the Maple Ridge farm, near Lowville, N.Y., have sometimes become so congested that the company’s only choice is to shut down — or pay fees for the privilege of continuing to pump power into the lines. Politicians in Washington have long known about the grid’s limitations but have made scant headway in solving them. They are reluctant to trample the prerogatives of state governments, which have traditionally exercised authority over the grid and have little incentive to push improvements that would benefit neighboring states. In Texas, T. Boone Pickens, the oilman building the world’s largest wind farm, plans to tackle the grid problem by using a right of way he is developing for water pipelines for a 250-mile transmission line from the Panhandle to the Dallas market. He has testified in Congress that Texas policy is especially favorable for such a project and that other wind developers cannot be expected to match his efforts. “If you want to do it on a national scale, where the transmission line distances will be much longer, and utility regulations are different, Congress must act,” he said on Capitol Hill. Enthusiasm for wind energy is running at fever pitch these days, with bold plans on the drawing boards, like Mayor Michael Bloomberg’s notion of dotting New York City with turbines. Companies are even reviving ideas of storing wind-generated energy using compressed air or spinning flywheels. Yet experts say that without a solution to the grid problem, effective use of wind power on a wide scale is likely to remain a dream. The power grid is balkanized, with about 200,000 miles of power lines divided among 500 owners. Big transmission upgrades often involve multiple companies, many state governments and numerous permits. Every addition to the grid provokes fights with property owners. These barriers mean that electrical generation is growing four times faster than transmission, according to federal figures. In a 2005 energy law, Congress gave the Energy Department the authority to step in to approve transmission if states refused to act. The department designated two areas, one in the Middle Atlantic States and one in the Southwest, as national priorities where it might do so; 14 United States senators then signed a letter saying the department was being too aggressive. Energy Department leaders say that, however understandable the local concerns, they are getting in the way. “Modernizing the electric infrastructure is an urgent national problem, and one we all share,” said Kevin M. Kolevar, assistant secretary for electricity delivery and energy reliability, in a speech last year. Unlike answers to many of the nation’s energy problems, improvements to the grid would require no new technology. An Energy Department plan to source 20 percent of the nation’s electricity from wind calls for a high-voltage backbone spanning the country that would be similar to 2,100 miles of lines already operated by a company called American Electric Power. The cost would be high, $60 billion or more, but in theory could be spread across many years and tens of millions of electrical customers. However, in most states, rules used by public service commissions to evaluate transmission investments discourage multistate projects of this sort. In some states with low electric rates, elected officials fear that new lines will simply export their cheap power and drive rates up. Without a clear way of recovering the costs and earning a profit, and with little leadership on the issue from the federal government, no company or organization has offered to fight the political battles necessary to get such a transmission backbone built. Texas and California have recently made some progress in building transmission lines for wind power, but nationally, the problem seems likely to get worse. Today, New York State has about 1,500 megawatts of wind capacity. A megawatt is an instantaneous measure of power. A large Wal-Mart draws about one megawatt. The state is planning for an additional 8,000 megawatts of capacity. But those turbines will need to go in remote, windy areas that are far off the beaten path, electrically speaking, and it is not clear enough transmission capacity will be developed. Save for two underwater connections to Long Island, New York State has not built a major new power line in 20 years. A handful of states like California that have set aggressive goals for renewable energy are being forced to deal with the issue, since the goals cannot be met without additional power lines. But Bill Richardson, the governor of New Mexico and a former energy secretary under President Bill Clinton, contends that these piecemeal efforts are not enough to tap the nation’s potential for renewable energy. Wind advocates say that just two of the windiest states, North Dakota and South Dakota, could in principle generate half the nation’s electricity from turbines. But the way the national grid is configured, half the country would have to move to the Dakotas in order to use the power. “We still have a third-world grid,” Mr. Richardson said, repeating a comment he has made several times. “With the federal government not investing, not setting good regulatory mechanisms, and basically taking a back seat on everything except drilling and fossil fuels, the grid has not been modernized, especially for wind energy.”

Ignore all their evidence about job growth, only once source for the information and it’s unverified and inflated

Industrial Wind Action Group 6/27 **(6/27/12, “Wind energy jobs: Are the numbers pulled from thin air?”, http://www.windaction.org/faqs/35338, vh)**

The American Wind Energy Association has made extending the Production Tax Credit ('PTC') its primary focus this year. Documents available on the trade group's website show that about $4 million of its 2012 budget ($30 million) was directed toward securing extension of the PTC. With job growth the number one political issue in the United States, AWEA's strategic plan calls for rebranding of the wind industry as an economic engine that will produce steady job growth, particularly in the manufacturing sector. The problem for AWEA is that the industry's own record on job growth lacks credibility. Accurate information available in the public suggests the industry has inflated its overall job numbers. Section 1603 and Jobs Seventy-five percent of the Section 1603 largesse was lavished on big wind, yet, despite billions in public funding, the wind sector experienced a loss of 10,000 direct and indirect jobs in 2010 bringing AWEA's reported total to 75,000 jobs[1]. In April, NREL released its estimates of direct and indirect jobs created by projects receiving 1603 funding. The agency relied on the JEDI model ("Jobs and Economic Development Impacts") to estimate gross jobs, earnings, and economic output supported through the construction and operation of solar photovoltaic (PV) and large wind projects. But an investigation by the House Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations rightly objected to NREL's conclusions. The Subcommittee found that NREL overstated the number of jobs created under 1603, that it failed to report on the more important net job creation, and ignored potential jobs that would be created given alternative spending of Federal funds. The key sticking point was that NREL did not validate its models using actual data from completed projects. The Subcommittee concluded that models used to estimate job creation were no substitute for actual data and added: "The Section 1603 grant program was sold to the American people as a necessary stimulus jobs program, and yet, the Treasury and Energy Departments do not have the numbers to back up the Obama Administration's claims of its success in creating jobs." The problem with JEDI Since NREL's JEDI model provides a gross analysis only, it does not consider how building a renewable energy facility might displace energy or associated jobs, earnings, and output related to other existing or planned energy generation resources (e.g., jobs lost or gained related to changes in electric utility revenues and increased consumer energy bills, among other impacts). In other words, the model is one-sided, only considering the benefit side of a cost-benefit comparison and ignores everything else. Validating AWEA Job Data So what data do we have on wind industry jobs? Not much. Apparently, AWEA is the only source of nationwide employment statistics in the United States for wind-related jobs. Of the purported 75,000 direct and indirect jobs, the majority (around 60%) work in finance and consulting services, contracting and engineering services, and transportation and logistics. Twenty thousand are employed in wind-related manufacturing with the remaining jobs tied to construction and O&M. But validating this information is not possible since no industry codes exist that isolate wind power establishments or wind turbine and wind components establishments. The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) bundles wind-related manufacturers under the same code as the "Turbine and Turbine Generator Set Units" manufacturing industry (NAICS 333611), which includes "establishments primarily engaged in manufacturing turbines (except aircraft) and complete turbine generator set units, such as steam, hydraulic, gas, and wind." At the end of 2010, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported 26,218 total jobs in this industry. It's not credible that AWEA's estimated manufacturing jobs could represent the vast majority of employment under the NAICS 333611 classification.[2] Navigant's Magic In December, AWEA commissioned Navigant Consulting, Inc. to study the impact of the PTC on job growth in the wind industry. The study, also based on the JEDI model, considered two scenarios, one where the PTC is extended for 4 years (2013-2016); the other where the PTC expires at the end of this year. Navigant's model showed that extension of the PTC would provide a stable economic environment and allow the wind industry to grow to nearly 100,000 American jobs over four years, including a jump to 46,000 manufacturing positions. Expiration of the PTC showed a loss of 37,000 jobs. The message to Congress was clear: extend the PTC or you will be blamed for American jobs being lost. Even Interior Secretary Salazar peddled AWEA's numbers despite the Congressional report that raised doubts about the model. Recent statements by AWEA prompted us to look at the numbers even further. In May, AWEA's Denise Bode told Windpower Monthly that of the estimated 75,000 wind jobs, at least 30,000 were manufacturing jobs -- a jump of 10,000 jobs! Where did the additional manufacturing jobs come from? As it turns out, Navigant tabulated direct and indirect jobs but also quietly added INDUCED jobs -- those jobs created when the overall level of spending in an economy rises due to workers newly receiving incomes. Factoring in 'induced employment' was a radical departure from job figures previously provided by AWEA. Induced job figures are more abstract and inherently unreliable but a convenient way to inflate job numbers. We could find no documentation that explained this change in job reporting nor was the change footnoted in the Navigant study. We spoke with a Navigant represent who suggested AWEA might have been incorrectly treating 'induced jobs' as 'indirect jobs' in its prior reports but that would not explain the inflation in manufacturing jobs. Total job counts would have stayed about the same. In looking at the Navigant modeled numbers, it appears the wind industry currently only provides 58,000 direct and indirect jobs, not 75,000. A four-year extension of the PTC could result in a possible 70,000 direct and indirect jobs by 2016 (scenario 2) -- 5,000 less than the number AWEA touts today! Conclusion The change in job counts raises serious credibility issues about the industry's employment strength. But the absolute numbers tell only a piece of the story. Since Navigant's study is based on JEDI, the job figures represent gross numbers and do not consider them in the context of the larger economy. In that sense, Navigant's findings, like NREL's study, tell us nothing about the true impact of the PTC. But one thing does appear to be true: AWEA's job figures, dating back to least 2009, may be nothing more than figures pulled from thin air.

No environment impact

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.

### Advantage 2

Their own 1AC evidence says that Appalachia is only relevant because it can be a voting bloc – that voting bloc has been voting republican since 2000, and Obama still won twice – proves they don’t change the rest of the country

The election killed the Tea Party

Greenblatt 12-31

(“Is The Party Over For The Tea Party? Alan, NPR, <http://www.npr.org/blogs/itsallpolitics/2012/12/31/168196092/why-the-tea-party-stands-at-a-crossroads>

It's a little bit early, but the Tea Party is hitting its sophomore slump. A few of the prominent members of Congress elected as part of the Tea Party wave in 2010 lost their seats in November. With the end-of-year budget negotiations going nowhere, the Tea Party has been described variously as standing on the sidelines and losing its clout. "We could end up with taxes going up for everybody and Republicans getting the blame, which from the standpoint of the Tea Party is the worst of all possible outcomes," says Jack Pitney, a government professor at Claremont McKenna College in California. One group closely aligned with the Tea Party, FreedomWorks, suffered a near-meltdown this summer, with a power struggle leading to the ouster of its chair, Dick Armey, a former House majority leader. Putting aside the difficulties of the present moment, members of Congress associated with the Tea Party face a larger question. Like other large classes elected in the past, they're finding that it's easier to talk about changing Washington than actually doing it.

Tea party lost its appeal –social radicalism

Stanley 11-7 (Tim, US politics writer for The Telegraph, historian, The Telegraph, Is the Tea Party over? Radical social conservatism may have brought it to an end)

It’s not just about Obama v Romney. At a state level, a number of significant results spell trouble for the Tea Party movement. Some of its biggest names were decapitated: Richard Mourdock lost his Indiana race for the Senate. Mourdock was the guy who squeezed out moderate Dick Lugar for the nomination. Todd Akin lost his Senate race from Missouri. The less said about Akin, the better. Scott Brown – who was elected to fill Ted Kennedy’s seat at the height of the Tea Party revolution – lost Massachusetts. Allen West lost his congress seat. An African-American army veteran, West was something of a moral force within the Tea Party. Michele Bachmann has struggled to keep her congressional seat in Minnesota. She’ll probably pull it off, but only just. What went wrong? Only two years ago, the Tea Party transformed the political landscape and helped the Republicans capture the House. Bachmann was even a semi-serious candidate for the Republican nomination. But back then the Tea Party was defined by fiscal conservatism. In the last couple of years, it’s become increasingly redefined by radical social conservatism. Mourdock said in a debate that the victim of a rape should keep her baby because it’s “God’s will.” Akin talked about “legitimate rape.” West referred to some liberals as “communists.” Bachmann made her evangelicalism a key part of her presidential campaign. And poor old Scott Brown – who was actually socially liberal – got tarred with the same brush. It’s interesting to note how relatively poorly Romney did with women, which may have coloured the results in local races, too. Meanwhile, there’s evidence that America’s social attitudes are becoming more tolerant in certain areas. This year is a watershed for gay rights: Maine and Maryland have voted to permit gay marriage. Wisconsin has just elected America’s first openly gay senator – Tammy Baldwin beat moderate Republican Tommy Thompson. Meanwhile, Washington and Colorado voted to legalise cannabis use. Of course, you can find plenty of evidence of conservative strength elsewhere that challenges this narrative. But there’s no escaping that the Tea Party brand has become more associated with social conservatism at a time when significant portions of the American middle class are becoming a little more secular and a little more liberal (with a spotlight on shifting attitudes towards gay rights). The challenge for the Tea Party is to return to its fiscal roots and try to shake off some of the bad memories of this election year. It’s interesting to note that House candidates supported by Ron Paul – who peddles a less culturally toxic brand of libertarianism – did rather well. Is Paulism the future?

Diseases not a threat.

Posner, Federal Judge and Senior Lecturer at U Chicago Law, 2005

Richard, Catastrophe: the dozen most significant catastrophic risks and what we can do about them, Skeptic, 1-1, 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 fitterin 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. **The reason is improvements in medical science**. But the comfort is a small one. Pandemics can still impose enormous losses and resist prevention and cure: the lesson of the AIDS pandemic. And there is always a lust time.

No impact to protectionism

Stanford, 2010 (Jim, economist with the Canadian Auto Workers Union, “The new protectionism is shutting us out,” September 23, The Globe and Mail, http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/opinions/the-new-protectionism-is-shutting-us-out/article1719422/)

When the world plunged into recession in 2008, G20 **leaders**ostentatiously **pledged not to repeat the errors of the**19**30s**. To hasten economic recovery, they would avoid protectionism and keep trade flowing. Canada’s government has been among the loudest voices in this free trade chorus.**This is a gross misreadingof**actual **history.**World **trade collapsed**in the 1930s **because of**collapsing **consumer demand, not protectionism; competitive tariffs were a response to that implosion, not its cause. For the same reason, world trade plunged 12 per cent last year, despite the G20 promises.**

No risk of nuclear terrorism.

Mueller 9 – Prof Political Science @ Ohio State University, John, “The Atomic Terrorist?”, Paper Prepared for the International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, April 30, http://www.icnnd.org/research/Mueller\_Terrorism.pdf

Thus far **terrorist groups** seem to have **exhibited only limited desire** and even less progress **in going atomic**. This may be because, after brief exploration of the possible routes, they, unlike generations of alarmists on the issue, have discovered that the tremendous effort required is scarcely likely to be successful. **It is** highly **improbable** that **a** would-be atomic **terrorist would be given** or sold **a bomb** by a generous like-minded nuclear state because **the donor could not control its use and** because **the** ultimate **source** of the weapon **might be** **discovered**. Although there has been great worry about terrorists illicitly stealing or purchasing a nuclear weapon, it seems likely that **neither “loose nukes” nor a market in illicit** nuclear **materials exists**. Moreover, **finished bombs have** been outfitted with an array of **locks and safety devices**. There could be dangers in the chaos that would emerge if a nuclear state were utterly to fail, collapsing in full disarray. However, even under those conditions, nuclear weapons would likely remain under heavy guard by people who know that a purloined bomb would most likely end up going off in their own territory, would still have locks, and could probably be followed and hunted down by an alarmed international community. The most plausible route for terrorists would be to manufacture the device themselves from purloined materials. This task requires that a considerable series of difficult hurdles be conquered in sequence, including the effective **recruitment of people who** at once **have** **great technical skills and** will remain completely **devoted to the cause.** In addition, a host of **corrupted** co-**conspirators**, many of them foreign, **must remain** utterly **reliable**, international and local **security services** **must be kept** perpetually **in the dark**, and no curious outsider must get consequential wind of the project over the months or even years it takes to pull off. In addition, the **financial costs** of the operation **could** easily **become monumental**. Moreover, the **difficulties** are likely to **increase because of enhanced protective** and policing **efforts by** self-interested **governments** and because any foiled attempt would expose flaws in the defense system, holes the defenders would then plug. The evidence of al-Qaeda’s desire to go atomic, and about its progress in accomplishing this exceedingly difficult task, is remarkably skimpy, if not completely negligible. The scariest stuff—a decade’s worth of loose nuke rumor—seems to have no substance whatever. For the most part, terrorists seem to be heeding the advice found in an al-Qaeda laptop seized in Pakistan: “Make use of that which is available ... rather than waste valuable time becoming despondent over that which is not within your reach.” In part because of current policies—but also because of a wealth of other technical and organizational difficulties—the atomic terrorists’ task is already monumental, and their likelihood of success is vanishingly small. Efforts to further enhance this monumentality, if cost-effective and accompanied with only tolerable side effects, are generally desirable

Unipolarity solves great power war from status conflict.

Wohlforth 9 - William C. Wohlforth is a professor of government at Dartmouth College, “Unipolarity, Status Competition, and Great Power War”, World Politics, 61.1, Jan, MUSE

The **evidence suggests** that **narrow and asymmetrical capabilities gaps foster status competition even** **among states** relatively **confident of** their basic territorial **security for** the **reasons identified in social** **identity theory** and theories of status competition. **Broad patterns of evidence** are consistent with this expectation, **suggesting** that **unipolarity shapes strategies of identity maintenance in ways that** **dampen status conflict.** The implication is that **unipolarity helps explain low levels of** military competition and **conflict among major powers after** 19**91 and** that a **return to bipolarity or multipolarity would increase the likelihood of such conflict.**

Prolif takes years and no impact to fast prolif.

Hagerty98—Lecturer, international politics, U. of Sydney, Devin, The Consequences of Nuclear Proliferation, p. 22

Arguments about the timing of proliferation misconceive its dynamics, which involved a process that takes decades, not a sudden, definitive outcome that can be pinpointed with certainty. While the notion of Third World countries hastily assembling nuclear weapons in the heat of battle is an alarming one, it ignores the fact that the nuclear development process takes many years, and that this process itself shapes behavior by moderating tendencies towards war

Err neg—predictions of rapid prolif have been wrong every single time.

Gavin 10 (Francis J., Tom Slick Professor of International Affairs and Director of the Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin, “Same as it ever was,” Winter, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Gavin.pdf)

One of the greatest fears of nuclear alarmists is that if a key state acquires nuclear weapons, others will follow. This idea of a nuclear tipping point, chain reaction, or “domino” effect, however, is by no means new. Consider this headline—“Many Nations Ready to Break into Nuclear Club”— from a front-page article in the Washington Post from June 1981.39 Articles with similar titles can be found from almost every year since at least the early 1960s. Fears of a tipping point were especially acute in the aftermath of China’s 1964 detonation of an atomic bomb: it was predicted that India, Indonesia, and Japan might follow, with consequences worldwide, as “Israel, Sweden, Germany, and other potential nuclear countries far from China and India would be affected by proliferation in Asia.”40 A U.S. government document identified “at least eleven nations (India, Japan, Israel, Sweden,West Germany, Italy, Canada, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Rumania, and Yugoslavia)” with the capacity to go nuclear, a number that would soon “grow substantially” to include “South Africa, the United Arab Republic, Spain, Brazil and Mexico.”41 A top-secret, blue-ribbon committee established to craft the U.S. response contended that “the [1964] Chinese nuclear explosion has increased the urgency and complexity of this problem by creating strong pressures to develop independent nuclear forces, which, in turn, could strongly influence the plans of other potential nuclear powers.”42 These predictions were largely wrong. In 1985 the National Intelligence Council noted that for “almost thirty years the Intelligence Community has been writing about which nations might next get the bomb.” All of these estimates based their largely pessimistic and ultimately incorrect estimates on factors such as the increased “access to fissile materials,” improved technical capabilities in countries, the likelihood of “chain reactions,” or a “scramble” to proliferation when “even one additional state demonstrates a nuclear capability.” The 1985 report goes on, “The most striking characteristic of the present-day nuclear proliferation scene is that, despite the alarms rung by past Estimates, no additional overt proliferation of nuclear weapons has actually occurred since China tested its bomb in 1964.” Although “some proliferation of nuclear explosive capabilities and other major proliferation-related developments have taken place in the past two decades,” they did not have “the damaging, systemwide impacts that the Intelligence community generally anticipated they would.”43 In his analysis of more than sixty years of failed efforts to accurately predict nuclear proliferation, analyst Moeed Yusuf concludes that “the pace of proliferation has been much slower than anticipated by most.” The majority of countries suspected of trying to obtain a nuclear weapons capability “never even came close to crossing the threshold. In fact, most did not even initiate a weapons program.” If all the countries that were considered prime suspects over the past sixty years had developed nuclear weapons, “the world would have at least 19 nuclear powers today.”44 As Potter and Mukhatzhanova argue, government and academic experts frequently “exaggerated the scope and pace of nuclear weapons proliferation.”45 Nor is there compelling evidence that a nuclear proliferation chain reaction will ever occur. Rather, the pool of potential proliferators has been shrinking. Proliferation pressures were far greater during the Cold War. In the 1960s, at least twenty-one countries either had or were considering nuclear weapons research programs. Today only nine countries are known to have nuclear weapons. Belarus, Brazil, Kazakhstan, Libya, South Africa, Sweden, and Ukraine have dismantled their weapons programs. Even rogue states that are/were a great concern to U.S. policymakers—Iran, Iraq, Libya, and North Korea— began their nuclear weapons programs before the Cold War had ended.46 As far as is known, no nation has started a new nuclear weapons program since the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991.47 Ironically, by focusing on the threat of rogue states, policymakers may have underestimated the potentially far more destabilizing effect of proliferation in “respectable” states such as Germany, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan.

No strikes on Iran

Adamsky 11 - DIMA ADAMSKY is an Assistant Professor at the Lauder School of Government, Diplomacy, and Strategy at the Interdisciplinary Center Herzliya and the author of The Culture of Military Innovation, The Morning After in Israel. By: ADAMSKY, DIMA, Foreign Affairs, 00157120, Mar/Apr2011, Vol. 90, Issue 2

In a scenario in which Iran communicated its readiness to intervene on behalf of its clients, **Israeli strategists would** likely **assume** that **Tehran would not risk** a **nuclear confrontation to assist an embattled Hamas, Hezbollah, or Syria**. Nevertheless, **uncertainty about** the **Iranian nuclear posture is likely to force Israel to act with caution** and restrict its actions when fighting Iranian allies. The **increasing** range and **accuracy of missiles** held **by** Iranian **proxies introduce a new** kind of **threat: disarming conventional strikes on Israel's military installations**, strategic infrastructure, and the Dimona nuclear reactor in particular. **Given** the **sophistication** of **Hamas' and Hezbollah's** ballistic **arsenals, these scenarios are** already **conceivable** today. Such strikes would add a counterforce mode to the predominantly countervalue warfare waged against Israel in recent years.