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#### Decline causes war

Green and Schrage ‘9 (Michael J Green is Senior Advisor and Japan Chair at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) and Associate Professor at Georgetown University. Steven P Schrage is the CSIS Scholl Chair in International Business and a former senior official with the US Trade Representative's Office, State Department and Ways & Means Committee, Asia Times, 2009 <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Asian_Economy/KC26Dk01.html>)

Facing the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, analysts at the World Bank and the US Central Intelligence Agency are just beginning to contemplate the ramifications for international stability if there is not a recovery in the next year. For the most part, the focus has been on fragile states such as some in Eastern Europe. However, the Great Depression taught us that a downward global economic spiral can even have jarring impacts on great powers. It is no mere coincidence that the last great global economic downturn was followed by the most destructive war in human history. In the 1930s, economic desperation helped fuel autocratic regimes and protectionism in a downward economic-security death spiral that engulfed the world in conflict. This spiral was aided by the preoccupation of the United States and other leading nations with economic troubles at home and insufficient attention to working with other powers to maintain stability abroad. Today's challenges are different, yet 1933's London Economic Conference, which failed to stop the drift toward deeper depression and world war, should be a cautionary tale for leaders heading to next month's London Group of 20 (G-20) meeting. There is no question the US must urgently act to address banking issues and to restart its economy. But the lessons of the past suggest that we will also have to keep an eye on those fragile threads in the international system that could begin to unravel if the financial crisis is not reversed early in the Barack Obama administration and realize that economics and security are intertwined in most of the critical challenges we face. A disillusioned rising power? Four areas in Asia merit particular attention, although so far the current financial crisis has not changed Asia's fundamental strategic picture. China is not replacing the US as regional hegemon, since the leadership in Beijing is too nervous about the political implications of the financial crisis at home to actually play a leading role in solving it internationally. Predictions that the US will be brought to its knees because China is the leading holder of US debt often miss key points. China's currency controls and full employment/export-oriented growth strategy give Beijing few choices other than buying US Treasury bills or harming its own economy. Rather than creating new rules or institutions in international finance, or reorienting the Chinese economy to generate greater long-term consumer demand at home, Chinese leaders are desperately clinging to the status quo (though Beijing deserves credit for short-term efforts to stimulate economic growth). The greater danger with China is not an eclipsing of US leadership, but instead the kind of shift in strategic orientation that happened to Japan after the Great Depression. Japan was arguably not a revisionist power before 1932 and sought instead to converge with the global economy through open trade and adoption of the gold standard. The worldwide depression and protectionism of the 1930s devastated the newly exposed Japanese economy and contributed directly to militaristic and autarkic policies in Asia as the Japanese people reacted against what counted for globalization at the time. China today is similarly converging with the global economy, and many experts believe China needs at least 8% annual growth to sustain social stability. Realistic growth predictions for 2009 are closer to 5%. Veteran China hands were watching closely when millions of migrant workers returned to work after the Lunar New Year holiday last month to find factories closed and jobs gone. There were pockets of protests, but nationwide unrest seems unlikely this year, and Chinese leaders are working around the clock to ensure that it does not happen next year either. However, the economic slowdown has only just begun and nobody is certain how it will impact the social contract in China between the ruling communist party and the 1.3 billion Chinese who have come to see President Hu Jintao's call for "harmonious society" as inextricably linked to his promise of "peaceful development". If the Japanese example is any precedent, a sustained economic slowdown has the potential to open a dangerous path from economic nationalism to strategic revisionism in China too. Dangerous states It is noteworthy that North Korea, Myanmar and Iran have all intensified their defiance in the wake of the financial crisis, which has distracted the world's leading nations, limited their moral authority and sown potential discord. With Beijing worried about the potential impact of North Korean belligerence or instability on Chinese internal stability, and leaders in Japan and South Korea under siege in parliament because of the collapse of their stock markets, leaders in the North Korean capital of Pyongyang have grown increasingly boisterous about their country's claims to great power status as a nuclear weapons state. The junta in Myanmar has chosen this moment to arrest hundreds of political dissidents and thumb its nose at fellow members of the 10-country Association of Southeast Asian Nations. Iran continues its nuclear program while exploiting differences between the US, UK and France (or the P-3 group) and China and Russia - differences that could become more pronounced if economic friction with Beijing or Russia crowds out cooperation or if Western European governments grow nervous about sanctions as a tool of policy. It is possible that the economic downturn will make these dangerous states more pliable because of falling fuel prices (Iran) and greater need for foreign aid (North Korea and Myanmar), but that may depend on the extent that authoritarian leaders care about the well-being of their people or face internal political pressures linked to the economy. So far, there is little evidence to suggest either and much evidence to suggest these dangerous states see an opportunity to advance their asymmetrical advantages against the international system. Challenges to the democratic model The trend in East Asia has been for developing economies to steadily embrace democracy and the rule of law in order to sustain their national success. But to thrive, new democracies also have to deliver basic economic growth. The economic crisis has hit democracies hard, with Japanese Prime Minister Aso Taro's approval collapsing to single digits in the polls and South Korea's Lee Myung-bak and Taiwan's Ma Ying Jeou doing only a little better (and the collapse in Taiwan's exports - particularly to China - is sure to undermine Ma's argument that a more accommodating stance toward Beijing will bring economic benefits to Taiwan). Thailand's new coalition government has an uncertain future after two years of post-coup drift and now economic crisis. The string of old and new democracies in East Asia has helped to anchor US relations with China and to maintain what former secretary of state Condoleezza Rice once called a "balance of power that favors freedom". A reversal of the democratic expansion of the past two decades would not only impact the global balance of power but also increase the potential number of failed states, with all the attendant risk they bring from harboring terrorists to incubating pandemic diseases and trafficking in persons. It would also undermine the demonstration effect of liberal norms we are urging China to embrace at home. Protectionism The collapse of financial markets in 1929 was compounded by protectionist measures such as the Smoot-Hawley tariff act in 1932. Suddenly, the economic collapse became a zero-sum race for autarkic trading blocs that became a key cause of war. Today, the globalization of finance, services and manufacturing networks and the World Trade Organization (WTO) make such a rapid move to trading blocs unlikely. However, protectionism could still unravel the international system through other guises. Already, new spending packages around the world are providing support for certain industries that might be perceived by foreign competitors as unfair trade measures, potentially creating a "Smoot-Hawley 2.0" stimulus effect as governments race to prop up industries. "Buy American" conditionality in the US economic stimulus package earlier this year was watered down somewhat by the Obama administration, but it set a tempting precedent for other countries to put up barriers to close markets.

#### Statistics agree- diversionary war theory

Royal ‘10 (Director of CTR Jedediah, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction – U.S. Department of Defense, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises”, Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, Ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. "Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

#### Collapse causes global transition wars – turns their impacts

Panzner ‘8 (Faculty at the New York Institute of Finance, 25-year veteran of the global stock, bond, and currency markets who has worked in New York and London for HSBC, Soros Funds, ABN Amro, Dresdner Bank, and JPMorgan Chase (Michael, Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse, Revised and Updated Edition, p. 136-138, googlebooks)

Continuing calls for curbs on the flow of finance and trade will inspire the United States and other nations to spew forth protectionist legislation like the notorious Smoot-Hawley bill. Introduced at the start of the Great Depression, it triggered a series of tit-for-tat economic responses, which many commentators believe helped turn a serious economic downturn into a prolonged and devastating global disaster, But if history is any guide, those lessons will have been long forgotten during the next collapse. Eventually, fed by a mood of desperation and growing public anger, restrictions on trade, finance, investment, and immigration will almost certainly intensify. Authorities and ordinary citizens will likely scrutinize the cross-border movement of Americans and outsiders alike, and lawmakers may even call for a general crackdown on nonessential travel. Meanwhile, many nations will make transporting or sending funds to other countries exceedingly difficult. As desperate officials try to limit the fallout from decades of ill-conceived, corrupt, and reckless policies, they will introduce controls on foreign exchange, foreign individuals and companies seeking to acquire certain American infrastructure assets, or trying to buy property and other assets on the (heap thanks to a rapidly depreciating dollar, will be stymied by limits on investment by noncitizens. Those efforts will cause spasms to ripple across economies and markets, disrupting global payment, settlement, and clearing mechanisms. All of this will, of course, continue to undermine business confidence and consumer spending. In a world of lockouts and lockdowns, any link that transmits systemic financial pressures across markets through arbitrage or portfolio-based risk management, or that allows diseases to be easily spread from one country to the next by tourists and wildlife, or that otherwise facilitates unwelcome exchanges of any kind will be viewed with suspicion and dealt with accordingly. The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to full-scale military encounters, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more healed sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an "intense confrontation" between the United States and China is "inevitable" at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

#### US growth spills over globally

Caploe ‘9 (David Caploe is CEO of the Singapore-incorporated American Centre for Applied Liberal Arts and Humanities in Asia., “Focus still on America to lead global recovery”, April 7, The Strait Times, lexis)

IN THE aftermath of the G-20 summit, most observers seem to have missed perhaps the most crucial statement of the entire event, made by United States President Barack Obama at his pre-conference meeting with British Prime Minister Gordon Brown: 'The world has become accustomed to the US being a voracious consumer market, the engine that drives a lot of economic growth worldwide,' he said. 'If there is going to be renewed growth, it just can't be the US as the engine.' While superficially sensible, this view is deeply problematic. To begin with, it ignores the fact that the global economy has in fact been 'America-centred' for more than 60 years. Countries - China, Japan, Canada, Brazil, Korea, Mexico and so on - either sell to the US or they sell to countries that sell to the US. This system has generally been advantageous for all concerned. America gained certain historically unprecedented benefits, but the system also enabled participating countries - first in Western Europe and Japan, and later, many in the Third World - to achieve undreamt-of prosperity. At the same time, this deep inter-connection between the US and the rest of the world also explains how the collapse of a relatively small sector of the US economy - 'sub-prime' housing, logarithmically exponentialised by Wall Street's ingenious chicanery - has cascaded into the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression. To put it simply, Mr Obama doesn't seem to understand that there is no other engine for the world economy - and hasn't been for the last six decades. If the US does not drive global economic growth, growth is not going to happen. Thus, US policies to deal with the current crisis are critical not just domestically, but also to the entire world. Consequently, it is a matter of global concern that the Obama administration seems to be following Japan's 'model' from the 1990s: allowing major banks to avoid declaring massive losses openly and transparently, and so perpetuating 'zombie' banks - technically alive but in reality dead. As analysts like Nobel laureates Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman have pointed out, the administration's unwillingness to confront US banks is the main reason why they are continuing their increasingly inexplicable credit freeze, thus ravaging the American and global economies.

#### Certainty is key- green economy leadership solidifies economic growth

Jenkins 11 -- Breakthrough Institute Energy Policy director (Jesse, "Is America Losing the Clean Energy Race?" National Journal, 10-26-11, energy.nationaljournal.com/2011/10/is-america-losing-the-clean-en.php?comments=expandall#comments, accessed 10-17-12, mss)

The global market for clean energy products grew to $243 billion in 2010, a year in which China and Germany both captured a greater share of this global investment than the United States. That has led many (myself included) to worry about the erosion of US competitiveness in a set of clean energy technology products—from solar and wind to nuclear and advanced batteries—originally invented in America. Yet this growing market for clean tech is almost entirely dependent upon public subsidy and policy support. To be blunt: today’s clean energy markets are artificial, and without perpetual policy support, conventional clean energy products could not compete in most global energy markets. Across the globe, cash-strapped governments and recession-hit publics are pulling back clean energy subsidies, revealing the ephemeral nature of today’s clean tech markets. In the last year, Spain, Italy, and the United Kingdom have all slashed feed-in tariffs for solar and certain other clean energy technologies. In America, expiring tax credits and fading stimulus investments are set to send federal clean tech expenditures plunging 75 percent from 2009 to 2014, according to our research. There are a host of reasons why targeted policies and smart public investments in emerging clean tech sectors are justified. But clean tech business leaders and policymakers alike must be crystal clear: the true economic rewards in clean energy industries will not come from producing technology for subsidy-created markets that vacillate wildly with the public mood and the business cycle. Without substantial innovation to improve the performance and reduce the cost of clean energy technologies, the promise that the clean energy sector might become economically viable, much less a cornerstone of American economic revival, will never be realized. The real clean energy race is thus to invent, commercialize, progressively improve, and mass-produce cheap and reliable clean energy technologies that can compete on cost not just with international competitors but also with fossil fuels. In short, the race is to make clean energy cheap and subsidy-independent. **The** ultimate economic prize **is a** $5 trillion global energy marketexpected to double over the next forty years. That economic opportunity dwarfs the value of today’s subsidy-dependent and often-volatile clean energymarkets. **For security, economic, and environmental reasons,** the **global energy** system **is** modernizing and **diversifying**. Developing and developed nations alike will move toward new forms of advanced energy technologies that reduce dependence on foreign nations, insulate their economies from volatile energy markets, and are cleaner and thus less costly from a public health perspective. Supplying this massive global market with reliable and affordable clean energy technologies thus represents one of the most significant market opportunities of the 21st century. In this clean energy race, **pole position is** still **up for grabs**. China may have cornered today’s subsidy-dependent markets for solar cells in recent years, but they have not yet won the race to make solar energy cheap. Chinese firms have achieved recent cost advantages by simply scaling up **yesterday’s** solar technology, wringing cost declines out of gigawatt-scale manufacturing supply chains and capitalizing on both a temporary glut in refined silicon and lucrative Chinese state subsidies. None of these factors are truly repeatable, and technology and market analysts project that China’s solar cost declines will soon stall out well above the levels necessary to make solar power truly affordable and subsidy-independent. America is still home to the most innovative solar firms, from technology leaders like First Solar making advanced thin film solar technologies to SunPower Corp., the manufacturer of the world’s most efficient crystalline PV panels. And we retain a global lead in venture capital investment and clean energy research. Yet to win this race to make clean energy cheap, America must overcome two threats, one each from both home and abroad. Abroad, we must ensure that Chinese firms play by the rules. And American manufacturers must out-innovate and out-compete China’s high-volume producers of conventional clean energy technologies, like crystalline PV cells, with steadily advancing technology and productivity. Already, technology leaders like First Solar are under pressure, with Citigroup reporting that the American firm may be facing layoffs of 10 percent of their workforce in coming months, as customers demand cheaper products. If these competitive pressures fuel a new round of American innovation, all the better. But if subsidized Chinese producers of conventional PV panels that will never become cheap enough to be subsidy independent end up knocking the real innovators out of the market, or squeezing their profits so much they cannot reinvest in continual R&D, both America and the world ultimately lose. At home, today’s repeatedly expiring and poorly optimized energy subsidies do American innovators little favor. The problem is that **today's subsidies** are principally designed to accelerate market adoption—a situation that strongly favors America's mercantilist, low-wage competitors like China—rather than demand and reward innovation and support continual adoption of the most advanced manufacturing processes by US firms. Energy subsidies today operate more like crop supports than like the demanding military procurement policies that delivered jet engines, microchips, and a suite of other **core tech**nologies now enabling **blockbuster products** like Apple’s iPhone. Theintermittent **and** haphazardnatureof US **energy policy** also wreaks havoc with the business confidence necessary **for** long-term investments in **innovation**. As a result, many private firms focus principally on ramping-up production for subsidized markets rather than **pioneering next-gen**eration **designs** and manufacturing processes. This must change. Both industry and government must re-prioritize innovation and competitiveness if the United States is to build a durable and globally competitive clean energy industry. Making clean energy cheap and fully competitive should become our nation’s rallying focus. The coming collapse of US clean tech policies thus presents a critical opportunity for intelligent energy policy reform. With the US clean energy policy system set to be effectively wiped clean in the coming years, American business and policymakers must now unite to craft a coordinated new set of limited but direct federal strategies optimized to drive innovation, advanced manufacturing, and competitiveness. With such a strategy in place, the United States has the potential to out-innovate and out-compete all global challengers and successfully make clean energy cheap enough for widespread export to energy-hungry markets throughout the world.

#### Green innovation key to US economy primacy

Klarevas, 9 -- NYU Center for Global Affairs professor (Louis, "Securing American Primacy While Tackling Climate Change: Toward a National Strategy of Greengemony," Huffington Post, 12-15-9, www.huffingtonpost.com/louis-klarevas/securing-american-primacy\_b\_393223.html, accessed 10-19-12, mss)

As national leaders from around the world are gathering in Copenhagen, Denmark, to attend the United Nations Climate Change Conference, the time is ripe to re-assess America's current energy policies - but within the larger framework of how a new approach on the environment will stave off global warming and shore up American primacy. By not addressing climate change more aggressively and creatively, the United States is squandering an opportunity to **secure** its global **primacy for** the next few **generations** to come. To do this, though, the U.S. must rely on innovation to help the world escape the coming environmental meltdown. Developing the key technologies that will save the planet from global warming will allow the U.S. to **outmaneuver** potential **great power rivals** seeking to replace it as the international system's hegemon. But the greening of American strategy must occur soon. The U.S., however, seems to be stuck in time, unable to move beyond oil-centric geo-politics in any meaningful way. Often, the gridlock is portrayed as a partisan difference, with Republicans resisting action and Democrats pleading for action. This, though, is an unfair characterization as there are numerous proactive Republicans and quite a few reticent Democrats. The real divide is instead one between realists and liberals. Students of realpolitik, which still heavily guides American foreign policy, largely discount environmental issues as they are not seen as advancing national interests in a way that generates relative power advantages vis-à-vis the other major powers in the system: Russia, China, Japan, India, and the European Union. Liberals, on the other hand, have recognized that global warming might very well become the greatest challenge ever faced by mankind. As such, their thinking often eschews narrowly defined national interests for the greater global good. This, though, ruffles elected officials whose sworn obligation is, above all, to protect and promote American national interests. What both sides need to understand is that by becoming a lean, mean, green fighting machine, the U.S. can actually bring together liberals and realists to advance a collective interest which benefits every nation, while at the same time, securing America's global primacy well into the future. To do so, the U.S. must re-invent itself as not just your traditional hegemon, but as history's first ever green hegemon. Hegemons are countries that dominate the international system - bailing out other countries in times of global crisis, establishing and maintaining the most important international institutions, and covering the costs that result from free-riding and cheating global obligations. Since 1945, that role has been the purview of the United States. Immediately after World War II, Europe and Asia laid in ruin, the global economy required resuscitation, the countries of the free world needed security guarantees, and the entire system longed for a multilateral forum where global concerns could be addressed. The U.S., emerging the least scathed by the systemic crisis of fascism's rise, stepped up to the challenge and established the postwar (and current) liberal order. But don't let the world "liberal" fool you. While many nations benefited from America's new-found hegemony, the U.S. was driven largely by "realist" selfish national interests. The liberal order first and foremost benefited the U.S. With the U.S. becoming bogged down in places like Afghanistan and Iraq, running a record national debt, and failing to shore up the dollar, the future of American hegemony now seems to be facing a serious contest: potential rivals - acting like sharks smelling blood in the water - wish to challenge the U.S. on a variety of fronts. This has led numerous commentators to forecast the U.S.'s imminent fall from grace. Not all hope is lost however. With the impending systemic crisis of global warming on the horizon, the U.S. again finds itself in a position to address a transnational problem in a way that will benefit both the international community collectively and the U.S. selfishly. The current problem is two-fold. First, the competition for oil is fueling animosities between the major powers. The geopolitics of oil has already emboldened Russia in its 'near abroad' and China in far-off places like Africa and Latin America. As oil is a limited natural resource, a nasty zero-sum contest could be looming on the horizon for the U.S. and its major power rivals - a contest which threatens American primacy and global stability. Second, converting fossil fuels like oil to run national economies is producing irreversible harm in the form of carbon dioxide emissions. So long as the global economy remains oil-dependent, greenhouse gases will continue to rise. Experts are predicting as much as a 60% increase in carbon dioxide emissions in the next twenty-five years. That likely means more devastating water shortages, droughts, forest fires, floods, and storms. In other words, if global competition for access to energy resources does not undermine international security, global warming will. And in either case, oil will be a culprit for the instability. Oil arguably has been the most precious energy resource of the last half-century. But "black gold" is so 20th century. The key resource for this century will be green gold - clean, environmentally-friendly energy like wind, solar, and hydrogen power. **Climate change leaves no alternative**. And the sooner we realize this, the better off we will be. What Washington must do in order to avoid the traps of petropolitics is to convert the U.S. into the world's first-ever green hegemon. For starters, the federal government must drastically increase investment in energy and environmental research and development (E&E R&D). This will require a serious sacrifice, committing upwards of $40 billion annually to E&E R&D - a far cry from the few billion dollars currently being spent. By promoting a new national project, the U.S. could develop new technologies that will assure it does not drown in a pool of oil. Some solutions are already well known, such as raising fuel standards for automobiles; improving public transportation networks; and expanding nuclear and wind power sources. Others, however, have not progressed much beyond the drawing board: batteries that can store massive amounts of solar (and possibly even wind) power; efficient and cost-effective photovoltaic cells, crop-fuels, and hydrogen-based fuels; and even fusion. Such innovations will not only provide alternatives to oil, they will also give the U.S. an edge in the global competition for hegemony. If the U.S. is able to produce technologies that allow modern, globalized societies to escape the oil trap, those nations will eventually **have no choice** but to adopt such technologies. And **this will give the U.S. a tremendous economic boom**, while simultaneously **providing it with** means of leverage **that can** be employed to **keep** potential **foes in check**. The bottom-line is that the U.S. needs to become green energy dominant as opposed to black energy independent - and the best approach for achieving this is to promote a national strategy of greengemony.

#### Economic strength key to American influence- largest internal link

Hubbard ’10 (Hegemonic Stability Theory: An Empirical Analysis By: Jesse Hubbard Jesse Hubbard Program Assistant at Open Society Foundations Washington, District Of Columbia International Affairs Previous National Democratic Institute (NDI), National Defense University, Office of Congressman Jim Himes Education PPE at University of Oxford, 2010

Regression analysis **of this data shows** that Pearson’s r-value is -.836. In the case of American hegemony, economic strength is a better predictor of violent conflict than even overall national power, which had an r-value of -.819. The data is also well within the realm of statistical significance, with a p-value of .0014. While the data for British hegemony was not as striking, the same overall pattern holds true in both cases. During both periods of hegemony, hegemonic strength was negatively related with violent conflict, and yet use of force by the hegemon was positively correlated with violent conflict in both cases. Finally, in both cases, economic power was more closely associated with conflict levels than military power. Statistical analysis created a more complicated picture of the hegemon’s role in fostering stability than initially anticipated. VI. Conclusions and Implications for Theory and Policy To elucidate some answers regarding the complexities my analysis unearthed, I turned first to the existing theoretical literature on hegemonic stability theory. The existing literature provides some potential frameworks for understanding these results. Since economic strength proved to be of such crucial importance, reexamining the literature that focuses on hegemonic stability theory’s economic implications was the logical first step. As explained above, the literature on hegemonic stability theory can be broadly divided into two camps – that which focuses on the international economic system, and that which focuses on armed conflict and instability. This research falls squarely into the second camp, but insights from the first camp are still of relevance. Even Kindleberger’s early work on this question is of relevance. Kindleberger posited that the economic **instability** between the First and Second World Wars **could be attributed to the lack of an economic hegemon** (Kindleberger 1973). But economic instability obviously has spillover effects into the international political arena. Keynes, writing after WWI, warned in his seminal tract The Economic Consequences of the Peace that Germany’s economic humiliation could have a radicalizing effect on the nation’s political culture (Keynes 1919). Given later events, his warning seems prescient. In the years since the Second World War, however, the European continent has not relapsed into armed conflict. What was different after the second global conflagration? Crucially, the United States was in a far more powerful position than Britain was after WWI. As the tables above show, Britain’s economic strength after the First World War was about 13% of the total in strength in the international system. In contrast, the United States possessed about 53% of relative economic power in the international system in the years immediately following WWII. The U.S. helped rebuild Europe’s economic strength with billions of dollars in investment through the Marshall Plan, assistance that was never available to the defeated powers after the First World War (Kindleberger 1973). Theinterwar years were also marked by a series of debilitating trade wars that likely worsened the Great Depression (Ibid.). In contrast, when Britain was more powerful, it was able to facilitate greater free trade, and after World War II, **the United States played a leading role in creating institutions like the GATT that had an essential role in facilitating global trade** (Organski 1958). The possibility that economic stability is an important factor in the overall security environment should not be discounted, especially given the results of my statistical analysis. Another theory that could provide insight into the patterns observed in this research is that of preponderance of power. Gilpin theorized that **when a state has the preponderance of power in the international system, rivals are more likely to resolve their disagreements without resorting to armed conflict** (Gilpin 1983). The logic behind this claim is simple – it makes more sense to challenge a weaker hegemon than a stronger one. This simple yet powerful theory can help explain the puzzlingly strong positive correlation between military conflicts engaged in by the hegemon and conflict overall. It is not necessarily that military involvement by the hegemon instigates further conflict in the international system. Rather, this military involvement could be a function of the hegemon’s weaker position, which is the true cause of the higher levels of conflict in the international system. Additionally, it is important to note that **military power is,** in the long run, dependent on economic strength. Thus, it is possible that **as hegemons lose relative economic power, other nations are tempted to** challenge them even if their short-term military capabilities are still strong. This would help explain some of the variation found between the economic and military data. The results of this analysis are of clear importance beyond the realm of theory. As the debate rages over the role of the United States in the world, hegemonic stability theory has some useful insights to bring to the table. What this research makes clear is that a strong hegemon can exert a positive influence on stability in the international system. However, this should not give policymakers a justification to engage in conflict or escalate military budgets purely for the sake of international stability. If anything, this research points to the central importance of economic influence in fostering international stability. To misconstrue these findings to justify anything else would be a grave error indeed. Hegemons may play a stabilizing role in the international system, but this role is complicated. **It is economic strength, not military dominance that is the** true test **of hegemony**. **A weak state with a strong military is a** paper tiger – it may appear fearsome, but it is vulnerable to even a short blast of wind.

#### Hegemony prevents multiple nuclear conflicts

Brooks, Ikenberry, and Wohlforth ’13 (Stephen, Associate Professor of Government at Dartmouth College, John Ikenberry is the Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University in the Department of Politics and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, William C. Wohlforth is the Daniel Webster Professor in the Department of Government at Dartmouth College “Don’t Come Home America: The Case Against Retrenchment,” International Security, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Winter 2012/13), pp. 7–51)

A core premise of deep engagement is that it prevents the emergence of a far more dangerous global security environment. For one thing, as noted above, the United States’ overseas presence gives it the leverage to restrain partners from taking provocative action. Perhaps more important, its core alliance commitments also deter states with aspirations to regional hegemony from contemplating expansion and make its partners more secure, reducing their incentive to adopt solutions to their security problems that threaten others and thus stoke security dilemmas. The contention that engaged U.S. power dampens the baleful effects of anarchy is consistent with influential variants of realist theory. Indeed, arguably the scariest portrayal of the war-prone world that would emerge absent the “American Pacifier” is provided in the works of John Mearsheimer, who forecasts dangerous multipolar regions replete with security competition, arms races, nuclear proliferation and associated preventive war temptations, regional rivalries, and even runs at regional hegemony and full-scale great power war. 72 How do retrenchment advocates, the bulk of whom are realists, discount this benefit? Their arguments are complicated, but two capture most of the variation: (1) U.S. security guarantees are not necessary to prevent dangerous rivalries and conflict in Eurasia; or (2) prevention of rivalry and conflict in Eurasia is not a U.S. interest. Each response is connected to a different theory or set of theories, which makes sense given that the whole debate hinges on a complex future counterfactual (what would happen to Eurasia’s security setting if the United States truly disengaged?). Although a certain answer is impossible, each of these responses is nonetheless a weaker argument for retrenchment than advocates acknowledge. The first response flows from defensive realism as well as other international relations theories that discount the conflict-generating potential of anarchy under contemporary conditions. 73 Defensive realists maintain that the high expected costs of territorial conquest, defense dominance, and an array of policies and practices that can be used credibly to signal benign intent, mean that Eurasia’s major states could manage regional multipolarity peacefully without the American pacifier. Retrenchment would be a bet on this scholarship, particularly in regions where the kinds of stabilizers that nonrealist theories point to—such as democratic governance or dense institutional linkages—are either absent or weakly present. There are three other major bodies of scholarship, however, that might give decisionmakers pause before making this bet. First is regional expertise. Needless to say, there is no consensus on the net security effects of U.S. withdrawal. Regarding each region, there are optimists and pessimists. Few experts expect a return of intense great power competition in a post-American Europe, but many doubt European governments will pay the political costs of increased EU defense cooperation and the budgetary costs of increasing military outlays. 74 The result might be a Europe that is incapable of securing itself from various threats that could be destabilizing within the region and beyond (e.g., a regional conflict akin to the 1990s Balkan wars), lacks capacity for global security missions in which U.S. leaders might want European participation, and is vulnerable to the influence of outside rising powers. What about the other parts of Eurasia where the United States has a substantial military presence? Regarding the Middle East, the balance begins to swing toward pessimists concerned that states currently backed by Washington— notably Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia—might take actions upon U.S. retrenchment that would intensify security dilemmas. And concerning East Asia, pessimism regarding the region’s prospects without the American pacifier is pronounced. Arguably the principal concern expressed by area experts is that Japan and South Korea are likely to obtain a nuclear capacity and increase their military commitments, which could stoke a destabilizing reaction from China. It is notable that during the Cold War, both South Korea and Taiwan moved to obtain a nuclear weapons capacity and were only constrained from doing so by a still-engaged United States. 75 The second body of scholarship casting doubt on the bet on defensive realism’s sanguine portrayal is all of the research that undermines its conception of state preferences. Defensive realism’s optimism about what would happen if the United States retrenched is very much dependent on its particular—and highly restrictive—assumption about state preferences; once we relax this assumption, then much of its basis for optimism vanishes. Specifically, the prediction of post-American tranquility throughout Eurasia rests on the assumption that security is the only relevant state preference, with security defined narrowly in terms of protection from violent external attacks on the homeland. Under that assumption, the security problem is largely solved as soon as offense and defense are clearly distinguishable, and offense is extremely expensive relative to defense. Burgeoning research across the social and other sciences, however, undermines that core assumption: states have preferences not only for security but also for prestige, status, and other aims, and they engage in trade-offs among the various objectives. 76 In addition, they define security not just in terms of territorial protection but in view of many and varied milieu goals. It follows that even states that are relatively secure may nevertheless engage in highly competitive behavior. Empirical studies show that this is indeed sometimes the case. 77 In sum, a bet on a benign postretrenchment Eurasia is a bet that leaders of major countries will never allow these nonsecurity preferences to influence their strategic choices. To the degree that these bodies of scholarly knowledge have predictive leverage, U.S. retrenchment would result in a significant deterioration in the security environment in at least some of the world’s key regions. We have already mentioned the third, even more alarming body of scholarship. Offensive realism predicts that the withdrawal of the American pacifier will yield either a competitive regional multipolarity complete with associated insecurity, arms racing, crisis instability, nuclear proliferation, and the like, or bids for regional hegemony, which may be beyond the capacity of local great powers to contain (and which in any case would generate intensely competitive behavior, possibly including regional great power war). Hence it is unsurprising that retrenchment advocates are prone to focus on the second argument noted above: that avoiding wars and security dilemmas in the world’s core regions is not a U.S. national interest. Few doubt that the United States could survive the return of insecurity and conflict among Eurasian powers, but at what cost? Much of the work in this area has focused on the economic externalities of a renewed threat of insecurity and war, which we discuss below. Focusing on the pure security ramifications, there are two main reasons why decisionmakers may be rationally reluctant to run the retrenchment experiment. First, overall higher levels of conflict make the world a more dangerous place. Were Eurasia to return to higher levels of interstate military competition, one would see overall higher levels of military spending and innovation and a higher likelihood of competitive regional proxy wars and arming of client states—all of which would be concerning, in part because it would promote a faster diffusion of military power away from the United States. Greater regional insecurity could well feed proliferation cascades, as states such as Egypt, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and Saudi Arabia all might choose to create nuclear forces. 78 It is unlikely that proliferation decisions by any of these actors would be the end of the game: they would likely generate pressure locally for more proliferation. Following Kenneth Waltz, many retrenchment advocates are proliferation optimists, assuming that nuclear deterrence solves the security problem. 79 Usually carried out in dyadic terms, the debate over the stability of proliferation changes as the numbers go up. Proliferation optimism rests on assumptions of rationality and narrow security preferences. In social science, however, such assumptions are inevitably probabilistic. Optimists assume that most states are led by rational leaders, most will overcome organizational problems and resist the temptation to preempt before feared neighbors nuclearize, and most pursue only security and are risk averse. Confidence in such probabilistic assumptions declines if the world were to move from nine to twenty, thirty, or forty nuclear states. In addition, many of the other dangers noted by analysts who are concerned about the destabilizing effects of nuclear proliferation—including the risk of accidents and the prospects that some new nuclear powers will not have truly survivable forces—seem prone to go up as the number of nuclear powers grows. 80 Moreover, the risk of “unforeseen crisis dynamics” that could spin out of control is also higher as the number of nuclear powers increases. Finally, add to these concerns the enhanced danger of nuclear leakage, and a world with overall higher levels of security competition becomes yet more worrisome. The argument that maintaining Eurasian peace is not a U.S. interest faces a second problem. On widely accepted realist assumptions, acknowledging that U.S. engagement preserves peace dramatically narrows the difference between retrenchment and deep engagement. For many supporters of retrenchment, the optimal strategy for a power such as the United States, which has attained regional hegemony and is separated from other great powers by oceans, is offshore balancing: stay over the horizon and “pass the buck” to local powers to do the dangerous work of counterbalancing any local rising power. The United States should commit to onshore balancing only when local balancing is likely to fail and a great power appears to be a credible contender for regional hegemony, as in the cases of Germany, Japan, and the Soviet Union in the midtwentieth century. The problem is that China’s rise puts the possibility of its attaining regional hegemony on the table, at least in the medium to long term. As Mearsheimer notes, “The United States will have to play a key role in countering China, because its Asian neighbors are not strong enough to do it by themselves.” 81 Therefore, unless China’s rise stalls, “the United States is likely to act toward China similar to the way it behaved toward the Soviet Union during the Cold War.” 82 It follows that the United States should take no action that would compromise its capacity to move to onshore balancing in the future. It will need to maintain key alliance relationships in Asia as well as the formidably expensive military capacity to intervene there. The implication is to get out of Iraq and Afghanistan, reduce the presence in Europe, and pivot to Asia— just what the United States is doing. 83 In sum, the argument that U.S. **security** commitments are unnecessary **for peace** is countered by a lot of scholarship, including highly influential realist scholarship. In addition, the argument that Eurasian peace is unnecessary for U.S. security is weakened by the potential for a large number of nasty security consequences as well as the need to retain a latent onshore balancing capacity that dramatically reduces the savings retrenchment might bring. Moreover, switching between offshore and onshore balancing could well be difªcult. Bringing together the thrust of many of the arguments discussed so far underlines the degree to which the case for retrenchment misses the underlying logic of the deep engagement strategy. By supplying reassurance, deterrence, and active management, the United States lowers security competition in the world’s key regions, thereby preventing the emergence of a hothouse atmosphere for growing new military capabilities. Alliance ties dissuade partners from ramping up and also provide leverage to prevent military transfers to potential rivals. On top of all this, the United States’ formidable military machine may deter entry by potential rivals. Current great power military expenditures as a percentage of GDP are at historical lows, and thus far other major powers have shied away from seeking to match top-end U.S. military capabilities. In addition, they have so far been careful to avoid attracting the “focused enmity” of the United States. 84 All of the world’s most modern militaries are U.S. allies (America’s alliance system of more than sixty countries now accounts for some 80 percent of global military spending), and the gap between the U.S. military capability and that of potential rivals is by many measures growing rather than shrinking. 85

#### Plan solves

#### First- the plan solves the green economy

Saha 11/13, Devashree, senior policy analyst and associate fellow at the Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program,” “Enact Legislation Supporting Residential Property Assessed Clean Energy Financing,” November 13th, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Research/Files/Papers/2012/11/13%20federalism/13%20housing%20energy%20efficiency.pdf>

Summary Congress should enact legislation that supports residential property assessed clean energy (PACE) programs in the nation’s states and metropolitan areas. Such legislation should require the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) to allow Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to purchase residential mortgages with PACE assessments while at the same time providing responsible underwriting standards and a set of benchmarks for residential PACE assessments in order to minimize financial risks to mortgage holders. Congressional support of residential PACE financing will improve energy efficiency, encourage job creation, and foster economic growth in the nation’s state and metropolitan areas. Background In the aftermath of the Great Recession, the U.S. needs to move toward a new economic growth model, a “next economy” in which the nation takes the lead in the clean economy by accelerating the development and adoption of the energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies necessary for a low carbon future. Given that **the clean economy could** **trigger a market transformation as profound as the information revolution**, the U.S. needs to fully engage in the clean economy—which is expected to grow four-fold to more than $2 trillion by 2020. Along these lines, a first priority for unleashing clean economy growth in the nation must be to **catalyze stronger market demand** for energy efficiency and renewable energy products and services in the residential, commercial, and institutional markets. Of particular note here is the market potential of energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades and retrofits in buildings. Since buildings consume nearly half (48.7 percent) of the nation’s primary energy and are also responsible for half of the carbon emissions, such upgrades and retrofits offer the potential for significant economic, employment, and climate benefits. Given that, it has been estimated that scaling up energy efficiency retrofits offers a $279 billion investment opportunity with potential for energy savings totaling more than $1 trillion over a period of 10 years—of which $182 billion of investment potential is tied to residential energy efficiency upgrades alone. Cities and states across the nation—motivated by challenges of escalating energy costs and the significant economic benefits of energy efficient solutions—have led the nation through their efforts to retrofit the residential, commercial, and public buildings in their jurisdictions. At the same time though, cities and states have contended with a number of challenging market barriers that prevent the energy retrofit market from scaling up, including perceived risk of investing in energy retrofit projects, high transaction costs, and inadequate access to capital. Given these financing challenges, property assessed clean energy (PACE) programs have attracted attention as an innovative financing mechanism for energy retrofit upgrades. PACE is a financing structure that enables states and local governments to use money raised through bond issues or other sources of capital to fund energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades. These funds are used as upfront financing for upgrades to residential and commercial properties, recovered by the governmental entity through a special property tax assessment that runs with the land for up to 20 years. The PACE special district structure thus overcomes market barriers to energy upgrades by spreading cost recovery with savings realized over the life of the improvement. First piloted in 2008, PACE programs quickly spread throughout the country and today 28 states and the District of Columbia have passed PACE-enabling legislation. As a result, PACE programs have enjoyed significant success in many cities and counties. Palm Desert, CA’s PACE program, for example, has approved $8.5 million in projects to date. Sonoma County’s program, meanwhile, has financed over $55 million in projects for 1,600 residential and 50 non-residential property owners. What’s more, **studies analyzing** the economic effects of **PACE** programs **suggest that they have the potential of generating significant positive economic and fiscal benefits**. One study found that $4 million in total PACE spending can generate on average $10 million in gross economic output; $1 million in combined federal, state, and local tax revenue; and 60 new jobs. Extrapolating from this study, if just one percent of the 75 million owner-occupied homes in the U.S. were to invest in a PACE project that cost an average of $20,000 each, the economic impact would translate to $15 billion in gross economic output; $4 billion in combined federal, state, and local tax revenue; and 226,000 new jobs. The Problem And yet, for all their promise, neither energy retrofit projects in general nor residential PACE programs specifically have achieved their full potential. Part of the problem owes to the well-known market barriers that depress demand, including: a status quo bias, difficulty in quantifying energy savings from retrofits and upgrades, lack of information about existing energy inefficiency in homes and what can be done about it, high up-front costs, and difficulty identifying quality contractors. In addition, and perhaps more significantly, the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) has blocked the scale-up of residential PACE programs. In July 2010, just as residential PACE programs were gathering momentum, the FHFA issued a statement asserting that PACE programs constituted first liens over pre-existing mortgages, thereby creating significant risks for lenders, servicers, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and other mortgage holders. Despite evidence to the contrary, the FHFA deemed these risks unacceptable and instructed Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to restrict the kind of loans that homeowners could get if they live in a PACEdesignated area. This ruling effectively ended residential PACE financing, with many local governments suspending their programs as a result. Commercial PACE programs were not affected by the FHFA decision and have been moving forward in various places. The FHFA ruling on residential PACE financing has resulted in:  The cessation of almost all existing PACE programs focused on the residential sector out of concern that mortgages in PACE-designated areas would fail to receive the backing of Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac  Redirection of nearly $150 million in federal Recovery Act funds that had originally been designated to support the implementation and operation of residential PACE programs throughout the U.S. Despite efforts by advocates of PACE to address FHFA concerns, the FHFA ruling against residential PACE financing persists. Meanwhile, some states have challenged the FHFA ruling in federal court, though such efforts have thus far proven unsuccessful in changing FHFA’s stance. A federal district court in California—while not ordering the FHFA to reverse its current position on underwriting mortgages for properties with a PACE assessment—directed the agency to proceed with a notice and comment period for rulemaking. The FHFA took comments on proposed rules until September 2012 and it is not clear how long it will take to finalize the proposed rules or what the outcome will be. In addition, there have been a number of attempts to resolve the residential PACE issue through legislative action, including the PACE Assessment Protection Act (H.R. 2599), introduced in July 2011, that would prevent the FHFA and mortgage underwriters from discriminating against localities participating in or implementing a PACE program. To date, however, no legislation supporting residential PACE programs has been passed. Proposal The Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings therefore proposes that Congress enact legislation that would require the FHFA to allow Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to purchase residential mortgages with PACE assessments and incorporate underwriting standards protecting lenders and program standards for states and local governments offering PACE programs. These underwriting standards should be aligned with the PACE guidelines released by the Department of Energy in May 2010. Along these lines, Congressional support of residential PACE programs would:  Send a strong signal that the U.S. remains fiercely committed to investing in smart, innovative financing structures that can catalyze the energy retrofit market  Enable states and local governments—many of which suspended their residential PACE programs in the wake of the FHFA ruling—to design and implement such programs in their communities  Save money for homeowners by reducing energy costs  Create new jobs and career opportunities in both the energy efficiency and renewable energy industries  Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and so produce significant climate benefits Congressional support of residential PACE financing has the potential to inject billions of dollars into the U.S. economy while at the same time making lasting energy improvements in the nation’s metropolitan areas.

#### Second is housing – it’s declining now and key to the economy

Hughes 11/15, Sam, intern with the Housing team at the Center for American Progress “A Strong Housing Market Is Critical to Our Economic Recovery,” 11/15, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/housing/news/2012/11/15/45042/a-strong-housing-market-is-critical-to-our-economic-recovery/

In reality, the housing market is where the Great Recession of 2007­–2009 began and we’re not likely to see a robust economic recovery until the housing market heals. We’re beginning to see the early stages of a housing recovery with the housing sector finally starting to contribute positively to economic growth, but the housing market remains far from healthy. Below are six reasons why lawmakers need to focus on housing to help spur further growth, rather than ignore this important business sector and hope for the best: Housing booms lead the way to broader economic growth, not vice versa. During our three previous recessions—in 1980, 1991, and 2001—residential investment led the way to recovery, growing more than 30 percent on average in the first years of the recovery. Despite recent gains, the housing market has so far lagged behind growth in the broader economy, translating into billions of dollars in lost economic output and millions of missing jobs. If home construction were near its historic norm, it would create an additional 3 million jobs. The housing sector traditionally accounts for roughly one-fifth of the U.S. economy, but construction on new homes today is currently about half of the historic norm. Since each home built creates three new full-time jobs and $90,000 in tax revenue, an upturn in home construction would be a significant boost for the economy and alleviate some pressure on state and local budgets. Demand for homes is down primarily because of tight lending standards, not the economy. According to a recent survey from Fannie Mae, 72 percent of Americans believe that now is a good time to buy a home, but many are having a hard time getting approved for a home loan, thanks to excessively tight credit standards at banks. In August 2012 a typical rejected applicant for a Fannie- or Freddie-backed loan had a FICO credit score of 734 and a down payment of 19 percent. Data show that more than 50 percent of credit scores are below 734. Consumer spending will not come back until housing recovers. High-debt households generally consume 15 percent less than low-debt households. In particular, underwater borrowers—those who owe more on their house than their house is worth—spend less on home maintenance and renovations, chilling demand in home-related industries. Lack of home equity constrains small-business formation and investment. Roughly one in four small-business owners uses home equity as a source of capital or collateral. Each foreclosure results in enormous spillover costs to investors, borrowers, and local communities. Foreclosures not only harm borrowers and investors but they also devastate communities. One recent study estimates that spillover costs of foreclosures have reached nearly $2 trillion. Plus, each vacant home brings down the value of neighboring homes by more than $20,000, costs state and local governments $34,000 in tax revenues and associated services, and can also become a hotbed for crime and other social problems. Fixing our housing problems will not be easy but it is crucial to our economic recovery. With that in mind, policymakers should stop waiting for the housing sector to fix itself and should put in place policies to get the market back to full strength.

#### Declining housing sector guarantees double dip recession that none of their impact defense assumes

#### Isidore ‘11

(Chris, writer at CNNMoney, “Recession 2.0 would hurt worse,” 2011, [http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/10/news/economy/double\_dip\_recession\_economy/index.htm)](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/10/news/economy/double_dip_recession_economy/index.htm%29)

The risk of double dip recession is rising. And while economists disagree on just how likely the U.S. economy is to fall into another downturn, they generally agree on one thing -- a new recession would be worse than the last and very difficult to pull out of. "Going back into recession now would be scary, because we don't have the resources or the will to respond, and our initial starting point is such a point of weakness," said Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Analytics. "It won't feel like a new recession. It would likely feel like a depression."Zandi said the recent sell-off in stocks have caused him to raise the odds of a new recession to 33% from 25% only 10 days ago. Other economists surveyed by CNNMoney are also [raising their recession risk estimates](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/03/news/economy/recession_risk_economy/index.htm?iid=EL). The survey found an average chance of a new recession to be about 25%, up from a [15% chance](http://money.cnn.com/2011/06/10/news/economy/recession_economic_survey/index.htm?iid=EL) only three months ago. Of the 21 economists who responded to the survey, six have joined Zandi in increasing their estimates in just the last few days. The main reason: the huge slide in stocks. Standard & Poor's [downgrade of the U.S. credit rating](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/06/news/economy/sp_rating_fallout/index.htm?iid=EL) is another concern. "The correction in equity markets raises the risk of recession due to the negative [hit to wealth](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/08/markets/stock-market-loss/index.htm?iid=EL) and [confidence](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/08/pf/expert/investing_cash.moneymag/index.htm?iid=EL)," said Sal Guatieri, senior economist for BMO Capital Markets. Even with a [430-point rebound](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/09/markets/markets_newyork/index.htm?iid=EL) in the Dow Jones industrial average Tuesday following the Federal Reserve meeting, major U.S. stock indexes have lost more than 11% of their value over the last 12 trading days. [Recovery at risk](http://money.cnn.com/news/economy/recovery_at_risk/?iid=EL) A plunge in stocks doesn't necessarily mean a new recession. The economy avoided a recession after the stock market crash of 1987. "Stock price declines are often misleading indicators of future recessions," said David Berson, chief economist of BMI Group. But with the economy already so fragile, the shock of another stock market drop and resulting [loss of wealth](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/08/markets/stock-market-loss/index.htm?iid=EL) could be the tipping point. "It really does matter where the economy is when it gets hit by these shocks," said Zandi. "If we all [pull back on spending](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/02/news/economy/personal_income_spending/index.htm?iid=EL), that's a prescription for a long, painful recession," he said. Most economists say they aren't worried that S&P's downgrade makes recession more likely, although a few said any bad news at this point increases the risk. "The downgrade has a psychological impact in terms of hurting consumer confidence," said Lawrence Yun, chief economist with the National Association of Realtors. On shakier ground Another recession could be **even worse** thanthe last one for a few reasons. For starters, the economy is more vulnerable than it was in 2007 when the Great Recession began. In fact, the economy would enter the new recession much weaker than the start of any other downturn since the end of World War II. Unemployment currently stands at 9.1%. In November 2007, the month before the start of the Great Recession, it was just 4.7%. And the large number of Americans who have stopped looking for work in the last few years has left the [percentage of the population with a job](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/08/news/economy/unemployment_jobs/index.htm?iid=EL) at a 28-year low. Various parts of the economy also have yet to recover from the last recession and would be at serious risk of lasting damage in a new downturn. [Home values continue to lose ground](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/09/real_estate/home_price_recovery/index.htm?iid=EL) and are projected to continue their fall. While manufacturing has had a nice rebound in the last two years, industrial production is still 18% below pre-recession levels.There are nearly 900 banks on the [FDIC's list of troubled institutions](http://finance.fortune.cnn.com/2011/05/24/problem-banks-list-hits-888/?iid=EL), the highest number since 1993. Only 76 banks were at risk as the Great Recession took hold. But what has economists **particularly worried** is that the tools generally used to try to jumpstart an economy teetering on the edge of recession aren't available this time around. "The reason we didn't go into a depression three years ago is the policy response by Congress and the Fed," said Dan Seiver, a finance professor at San Diego State University. "**We won't see that this time**." Three times between 2008 and 2010, Congress approved massive spending or temporary tax cuts to try to stimulate the economy. But fresh from the [bruising debt ceiling battle](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/02/news/economy/debt_ceiling_senate_vote/?iid=EL) and credit rating downgrade, and with elections looming, the federal government has shown little inclination to move in that direction. So **this new recession would likely have virtually no policy effort to counteract it.**

#### The plan solves – increases property values and decreases default risk

Hale 10, Greg, Director of Efficiency Finance at NRDC's Center for Market Innovation “PACE program is good for banks & property owners,” March 29th, http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ghale/pace\_program\_is\_good\_for\_banks.html

On March 25th, the Wall Street Journal published an article titled “Fannie and Freddie Resist Loans for Energy Efficiency” that looks at an innovative financing vehicle for clean energy retrofits called PACE (Property Assessed Clean Energy). While we were glad to see coverage of this exciting new mechanism, we were disappointed that the article focused narrowly on concerns about PACE that the mortgage banking industry raised a year ago. These concerns were valid, but they are old news and have been fully addressed. Perhaps more importantly, the WSJ article doesn’t mention the significant business opportunities that PACE presents for the mortgage banking community: the banks themselves can participate in various stages of the PACE financing system. The article correctly asserts that PACE makes clean energy retrofits easier for property owners, by allowing them to undertake retrofits at no upfront cost, and repay PACE financing through incremental assessments on their property taxes over terms as long as 20 years. And it correctly asserts that PACE has faced resistance from the government’s mortgage finance agencies - Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac and their regulator, the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) - which are concerned about PACE lien priority over existing mortgage holders in the event of foreclosure. But here the article omits an essential point: if a property with a PACE lien goes into foreclosure, the entire PACE-financed amount does not become due. Instead, only the past-due portion of the PACE financing is paid out before the existing lender’s mortgage. Thus, the risk to existing lenders of PACE lien seniority in foreclosure is actually extremely small. In response to the very same mortgage industry concerns that are rehashed by this WSJ article, the White House created an inter-agency task force last summer, including senior representatives from FHFA, the National Economic Council, and the Departments of Energy, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development. Following an in-depth analysis of the issues, the task force published the federal PACE Policy Framework last October, which establishes a set of best practices for PACE programs, specifically designed to resolve the mortgage bankers’ issues. Large and small communities alike (e.g., San Francisco, CA and Montgomery County, MD) are adopting the task force’s best practice guidelines as they launch their PACE programs this spring. Planned programs in Los Angeles, San Diego, New Mexico and Louisiana are also expected to adhere to the task force guidelines. When properly designed to include these best practices, PACE programs will benefit virtually all stakeholders, including homeowners and existing lenders, while creating large job growth and all with no credit risk to municipalities. In particular, the position of existing lenders is actually improved by PACE-financed clean energy retrofits because: PACE lowers the risk that mortgage holders will default on their mortgages. PACE financing is designed so that the annual energy savings resulting from clean energy retrofits will be greater than the corresponding annual PACE assessments, so property owners have more cash to make their mortgage payments. This increased cash on hand, combined with property owners’ lower vulnerability to energy price spikes, reduces mortgage default risk, consistent with prudent underwriting practices (contrary to critics’ claims otherwise). PACE projects increase property value, benefitting both owners and lenders. As noted by the article, PACE financing can only be used to make qualified energy saving improvements to the owners’ property. According to this recent article in the Appraisal Journal, every utility-bill dollar saved annually by energy improvements yields an increase of approximately $20 in property value, so reducing a property owner’s annual utility bill by $1,000 would return about $20,000 in property value. In other words, PACE projects substantially increase the value of the existing mortgage lenders’ collateral. In the case of foreclosure, the incremental risk PACE causes for lenders is very low. As noted above, in the event that a property with a PACE lien goes into foreclosure, the good news for mortgage lenders is that only the past-due PACE assessments are paid prior to the lender’s claim. Contrary to the inference raised by the article, PACE best practices include various underwriting criteria to further protect existing lenders and property owners, including: (a) the sum of existing mortgage debt plus proposed PACE financing should not exceed the fair value of the property; (b) the PACE financing should be limited to a certain percentage of property value (generally 10%); and (c) property owners must be current on property taxes and have no unsatisfied liens, notices of default or other material property-based delinquencies. Finally, the WSJ article alluded to the “legal challenges” that critics of PACE say cities will face, but in reality, PACE financing presents very little that is out of the ordinary. PACE is simply a variation on municipal financing districts which have a 100+ year history in the U.S. to pay for improvements in the public interest, such as sewer systems, parks and street lights. PACE programs support important public purposes, including job creation, advancement of a clean energy economy, improved energy independence, and global climate change mitigation. In fact, PACE programs should be even less of a concern to mortgage lenders than traditional municipal financing districts because PACE is 100% voluntary – no property owner pays additional tax assessments or fees unless they opt to have clean energy improvements made to their property as part of the program. Certainly, we agree that now is not a time to take any lending concerns lightly – but these issues have all been addressed. It’s also not the time to turn our back on creative, responsible and financially sound ideas like PACE. PACE gets to the core of energy efficiency, while increasing property value and creating jobs. We hope mortgage bankers will begin to see the financial opportunity that PACE presents, and will help scale up this innovative program.

# Climate

#### Warming causes extinction- tipping point

Dyer ‘12 (London-based independent journalist, PhD from King's College London, citing UC Berkeley scientists (Gwynne, "Tick, tock to mass extinction date," The Press, 6-19-12, l/n, accessed 8-15-12, mss)

Meanwhile, a team of respected scientists warn that life on Earth may be on the way to an irreversible "**tipping point"**. Sure. Heard that one before, too. Last month one of the world's two leading scientific journals, Nature, published a paper, "Approaching a state shift in Earth's biosphere," pointing out that more than 40 per cent of the Earth's land is already used for human needs. With the human population set to grow by a further two billion by 2050, that figure could soon exceed 50 per cent. "It really will be a new world, biologically, at that point," said the paper's lead author, Professor Anthony Barnofsky of the University of California, Berkeley. But Barnofsky doesn't go into the details of what kind of new world it might be. Scientists hardly ever do in public, for fear of being seen as panic-mongers. Besides, it's a relatively new hypothesis, but it's a pretty convincing one, and it should be more widely understood. Here's how bad it could get. The scientific consensus is that we are still on track for 3 degrees C of warming by 2100, but that's just warming caused by human greenhouse- gas emissions. The problem is that +3 degrees is well past the point where the major feedbacks kick in: natural phenomena triggered by our warming, like melting permafrost and the loss of Arctic sea-ice cover, that will add to the heating and that we cannot turn off. The trigger is actually around 2C (3.5 degrees F) higher average global temperature. After that we lose control of the process: ending our own carbon- dioxide emissions would no longer be enough to stop the warming. We may end up trapped on an escalator heading up to +6C (+10.5F), with no way of getting off. And +6C gives you the **mass extinction**. There have been five mass extinctions in the past 500 million years, when 50 per cent or more of the species then existing on the Earth vanished, but until recently the only people taking any interest in this were paleontologists, not climate scientists. They did wonder what had caused the extinctions, but the best answer they could come up was "climate change". It wasn't a very good answer. Why would a warmer or colder planet kill off all those species? The warming was caused by massive volcanic eruptions dumping huge quantities of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere for tens of thousands of years. But it was very gradual and the animals and plants had plenty of time to migrate to climatic zones that still suited them. (That's exactly what happened more recently in the Ice Age, as the glaciers repeatedly covered whole continents and then retreated again.) There had to be a more convincing kill mechanism than that. The paleontologists found one when they discovered that a giant asteroid struck the planet 65 million years ago, just at the time when the dinosaurs died out in the most recent of the great extinctions. So they went looking for evidence of huge asteroid strikes at the time of the other extinction events. They found none. What they discovered was that there was indeed major warming at the time of all the other extinctions - and that the warming had radically changed the oceans. The currents that carry oxygen- rich cold water down to the depths shifted so that they were bringing down oxygen- poor warm water instead, and gradually the depths of the oceans became anoxic: the deep waters no longer had any oxygen. When that happens, the sulfur bacteria that normally live in the silt (because oxygen is poison to them) come out of hiding and begin to multiply. Eventually they rise all the way to the surface over the whole ocean, killing all the oxygen-breathing life. The ocean also starts emitting enormous amounts of lethal hydrogen sulfide gas that destroy the ozone layer and directly poison land- dwelling species. This has happened many times in the Earth's history.

#### It will be rapid

Light ‘12 (Malcolm, PhD, University of London – Earth science and climate consultant, “Global Extinction within one Human Lifetime as a Result of a Spreading Atmospheric Arctic Methane Heat wave and Surface Firestorm,” <http://arctic-news.blogspot.com/p/global-extinction-within-one-human.html>)

Although the sudden high rate Arctic methane increase at Svalbard in late 2010 data set applies to only a short time interval, similar sudden methane concentration peaks also occur at Barrow point and the effects of a major methane build-up has been observed using all the major scientific observation systems. Giant fountains/torches/plumes of methane entering the atmosphere up to 1 km across have been seen on the East Siberian Shelf. This methane eruption data is so consistent and aerially extensive that when combined with methane gas warming potentials, Permian extinction event temperatures and methane lifetime data it paints a frightening picture of the beginning of the now uncontrollable global warming induced destabilization of the subsea Arctic methane hydrates on the shelf and slope which started in late 2010. This process of methane release will **accelerate exponentially**, release huge quantities of methane into the atmosphere and lead to the demise of all life on earth before the middle of this century. Introduction The 1990 global atmospheric mean temperature is assumed to be 14.49 oC (Shakil, 2005; NASA, 2002; DATAWeb, 2012) which sets the 2 oC anomaly above which humanity will lose control of her ability to limit the effects of global warming on major climatic and environmental systems at 16.49 oC (IPCC, 2007). The major Permian extinction event temperature is 80 oF (26.66 oC) which is a temperature anomaly of 12.1766 oC above the 1990 global mean temperature of 14.49 oC (Wignall, 2009; Shakil, 2005). Results of Investigation Figure 1 shows a huge sudden atmospheric spike like increase in the concentration of atmospheric methane at Svalbard north of Norway in the Arctic reaching 2040 ppb (2.04 ppm)(ESRL/GMO, 2010 - Arctic - Methane - Emergency - Group.org). The cause of this sudden anomalous increase in the concentration of atmospheric methane at Svalbard has been seen on the East Siberian Arctic Shelf where a recent Russian - U.S. expedition has found widespread, continuous powerful methane seepages into the atmosphere from the subsea methane hydrates with the methane plumes (fountains or torches) up to 1 km across producing an atmospheric methane concentration 100 times higher than normal (Connor, 2011). Such high methane concentrations could produce local temperature anomalies of more than 50 oC at a conservative methane warming potential of 25. Figure 2 is derived from the Svalbard data in Figure 1 and the methane concentration data has been used to generate a Svalbard atmospheric temperature anomaly trend using a methane warming potential of 43.5 as an example. The huge sudden anomalous spike in atmospheric methane concentration in mid August, 2010 at Svalbard is clearly evident and the methane concentrations within this spike have been used to construct a series of radiating methane global warming temperature trends for the entire range of methane global warming potentials in Figure 3 from an assumed mean start temperature of -3.575 degrees Centigrade for Svalbard (see Figure 2) (Norwegian Polar Institute; 2011). Figure 3 shows a set of radiating Arctic atmospheric methane global warming temperature trends calculated from the steep methane atmospheric concentration gradient at Svalbard in 2010 (ESRL/GMO, 2010 - Arctic-Methane-Emergency-Group.org). The range of extinction temperature anomalies above the assumed 1990 mean atmospheric temperature of 14.49 oC (Shakil, 2005) are also shown on this diagram as well as the 80 oF (26.66 oC) major Permian extinction event temperature (Wignall, 2009). Sam Carana (pers. com. 7 Jan, 2012) has described large December 2011 (ESRL-NOAA data) warming anomalies which exceed 10 to 20 degrees centigrade and cover vast areas of the Arctic at times. In the centres of these regions, which appear to overlap the Gakkel Ridge and its bounding basins, the temperature anomalies may exceed 20 degrees centigrade. See this site:<http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/map/images/fnl/sfctmpmero1a30frames.fnl.anim.html> The temperature anomalies in this region of the Arctic for the period from September 8 2011 to October 7, 2011 were only about 4 degrees Centigrade above normal (Carana, pers. com. 2012) and this data set can be seen on this site: <http://arctic-newsblogspot.com/p/arctic-temperatures.html> Because the Svalbard methane concentration data suggests that the major spike in methane emissions began in late 2010 it has been assumed for calculation purposes that the 2010 temperature anomalies peaked at 4 degrees Centigrade and the 2011 anomalies at 20 degrees Centigrade in the Gakkel Ridge region. The assumed 20 degree Centigrade temperature anomaly trend from 2010 to 2011 in the Gakkel Ridge region requires a methane gas warming potential of about 1000 to generate it from the Svalbard methane atmospheric concentration spike data in 2010. Such high methane warming potentials could only be active over a very short time interval (less than 5.7 months) as shown when the long methane global warming potential lifetimes data from the IPCC (2007; 1992) and Dessus, Laponte and Treut (2008 ) are used to generate a global warming potential growth curve with a methane global warming potential of 100 with a lifespan of 5 years. Because of the high methane global warming potential (1000) of the 2011, 20 oC temperature anomalies in the Gakkel Ridge region, the entire methane global warming potential range from 5 to 1000 has been used to construct the radiating set of temperature trends shown in Figure 3. The 50, 100, 500 and 1000 methane global warming potential (GWP) trends are red and in bold. The choice of a high temperature methane peak with a global warming potential near 1000 is in fact very conservative because the 16 oC increase is assumed to occur over a year. The observed ESRL-NOAA Arctic temperature anomalies varied from 4 to 20 degrees over less than a month in 2011 (Sam Carana, pers. comm. 2012). […] . This very narrow temperature range includes all the mathematically and visually determined extinction times and their means for the northern and southern hemispheres which were calculated quite separately (Figure 7; Table 1). Once the world's ice caps have completely melted away at temperatures above 22.49 oC and times later than 2051.3, the Earth's atmosphere will heat up at an extremely fast rate to reach the Permian extinction event temperature of 80oF (26.66 oC)(Wignall, 2009) by which time all life on Earth will have been completely extinguished. The position where the latent heat of ice melting curve intersects the 8 oC extinction line (22.49 oC) at 2051.3 represents the time when 100 percent of all the ice on the surface of the Earth will have melted. If we make this point on the latent heat of ice melting curve equal to 1 we can determine the time of melting of any fraction of the Earth's icecaps by using the time\*temperature function at each time from 2051.3 back to 2015, the time the average Arctic atmospheric temperature curve is predicted to exceed 0 oC. The process of melting 1 kg of ice and heating the produced water up to a certain temperature is a function of the sum of the latent heat of melting of ice is 334 kilo Joules/kg and the final water temperature times the 4.18 kilo Joules/Kg.K (Wikipedia, 2012). This however represents the energy required over a period of one second to melt 1 kg of ice to water and raise it to the ambient temperature. Therefore the total energy per mass of ice over a certain time period is equal to (334 +(4.18\*Ambient Temperature)\*time in seconds that the melted water took to reach the ambient temperature. From the fractional time\*temperature values at each ambient temperature the fractional amounts of melting of the total global icecaps have been calculated and are shown on Figure 9. The earliest calculated fractional volume of melting of the global ice caps in 2016 is 1.85\*10^-3 of the total volume of global ice with an average yearly rate of ice melting of 2.557\*10^-3 of the total volume of global ice. This value is remarkably similar to, but slightly less than the average rate of melting of the Arctic sea ice measured over an 18 year period of 2.7\*10^-3 (1978 to 1995; 2.7% per decade - IPCC 2007).This close correlation between observed rates of Arctic ice cap and predicted rates of global ice cap melting indicates that average rates of Arctic ice cap melting between 1979 and 2015 (which represents the projected time the Arctic will lose its ice cover - Masters, 2009) will be continued during the first few years of melting of the global ice caps after the Arctic ice cover has gone in 2015 as the mean Arctic atmospheric temperature starts to climb above 0 oC. However from 2017 the rate of melting of the global ice will start to accelerate as will the atmospheric temperature until by 2049 it will be more than 9 times as fast as it was around 2015 (Table 2). The mean rate of melting of the global icecap between 2017 and 2049 is some 2\*10^-2, some 7.4 times the mean rate of melting of the Arctic ice cap (Table 2). In concert with the increase in rate of global ice cap melting between 2017 and 2049, the acceleration in the rate of melting also increases from 7\*10^-4 to 9.9\*10^-4 with a mean value close to 8.6\*10^-4 (Table 2). The ratio of the acceleration in the rate of global ice cap melting to the Arctic ice cap melting increases from 3.4 in 2017 to 4.8 by 2049 with a mean near 4.2. This fast acceleration in the rate of global ice cap melting after 2015 compared to the Arctic sea ice cap melting before 2015 is because the mean Arctic atmospheric temperature after 2017 is spiraling upward in temperature above 0 oC adding large amounts of additional energy to the ice and causing it to melt back more quickly. The melt back of the Arctic ice cap is a symptom of the Earth's disease but not its cause and it is the cause that has to be dealt with if we hope to bring about a cure. Therefore a massive cut back in carbon dioxide emissions should be mandatory for all developed nations (and some developing nations as well). Total destruction of the methane in the Arctic atmosphere is also mandatory if we are to survive the effects of its now catastrophic rate of build up in the atmospheric methane concentration However cooling of the Arctic using geoengineering methods is also vitally important to reduce the effects of the ice cap melting further enhancing the already out of control destabilization of the methane hydrates on the Arctic shelf and slope. · Developed (and some developing) countries must cut back their carbon dioxide emissions by a very large percentage (50% to 90%) by 2020 to immediately precipitate a cooling of the Earth and its crust. If this is not done the earthquake frequency and methane emissions in the Arctic will continue to grow exponentially leading to our inexorable demise between 2031 to 2051. · Geoenginering must be used immediately as a cooling method in the Arctic to counteract the effects of the methane buildup in the short term. However these methods will lead to further pollution of the atmosphere in the long term and will not solve the earthquake induced Arctic methane buildup which is going to lead to our annihilation. · The United States and Russia must immediately develop a net of powerful radio beat frequency transmission stations around the Arctic using the critical 13.56 MHZ beat frequency to break down the methane in the stratosphere and troposphere to nanodiamonds and hydrogen (Light 2011a) . Besides the elimination of the high global warming potential methane, the nanodiamonds may form seeds for light reflecting noctilucent clouds in the stratosphere and a light coloured energy reflecting layer when brought down to the Earth by snow and rain (Light 2011a). HAARP transmission systems are able to electronically vibrate the strong ionospheric electric current that feeds down into the polar areas and are thus the least evasive method of directly eliminating the buildup of methane in those critical regions (Light 2011a). The warning about extinction is stark. It is remarkable that global scientists had not anticipated a giant buildup of methane in the atmosphere when it had been so clearly predicted 10 to 20 years ago and has been shown to be critically linked to extinction events in the geological record (Kennett et al. 2003). Furthermore all the experiments should have already been done to determine which geoengineering methods were the most effective in oxidising/destroying the methane in the atmosphere in case it should ever build up to a concentration where it posed a threat to humanity. Those methods need to be applied immediately if there is any faint hope of reducing the catastrophic heating effects of the fast building atmospheric methane concentration.

#### Its anthro- 500 studies go aff

Romm ‘10 (Jon, Editor of Climate Progress, Senior Fellow at the American Progress, former Acting Assistant Secretary of Energy for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, “Disputing the “consensus” on global warming,” <http://climateprogress.org/2010/06/16/scientific-consensus-on-global-warming-climate-science/>,)

A good example of how scientific evidence drives our understanding concerns how we know that humans are the dominant cause of global warming. This is, of course, the deniers’ favorite topic. Since it is increasingly obvious that the climate is changing and the planet is warming, the remaining deniers have coalesced to defend their Alamo — that human emissions aren’t the cause of recent climate change and therefore that reducing those emissions is pointless. Last year, longtime Nation columnist [Alexander Cockburn wrote](http://www.counterpunch.org/cockburn04282007.html), “There is still zero empirical evidence that anthropogenic production of CO2 is making any measurable contribution to the world’s present warming trend. The greenhouse fearmongers rely entirely on unverified, crudely oversimplified computer models to finger mankind’s sinful contribution.” In fact, the evidence is amazingly strong. Moreover, if the relatively complex climate models are oversimplified in any respect, it is by omitting amplifying feedbacks and other factors that suggest human-caused climate change will be worse than is widely realized. The [IPCC concluded](http://ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/Report/AR4WG1_Print_Ch09.pdf) last year: “Greenhouse gas forcing has very likely (>90 percent) caused most of the observed global warming over the last 50 years. This conclusion takes into account … the possibility that the response to solar forcing could be underestimated by climate models.” Scientists have come to understand that “forcings” (natural and human-made) explain most of the changes in our climate and temperature both in recent decades and over the past millions of years. The primary human-made forcings are the heat-trapping greenhouse gases we generate, particularly carbon dioxide from burning coal, oil and natural gas. The natural forcings include fluctuations in the intensity of sunlight (which can increase or decrease warming), and major volcanoes that inject huge volumes of gases and aerosol particles into the stratosphere (which tend to block sunlight and cause cooling)…. Over and over again, scientists have demonstrated that observed changes in the climate in recent decades can only be explained by taking into account the observed combination of human and natural forcings. Natural forcings alone just don’t explain what is happening to this planet. For instance, in April 2005, one of the nation’s top climate scientists, NASA’s James Hansen, led a team of scientists that made “precise measurements of increasing ocean heat content over the past 10 years,” which revealed that the Earth is absorbing far more heat than it is emitting to space, confirming what earlier computer models had shown about warming. [Hansen called](http://www.columbia.edu/~jeh1/imbalance_release.pdf) this energy imbalance the “smoking gun” of climate change, and said, “There can no longer be genuine doubt that human-made gases are the dominant cause of observed warming.” Another 2005 study, led by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, compared actual ocean temperature data from the surface down to hundreds of meters (in the Atlantic, Pacific and Indian oceans) with climate models and [concluded](http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/abstract/1112418): A warming signal has penetrated into the world’s oceans over the past 40 years. The signal is complex, with a vertical structure that varies widely by ocean; it cannot be explained by natural internal climate variability or solar and volcanic forcing, but is well simulated by two anthropogenically [human-caused] forced climate models. We conclude that it is of human origin, a conclusion robust to observational sampling and model differences. Such studies are also done for many other observations: land-based temperature rise, atmospheric temperature rise, sea level rise, arctic ice melt, inland glacier melt, Greeland and Antarctic ice sheet melt, expansion of the tropics (desertification) and changes in precipitation. Studies compare every testable prediction from climate change theory and models (and suggested by paleoclimate research) to actual observations. How many studies? Well, the IPCC’s definitive treatment of the subject, “Understanding and Attributing Climate Change,” has 11 full pages of references, some 500 peer-reviewed studies. This is not a consensus of opinion. It is what scientific research and actual observations reveal. And the science behind human attribution has gotten much stronger in the past 2 years (see a recent literature review by the Met Office [here](http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/pressoffice/2010/pr20100305.html)). That brings us to another problem with the word “consensus.” It can mean “unanimity” or “the judgment arrived at by most of those concerned.” Many, if not most, people hear the second meaning: “consensus” as majority opinion. The scientific consensus most people are familiar with is the IPCC’s “Summary for Policymakers” reports. But those aren’t a majority opinion. Government representatives participate in a line-by-line review and revision of these summaries. So China, Saudi Arabia and that hotbed of denialism — the Bush administration — get to veto anything they don’t like. The deniers call this “politicized science,” suggesting the process turns the IPCC summaries into some sort of unscientific exaggeration. In fact, the reverse is true. The net result is unanimous agreement on a conservative or watered-down document. You could argue that rather than majority rules, this is “minority rules.” Last April, in an article titled “Conservative Climate,” [Scientific American](http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?chanID=sa006&articleID=5B9E73AD-E7F2-99DF-3F71280BCE41ED77&colID=5) noted that objections by Saudi Arabia and China led the IPCC to remove a sentence stating that the impact of human greenhouse gas emissions on the Earth’s recent warming is five times greater than that of the sun. In fact, lead author Piers Forster of the University of Leeds in England said, “The difference is really a factor of 10.” Then I discuss the evidence we had even back in 2008 that the IPCC was underestimating key climate impacts, a point I [update here](http://climateprogress.org/2010/02/18/ipcc-lowballs-impacts-pachauri-disband/). The bottom line is that recent observations and research make clear the planet almost certainly faces a greater and more imminent threat than is laid out in the IPCC reports. That’s why climate scientists are so desperate. That’s why they keep begging for immediate action. And that’s why the “consensus on global warming” is a phrase that should be forever retired from the climate debate. The leading scientific organizations in this country and around the world, including all the major national academies of science, aren’t buying into some sort of consensus of opinion. They have analyzed the science and observations and expressed their understanding of climate science and the likely impacts we face on our current emissions path — an understanding that has grown increasingly dire in recent years (see “[An illustrated guide to the latest climate science](http://climateprogress.org/2010/02/17/an-illustrated-guide-to-the-latest-climate-science/)” and “[An introduction to global warming impacts: Hell and High Water](http://climateprogress.org/2009/03/22/an-introduction-to-global-warming-impacts-hell-and-high-water/)“).

#### Two internal links – the first is climate leadership

#### The plan is key

Saha 11/13, Devashree, senior policy analyst and associate fellow at the Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program,” “Enact Legislation Supporting Residential Property Assessed Clean Energy Financing,” November 13th, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Research/Files/Papers/2012/11/13%20federalism/13%20housing%20energy%20efficiency.pdf>

Along these lines, a first priority for unleashing clean economy growth in the nation must be to catalyze stronger market demand for energy efficiency and renewable energy products and services in the residential, commercial, and institutional markets. Of particular note here is the market potential of energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades and retrofits in buildings. Since buildings consume nearly half (48.7 percent) of the nation’s primary energy and are also responsible for half of the carbon emissions, such upgrades and retrofits offer the potential for significant economic, employment, and climate benefits. Given that, it has been estimated that scaling up energy efficiency retrofits offers a $279 billion investment opportunity with potential for energy savings totaling more than $1 trillion over a period of 10 years—of which $182 billion of investment potential is tied to residential energy efficiency upgrades alone. Cities and states across the nation—motivated by challenges of escalating energy costs and the significant economic benefits of energy efficient solutions—have led the nation through their efforts to retrofit the residential, commercial, and public buildings in their jurisdictions. At the same time though, cities and states have contended with a number of challenging market barriers that prevent the energy retrofit market from scaling up, including perceived risk of investing in energy retrofit projects, high transaction costs, and inadequate access to capital. Given these financing challenges, property assessed clean energy (PACE) programs have attracted attention as an innovative financing mechanism for energy retrofit upgrades. PACE is a financing structure that enables states and local governments to use money raised through bond issues or other sources of capital to fund energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades. These funds are used as upfront financing for upgrades to residential and commercial properties, recovered by the governmental entity through a special property tax assessment that runs with the land for up to 20 years. The PACE special district structure thus overcomes market barriers to energy upgrades by spreading cost recovery with savings realized over the life of the improvement. First piloted in 2008, PACE programs quickly spread throughout the country and today 28 states and the District of Columbia have passed PACE-enabling legislation. As a result, PACE programs have enjoyed significant success in many cities and counties. Palm Desert, CA’s PACE program, for example, has approved $8.5 million in projects to date. Sonoma County’s program, meanwhile, has financed over $55 million in projects for 1,600 residential and 50 non-residential property owners. What’s more, studies analyzing the economic effects of PACE programs suggest that they have the potential of generating significant positive economic and fiscal benefits. One study found that $4 million in total PACE spending can generate on average $10 million in gross economic output; $1 million in combined federal, state, and local tax revenue; and 60 new jobs. Extrapolating from this study, if just one percent of the 75 million owner-occupied homes in the U.S. were to invest in a PACE project that cost an average of $20,000 each, the economic impact would translate to $15 billion in gross economic output; $4 billion in combined federal, state, and local tax revenue; and 226,000 new jobs. The Problem And yet, for all their promise, neither energy retrofit projects in general nor residential PACE programs specifically have achieved their full potential. Part of the problem owes to the well-known market barriers that depress demand, including: a status quo bias, difficulty in quantifying energy savings from retrofits and upgrades, lack of information about existing energy inefficiency in homes and what can be done about it, high up-front costs, and difficulty identifying quality contractors. In addition, and perhaps more significantly, the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) has blocked the scale-up of residential PACE programs. In July 2010, just as residential PACE programs were gathering momentum, the FHFA issued a statement asserting that PACE programs constituted first liens over pre-existing mortgages, thereby creating significant risks for lenders, servicers, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and other mortgage holders. Despite evidence to the contrary, the FHFA deemed these risks unacceptable and instructed Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to restrict the kind of loans that homeowners could get if they live in a PACEdesignated area. This ruling effectively ended residential PACE financing, with many local governments suspending their programs as a result. Commercial PACE programs were not affected by the FHFA decision and have been moving forward in various places. The FHFA ruling on residential PACE financing has resulted in:  The cessation of almost all existing PACE programs focused on the residential sector out of concern that mortgages in PACE-designated areas would fail to receive the backing of Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac  Redirection of nearly $150 million in federal Recovery Act funds that had originally been designated to support the implementation and operation of residential PACE programs throughout the U.S. Despite efforts by advocates of PACE to address FHFA concerns, the FHFA ruling against residential PACE financing persists. Meanwhile, some states have challenged the FHFA ruling in federal court, though such efforts have thus far proven unsuccessful in changing FHFA’s stance. A federal district court in California—while not ordering the FHFA to reverse its current position on underwriting mortgages for properties with a PACE assessment—directed the agency to proceed with a notice and comment period for rulemaking. The FHFA took comments on proposed rules until September 2012 and it is not clear how long it will take to finalize the proposed rules or what the outcome will be. In addition, there have been a number of attempts to resolve the residential PACE issue through legislative action, including the PACE Assessment Protection Act (H.R. 2599), introduced in July 2011, that would prevent the FHFA and mortgage underwriters from discriminating against localities participating in or implementing a PACE program. To date, however, no legislation supporting residential PACE programs has been passed. Proposal The Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings therefore proposes that Congress enact legislation that would require the FHFA to allow Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to purchase residential mortgages with PACE assessments and incorporate underwriting standards protecting lenders and program standards for states and local governments offering PACE programs. These underwriting standards should be aligned with the PACE guidelines released by the Department of Energy in May 2010. Along these lines, Congressional support of residential PACE programs would:  Send a strong signal that the U.S. remains fiercely committed to investing in smart, innovative financing structures that can catalyze the energy retrofit market  Enable states and local governments—many of which suspended their residential PACE programs in the wake of the FHFA ruling—to design and implement such programs in their communities  Save money for homeowners by reducing energy costs  Create new jobs and career opportunities in both the energy efficiency and renewable energy industries  Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and so produce significant climate benefits

#### US action to undercut fossil fuels gets modeled to solve – the brink is now

Traub 12/14, James, fellow of the Centre on International Cooperation. He writes Terms of Engagement for Foreign Policy,” “Transforming the future lies in our hands,” December 14th, <http://gulfnews.com/opinions/columnists/transforming-the-future-lies-in-our-hands-1.1118704>

Despite President Barack Obama’s vow, in his first post-reelection press conference, to take decisive action on climate change, the global climate talks in Doha dragged to a close with the US, as usual, a target of activists’ wrath. The Obama administration has shown no interest in submitting to a binding treaty on carbon emissions and refuses to increase funding to help developing countries reduce their own emissions, even as the US continues to behave as a global scofflaw on climate change. Actually, that is not true — the last part, anyway. According to the International Energy Agency, US emissions have dropped 7.7 per cent since 2006 — “the largest reduction of all countries or regions”. Yes, you read that correctly. The US, which has refused to sign the Kyoto Accords establishing binding targets for emissions, has reduced its carbon footprint faster than the greener-than-thou European countries. The reasons for this have something to do with climate change itself (warm winters mean less heating oil — something to do with market forces — the shift from coal to natural gas in power plants) and something to do with policy at the state and regional levels. And in the coming years, as both new gas-mileage standards and new power-plant regulations, championed by the Obama administration kick in, policy will drive the numbers further downwards. US emissions are expected to fall 23 per cent between 2002 and 2020. Apparently, Obama’s record on climate change is not quite as calamitous as reputation would have it. The West has largely succeeded in bending downwards the curve of carbon emissions. However, the developing world has not. Last year, China’s emissions rose 9.3 per cent; India’s, 8.7 per cent. China is now the world’s No 1 source of carbon emissions, followed by the US, the European Union (EU) and India. The emerging powers have every reason to want to emulate the energy-intensive economic success of the West — even those, like China, who have taken steps to increase energy efficiency, are not prepared to do anything to harm economic growth. The real failure of US policy has been, first, that it is still much too timid; and second, that it has not acted in such a way as to persuade developing nations to take the truly difficult decisions which would put the world on a sustainable path. There is a useful analogy with the nuclear nonproliferation regime. In an earlier generation, the nuclear stockpiles of the US and the Soviet Union posed the greatest threat to global security. Now, the threat comes from the proliferation of weapons to weak or rogue states or to non-state actors. However, the only way that Washington can persuade other governments to join in a tough nonproliferation regime is by taking the lead in reducing its own nuclear stockpile — which the Obama administration has sought to do, albeit with very imperfect success. In other words, where power is more widely distributed, US action matters less in itself, but **carries great weight as a demonstration** model — or anti-demonstration model. Logic would thus dictate that the US bind itself in a global compact to reduce emissions, as through the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) it has bound itself to reduce nuclear weapons. However, the Senate would never ratify such a treaty. And even if it did, would China and India similarly bind themselves? Here the nuclear analogy begins to break down because the NPT mostly requires that states submit to inspections of their nuclear facilities, while a climate change treaty poses what looks very much like a threat to states’ economic growth. Fossil fuels are even closer to home than nukes. Is it any wonder that only EU countries and a few others have signed the Kyoto Accords? A global version of Kyoto is supposed to be readied by 2015, but a growing number of climate change activists — still very much a minority — accept that this may not happen and need not happen. So what can Obama do? It is possible that much tougher action on emissions will help persuade China, India and others that energy efficiency need not hinder economic growth. As Michael Levi, a climate expert at the Council on Foreign Relations points out, the US gets little credit abroad for reducing emissions largely — thanks to “serendipitous” events. Levi argues, as do virtually all policy thinkers and advocates, that the US must increase the cost of fossil fuels, whether through a “carbon tax” or cap-and-trade system, so that both energy efficiency and alternative fuels become more attractive and also to free-up money to be invested in new technologies. This is what Obama’s disappointed supporters thought he would do in the first term and urge him to do now. Obama is probably not going to do that. In his post-election news conference, he insisted that he would find “bipartisan” solutions to climate change and congressional Republicans are only slightly more likely to accept a sweeping change in carbon pricing than they are to ratify a climate-change treaty. The president also said that any reform would have to create jobs and growth, which sounds very much like a signal that he will avoid new taxes or penalties (even though advocates of such plans insist that they would spur economic growth). All these prudent political calculations are fine when you can afford to fail. But we cannot afford to fail. **Global temperatures have already increased 0.7 degrees Celsius. Disaster really strikes at a 2 degree Celsius increase**, which leads to large-scale drought, wildfires, decreased food production and coastal flooding. However, the current global trajectory of coal, oil and gas consumption means that, according to Fatih Birol, the International Energy Agency’s chief economist, “**the door to a 2 degree Celsius trajectory is about to close**.” That is how dire things are. What, then, can Obama do that is equal to the problem? He can invest. Once the fiscal cliff negotiations are behind him, and after he has held his planned conversation with “scientists, engineers and elected officials,” he can tell the American people that they **have a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to transform the future** — for themselves and for people everywhere. He can propose — as he hoped to do as part of the stimulus package of 2009 — that the US build a “smart grid” to radically improve the efficiency of electricity distribution. He can argue for large-scale investments in research and development of new sources of energy and energy-efficient construction technologies and lots of other whiz-bang things. This, too, was part of the stimulus spending; it must become bigger and permanent. The reason Obama should do this is, first, because the American people will (or could) **rally behind a visionary programme** in a way that they never will get behind the dour mechanics of carbon pricing. Second, because the way to get to a carbon tax is to use it as a financing mechanism for such a plan. Third, because oil and gas are in America’s bloodstream; as Steven Cohen, executive director of the Earth Institute, puts it: “**The only thing that’s going to drive fossil fuels off the market is cheaper renewable energy**.” Fourth, the US cannot afford to miss out on the gigantic market for green technology. Finally, there’s leverage. China and India may not do something sensible but painful, like adopting carbon pricing, because the US does so, but they will adopt new technologies if the US can prove that they work without harming economic growth. Developing countries have already made major investments in reducing air pollution, halting deforestation and practising sustainable agriculture. They are just too modest. It is here, above all, that the US can serve as a demonstration model — the world’s most egregious carbon consumer showing the way to a low-carbon future. Global warming-denial is finally on the way out. Three-quarters of Americans now say they believe in global warming and more than half believe that humans are causing it and want to see a US president take action. President Obama does not have to do the impossible. He must, however, do the possible.

#### The second is the plan – it independently solves warming

Hoops 12, Jeffrey, J.D. Candidate (2012), Washington University School of Law; B.A. cum laude in English (2007), Truman State University “Setting The Pace For Energy Efficiency: The Rise, Fall, And (Potential) Return Of Property Assessed Clean Energy,” Volume 89 | Issue 4, <http://lawreview.wustl.edu/inprint/89/4/hoops.pdf>

Concerns about climate change and future energy shortfalls have spurred energy conservation and efficiency initiatives at a rate not seen since the 1970s oil-shortage crisis. 15 Both private and state actors are moving to facilitate, encourage, and in some cases, require energy conservation measures. 16 While lasting and long-term solutions to climate change and future energy shortfalls will likely entail a major overhaul of the global energy economy, simpler and more easily implemented steps can be taken in the short-term to ease this transition. Specifically, energy efficiency measures, often described as the “low-hanging fruit” of potential energy conservation efforts, can offer **dramatic results** in terms of reducing energy use and greenhouse gas emissions (“GHG”) through the application of commonly available technology and techniques. 17 Simple home energy efficiency retrofits can help homeowners **significantly reduce** their utility bills while at the same time reducing **GHG emissions** and energy use. 18 Energy efficiency initiatives can also serve to stimulate the economy through the creation of “green” jobs. 19 However, many homeowners are reluctant to take such measures due to the requisite initial net capital outlay and the relatively long period of time required to recoup this cost. 20 Some homeowners are unable to afford these upfront costs, while others may be unwilling to make this long-term investment if they believe they may sell the property before their energy efficiency investments result in a net gain. Policymakers in all levels of government can do much to incentivize homeowners to nevertheless take the plunge and retrofit their homes for increased energy efficiency. While a wide variety of such policies and laws have been enacted throughout the United States, 21 this Note will focus on PACE and its implementation throughout the country. PACE is a popular and innovative solution to obstacles preventing the widespread implementation of energy efficiency measures. Originating in California in 2007, 22 PACE is a form of legislation that allows municipalities to create special assessment districts for the purpose of financing homeowners’ upfront costs for energy efficiency improvements. 23 Many states already have statutes in place that allow municipalities to create assessment districts for the purpose of improving local infrastructure. 24 Under such a statute, for example, a city may issue bonds for the purpose of financing sewer lines in a given area. The bonds are repaid through property assessments by property owners who benefit from the improvement. 25 PACE legislation typically expands the language of this type of statute to include energy efficiency improvements within its ambit. 26 The legislation also generally provides that local governments may prescribe the types of energy efficiency improvements that the municipality will be willing to finance, 27 as well as underwriting standards for the program. 28 Finally, in the vast majority of states that have enacted PACE programs, PACE legislation provides that a first priority lien will be placed on the property in the event of default or delinquency on the part of the homeowner in paying the special assessment. 29 In a typical PACE scenario, a municipality first sells bonds to raise starting capital for energy efficiency project financing. 30 Then, a homeowner seeking to finance energy efficiency improvements to her home applies to the city for the financing. 31 Assuming the applicant shows that she will be able to pay the special assessment by meeting designated underwriting criteria, the municipality then finances approved energy efficiency projects. 32 The municipality recovers this cost and pays back the bonds by placing a special assessment on the property for a period of time equal to or less than the lifetime of the energy efficiency improvements made to the property, typically no more than twenty years. 33 PACE legislation allows property owners to reap the benefits of energy efficiency improvements while minimizing or eliminating the usual barriers to implementation. 34 Since the municipality provides the initial funding, there is no initial outlay of capital on the part of the homeowner. 35 And since the special assessment attaches to and runs with the property rather than the homeowner, a homeowner is not penalized if she moves before the energy efficiency investments result in an overall net gain; instead, the homeowner merely pays for the benefit she derives and no more. 36 The next owner of the property continues to enjoy the benefits of energy efficiency while paying their proportionate share of the costs, depending on how long they own the property. 37 Moreover, PACE programs are generally designed so that the homeowners’ savings in the form of utility bill reductions will be greater than the amount the homeowners pay the city through the special assessment; that is, the Savings-to-Investment ratio is greater than one. 38 PACE programs therefore **make energy efficiency improvements a winning proposition** for both homeowners and municipalities.

#### Building integrated solar revitalizes the whole market

O’Connor 12, Mary Catherine, written for Fast Company, Wired, Outside, Entrepreneur, Earth2Tech, Earth Island Journal and The Bold Italic “Will building-integrated solar take off?” August 15th, <http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/design-architecture/will-building-integrated-solar-take-off/8189>

**The solar industry has been taking a beating** in recent months, thanks to falling costs and falling trust in the industry, a’la Solyndra. But a new report from Pike Research examines whether building-integrated photovoltaics — that is, energy-generating solar cells integrated into windows and other building facades — might **infuse the solar industry with new energy**. The report examines the “demand drivers and economics, technology issues, and key industry players” for both building-integrated photovoltaics (BIPV) and building-applied photovoltaics (BAPV), which refers to panels integrated into building facades retroactively. It concludes that BIPV is one of the fastest-growing industry sectors, globally. In the United States the technology is coming along quite slowly, however, especially compared to BIPV hotspots in Western Europe. One reason for slow adoption, says Paula Mints, the principal analyst for the solar services program at Navigant, Pike’s parent company, is how BIPV vendors are approaching customers. “Essentially the way the industry wants to move is toward a green building philosophy. They want PV integrated into buildings because distributed generation is seen as the backbone of solar industry and will really start to change things if buildings can become self-sustaining. The problem has been that as an industry we don’t understand how architects and builders think, and what kind of products they want.”

# Solvency

#### Property Assessed Clean Energy works and the tech is ready

Hidari 10, Jack, writer for the Harvard Business Review, Chairman of PrimaryInsight.com, National steering committee, PACENow.org “A Market Solution for Achieving “Green”, in The HBR List: Breakthrough Ideas for 2010,” HARV. BUS. REV. 41, 50-51 (Jan./Feb. 2010).

The Problem It's easy to get excited about the promise of clean technology--especially new high-efficiency and solar devices that can significantly reduce the energy use of existing homes and commercial buildings. But the retrofitting challenge we face is immense, and if we hope to see major progress, we must help home and building owners overcome the barrier of up-front costs. Few of today's owners have the necessary capital on hand, or can tie it up until the break-even point is reached and payback begins. In theory they could tap into lines of credit and home equity to pay for clean tech, but in practice they are reluctant or unable to do so. Institutional investors, meanwhile, have the capital and the appetite for the sure and steady returns of clean-tech installations; but they are set up to write large checks, not to finance disaggregated, small-scale projects. And, as smart investors, they are leery of opportunities where borrowers can default but improvements can't be undone and funds recouped. Already we are at the point--thanks to falling prices from large-scale production in China and other manufacturing hubs, and thanks to government rebates--where some clean-tech retrofits **achieve cash payback in less than three years**. But unless we can provide the necessary assurance to investors and tap into private capital markets, the improved economics of clean technology won't make enough difference. The Breakthrough Idea Enter PACE (Property Assessed Clean Energy) bonds, which are just being introduced in 15 states across the country. PACE bonds are debt instruments issued by a municipality and backed by property-tax liens on buildings whose owners take PACE loans from the bond pool. Here's an example: Suppose a commercial building in Annapolis, Maryland, has utility costs of $20,000 a month, which include electricity and natural gas. The building owner, Annapolis Management, has done an energy audit and concluded that a $300,000 investment in energy efficiency (retrofitting windows, lighting, and HVAC) would bring monthly utilities down to $13,000. Annapolis Management takes a $300,000 loan from the city's PACE program and retrofits the building. The owner repays the loan over 20 years through an increase in the building's annual property taxes equal to one-twentieth of the loan amount plus interest. In this example, assuming an 8% interest rate, that means additional taxes of $1,350 a month. Because this expense is markedly less than the utility cost savings of $7,000, **the owner is cash-flow positive from day one** after retrofit. The Promise Let's examine PACE bonds from the perspective of the city. The municipality issues the bonds, which are bought by institutional investors. Investors are drawn to bonds backed by property taxes, because they have **very low default rates**. The obligation to pay them survives foreclosure, so even if a property owner defaults on a mortgage, the new owner who buys the building at a bank fire sale must immediately bring the tax payments up to date.

#### And, no risk of loan deficiency – the plan is a functional lifting of a federal restriction that is necessary to the program

Hiskes 10, Jonathan, staff writer at Grist.org “PACE Rescue Bill Could Get Republican Help,” “Why won’t Team Obama save a clean-energy program from Fannie and Freddie?” August 5th, <http://grist.org/article/2010-08-05-why-wont-team-obama-save-a-clean-energy-program-from-fannie-and/>

PACE works by letting homeowners pay for rooftop solar arrays and energy-saving retrofits through a surcharge on their property tax bills, paid back over 10 to 20 years. In this way it removes high upfront costs and ensures that property owners don’t lose out if it they sell — the new buyer inherits both the home improvements and the tax assessment. The Berkeley-born model creates work for building contractors, cuts carbon pollution, and essentially runs on private capital, since cities and towns that offer PACE fund it through municipal bonds. Until late spring, PACE was spreading at a steady clip: Twenty-two states had endorsed the model and encouraged municipalities to set up programs. San Francisco had just launched a program and Los Angeles was preparing for one later in the year. The Obama administration backed the model with $150 million in stimulus-act funding and an endorsement from the vice president’s Middle Class Task Force. Then Fannie and Freddie threw the nation’s first programs into confusion in May by warning lenders to stay away from properties with PACE assessments. The mortgage-finance corporations object to the liens that PACE puts on properties, which get paid off ahead of mortgages if a borrower defaults. That adds a theoretical risk into an already jittery credit market. But it’s an unfounded fear, since well-designed energy retrofits can add to a homeowner’s financial security, cutting their utility bills and making them a safer bet for lenders. A report commissioned by a major financial institution last year found that energy-efficient homes had default and delinquency rates 11 percent lower than other homes. PACE advocates have worked to integrate standards to ensure the quality of energy retrofits, but that work can’t continue with programs stalled out.

#### Plan spills over to broader solar adoption even if not many people initially take up the program

Higgins 11/19, Ben, Director of Government Affairs for Mainstream Energy “The Psychology of Small-Scale Solar,” November 19th, <http://energy.aol.com/2012/11/19/the-psychology-of-small-scale-solar/?icid=related4>

Further evidence that consumer awareness is key to solar's growth comes from a recent Yale and New York University study, "Peer Effects in the Diffusion of Solar Photovoltaic Panels," which found that residents are clearly more likely to install solar if other solar systems are already present in their area and on their street. "We looked at the influence that the number of cumulative adoptions - the number of people who already installed solar panels in a zip code - had on the probability there would be a new adoption in that zip code," said Kenneth Gillingham, the study's co-author and Professor at the Yale University School of Forestry & Environmental Studies. "Our approach controls for a variety of other possible explanations, including clustering of environmental preferences or marketing activity." The study also showed that the visibility of the solar system and word-of-mouth were both critical in generating interest. "**If my neighbor installs solar and tells me he's saving money** and he's really excited about it, **it's likely I'll go ahead and do the same** thing," said Gillingham. This is simultaneously a simple concept – people need to actually see firsthand and hear from people they trust about the real-world benefits of new technology – and a maddeningly complex one – even after enormous effort to make commercial and residential solar simple, accessible and without upfront costs, there are still fundamental awareness issues to tackle. One can perhaps debate whether solar companies have developed the right product yet – after all, MP3 players were widely available (if not widely popular) before the IPod and ITunes revolutionized the digital music scene – but regardless, there's a clear takeaway here. Policy matters. Economics matter. Technology matters. The solar industry has made enormous progress in recent years on these fronts. Above all, people matter. If solar can get the human element of solar just right, we'll be making an enormous step towards our country's clean energy future.

#### Government incentives are key

Hiskes 11, Jonathan, staff writer at Grist.org “Cost Savings Are Biggest Motivator for Commercial Retrofits,” June 22nd, <http://sustainableindustries.com/articles/2011/06/cost-savings-are-biggest-motivator-commercial-retrofits>

Cash still rules when it comes to **motivating commercial building owners** to take on energy efficiency retrofits. That’s the top-line finding of a new survey from the Institute For Building Efficiency, which talked to nearly 4,000 owners and property managers of commercial buildings on six continents. The institute, a project of building management heavyweight Johnson Controls, asked owners and managers an array of questions about their latest thinking on energy efficiency investments. It’s valuable information for the company, which operates in 150 countries – but it’ll be useful for competitors working in the space too. After cost savings, government and utility rebates and incentives were the next most powerful motivator, according to respondents in Europe and North America (although those too are purely financial incentives). In India and China, however, respondents said increasing energy security was the second most important factor. Branding/public image was most important in North America, suggesting property owners are more image-conscious here, or they believe tenants are more likely to shop around for greener spaces. And greenhouse gas reductions fell from second-most important in a somewhat different 2010 survey to fourth-most important in this year’s survey. A full 80 percent of respondents expected energy prices to rise by double digits in the coming year, and they said capital costs were the largest barrier to investing in efficiency. “This year’s survey clearly shows that there’s growing urgency in making buildings more energy efficient, and large strides have been made with the help of government incentives,” Dave Myers, vice president and president of building efficiency for Johnson Controls, said in a news release.“However, building owners continue to tell us that access to capital remains the top barrier for improving energy consumption. By making funding more accessible, policymakers have a **tremendous opportunity to influence** the achievement of their energy and environmental goals.”

#### However, the federal housing finance agency issued a ruling that ended state PACE programs

Saha 11/13, Devashree, senior policy analyst and associate fellow at the Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program,” “Enact Legislation Supporting Residential Property Assessed Clean Energy Financing,” November 13th, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Research/Files/Papers/2012/11/13%20federalism/13%20housing%20energy%20efficiency.pdf>

And yet, for all their promise, neither energy retrofit projects in general nor residential PACE programs specifically have achieved their full potential. Part of the problem owes to the well-known market barriers that depress demand, including: a status quo bias, difficulty in quantifying energy savings from retrofits and upgrades, lack of information about existing energy inefficiency in homes and what can be done about it, high up-front costs, and difficulty identifying quality contractors. In addition, and perhaps more significantly, the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) has blocked the scale-up of residential PACE programs. In July 2010, just as residential PACE programs were gathering momentum, the FHFA issued a statement asserting that PACE programs constituted first liens over pre-existing mortgages, thereby creating significant risks for lenders, servicers, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and other mortgage holders. Despite evidence to the contrary, the FHFA deemed these risks unacceptable and instructed Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to restrict the kind of loans that homeowners could get if they live in a PACE designated area. This ruling **effectively ended residential PACE financing**, with many local governments suspending their programs as a result. Commercial PACE programs were not affected by the FHFA decision and have been moving forward in various places. The FHFA ruling on residential PACE financing has resulted in:  The cessation of almost all existing PACE programs focused on the residential sector out of concern that mortgages in PACE-designated areas would fail to receive the backing of Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac  Redirection of nearly $150 million in federal Recovery Act funds that had originally been designated to support the implementation and operation of residential PACE programs throughout the U.S. Despite efforts by advocates of PACE to address FHFA concerns, the FHFA ruling against residential PACE financing persists. Meanwhile, some states have challenged the FHFA ruling in federal court, though such efforts have thus far proven unsuccessful in changing FHFA’s stance. A federal district court in California—while not ordering the FHFA to reverse its current position on underwriting mortgages for properties with a PACE assessment—directed the agency to proceed with a notice and comment period for rulemaking. The FHFA took comments on proposed rules until September 2012 and it is not clear how long it will take to finalize the proposed rules or what the outcome will be. In addition, there have been a number of attempts to resolve the residential PACE issue through legislative action, including the PACE Assessment Protection Act (H.R. 2599), introduced in July 2011, that would prevent the FHFA and mortgage underwriters from discriminating against localities participating in or implementing a PACE program. To date, however, no legislation supporting residential PACE programs has been passed. Proposal The Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings therefore proposes that Congress enact legislation that would require the FHFA to allow Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to purchase residential mortgages with PACE assessments and incorporate underwriting standards protecting lenders and program standards for states and local governments offering PACE programs. These underwriting standards should be aligned with the PACE guidelines released by the Department of Energy in May 2010.

#### The Federal Housing Authority should provide loan guarantees for solar Property Assessed Clean Energy assessments levied on new or refinanced mortgages in the United States.

#### The FHA solves and doesn’t link to politics

Collins 12, Jordan M, Director of Government Relations at Mintz-Leven, “PACE-ing in Purgatory: Outlook for Property Assessed Clean Energy Financing,” January 19th, http://www.mintz.com/newsletter/2012/Advisories/1578-0112-NAT-ECT\_Collins/index.htm

Although FHFA has issued policy statements effectively barring Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac from insuring mortgages for homes with a PACE assessment, the Federal Housing Authority (FHA) is not subject to FHFA conservatorship or regulatory oversight, and could serve as **another pathway for supporting** the adoption of state and local **PACE** programs. Housed within the Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD), FHA provides federal insurance for private mortgages associated with single family and multifamily homes, including manufactured homes and hospitals. FHA is the largest insurer of mortgages in the world, insuring over 34 million properties since its inception in 1934, and currently insures 25% of the U.S. residential housing market.34 Under current FHA policy, the agency’s insurance instruments reimburse mortgage holders for the full costs of property taxes associated with a home in the event of a mortgage default. Therefore, **FHA could agree to provide a 100% federal guarantee of PACE assessments** levied on new or refinanced mortgages insured by the FHA. FHA lenders could in turn also agree to allow the PACE assessments to be senior to their loan. Because the PACE assessments could be fully guaranteed by FHA, those financial obligations would theoretically impose no additional risk to the lender or a subsequent mortgage holder. The advantage of leveraging FHA’s position in the residential housing market is three-fold: (1) FHA insures a significant (and growing) portion of the housing market allowing PACE programs to be meaningfully scaled, (2) **HUD would not need** additional legislative authority or appropriations from Congress, and (3) HUD would not be required to seek FHFA, Fannie, Freddie, or other Federal bank regulators’(e.g., FDIC, OCC) approval because FHA-insured mortgages are not sold or securitized through Fannie/Freddie, nor are they subject to FHFA regulations. (The secondary market for FHA-insured mortgages exists through Ginnie Mae, which is part of HUD and not in any way associated with FHFA, Fannie or Freddie.)

#### No disads – the FHA did something extremely similar to the aff but it didn’t solve

Farrell 11, John, Institute for Local Self-Reliance senior researcher, “FHA PowerSaver Loans – a PACE Replacement?” February 24th, <http://grist.org/article/2011-02-24-fha-powersaver-loans-a-pace-replacement/>

Late last year, the Federal Housing Administration announced a new PowerSaver loan program to provide financing for home energy efficiency improvements. The program comes on the heels of the downfall of residential Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) financing, which allowed homeowners to pay back energy efficiency improvements via long-term property tax payments, as well as to pass the payments on to the next homeowner. Can PowerSaver adequately replace PACE? Sadly, no. First, a bit of background on PowerSaver. The loan program is part of FHA’s Title I Property Improvement Program and the basic principle is that the FHA provides loan insurance for participating private lenders who loan to eligible homeowners. Federal insurance provides 90% coverage for the loan, with the lender only accountable for the remaining 10%, with limits on the portion of a lender’s portfolio in the Title I program. Participating homeowners pay a premium equal to 1% of the loan amount multiplied by the loan term. For example, a $10,000 loan financed over 15 years would have an annual premium of $1,500. Loans are capped at $25,000 with 15 year terms for energy efficiency and 20 year terms for renewable energy investments. A list of eligible improvements can be found here. Borrower’s can only be owners of single-family, detached homes with a 660 credit score and a maximum 45% debt-to-income ratio. Loans under $7,500 can be unsecured, but larger loan amounts must be secured by the first mortgage. The following table illustrates the major differences between PACE and PowerSaver: PowerSaver PACE Lien type Secondary Primary Backstop Federal insurance Local government Credit score > 660 n/a Transferable No Yes In most cases, the differences make the PowerSaver loan significantly less attractive than PACE financing. A PACE lien came before the mortgage, potentially allowing PACE programs to sell their obligations on the market and allowing local governments to obtain low interest rates. PACE liens did not require credit scores, allowing many Americans with damaged credit (but good property tax payment history) to make their home more energy efficiency and cost effective. Finally, the lien could be transferred between property owners, removing the discontinuity between the lifespan of effective energy efficiency improvements (15 years) and the average stay in one home (5 years). Perhaps most powerfully, PACE allowed cities and counties to become a hub of energy planning for their communities, whereas PowerSaver simply backstops the private lending market. FHA should be applauded for expanding the financing options available to homeowners for energy efficiency and renewable energy improvements, but their offering **will not provide the same power as PACE.**

# 2ac
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# Warming impact

**Growth solves warming – [research, the California effect, the EKC, and better tech]**

**Norberg, 03** – Fellow at Timbro and CATO [Johan Norberg, In Defense of Global Capitalism, pg 225-237]

All over the world, economic progress and growth are moving hand in hand with intensified environmental protection. Four researchers who studied these connections found “a very strong, positive association between our [environmental] indicators and the level of economic development.” A country that is very poor is too preoccupied with lifting itself out of poverty to bother about the environment at all. Countries usually begin protecting their natural resources when they can afford to do so. When they grow richer, they start to regulate effluent emissions, and when they have still more resources they also begin regulating air quality. 19 A number of factors cause environment protection to increase with wealth and development. Environmental quality is unlikely to be a top priority for people who barely know where their next meal is coming from. Abating misery and subduing the pangs of hunger takes precedence over conservation. When our standard of living rises we start attaching importance to the environment and obtaining resources to improve it. Such was the case earlier in western Europe, and so it is in the developing countries today. Progress of this kind, however, requires that people live in democracies where they are able and allowed to mobilize opinion; otherwise, their preferences will have no impact. Environmental destruction is worst in dictatorships. But it is the fact of prosperity no less than a sense of responsibility that makes environmental protection easier in a wealthy society. A wealthier country can afford to tackle environmental problems; it can develop environmentally friendly technologies—wastewater and exhaust emission control, for example—and begin to rectify past mistakes. Global environmental development resembles not so much a race for the bottom as a race to the top, what we might call a “California effect.” The state of California's Clean Air Acts, first introduced in the 1970s and tightened since, were stringent emissions regulations that made rigorous demands on car manufacturers. Many prophets of doom predicted that firms and factories would move to other states, and California would soon be obliged to repeal its regulations. But instead the opposite happened: other states gradually tightened up their environmental stipulations. Because car companies needed the wealthy California market, manufacturers all over the United States were forced to develop new techniques for reducing emissions. Having done so, they could more easily comply with the exacting requirements of other states, whereupon those states again ratcheted up their requirements. Anti-globalists usually claim that the profit motive and free trade together cause businesses to entrap politicians in a race for the bottom. The California effect implies the opposite: free trade enables politicians to pull profit-hungry corporations along with them in a race to the top. This phenomenon occurs because compliance with environmental rules accounts for a very small proportion of most companies' expenditures. What firms are primarily after is a good business environment—a liberal economy and a skilled workforce— not a bad natural environment. A review of research in this field shows that there are no clear indications of national environmental rules leading to a diminution of exports or to fewer companies locating in the countries that pass the rules. 20 This finding undermines both the arguments put forward by companies against environmental regulations and those advanced by environmentalists maintaining that globalization has to be restrained for environmental reasons. Incipient signs of the California effect's race to the top are present all over the world, because globalization has caused different countries to absorb new techniques more rapidly, and the new techniques are generally far gentler on the environment. Researchers have investigated steel manufacturing in 50 different countries and concluded that countries with more open economies took the lead in introducing cleaner technology. Production in those countries generated almost 20 percent less emissions than the same production in closed countries. This process is being driven by multinational corporations because they have a lot to gain from uniform production with uniform technology. Because they are restructured more rapidly, they have more modern machinery. And they prefer assimilating the latest, most environmentally friendly technology immediately to retrofitting it, at great expense, when environmental regulations are tightened up. Brazil, Mexico, and China—the three biggest recipients of foreign investment—have followed a very clear pattern: the more investments they get, the better control they gain over air pollution. The worst forms of air pollution have diminished in their cities during the period of globalization. When Western companies start up in developing countries, their production is considerably more environment-friendly than the native production, and they are more willing to comply with environmental legislation, not least because they have brand images and reputations to protect. Only 30 percent of Indonesian companies comply with the country's environmental regulations, whereas no fewer than 80 percent of the multinationals do so. One out of every 10 foreign companies maintained a standard clearly superior to that of the regulations. This development would go faster if economies were more open and, in particular, if the governments of the world were to phase out the incomprehensible tariffs on environmentally friendly technology. 21 Sometimes one hears it said that, for environmental reasons, the poor countries of the South must not be allowed to grow as affluent as our countries in the North. For example, in a compilation of essays on Environmentally Significant Consumption published by the National Academy of Sciences, we find anthropologist Richard Wilk fretting that: If everyone develops a desire for the Western high-consumption lifestyle, the relentless growth in consumption, energy use, waste, and emissions may be disastrous. 22 But studies show this to be colossal misapprehension. On the contrary, it is in the developing countries that we find the gravest, most harmful environmental problems. In our affluent part of the world, more and more people are mindful of environmental problems such as endangered green areas. Every day in the developing countries, more than 6,9000 people die from air pollution when using wood, dung, and agricultural waste in their homes as heating and cooking fuel. UNDP estimates that no fewer than 2.2 million people die every year from polluted indoor air. This result is already “disastrous” and far more destructive than atmospheric pollution and industrial emissions. Tying people down to that level of development means condemning millions to premature death every year. It is not true that pollution in the modern sense increases with growth. Instead, pollution follows an inverted U-curve. When growth in a very poor country gathers speed and the chimneys begin belching smoke, the environment suffers. But when prosperity has risen high enough, the environmental indicators show an improvement instead: emissions are reduced, and air and water show progressively lower concentrations of pollutants. The cities with the worst problems are not Stockholm, New York, and Zürich, but rather Beijing, Mexico City, and New Delhi. In addition to the factors already mentioned, this is also due to the economic structure changing from raw-material-intensive to knowledge-intensive production. In a modern economy, heavy, dirty industry is to a great extent superseded by service enterprises. Banks, consulting firms, and information technology corporations do not have the same environmental impact as old factories. According to one survey of available environmental data, the turning point generally comes before a country's per capita GDP has reached $8,000. At $10,000, the researchers found a positive connection between increased growth and better air and water quality. 23 That is roughly the level of prosperity of Argentina, South Korea, or Slovenia. In the United States, per capita GDP is about $36,300. Here as well, the environment has consistently improved since the 1970s, quite contrary to the picture one gets from the media. In the 1970s there was constant reference to smog in American cities, and rightly so: the air was judged to be unhealthy for 100–300 days a year. Today it is unhealthy for fewer than 10 days a year, with the exception of Los Angeles. There, the figure is roughly 80 days, but even that represents a 50 percent reduction in 10 years. 24 The same trend is noticeable in the rest of the affluent world—for example, in Tokyo, where, a few decades ago, doomsayers believed that oxygen masks would in the future have to be worn all around the city because of the bad air. Apart from its other positive effects on the developing countries, such as ameliorating hunger and sparing people the horror of watching their children die, prosperity beyond a certain critical point can improve the environment. What is more, this turning point is now occurring progressively earlier in the developing countries, because they can learn from more affluent countries' mistakes and use their superior technology. For example, air quality in the enormous cities of China, which are the most heavily polluted in the world, has steadied since the mid-1980s and in several cases has slowly improved. This improvement has coincided with uniquely rapid growth. Some years ago, the Danish statistician and Greenpeace member Bjørn Lomborg, with about 10 of his students, compiled statistics and facts about the world's environmental problems. To his astonishment, he found that what he himself had regarded as self-evident, the steady deterioration of the global environment, did not agree at all with official empirical data. He found instead that air pollution is diminishing, refuse problems are diminishing, resources are not running out, more people are eating their fill, and people are living longer. Lomborg gathered publicly available data from as many fields as he could find and published them in the book The Skeptical Environmentalist: Measuring the Real State of the World. The picture that emerges there is an important corrective to the general prophesies of doom that can so easily be imbibed from newspaper headlines. Lomborg shows that air pollution and emissions have been declining in the developed world during recent decades. Heavy metal emissions have been heavily reduced; nitrogen oxides have diminished by almost 30 percent and sulfur emissions by about 80 percent. Pollution and emission problems are still growing in the poor developing countries, but at every level of growth annual particle density has diminished by 2 percent in only 14 years. In the developed world, phosphorus emissions into the seas have declined drastically, and E. coli bacteria concentrations in coastal waters have plummeted, enabling closed swimming areas to reopen. Lomborg shows that, instead of large-scale deforestation, the world's forest acreage increased from 40.24 million to 43.04 million square kilometers between 1950 and 1994. He finds that there has never been any large-scale tree death caused by acid rain. The oft-quoted, but erroneous statement about 40,000 species going extinct every year is traced by Lomborg to its source—a 20-year-old estimate that has been circulating in environmentalist circles ever since. Lomborg thinks it is closer to 1,500 species a year, and possibly a bit more than that. The documented cases of extinction during the past 400 years total just over a thousand species, of which about 95 percent are insects, bacteria, and viruses. As for the problem of garbage, the next hundred years worth of Danish refuse could be accommodated in a 33-meter-deep pit with an area of three square kilometers, even without recycling. In addition, Lomborg illustrates how increased prosperity and improved technology can solve the problems that lie ahead of us. All the fresh water consumed in the world today could be produced by a single desalination plant, powered by solar cells and occupying 0.4 percent of the Sahara Desert. It is a mistake, then, to believe that growth automatically ruins the environment. And claims that we would need this or that number of planets for the whole world to attain a Western standard of consumption—those “ecological footprint” calculations—are equally untruthful. Such a claim is usually made by environmentalists, and it is concerned, not so much with emissions and pollution, as with resources running out if everyone were to live as we do in the affluent world. Clearly, certain of the raw materials we use today, in presentday quantities, would not suffice for the whole world if everyone consumed the same things. But that information is just about as interesting as if a prosperous Stone Age man were to say that, if everyone attained his level of consumption, there would not be enough stone, salt, and furs to go around. Raw material consumption is not static. With more and more people achieving a high level of prosperity, we start looking for ways of using other raw materials. Humanity is constantly improving technology so as to get at raw materials that were previously inaccessible, and we are attaining a level of prosperity that makes this possible. New innovations make it possible for old raw materials to be put to better use and for garbage to be turned into new raw materials. A century and a half ago, oil was just something black and sticky that people preferred not to step in and definitely did not want to find beneath their land. But our interest in finding better energy sources led to methods being devised for using oil, and today it is one of our prime resources. Sand has never been all that exciting or precious, but today it is a vital raw material in the most powerful technology of our age, the computer. In the form of silicon—which makes up a quarter of the earth's crust— it is a key component in computer chips. There is a simple market mechanism that averts shortages. If a certain raw material comes to be in short supply, its price goes up. This makes everyone more interested in economizing on that resource, in finding more of it, in reusing it, and in trying to find substitutes for it. The trend over the last few decades of falling raw material prices is clear. Metals have never been as cheap as they are today. Prices are falling, which suggests that demand does not exceed supply. In relation to wages, that is, in terms of how long we must work to earn the price of a raw material, natural resources today are half as expensive as they were 50 years ago and one-fifth as expensive as they were a hundred years ago. In 1900 the price of electricity was eight times higher, the price of coal seven times higher, and the price of oil five times higher than today. 25 The risk of shortage is declining all the time, because new finds and more efficient use keep augmenting the available reserves. In a world where technology never stops developing, static calculations are uninteresting, and wrong. By simple mathematics, Lomborg establishes that if we have a raw material with a hundred years' use remaining, a 1 percent annual increase in demand, and a 2 percent increase in recycling and/or efficiency, that resource will never be exhausted. If shortages do occur, then with the right technology most substances can be recycled. One-third of the world's steel production, for example, is being reused already. Technological advance can outstrip the depletion of resources. Not many years ago, everyone was convinced of the impossibility of the whole Chinese population having telephones, because that would require several hundred million telephone operators. But the supply of manpower did not run out; technology developed instead. Then it was declared that nationwide telephony for China was physically impossible because all the world's copper wouldn't suffice for installing heavy gauge telephone lines all over the country. Before that had time to become a problem, fiber optics and satellites began to supersede copper wire. The price of copper, a commodity that people believed would run out, has fallen continuously and is now only about a tenth of what it was 200 years ago. People in most ages have worried about important raw materials becoming exhausted. But on the few occasions when this has happened, it has generally affected isolated, poor places, not open, affluent ones. To claim that people in Africa, who are dying by the thousand every day from supremely real shortages, must not be allowed to become as prosperous as we in the West because we can find theoretical risks of shortages occurring is both stupid and unjust.

**Econ collapse doesn’t solve warming – [try or die for growth]**

**Elliot 8**, Larry, economics editor at the Guardian [“Can a dose of recession solve climate change?” August 24th, http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2008/aug/25/economicgrowth.globalrecession]

This may strike some as a strange way of looking at things. Sure, the global economy is slowing. But what's so bad about that? Is it, in fact, bad news that the world economy will no longer grow at its recent rate of 5% a year? And if the answer to that question is "no", wouldn't it be good news if this modest retrenchment was turned into a full-blown slump? Indeed, why stop there? Shouldn't those who fear for the future of the planet pursue something akin to the Great Depression of the 1930s? It's an interesting thought. Logically, if the obsession with growth at all costs has increased emissions to the point where rising temperatures pose a threat to mankind's existence (as many experts believe) then a prolonged period of slow or negative growth will limit the damage to the environment. At the very least, it would provide a breathing space to come up with an international agreement on how to tackle the problem. There are many reasons why it is not quite as simple as that. My rudimentary understanding of the science of climate change is that concentrations of greenhouse gases have been building up over many decades, and **you can't simply** turn them off like a tap**.** **Even a** three- or four-year **1930s-style global slump would have** little or no impact, particularly if it was followed by a period of vigorous catch-up growth. On a chart showing growth since the dawn of the industrial age 250 years ago, the Great Depression is a blip. Similarly, Britain's trade deficit always comes down in recessions because imports go down, but then widens again once the economy returns to its trend rate of growth. Politically, recessions are not helpful to the cause of environmentalism. Climate change is replaced by concerns about unemployment and stimulating growth. To be fair, politicians respond to what they hear from voters: Gordon Brown's survival as prime minister depends on how well his package of economic measures is received, not on what he does or doesn't do to limit greenhouse gases. Looking back, it is clear that **every advance** in the green movement has coincided with period of strong growth - the early 1970s, the late 1980s and the first half of the current decade. It was tough enough to get world leaders to make tackling climate change a priority when the world economy was experiencing its longest period of sustained growth: it will be mightily difficult to persuade them to take measures that might have a dampen growth while the dole queues are lengthening. Those most likely to suffer are workers in the most marginal jobs and pensioners who will have to pay perhaps 20% of their income on energy bills. Hence, recession does not offer even a temporary solution to the problem of climate change and **it is a** fantasy **to imagine that it does**. The real issue is whether it is possible to challenge the "growth-at-any-cost model" and come up with an alternative that is environmentally benign, economically robust and politically feasible. Hitting all three buttons is mightily difficult but attempting to do so is a heck of a lot more constructive than waiting for industrial capitalism to collapse under the weight of its own contradictions.

# Trans fails

**Won’t happen**

**Mead 09** – Walter Russell, Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations and the author of God and Gold: Britain, America and the Making of the Modern World. Lauren Gottlieb provided research assistance for this article. February 04, 2009 <http://www.tnr.com/article/only-makes-you-stronger> “[Only Makes You Stronger: Why the recession bolstered America”](http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/news/2169866/posts)

But, in many other countries where capitalism rubs people the wrong way, this is not the case. On either side of the Atlantic, for example, the Latin world is often drawn to anti-capitalist movements and rulers on both the right and the left. Russia, too, has never really taken to capitalism and liberal society--whether during the time of the czars, the commissars, or the post-cold war leaders who so signally failed to build a stable, open system of liberal democratic capitalism even as many former Warsaw Pact nations were making rapid transitions. Partly as a result of these internal cultural pressures, and partly because, in much of the world, capitalism has appeared as an unwelcome interloper, imposed by foreign forces and shaped to fit foreign rather than domestic interests and preferences, many countries are only half-heartedly capitalist. When crisis strikes, they are quick to decide that capitalism is a failure **and look for alternatives**.

So far, **such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position**, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies.

As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises **often reinforce rather than challenge** the global distribution of power and wealth. This may be happening yet again.

None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises.

#  a/t: causes war

**No theoretical or empirical defense of K-Waves**

North 9, Austrian School economic analyst, PhD in History, edited the financial newsletter, Remnant Review, formerly served as Research Assistant for Congressman Ron Paul (R-TX). (Gary, “The Myth of the Kondratieff Wave,” June 27, <http://www.lewrockwell.com/north/north725.html>)

Pugsley = American conservative libertarian political and economics commentator, lecturer, and New York Times bestselling author

Kondratieff had at most two and a half cycles in his two papers. That number was available for only four data series. Of the 36 data series, he could find evidence of cycles in only 11 of them. The monetary series and the real series correlated in only 11 of 21 series, all short. Pugsley then cited extensively from an article by C. Van Ewijk of the University of Amsterdam (The Economist, Nov. 3, 1981). Van Ewijk noted that Kondratieff followed no consistent methodology in choosing the types of trend curves that he selected for different data sources. Kondratieff used various statistical techniques to smooth the curves to make them appear as long waves. "In case after case, no wave could be identified." He used price data, but these did not correlate with the actual economic output of the four economies that he studied. Then the waves that he presented were further "idealized" by whoever created the chart that has circulated ever since. Pugsley noted: "The upward movement of prices from 1933 to the present has already spanned fifty years, which is supposed to be the average length of a complete cycle." So far, price inflation has extended for about 75 years. Yet the deflationists are still predicting long-term, severe price deflation, and some of them invoke the Kondratieff wave to prove their assertion. Pugsley concluded: In not one case does the evidence corroborate the existence of the wave. Prices and output are not directly related – if anything they are inversely related. The forty-five to sixty-year period of the wave is only partially evident in the nineteenth century, and then only in the price series. Price moves in the twentieth century do not correspond to this periodicity, as claimed by long-wave proponents. There is absolutely no statistical correlation between series of real variables such as production and consumption, and monetary series such as prices and interest rates. Production and prices of the four countries studied do not statistically correlate; thus there is no wave operating coincidentally in the industrialized countries. In other words, Kondratieff's hypothesis is simply not supported by any evidence. The long wave exists only in the minds of a few misguided analysts, but not in the real world. It is pure hokum.

# a/t: inequality

**No Resource Wars – Three Reasons**

* Trade
* Low Benefit
* Decline in nonrenewable costs

**Deudney 99** – (Dan, Associate Professor of Political Science, Johns Hopkins, Contested Grounds: Security and Conflict in the New Environmental Politics, Eds. Deudney & Matthews p 205-6)

The hypothesis that states will begin fighting each other as natural resources are depleted and degraded seems intuitively accurate. The popular metaphor of a lifeboat adrift at sea with declining supplies of clean water and rations suggests there will be fewer opportunities for positive-sum gains between actors as resource scarcity grows. Many fears of resource war are derived from the cataclysmic world wars of the first half of the twentieth century Influenced by geopolitical theories that emphasized the importance of land and resources for great power status, Adolf Hitler fashioned Nazi German war aims to achieve resource autonomy. The aggression of Japan was directly related to resource goals: lacking indigenous fuel and minerals, and faced with a slowly tightening embargo by the Western colonial pow ers in Asia, the Japanese invaded Southeast Asia for oil, tin, and rub ber. Although the United States had a richer resource endowment than the Axis powers, fears of shortages and industrial strangulation played a central role in the strategic thinking of American elites about world strategy. During the Cold War, the presence of natural resources in the Third World helped turn this vast area into an arena for East-West conflict. Given this record, the scenario of conflicts over resources playing a powerful role in shaping international order should be taken seriously. However, there are three strong reasons for concluding that the familiar scenarios of resource war are of diminishing plausibility for the foreseeable future. First, the robust character of the world trade system means that states no longer experience resource dependency as a major threat to their military security and political autonomy. During the 1930s, the collapse of the world trading system drove states to pursue economic autarky, but the resource needs of contemporary states are routinely met without territorial control of the resource source. As Ronnie Lipschutz has argued, this means that re source constraints are much less likely to generate interstate violence than in the past. Second, the prospects for resource wars are diminished by the growing difficulty that states face in obtaining resources through territorial conquest. Although the invention of nuclear explosives has made it easy and cheap to annihilate humans and infrastructure in extensive areas, the spread of conventional weaponry and national consciousness has made it very costly for an invader, even one equipped with advanced technology, to subdue a resisting population, as France discovered in Indochina and Algeria, the United States in Vietnam, and the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. At the lower levels of violence capability that matter most for conquering and subduing territory; the great powers have lost effective military superiority and are unlikely soon to regain it. Third, nonrenewable resources are, contrary to intuitive logic, becoming less economically scarce. There is strong evidence that the world is entering what H. E. Goeller and Alvin M. Weinberg have labeled the “age of substitutability,” in which industrial technology is increasingly capable of fashioning ubiquitous and plentiful earth materials such as iron, aluminum, silicon, and hydrocarbons into virtually everything needed by modem societies. The most striking manifestation of this trend is that prices for virtually every raw material have been stagnant or falling for the last two decades despite the continued growth in world economic output. In contrast to the expectations widely held during the 1970s that resource scarcity would drive up commodity prices to the benefit of Third World raw material suppliers, prices have fallen.

# 2ac incentive

**we meet – DoE says we’re topical**

Waxman, 98 **– Solicitor General of the** **US** (Seth, Brief for the United States in Opposition for the US Supreme Court case HARBERT/LUMMUS AGRIFUELS PROJECTS, ET AL., PETITIONERS v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, <http://www.justice.gov/osg/briefs/1998/0responses/98-0697.resp.opp.pdf>) 2 On November 15, 1986, Keefe was delegated “the authority, with respect to actions valued at $50 million or less, to approve, execute, enter into, modify, administer, closeout, terminate and take any other necessary and appropriate action (collectively, ‘Actions’) with respect to Financial Incentive awards.” Pet. App. 68, 111-112. Citing DOE Order No. 5700.5 (Jan. 12, 1981), the delegation defines “Financial Incentives” as the authorized financial incentive programs of DOE, “including direct loans, loan guarantees, purchase agreements, price supports, guaranteed market agreements and any others which may evolve.” The delegation proceeds to state, “[h]owever, a separate prior written approval of any such action must be given by or concurred in by Keefe to accompany the action.” The delegation also states that its exercise “shall be governed by the rules and regulations of [DOE] and policies and procedures prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate(s).” Pet. App. 111-113.

**we meet – we lift a restriction**

**plan specifies solar**

**counter-interpration – Financial incentives must commit public funds — solves limits**

Webb, sessional lecture – Faculty of Law @ University of Ottawa, ‘93

(Kernaghan, 31 Alta. L. Rev. 501)

One of the obstacles to intelligent discussion of this topic is the tremendous potential for confusion about what is meant by several of the key terms involved. In the hopes of contributing to the development of a consistent and precise vocabulary applying to this important but understudied area of regulatory activity, various terms are defined below. In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean **disbursements18** **of** **public** **funds** or contingent commitments to individuals and organizations, intended to encourage, support or induce certain behaviours in accordance with express public policy objectives. They take the form of **grants, contributions**, repayable contributions, **loans,** loan guarantees **and** insurance, subsidies, procurement contracts and **tax expenditures.19** Needless to say, the ability of government to achieve desired behaviour may vary with the type of incentive in use: up-front disbursements of funds (such as with contributions and procurement contracts) may put government in a better position to dictate the terms upon which assistance is provided than contingent disbursements such as loan guarantees and insurance. In some cases, the incentive aspects of the funding come from the conditions attached to use of the monies.20 In others, the mere existence of a program providing financial assistance for a particular activity (eg. low interest loans for a nuclear power plant, or a pulp mill) may be taken as government approval of that activity, and in that sense, an incentive to encourage that type of activity has been created.21 Given the wide variety of incentive types, it will not be possible in a paper of this length to provide anything more than a cursory discussion of some of the main incentives used.22 And, needless to say, the comments made herein concerning accountability apply to differing degrees depending upon the type of incentive under consideration. By limiting the definition of financial incentives to initiatives where public funds are either disbursed or contingently committed, a large number of regulatory programs with incentive effects which exist, but in which no money is forthcoming,23 are excluded from direct examination in this paper. Such programs might be referred to as indirect incentives. Through elimination of indirect incentives from the scope of discussion, the definition of the incentive instrument becomes both more manageable and more particular. Nevertheless, it is possible that much of the approach taken here may be usefully applied to these types of indirect incentives as well.24 Also excluded from discussion here are social assistance programs such as welfare and ad hoc industry bailout initiatives because such programs are not designed primarily to encourage behaviours in furtherance of specific public policy objectives. In effect, these programs are assistance, but they are not incentives.

Their ev concedes we’re t

Financial incentives have taken the form of direct grants from government entities,4 tax incentives, and rebates.5 Other forms of financial incentives for green buildings are rebates of the typical government-related costs of building, such as application fees.6

**Aff ground – if you want to hear a debate about anything other than SMRs you have to include the aff**

**Reasonability – good is good enough – competing interpretations is arbitrary and forces a race to the bottom**

**Precision is vital— key to research quality and communication skills**

**Resnick 1** [Evan Resnick, Journal of International Affairs, 0022197X, Spring 2001, Vol. 54, Issue 2, “Defining Engagement”]

In matters of national security, establishing a clear definition of terms is a precondition for effective policymaking. Decisionmakers who invoke critical terms in an erratic, ad hoc fashion risk alienating their constituencies. They also risk exacerbating misperceptions and hostility among those the policies target. Scholars who commit the same error undercut their ability to conduct valuable empirical research. Hence, if scholars and policymakers fail rigorously to define "engagement," they undermine the ability to build an effective foreign policy.

# 2ac states

**This CP makes no sense – the problem is the second mortgage market not the states**

**ASE 10**, Alliance to Save Energy “Fannie and Freddie Drop the PACE,” June 29th, http://ase.org/efficiencynews/fannie-and-freddie-drop-pace

Fannie and Freddie’s complaint is that PACE financing generally holds ‘senior status’ to a mortgage – that is, if the property-owner defaults, the PACE lender would be repaid before Fannie or Freddie. As such, the two organizations have indicated that they will not purchase mortgages on the secondary market from those who have PACE financing. This position was affirmed by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac’s regulator, the Federal Housing Finance Agency, in a statement issued July 6. What does this mean for PACE financing? This action would have an **extremely chilling effect** on PACE programs across the country. Given Fannie and Freddie’s dominance in the secondary mortgage market, mortgage lenders would not want their mortgage-holders to participate in PACE programs because it would prevent resale of those mortgages to Fannie or Freddie – or to other investors who might subsequently wish sell the mortgages on to Fannie or Freddie. This means the majority of people who hold conventional mortgages would be effectively blocked from participation in PACE programs.

**Doesn’t solve econ – unstable federal policy is the problem and the states can’t solve that – that’s Jenkins**

**Doesn’t climate leadership – only the federal government can send the necessary signal – that’s traub**

**Perm do both – shields the blame**

**Elkind 11**, Ethan, Bank of America Climate Change Research Fellow with a joint appointment at the UC Berkeley School of Law and the UCLA School of Law “The Tea Party Embraces Local Energy Efficiency Financing?,” August 11th, http://legalplanet.wordpress.com/2011/08/11/the-tea-party-embraces-local-energy-efficiency-financing/

It looks like we’ve finally found an environmental issue that can attract strong bipartisan support. The PACE program allows municipal bond financing to pay for energy efficiency retrofits and solar panels, among other environmentally benign building improvements, to be repaid through property tax assessments. But the Federal Housing Finance Administration (FHFA) essentially squashed the residential version of this program, and lawsuits against FHFA have had mixed results. The only hope has been Congress, and now Republicans seem to be riding to the rescue. While Congress flailed during the debt ceiling deliberations, Republicans Nan Hayworth (NY) and Dan Lungren (CA) co-sponsored the PACE Assessment Protection Act of 2011, along with 12 other Republicans and 11 Democrats. The proposed law tells FHFA to rescind its policy of withholding mortgage insurance for residential properties with PACE assessments, provided that the PACE arrangements meet certain standards. These standards include the use of a locally approved contractor, a home energy audit or feasibility study by a certified auditor prior to the PACE deal, and eligibility limited to property owners who have not been delinquent for at least the past three years on property taxes, among other safeguards. Why would a Tea Party-supported member of Congress like Hayworth sponsor this bill? Much of it has to do with **preserving local control and staving off federal intervention** into local matters, typically a Republican ideal. But the benefits go beyond philosophy or political structure: energy efficiency retrofits save building owners money, create much-needed construction jobs, and clean our air. And they don’t require federal spending, since these measures pay for themselves over time. Certainly after the light bulb fiasco that Dan wrote about, it’s nice to see that some energy efficiency measures pass muster in a Republican-controlled House.

**Not having a solvency advocate is a voting issue – makes aff ground impossible and justifies an infinite number of cheating counterplans**

**Independent state action fails**

**Hoops 12**, Jeffrey, J.D. Candidate (2012), Washington University School of Law; B.A. cum laude in English (2007), Truman State University “Setting The Pace For Energy Efficiency: The Rise, Fall, And (Potential) Return Of Property Assessed Clean Energy,” Volume 89 | Issue 4, <http://lawreview.wustl.edu/inprint/89/4/hoops.pdf>

Another possible answer could come in the form of state PACE legislation that complies with the FHFA’s demands. Specifically, since the FHFA objects to the senior priority status of PACE assessments over preexisting mortgages, 112 states could simply enact PACE legislation that provides that PACE assessments receive no special priority over preexisting liens. Presumably, the FHFA would have no objection to such programs. But as was explained above, it is predicted that PACE assessments with junior lien status would not allow municipalities to find the needed purchasers for the bonds used to finance these programs. 113 Nevertheless, at least one state has enacted such a statute. 114 It remains to be seen whether PACE will be as successful there as it has been in states that provide that PACE assessments are senior to pre-existing liens.

**50 state fiat is a voting issue**

# 2ac other states

Perm do both

Residential is key

Cross-apply all ansewrs

**solar power’s key to sustainable desalination – solves extinction**

Al Gobaisi 12 (Darwish, <http://www.desware.net/Desalination-Continuity-Human-Civilization.aspx>, “Desalination Continuity in Human Civilization”, Darwish Al Gobaisi is a member of the International Study Group for Water and Energy Systems (ISGWES) and International Centre for Water and Energy Systems (ICWES)

DESALINATION AND THE CONTINUITY OF HUMAN CIVILIZATION Water, Population and Development To support the growing human population, which has already crossed the 6 billion mark and is expected to reach 8.3 billion in 2025, and 10 - 12 billion in 2050, humanity must rely on industrial development within a framework of socio-economic development. The Dublin Principles and also Agenda-21, particularly its Freshwater Chapter, make it clear that water is a key to sustainable development. The World Health Organization (WHO) has estimated that 1000 cubic meters per person per year is the benchmark level below which chronic water scarcity is considered to impede development and harm human health.  97.5% of the total global stock of water is saline and only 2.5% is fresh water. Approximately 70% of this global freshwater stock is locked up in polar icecaps and a major part of the remaining 30% lies in remote underground aquifers. In effect, only a miniscule fraction of freshwater (less than 1% of total freshwater, or 0.007% of the total global water stock) that is available in rivers, lakes and reservoirs is readily accessible for direct human use. Furthermore, the spatial and temporal distribution of the freshwater stocks and flows is hugely uneven. Hydrologists estimate the average annual flow of all the world's rivers to be about 41,000 km3/yr. Less than a third of this potential resource can be harnessed for human needs. This is further reduced by pollution such as discharges from industrial processes, drainage from mines and leaching of the residues of fertilizers and pesticides used in agriculture.  Sun is the Source of Renewable Energy and the Oceans are a Major Alternative Source of Water Just as the sun is an alternative source of energy to meet future demands, the oceans are an alternative water resource. However, extraction of fresh water from the oceans requires significant development of desalination infrastructure. Desalination is very energy-intensive, and sustainable energy systems urgently need to be developed. The most arid lands are also those blessed with abundant solar energy and this needs to be exploited for large-scale production of freshwater from the oceans. Human engineered desalination systems actually mimic the hydrologic cycle, which is itself a grand process of distillation. If these systems are driven by the sun, they will augment the fresh water supplies of the global hydrologic cycle. The resulting process will add a human engineered, sustainable and very controllable, contribution to the natural hydrological cycle. There is a clear need for further research and development, and adequate funding towards this end. The oil-rich and water-poor Arab nations must, and they can afford at present, take significant steps in this direction. They are strangely living in a false paradise without adequate concern about the inevitable crisis they will have to face in the not too distant a future when their oil reserves will be exhausted. Commercial Potential of Desalination The world has seen a 22-fold increase in desalination capacity since 1972 and the figure continues to rise. Desalinated water is still expensive and one way of bringing down the cost is by building large-scale units with appropriate technology. There were ambitious studies in the 1960s and 1970s on large-scale thermal desalination units with a capacity of 50 million gallons per day, but little came of this. Economics of desalination continues to be based on a flawed accounting system, which disregards fundamental life support systems. Remember that main stream economists (neoclassical economics) are still unwilling and unable to internalize external costs in marketprices. However 'natural capitalism' would certainly mean that natural ressources and environmental costs need to be part of the economic calculations. *See The Economics of Life and Death (John McMurtry )* *and Energy Economics: Deep Breath or http://www.eroei.com/articles/the\_chain/energy\_economics/* The 'dismal science' of economics has developed in isolation from other sciences, in particular those that concern the living world. As a result, what is necessary to preserve our planet's life processes is all too likely to be 'irrational' from an economic standpoint. The choice is simple: to rewrite economics or to destroy the natural world". (*Goldsmith, 2003*) The current structures of the energy market and domestic energy prices are major barriers to increasing the use of renewables. However, policy dimensions, and cultural issues all are challenges confronting decision makers worldwide at local, regional and global levels. As it is well known that oil and gas are running out and soon or later, every type of fossil energy will run out – including fossil uranium ore which is used by nuclear power plants. According to the findings of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), climate gases will have to be reduced by at least 60 per cent by 2050 if earth ecological system collapse is to be avoided. The sun, with its by-products (renewable and non-renewable resources) supplies our planet with many times more energy per day than the earth consumes, as for example if we assume the world energy demand for electric power in 2004 is about 14.5 Terawatts and considering the total solar energy potential of earth is about 165000 Terawatts the result is about 11400 times the world energy demands. If we consider just 3% of the Arab region surface area, it is equivalent to about 127.7 Terawatts. This is indeed what may be classified as true sustainable wealth of the Arab region, however the sad story is that Arab governments have unfortunately failed to realize the proper utilization of this enormous clean energy. The apparent abundance of fossil fuels brings the energy prices deceitfully to low levels that are surely unsustainable. This is tantamount to robbing future generations, and is in breach of the principle of intergenerational equity. The result is a situation in which decision makers have been satisfied with a performance ratio of around 6 to 10. With suitable motivation, the industry should be capable of achieving performance ratios of 20 or even 30 for thermal desalination processes. Market forces tell us that the costs of conventional water supplies from freshwater flows are expected to rise sharply. In urban water management, most of the cost goes into distribution and sewage treatment, whereas a significant decline has been noticed in recent years in the costs of desalination. In the last fifty years, a reduction of nearly 90% has been achieved in energy usage for seawater desalting. By 2025 the costs of desalination are likely to be of the same order as those of urban water supply and sanitation. Furthermore, water quality improvement can be achieved at the local level as well as by means of large industrial plants. Of late, there has been an increasing focus on the installation of small-scale distillation plants at the community and household level, in order to remove contaminants in supply lines. Thus small-scale distillation units for water purification (particularly solar based ones) offer good commercial potential. Desalination and Sustainable Development: Desalination has already made a major contribution to quality of life in the most arid regions of the world, particularly the Arab region and North Africa. Without desalination, many of these regions would have remained uninhabited. With rising global demand, uneven distribution of freshwater and increasing population, Malthusian apocalypse would have already come true. Desalination technology is providing safe drinking water even to some 'water-rich' nations where pollution reduced the quality of natural waters. Thus, as a means of augmenting fresh water supplies, desalination contributes significantly to global sustainability. The desalination associations and institutions have a pivotal role to play here, encouraging the scientific and industrial communities to make efforts to meet world water requirements through environmentally sustainable technologies. Investments in this direction are not impossible; the annual global expenditures for arms and advertisement are currently about US$780 billion (SIPRI 1998) and US$435 billion respectively. Just 1% of this over ten years would be a prudent diversion of resources enough to provide safe water and decent sanitation facilities for all human beings.  Solar Energy for Desalination in the Arab World The Arab World (AW) stretches across well over 12.9 million square kilometers of area including North Africa and the part of Western Asia known as the Arab Region. This is a region of highest water scarcity and arid climate with annual precipitation ranging from 100 mm to 400 mm. The total annual renewable water resources (TARWR) vary tremendously between the different Arab countries ranging between 0.1 km3/yr for Qatar and 75 billion m3/yr for Iraq. With a current total population of around 325 million people and a very high growth rate of 2.7%, the per capita share of TARWR has dropped well below the UN threshold for water poverty (1000 m3 per year) with most of the Gulf Arab countries reaching per capita TARWR below 200 m3/yr.  In order to meet the rising water demand required by an expanding population and developing economy and to fill the gap between supply and demand, it was found that desalination of seawater and brackish water could provide a portion of the shortfall in water supply. The growing technology of desalination is currently providing enormous quantities of water to meet the escalating needs for domestic and industrial sectors in many water scarce Arab countries. Based on recent published estimates, the current water deficit in the region amounts to 60 billion m3/year and this is expected to grow to 160 billion m3/year by 2050. A significant amount of the current 60 billion m3/year deficit is provided by desalination and it is expected that desalination will also provide more to make up for the 160 billion m3/year needed by 2050. Desalination processes, however, are energy intensive and are responsible for a good portion of GHG emissions in the region. To produce 1 m3of desalted water from a typical cogeneration plant results in 12 kg of CO2gas emission (at an energy consumption rate of 24 kWh/m3 using thermal processes). The current CO2emission due to desalination can therefore be estimated as 720 million ton CO2 per year. With business-as-usual, this amount is expected to increase to 1600 million ton CO2 by 2050. This is an unacceptable situation and cannot be allowed to continue from both population health viewpoint and from the global warming point of view. Fortunately, the AW is blessed with a renewable energy resource that is matched only in very few areas of the world, namely, Solar Energy. The region lies in the so called “sun belt” area which is the area of the globe that has the highest solar radiation intensity. The solar radiation intensity in the region lies in the range 2000 – 2800 kWh/m2 yr. The major advantage of using solar energy for desalination is that the GHG emissions produced by solar desalination plants is almost zero and the resource is available almost everywhere in the AW. The current issue of high capital cost for solar collectors and solar PV fields is a temporary problem that will be eventually solved by new technology, mass production and engineering innovation. The total installed capacity of desalinated water systems in the world in 2006 was about 37 million m3/d, which is expected to increase drastically in the next decades. The dramatic increase in desalinated water supply will create a series of problems, the most significant of which are those related to energy consumption. It has been estimated that production of 25 million m3/d requires about 338.4 million barrels of oil per year (considering specific energy consumption 24 kWh/m3). Even if oil were much more widely available, could we afford to burn it on the scale needed to provide everyone with fresh water? Given the current understanding of the greenhouse effect and the importance of CO2 levels, this use of oil is debatable. Thus, apart from satisfying the additional energy demand, environmental pollution would be a major concern. If desalination is accomplished by conventional technology, then it will require burning of substantial quantities of fossil fuels]. Fortunately, the Arab world (AW), as many other regions of the world, is blessed with a non-polluting resource of energy and is renewable, namely Solar Energy.  Problems relevant to the use of fossil fuels, in part, could be resolved by considering possible utilization of renewable resources, such as solar energy. In fact, most developing countries, with vast areas but having no access to the electric grid, appear to be well versed in renewable energies. Such sources, able to be used directly even at far remote and isolated areas, could be exploited to power low to medium scale desalination plants. A meaningful contribution from the above mentioned environmentally friendly energy resources would certainly be to extend the foreseen duration of fossil fuels store as well as attenuate the socially negative impacts caused by sudden increases in oil price. It is to be noted that nearly 3 kg of CO2generated for each m3 of water produced (at an energy consumption rate of 6 kWh/m3 with the alternative desalination technology currently used on large scale) could be avoided if the conventional fuel is replaced by a renewable one. Security policy should be Renewable Energy Policy  Our dependency on exhaustible fossil and uranium resources leads to the vulnerability of societies. Remember that there are many hidden costs associated with fossil and nuclear energy such as, undermining health, destabilizing the climate system, disposal of radioactive nuclear waste and pollution of water resources. This may lead to irreversible damage to Earth's Life Support Systems. Global life-support systems, incorporate the environmental resources (healthy environment) that sustain the economy as well as those - such as water and air , that support life on earth . At present, critical stress suffered by our environment is manifest in the air, water, and soil, our climate, and plant and animal species. Should this deterioration be allowed to continue, we can expect to alter the living world to the extent that it will be unable to sustain life as we know it. Just imagine the enormous expenditures on international security associated with safeguarding of fossil and atomic fuels including processing. All these are bad enough but an even worse aspect of nuclear technology is the creation of massive security risks such as nuclear weapons proliferation and nuclear terrorism. All of the financial expenditures should wisely be used to promote the use renewable energy resources for eternal peace and protection of life support systems. Therefore humanity should consider seriously the total replacement of fossil and atomic energy by renewable energy in the next 40-50 years. Atomic and fossil energy prices will inevitably increase due to the exhaustion of natural resources as well as the additional costs from environmental damages. Renewable energy prices will continue to drop due to the increase in mass production and improvement of technology. As there are no fuel costs for wind, solar, the renewable energy system is more cost effective, perhaps exception to this is biomass. *However Most of biomass is the energy source for the bottom half of the global economic ladder, three billion people or so. A great deal of that was unsustainably burned vegetation, cow dung, and other materials that are used where modern energy is not available or affordable*(*Richard Smalley).  See also  [Solar Energy-The Availability Perspective for Meeting the Future Energy Demands of the Arab as well as the Entire World.](http://www.desware.net/Solar-Energy-Availability-Perspective-Meeting-Future-Energy-Demands-Arab-Entire-World.aspx)* Let us hope that the entire world rises to meet this requirement of faith in the survival of life on earth.

# 2ac Hagel

**Hagel not key**

Walt 12-26. [Stephen, Robert and Renee Belfer professor of international relations @ Harvard, "What's at stake in the Hagel affair" Foreign Policy -- walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/12/26/whats\_at\_stake\_in\_the\_hagel\_affair?wp\_login\_redirect=0]

Second, let's not lose sight of what is at stake here. Contrary to what some suggest, the choice of SecDef isn't going to make any difference in U.S. policy toward Israel or the "peace process." Policy on those issues will be set by the White House and Congress, with AIPAC et al. breathing down both their necks. The Israeli government has no interest in a two-state solution, the Palestinians are too weak and divided to persuade Israel to rethink its present course, and the United States is incapable of mounting the sort of sustained pressure that might force both sides to compromise. Which means the two-state solution is dead, and it won't matter whether Hagel gets the nod or not. The $3-4 billion annual aid package won't be affected, and I'll bet the United States continues to wield its U.N. Security Council veto whenever it is asked.¶ This appointment could affect U.S. policy toward Iran, insofar as Hagel's been skeptical about the wisdom of using military force in the past. He's hardly a dove or an appeaser, of course; he just recognizes that military force may not be a very good way to deal with this problem. (Well, duh.) If Obama wants to pursue diplomacy instead of preventive war -- and he should -- the combination of Hagel at Defense and Kerry at State would give him two respected, articulate, and persuasive voices to help him make that case. But if Obama were to decide that force was a good idea, neither Kerry nor Hagel would stand in his way. So in terms of overall Middle East policy in the next couple of years, this appointment may matter less than most people think.

**Fiscal fights trigger the link**

Benac, 1-24 -- covered government and politics in Washington for more than three decades

[Nancy, "Obama's Uphill Agenda," Detroit News, 1-24-13, www.detroitnews.com/article/20130124/OPINION01/301240324/1008/opinion01/Obama-s-uphill-agenda, accessed 1-25-13, mss]

Obama's uphill agenda: President's second term, the legacy-maker, will be over before we know it

It's a good thing President Barack Obama considers himself a congenital optimist. **There are no easy "gets"** as he scrolls through his second-term to-do list and looks ahead to the uncertainties of the next four years. Many of the items already on his agenda aren't there of his own choosing. First up is certain battle with Congress in the next few months over deadlines on automatic budget cuts, expiring government spending authority and raising the debt limit. House Republicans last week agreed to bump up the debt limit slightly, but that just puts off that part of the fight for a few months. Obama's goal is to get through that trifecta and still have the political capital left for the things he'd rather focus on: Reducing gun violence, overhauling immigration policy, revamping tax laws, addressing climate change and more. With Republicans in Congress approaching the new year with very different goals, "**it's a formula for deadlock** and difficulty for the president," says James Thurber, director of the Center for Congressional and Presidential Studies at American University. "**I don't think this president has even a month of political capital."** The president also will have to devote significant energy simply to safeguarding the achievements of his first term, by keeping the economic recovery alive, making sure his health care law is properly put in place in the face of persisting objections from businesses and individuals, and ensuring new financial regulations have teeth. International worries, including the civil war in Syria, Iran's nuclear intentions and instability in Mali could complicate the president's Term Two game plan as well. "**Things are stacked up**," Obama senior adviser David Plouffe acknowledged Sunday on ABC's "This Week."

**Hagel confirmation inevitable – Schumer.**

Baron 1-23. [Kevin, Pentagon reporter, "Chuck Hagel’s unusual door-to-door sales pitch" Foreign Policy -- e-ring.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/01/23/chuck\_hagel\_s\_unusual\_door\_to\_door\_sales\_pitch]

While the Senate holds the power of advice and consent over presidential nominees, Hagel has taken to auditioning for a role that likely already is his; by now there is no real opposition in the Senate that appears to block his confirmation. Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-NY) backed Hagel after they met last week, effectively silencing the myth that “pro-Israel” opponents would sink Hagel. That was Hagel’s only real roadblock.

**Plan’s popular – no spending link**

**Saha 11/13**, Devashree, senior policy analyst and associate fellow at the Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program,” “Enact Legislation Supporting Residential Property Assessed Clean Energy Financing,” November 13th, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Research/Files/Papers/2012/11/13%20federalism/13%20housing%20energy%20efficiency.pdf>

Congressional action to support residential PACE programs would have no budgetary impact. If legislation is passed, it will restore local governments’ ability to offer residential PACE programs and help homeowners finance energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades without any government subsidies or expenditures. State of Play Broad support for residential PACE programs exists across a wide group of entities and organizations, including local and county governments, state governments, state and federal elected representatives, national municipal associations, clean energy trade organizations, and businesses and business councils. The FHFA ruling notwithstanding, the federal government has strongly supported residential PACE programs and issued best practices guidelines in 2010 as a first step toward national standardization of PACE financing mechanisms. Congressional support for residential PACE financing exists on both sides of the aisle, as evidenced most recently by the PACE Assessment Protection Act (H.R. 2599), a bipartisan bill supported by 21 Republicans and 32 Democrats that was introduced in July 2011. Despite this broad support for residential PACE programs as well as court challenges and a federal district court ruling in California requiring the FHFA to initiate rulemaking on residential PACE financing, the FHFA maintains its opposition to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac purchasing otherwise conforming mortgages with PACE assessments.

**Plan doesn’t go through congress**

Collins 12, Jordan M, Director of Government Relations at Mintz-Leven, “PACE-ing in Purgatory: Outlook for Property Assessed Clean Energy Financing,” January 19th, http://www.mintz.com/newsletter/2012/Advisories/1578-0112-NAT-ECT\_Collins/index.htm

Although FHFA has issued policy statements effectively barring Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac from insuring mortgages for homes with a PACE assessment, the Federal Housing Authority (FHA) is not subject to FHFA conservatorship or regulatory oversight, and could serve as **another pathway for supporting** the adoption of state and local **PACE** programs. Housed within the Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD), FHA provides federal insurance for private mortgages associated with single family and multifamily homes, including manufactured homes and hospitals. FHA is the largest insurer of mortgages in the world, insuring over 34 million properties since its inception in 1934, and currently insures 25% of the U.S. residential housing market.34 Under current FHA policy, the agency’s insurance instruments reimburse mortgage holders for the full costs of property taxes associated with a home in the event of a mortgage default. Therefore, **FHA could agree to provide a 100% federal guarantee of PACE assessments** levied on new or refinanced mortgages insured by the FHA. FHA lenders could in turn also agree to allow the PACE assessments to be senior to their loan. Because the PACE assessments could be fully guaranteed by FHA, those financial obligations would theoretically impose no additional risk to the lender or a subsequent mortgage holder. The advantage of leveraging FHA’s position in the residential housing market is three-fold: (1) FHA insures a significant (and growing) portion of the housing market allowing PACE programs to be meaningfully scaled, (2) **HUD would not need** additional legislative authority or appropriations from Congress, and (3) HUD would not be required to seek FHFA, Fannie, Freddie, or other Federal bank regulators’(e.g., FDIC, OCC) approval because FHA-insured mortgages are not sold or securitized through Fannie/Freddie, nor are they subject to FHFA regulations. (The secondary market for FHA-insured mortgages exists through Ginnie Mae, which is part of HUD and not in any way associated with FHFA, Fannie or Freddie.)

**Pc not key**

**Edwards 9** – Distinguished Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M University, holds the George and Julia Blucher Jordan Chair in Presidential Studies and has served as the Olin Professor of American Government at Oxford (George, “The Strategic President”, Printed by the Princeton University Press, pg. 149-150)

Even presidents who appeared to dominate Congress were actually facilitators rather than directors of change. They understood their own limitations and explicitly took advantage of opportunities in their environments. Working at the margins, they successfully guided legislation through Congress. When their resources diminished, they reverted to the stalemate that usually characterizes presidential-congressional relations. As legendary management expert Peter Drucker put it about Ronald Reagan, "His great strength was not charisma, as is commonly thought, but his awareness and acceptance of exactly what he could and what he could not do."134 These conclusions are consistent with systematic research by Jon Bond, Richard Fleisher, and B. Dan Wood. They have focused on determining whether the presidents to whom we attribute the greatest skills in dealing with Congress were more successful in obtaining legislative support for their policies than were other presidents. After carefully controlling for other influences on congressional voting, they found no evidence that those presidents who supposedly were the most proficient in persuading Congress were more successful than chief executives with less aptitude at influencing legislators.135 Scholars studying leadership within Congress have reached similar conclusions about the limits on personal leadership. Cooper and Brady found that institutional context is more important than personal leadership skills or traits in determining the influence of leaders and that there is no relationship between leadership style and effectiveness.136 Presidential legislative leadership operates in an environment largely beyond the president's control and must compete with other, more stable factors that affect voting in Congress in addition to party. These include ideology, personal views and commitments on specific policies, and the interests of constituencies. By the time a president tries to exercise influence on a vote, most members of Congress have made up their mindson the basis of these other factors. Thus, a president's legislative leadership is likely to be critical only for those members of Congress who remain open to conversion after other influences have had their impact. Although the size and composition of this group varies from issue to issue, it will almost always be a minority in each chamber.

**Winners win for Obama --- inaction burns capital**

**Kuttner 11** (Robert, Co-Founder and Co-Editor – American Prospect and Distinguished Senior Fellow – Demos (Think Tank), “Barack Obama’s Theory of Power”, The American Prospect, 5-16,<http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=barack_obamas_theory_of_power>)

Obama’s critics contend that his prolonged fantasy of bipartisanship, his failure to lay the blame for the depressed economy squarely on the Republicans, and his reluctance to use his bully pulpit to tell a coherent story, particularly about jobs, needlessly weakened the Democrats and led to avoidable losses in the 2010 midterm. More fundamentally, under Obama government has lost credibility as a necessary force for economic recovery and fairness, undermining the Democrats’ core appeal to voters. At the very least, Obama failed to drive the agenda or exploit the full possibilities of presidential leadership in a crisis. In the formulation of the political historian James MacGregor Burns, Obama ran and inspired voters as a “transformational” figure but governed as a “transactional” one. Notwithstanding a vow to profoundly change Washington, Obama took the Washington power constellation as a given. Despite an economic emergency, he moved neither Congress nor public opinion very much and only seldom used his oratorical gifts. “He is so damned smart and confident that he thinks he just has to explain things to the American people once,” says former House Appropriations Chair David Obey. “He doesn’t appreciate that you have to reinforce a message 50 times.” Obama’s reticence, his reluctance to lay blame, make sharp partisan distinctions, or practice a politics of class, reflects the interplay of his personality and his tacit theory of power—one that emphasizes building bridges to opponents, defying ideological categories, shying away from the kind of mass mobilization that swept him into office, and practicing a kind of Zen detachment. At moments in American history, that conception of the presidency has suited the times. This doesn’t seem to be one of those moments. Yet in the third year of his presidency, there are signs of a learning curve. It may be that Obama is playing his own elegant brand of rope-a-dope, biding his time, letting the Republicans lead with their chins, waiting for just the right moment to dramatize their extremism and exploit their schisms—then demonstrating a toughness that has largely eluded him until now and reshaping the political center as a more progressive one. The hope of a new, more combative Obama was kindled by portions of his April 13 speech at George Washington University, which showed an Obama that we’ve seldom seen during his presidency. “The man America elected president has re-emerged,” exulted The New York Times’ lead editorial. Obama departed from his usual reluctance to be partisan, explicitly criticizing the self-annihilating Republican designs so usefully spelled out in Rep. Paul Ryan’s proposed 10-year budget. The president resorted to a formulation he seldom uses—the injustices of class: “The top 1 percent saw their income rise by an average of more than a quarter of a million dollars each. That’s who needs to pay less taxes?” Obama said. “They want to give people like me a $200,000 tax cut that’s paid for by asking 33 seniors each to pay $6,000 more in health costs. That’s not right. And it’s not going to happen as long as I’m president.” At last, Obama shifted the mind-numbing debate from the scale of the budget and its deficits to its content and political meaning. He did what his progressive critics have long advocated, drawing a clear, bright, partisan line and pledging to defend Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. But the budgetary details of the speech showed an Obama who was still the transactional leader of the Burns paradigm. Obama devoted most of the speech to his own plans for cutting the deficit. Jobs and recovery were hardly mentioned. Most of the proposed deficit reductions came from cuts to programs rather than from tax increases. And Obama was far too generous with the word, we. As in: But after Democrats and Republicans committed to fiscal discipline during the 1990s, we lost our way in the decade that followed. We increased spending dramatically for two wars and an expensive prescription-drug program—but we didn’t pay for any of this new spending. Instead, we made the problem worse with trillions of dollars in unpaid-for tax cuts. [Emphasis added.] As Tonto said to the Lone Ranger, What do you mean, we? This fiscal deterioration, of course, was the Republicans’ handiwork. Why not point that out? Obama seemed to come to his partisanship reluctantly, almost apologetically. At one point in the speech, having just flayed the Republicans for their sheer extremism, he added, “I’m eager to hear other ideas from all ends of the political spectrum.” He further mixed his own message by declaring, “We will all need to make sacrifices.” Indeed, the main ideological themes of the speech had been undermined by Obama’s earlier compromises. The left pole that Obama defined in the budget debate had already been moved to the right by his yearlong emphasis on deficit reduction; his prior concessions in the December 2010 tax deal, which failed to restore higher tax rates on the rich; and the 2011 budget deal, which cut $38 billion in programs. If the bipartisan Gang of Six, spawn of Obama’s own Bowles-Simpson commission, does reach agreement, it will only add pressure to alter Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid for the worse—thus fatally blurring Obama’s bright line. Was Obama’s speech—the most resolutely political, partisan, progressive, and effective in recent memory—a turning point or a one-off? Is Obama now revising his theory and practice of presidential power? As the political scientist Richard Neustadt observed in his classic work, Presidential Power, a book that had great influence on President John F. Kennedy, the essence of a president’s power is “the power to persuade.” Because our divided constitutional system does not allow the president to lead by commanding, presidents amass power by making strategic choices about when to use the latent authority of the presidency to move public and elite opinion and then use that added prestige as clout to move Congress. In one of Neustadt’s classic case studies, Harry Truman, a president widely considered a lame duck, nonetheless persuaded the broad public and a Republican Congress in 1947-1948 that the Marshall Plan was a worthy idea. As Neustadt and Burns both observed, though an American chief executive is weak by constitutional design, a president possesses several points of leverage. He can play an effective outside game, motivating and shaping public sentiment, making clear the differences between his values and those of his opposition, and using popular support to box in his opponents and move them in his direction. He can complement the outside bully pulpit with a nimble inside game, uniting his legislative party, bestowing or withholding benefits on opposition legislators, forcing them to take awkward votes, and using the veto. He can also enlist the support of interest groups to pressure Congress, and use media to validate his framing of choices. Done well, all of this signals leadership that often moves the public agenda. The most effective presidents have worked all these levers. Think of Franklin Roosevelt, or Ronald Reagan, or Lyndon B. Johnson during the era of the War on Poverty and the civil-rights crusade. But except in the endgame of the battle for health careand his recent turnabout in defending Medicare, Obama has been relatively disengaged on all of these fronts. He left the details of his signature legislation andattendant bargaining to his staff. Says a senior Democrat who speaks frequently to Obama, “He is just not someone who enjoys what most of presidential politics entails.” Reviewing Obama’s relatively short career, a few core principles emerge in which he deeply believes. These have remained constants. Building Bridges. Obama, famously, is convinced both by his life journey and his prior experience in politics that he can persuade almost any adversary to find areas of common ground. “Much of Obama’s self-confidence,” wrote David Remnick in his biography of Obama, The Bridge, “resided in his belief that he could walk into a room, with any sort of people, and forge a relationship and even persuade those people of the rightness of his position.” From the Harvard Law Review, to the Illinois Senate, to the Iowa precinct caucuses, Obama’s political life before his presidency only strengthened that conviction. Obama has a deep certitude that the voters, especially political independents, are sick of partisan division and want a leader who will rise above it to solve practical problems. In service of that goal, he has bent over backward to praise his opposition rather than attack it, frequently offering concessions in advance. Mostly, he has pursued common ground by giving ground. The experience of his first two years, when Republicans wanted nothing so much as to destroy him, did not shake Obama from these strategic beliefs. “He doesn’t have a fighter’s instinct, but he is in the middle of a hugely consequential fight,” says a veteran Senate Democrat. “They will keep pushing him as long as he keeps backing up.” His drawing of bright lines in the April 13 speech was very much the exception. Defying Categories. This core political instinct interacts with, and is reinforced by, Obama’s personal reticence and determination not to be the angry black man. From his first entry into electoral politics, he defined himself as a different sort of African American and a different sort of liberal. Even though his voting record as a U.S. senator was one of the most progressive, as president he has almost gone out of his way to distance himself from the liberal base. In an interview with The New York Times’ Peter Baker on the eve of the 2010 elections, Obama expressed regrets for looking too much like “the same old tax-and-spend liberal Democrat.” Courting Elites, Wary of Mass Mobilization. Obama and his campaign staff brilliantly enlisted an army of volunteers who thought of themselves as a movement built on the values of sweeping change and the tactics of community organizing. Obama repeatedly vowed that he would use these engaged citizens to press Congress to enact health reform and other urgent priorities. But once elected, Obama’s political staff quickly downgraded Obama for America into Organizing for America, a denatured arm of the Democratic National Committee—out of concern that an independent movement might be more of a pressure group than an amen chorus. While he has maintained a close—and politically damaging—alliance with Wall Street (and lately, under Chief of Staff Bill Daley’s tutelage, has reached out to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce), Obama has been detached from the one recent popular rising that could help him win lost ground in the crucial states of the Midwest—the backlash against union busting and draconian budget cuts by Midwestern Republican governors and legislators. Though the line attributed to FDR speaking to supporters—“Now, make me do it”—is probably apocryphal, Roosevelt did make good use of popular groups to his left, as did Lyndon Johnson in his complex alliance with Martin Luther King. Obama and his political staff are distinctly uncomfortable with independent mobilizations making him do anything. At a time when progressive movements lack the energy of the 1930s or 1960s, the president has not chosen to help animate them. Zen Leadership. The adjectives widely used to describe Obama are words like diffident, detached, aloof, professorial. Obama practices restraint to a fault. As a policy expert and intellectual, he is hands-on when it comes to White House deliberation but mostly hands-off with Congress. As Burns demonstrated, power is enhanced in the course of its exercise. But Obama, despite his eloquence and capacity to motivate, seems to believe that power should be conserved and presidential leadership reserved for emergencies. He waited long and disabling months beforebecoming personally engaged in the health-reform battle. This left the details obscure, voters anxious, and Democrats at the August 2009 town meetings playing the role of pinata. By the time the bill finally passed, the victory was politically Pyrrhic. An exasperated David Obey told me, “Obama sat and let Jubilation T. Cornpone tie up Max Baucus for all those months. Hell, Chuck Grassley made it clear to me that he’d never vote for the thing.” Obama and his team never embraced such strategies as forcing Republicans (and conservative Democrats) to take awkward votes or using the veto to define clear and principled differences. David Axelrod told me that the White House considered it futile and self-defeating to bring up measures in the Senate that couldn’t win. This stance, the opposite of Harry Truman’s, has infuriated Obama’s allies in the House. During the last session, important progressive legislation on jobs and energy independence passed the House but was never even brought to a vote in the Senate. In one emblematic episode in December 2009, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi pulled out all the stops to get the House to narrowly pass a $154 billion public-investment, jobs, and unemployment-extension bill. The White House, however, rebuffed Pelosi’s entreaties to urge Majority Leader Harry Reid to bring the measure to a vote in the Senate. At the time, Obama’s aides were convinced that job growth was around the corner, had already moved on to deficit reduction as the theme of the 2010 State of the Union address, and were laying plans for “Recovery Summer,” a conceit that entirely backfired. Except on such rare occasions at late stages of the health debate, it was not Obama’s style to call in wavering Democrats to give them an LBJ-style treatment—or to call them in at all, even to discuss major pending policy decisions. A number of senior Democrats were livid that they were kept in the dark about the April 13 budget speech, which had evidently been months in preparation. They first heard about it when David Plouffe, the White House political director, made the rounds of the Sunday talk shows, three days before the speech. “You’ve heard of the ‘great man’ theory,” says Robert Borosage, who co-directs the progressive Campaign for America’s Future. “They believe in the ‘great speech’ theory.” Obama’s stirring speech at the 2004 Democratic National Convention established the novice as presidential timber. During the campaign, his superb address on race, a subject he dearly wanted to avoid, saved his candidacy from being destroyed by the controversy over the Rev. Jeremiah Wright. But as president, much of the time Obama has been AWOL rather than a defining presence driving the debate. His great speeches, like April’s budget address, often come late in the game, after concessions have been made and damage done. Obama seems to relish demonstrating that he can score the occasional touchdown run starting from his own end zone. But politics, like football, is a game of cumulative scoring. If you keep giving ground, the clock eventually runs out. Hands off, above the fray, turning the other cheek, representing decency and common purpose, conserving rather than wielding power, uncomfortable with popular movements he doesn’t control—by some alchemy, this style of leadership is expected to produce the voter approval that puts polite pressure on the other party to join the quest for consensus. Reciprocity and compromise then result in effective government and popular adulation. This has been Obama’s operating theory of power. For the most part, it hasn’t worked.

**Winners win**

**Halloran 10,** Liz Halloran is a Washington correspondent for NPR “For Obama, What A Difference A Week Made,” NPR April 6

Amazing what a win in a major legislative battle will do for a president's spirit. (Turmoil over spending and leadership at the Republican National Committee over the past week, and the release Tuesday of a major new and largely sympathetic book about the president by New Yorker editor David Remnick, also haven't hurt White House efforts to drive its own, new narrative.) Though the president's national job approval ratings failed to get a boost by the passage of the health care overhaul — his numbers have remained steady this year at just under 50 percent — he has earned grudging respect even from those who don't agree with his policies. "He's achieved something that virtually everyone in Washington thought he couldn't," says Henry Olsen, vice president and director of the business-oriented American Enterprise Institute's National Research Initiative. "And that's given him confidence." The protracted health care battle looks to have taught the White House something about power, says presidential historian Gil Troy — a lesson that will inform Obama's pursuit of his initiatives going forward. "I think that Obama realizes that presidential power is a muscle, and the more you exercise it, the stronger it gets," Troy says. "He exercised that power and had a success with health care passage, and now he wants to make sure people realize it's not just a blip on the map." The White House now has an opportunity, he says, to change the narrative that had been looming — that the Democrats would lose big in the fall midterm elections, and that Obama was looking more like one-term President Jimmy Carter than two-termer Ronald Reagan, who also managed a difficult first-term legislative win and survived his party's bad showing in the midterms. Approval Ratings Obama is exuding confidence since the health care bill passed, but his approval ratings as of April 1 remain unchanged from the beginning of the year, according to Pollster.com. What's more, just as many people disapprove of Obama's health care policy now as did so at the beginning of the year. According to the most recent numbers: Forty-eight percent of all Americans approve of Obama, and 47 disapprove. Fifty-two percent disapprove of Obama's health care policy, compared with 43 percent who approve. Stepping Back From A Precipice Those watching the re-emergent president in recent days say it's difficult to imagine that it was only weeks ago that Obama's domestic agenda had been given last rites, and pundits were preparing their pieces on a failed presidency. Obama himself had framed the health care debate as a referendum on his presidency. A loss would have "ruined the rest of his presidential term," says Darrell West, director of governance studies at the liberal-leaning Brookings Institution. "It would have made it difficult to address other issues and emboldened his critics to claim he was a failed president." The conventional wisdom in Washington after the Democrats lost their supermajority in the U.S. Senate when Republican Scott Brown won the Massachusetts seat long held by the late Sen. Edward Kennedy was that Obama would scale back his health care ambitions to get something passed. "I thought he was going to do what most presidents would have done — take two-thirds of a loaf and declare victory," says the AEI's Olsen. "But he doubled down and made it a vote of confidence on his presidency, parliamentary-style." "You've got to be impressed with an achievement like that," Olsen says. But Olsen is among those who argue that, long-term, Obama and his party would have been better served politically by an incremental approach to reworking the nation's health care system, something that may have been more palatable to independent voters Democrats will need in the fall. "He would have been able to show he was listening more, that he heard their concerns about the size and scope of this," Olsen says. Muscling out a win on a sweeping health care package may have invigorated the president and provided evidence of leadership, but, his critics say, it remains to be seen whether Obama and his party can reverse what the polls now suggest is a losing issue for them. Golden Boy Tested One of the questions that has trailed Obama is how he would deal with criticism and the prospect of failure, says Troy, a McGill University history professor and visiting scholar affiliated with the bipartisan Policy Center in Washington. "He is one of those golden boys who never failed in his life, and people like that are often not used to criticism and failure," Troy says. Obama and his campaign were temporarily knocked for a loop early in the 2008 presidential campaign by then-GOP vice presidential candidate Sarah Palin's "zingers," Troy says, "and Obama was thrown off balance again by the loss of the Massachusetts Senate seat." The arc of the health care debate reminded observers that Obama is not just a product of Harvard, but also of tough Chicago politics, Troy says. "You don't travel as far and as fast as Barack Obama without having a spine of steel," he says. "He has an ability to regenerate, to come back, and knows that there is no such thing as a dirty win: a win is a win" — even if it infuriates the progressive wing of the president's party, which wanted far more sweeping changes to the nation's health care system. GOP Stumbles Obama's new mojo has been abetted, in a way, by high-profile troubles at the Republican National Committee. RNC Chairman Michael Steele has been under fire over the past week for his spending on private jets and limousines, and a staffer resigned after submitting to the committee a nearly $2,000 tab for a visit by young party members to a risque Los Angeles nightclub. The disarray intensified Monday with the resignation of the committee's chief of staff, and growing anger among top GOP strategists and fundraisers. "Steele has kept Republicans off-message," says West, of Brookings. "Every story about RNC spending is one less story about their views on health care at a time when news coverage has shifted in a more favorable direction." The distraction continued Monday when detractors accused Steele of playing the race card after he told ABC News that as an African American, he, like Obama, is being held to a higher standard. White House Spokesman Robert Gibbs, when asked about Steele's assertion, said the RNC chairman's problem "isn't the race card, it's the credit card." The controversy, Olsen says, hasn't been good for the Republicans' preparations for elections in terms of money and organization. But he doesn't view it as "a voter issue." How Win Translates When Reagan won his tough legislative battle in the early 1980s, it was over tax cuts, something voters saw as directly related to the then-dismal economy. Obama has long made a case for health care reform as a big piece of economic reform, but it's a difficult argument to make to voters, Olsen says, particularly when many of the health care law's major provisions don't go into effect for another four years. But observers like Troy say they believe that though initially unrelated, a boost in employment among Americans would encourage voters to look more favorably on the health care overhauls. "The perceived success of health care legislation rides on job creation," Troy says. Economists have recently declared the nation's recession, which began in 2007, over. But the unemployment rate has remained stubbornly at just under 10 percent. "I think he understands he's in a crucial period of his presidency," Olsen says. "He's taken a lot of risks, and there's not immediate rewards." Obama faces continuing tests on other big domestic issues, including Wall Street reform, the economy and climate change, as well as myriad foreign policy challenges ranging from testy relations with Israel and uncertainties about Iran's nuclear capabilities, to wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Late last month, the administration and Russia agreed to a new nuclear arms treaty that is expected to be signed Thursday in advance of an international summit in Washington. The world is waiting, Troy says, to see how the president's renewed confidence plays out on the international stage. But the newly invigorated president continues to encourage voters to wait and see what his efforts produce.

# 2ac neolib k

**Framework – debate should be about the consequences of the plan were it to be done by the federal government – infinite number of assumptions and possible alt actors guts predictability**

**Key to avoid technocrat fill-in**

**Kuzemko 12** [Caroline Kuzemko, CSGR University of Warwick, Security, the State and Political Agency: Putting ‘Politics’ back into UK Energy, http://www.psa.ac.uk/journals/pdf/5/2012/381\_61.pdf]

Both Hay (2007) and Flinders and Buller (2006) suggest that there are other forms that depoliticisation can take, or in the terminology of Flinders and Buller ‘tactics’ which politicians can pursue in order to move a policy field to a more indirect governing relationship (Flinders and Buller 2006: 296). For the purposes of understanding the depoliticisation of UK energy policy, however, two of Colin Hay’s forms of depoliticisation are most useful: the ‘… offloading of areas of formal political responsibility to the market…’ and the passing of policymaking responsibility to quasipublic, or independent, authorities (Hay 2007: 82-3). 1 What each of these forms of depoliticisation has in common is the degree to which they can serve, over time, to reduce political capacity by removing processes of deliberation and contestation, thereby reducing the ability for informed agency and choice. In that politics can be understood as being inclusive of processes of deliberation, contestation, informed agency and collective choice the lack of deliberation and capacity for informed agency would result in sub-optimal politics (Hay 2007: 67; cf. Gamble 2000; Wood 2011; Jenkins 2011). There seems little doubt that, with regard to energy as a policy area, the principal of establishing a more indirect governing system had become accepted by UK political elites. One of the very few close observers of UK energy policy from the 1980s to early 2000s claims that both Conservative and New Labour politicians had actively sought to remove energy from politics, making it an ‘economic’ subject: From the early 1980s, British energy policy, and its associated regulatory regime, was designed to transform a state-owned and directed sector into a normal commodity market. Competition and 1 "These"forms"are"referred"to"elsewhere"by"the"author"as"‘marketised’"and"‘technocratic’"depoliticisation"(Kuzemko" 2012b:").liberalization would, its architects hoped, take energy out of the political arena… Labour shared this vision and hoped that energy would drop off the political agenda…. (Helm 2003: 386) 2 As already suggested this paper considers the intention to depoliticise energy to have been reasonably successful. By the early 2000s the Energy Ministry had been disbanded, there was little or no formal Parliamentary debate, energy was not represented at Cabinet level, responsibility for the supply of energy had been passed to the markets, it was regulated by an independent body, and the (cf. Kuzemko 2012b). Furthermore, the newly formed Energy Directorate within the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), which now had responsibility for energy policy, had no specific energy mandates but instead mandates regarding encouraging the right conditions for business with an emphasis on competition (Helm et al 1989: 55; cf. Kuzemko 2012b: 107). As feared by various analysts who write about depoliticisation as a sub-optimal form of politics, these processes of depoliticisation had arguably resulted in a lack of deliberation about energy and its governance outside of narrow technocratic elite circles. Within these circles energy systems were modelled, language was specific and often unintelligible to others, including generalist politicians or wider publics, and this did, indeed, further encourage a high degree of disengagement with the subject (cf. Kern 2010; Kuzemko 2012b; Stern 1987). Technical language and hiring practices that emphasised certain forms of economic education further isolated elite technocratic circles from political contestation and other forms of knowledge about energy. Arguably, by placing those actors who have been elected to represent the national collective interest at one remove from processes of energy governance the result was a lack of formal political capacity in this policy field. It is worth, briefly, at this point reiterating the paradoxical nature of depoliticisation. Whilst decisions to depoliticise are deeply political, political capacity to deliberate, contest and act in an issue area can be reduced through these processes. Depoliticisation has been an ongoing form of governing throughout the 20 th century it may (Burnham 2001: 464), however, be particularly powerful and more difficult to reverse when underpinned by increasingly dominant ideas about how best to govern. For example Hay, in looking for the domestic sources of depoliticisation in the 1980s and 1990s, suggests that these processes were firmly underpinned by neoliberal and public choice ideas not only about the role of the state but also about the ability for political actors to make sound decisions relating, in particular, to economic governance (Hay 2007: 95-99). Given the degree to which such ideas were held increasingly to be legitimate over this time period depoliticisation was, arguably, genuinely understood by many as a process that would result in better governance (Interviews 1, 2, 3, 15 cf. Hay 2007: 94; Kern 2010). This to a certain extent makes decisions to depoliticise appear both less instrumental but also harder to reverse given the degree to which such ideas become further entrenched via processes of depoliticisation (cf. Kuzemko 2012b: 61-66; Wood 2011: 7).

**Representations don’t affect policymaking - overlooks agency and material structures**

**Tuathail, 96** (Gearoid, Department of Georgraphy at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Political Geography, 15(6-7), p. 664, science direct)

While theoretical debates at academic conferences are important to academics, the discourse and concerns of foreign-policy decisionmakers are quite different, so different that they constitute a distinctive problemsolving, theory-averse, policy-making subculture. There is a danger th at academics assume that the discourses they engage are more significant in the practice of foreign policy and the exercise of power than they really are. This is not, however, to minimize the obvious importance of academia as a general institutional structure among many that sustain certain epistemic communities in particular states. In general, I do not disagree with Dalby’s fourth point about politics and discourse except to note that his statement-‘Precisely because reality could be represented in particular ways political decisions could be taken, troops and material moved and war fought’-evades the important question of agency that I noted in my review essay. The assumption that it is representations that make action possible is inadequate by itself. Political, military and economic structures, institutions, discursive networks and leadership are all crucial in explaining social action and should be theorized together with representational practices. Both here and earlier, Dalby’s reasoning inclines towards a form of idealism. In response to Dalby’s fifth point (with its three subpoints), it is worth noting, first, that his book is about the CPD, not the Reagan administration. He analyzes certain CPD discourses, root the geographical reasoning practices of the Reagan administration nor its public-policy reasoning on national security. Dalby’s book is narrowly textual; the general contextuality of the Reagan administration is not dealt with. Second, let me simply note that I find that the distinction between critical theorists and poststructuralists is a little too rigidly and heroically drawn by Dalby and others. Third, Dalby’s interpretation of the reconceptualization of national security in Moscow as heavily influenced by dissident peace researchers in Europe is highly idealist, an interpretation that ignores the structural and ideological crises facing the Soviet elite at that time. Gorbachev’s reforms and his new security discourse were also strongly selfinterested, an ultimately futile attempt to save the Communist Party and a discredited regime of power from disintegration. The issues raised by Simon Dalby in his comment are important ones for all those interested in the practice of critical geopolitics. While I agree with Dalby that questions of discourse are extremely important ones for political geographers to engage, there is a danger of fetishizing this concern with discourse so that we neglect the institutional and the sociological, the materialist and the cultural, the political and the geographical contexts within which particular discursive strategies become significant. Critical geopolitics, in other words, should not be a prisoner of the sweeping ahistorical cant that sometimes accompanies ‘poststructuralism nor convenient reading strategies like the identity politics narrative; it needs to always be open to the patterned mess that is human history.

**Perm do both**

**Vague alts are a voting issue – make stable offense impossible**

**No impact - Neoliberalism not oppressive or exploitive – empirically proven**

**Bhagvati ‘4** (University Professor at Columbia University and Senior Fellow in International Economics at the Council on Foreign Relations [JagdishBhagwati, “In Defense of Globalization”. 2004. Overview, <http://www.cfr.org/publication/6769/in_defense_of_globalization.html>]

JagdishBhagwati takes conventional wisdom—that globalization is the cause of several social ills—and turns it on its head. Properly regulated, globalization, he says, is the most powerful force for social good in the world. Drawing on his unparalleled knowledge of international economics, Bhagwati dismantles the antiglobalization case. He persuasively argues that globalization often leads to greater general prosperity in an underdeveloped nation: it can reduce child labor, increase literacy, and enhance the economic and social standing of women.And to counter charges that globalization leads to cultural hegemony, to a bland “McWorld,” Bhagwati points to several examples, from literature to movies, in which globalization has led to a spicy hybrid of cultures. Often controversial and always compelling, Bhagwati cuts through the noise on this most contentious issue, showing that globalization is part of the solution, not part of the problem. Anyone who wants to understand what’s at stake in the globalization wars will want to read *In Defense of Globalization*. The first edition of *In Defense of Globalization* addressed the critiques that concerned the social implications of economic globalization.Thus, it addressed questions such as the impact on women’s rights and equality, child labor, poverty in the poor countries, democracy, mainstream and indigenous culture, and the environment. Professor Bhagwati concluded that globalization was, on balance, a force for advancing these agendas as well.Thus, whereas the critics assumed thatglobalizationlacked a human face, itactually had a human face. He also examined in depth the ways in which policy and institutional design could further advance these social agendas, adding more glow to the human face.

**Their link evidence flows aff – it says bottom up efficiency approaches are key – that’s the aff**

**Society’s getting better and it’s sustainable**

Owen ‘11 (John M. Owen Professor of Politics at University of Virginia PhD from Harvard "DON’T DISCOUNT HEGEMONY" Feb 11 www.cato-unbound.org/2011/02/11/john-owen/dont-discount-hegemony/

Andrew Mack and his colleagues at the Human Security Report Project are to be congratulated. Not only do they present a study with a striking conclusion, driven by data, free of theoretical or ideological bias, but they also do something quite unfashionable: they bear good news. Social scientists really are not supposed to do that. Our job is, if not to be Malthusians, then at least to point out disturbing trends, looming catastrophes, and the imbecility and mendacity of policy makers. And then it is to say why, if people listen to us, things will get better. We do this as if our careers depended upon it, and perhaps they do; for if all is going to be well, what need then for us? Our colleagues at Simon Fraser University are brave indeed. That may sound like a setup, but it is not. I shall challenge neither the data nor the general conclusion that violent conflict around the world has been decreasing in fits and starts since the Second World War. When it comes to violent conflict among and within countries, things have been getting better. (The trends have not been linear—Figure 1.1 actually shows that the frequency of interstate wars peaked in the 1980s—but the 65-year movement is clear.) Instead I shall accept that Mack et al. are correct on the macro-trends, and focus on their explanations they advance for these remarkable trends. With apologies to any readers of this forum who recoil from academic debates, this might get mildly theoretical and even more mildly methodological. Concerning international wars, one version of the “nuclear-peace” theory is not in fact laid to rest by the data. It is certainly true that nuclear-armed states have been involved in many wars. They have even been attacked (think of Israel), which falsifies the simple claim of “assured destruction”—that any nuclear country A will deter any kind of attack by any country B because B fears a retaliatory nuclear strike from A. But the most important “nuclear-peace” claim has been about mutually assured destruction, which obtains between two robustly nuclear-armed states. The claim is that (1) rational states having second-strike capabilities—enough deliverable nuclear weaponry to survive a nuclear first strike by an enemy—will have an overwhelming incentive not to attack one another; and (2) we can safely assume that nuclear-armed states are rational. It follows that states with a second-strike capability will not fight one another. Their colossal atomic arsenals neither kept the United States at peace with North Vietnam during the Cold War nor the Soviet Union at peace with Afghanistan. But the argument remains strong that those arsenals did help keep the United States and Soviet Union at peace with each other. Why non-nuclear states are not deterred from fighting nuclear states is an important and open question. But in a time when calls to ban the Bomb are being heard from more and more quarters, we must be clear about precisely what the broad trends toward peace can and cannot tell us. They may tell us nothing about why we have had no World War III, and little about the wisdom of banning the Bomb now. Regarding the downward trend in international war, Professor Mack is friendlier to more palatable theories such as the “democratic peace” (democracies do not fight one another, and the proportion of democracies has increased, hence less war); the interdependence or “commercial peace” (states with extensive economic ties find it irrational to fight one another, and interdependence has increased, hence less war); and the notion that people around the world are more anti-war than their forebears were. Concerning the downward trend in civil wars, he favors theories of economic growth (where commerce is enriching enough people, violence is less appealing—a logic similar to that of the “commercial peace” thesis that applies among nations) and the end of the Cold War (which end reduced superpower support for rival rebel factions in so many Third-World countries). These are all plausible mechanisms for peace. What is more, none of them excludes any other; all could be working toward the same end. That would be somewhat puzzling, however. Is the world just lucky these days? How is it that an array of peace-inducing factors happens to be working coincidentally in our time, when such a magical array was absent in the past? The answer may be that one or more of these mechanisms reinforces some of the others, or perhaps some of them are mutually reinforcing. Some scholars, for example, have been focusing on whether economic growth might support democracy and vice versa, and whether both might support international cooperation, including to end civil wars. We would still need to explain how this charmed circle of causes got started, however. And here let me raise another factor, perhaps even less appealing than the “nuclear peace” thesis, at least outside of the United States. That factor is what international relations scholars call hegemony—specifically American hegemony**.** A theory that many regard as discredited, but that refuses to go away, is called hegemonic stability theory. The theory emerged in the 1970s in the realm of international political economy. It asserts that for the global economy to remain open—for countries to keep barriers to trade and investment low—one powerful country must take the lead. Depending on the theorist we consult, “taking the lead” entails paying for global public goods (keeping the sea lanes open, providing liquidity to the international economy), coercion (threatening to raise trade barriers or withdraw military protection from countries that cheat on the rules), or both. The theory is skeptical that international cooperation in economic matters can emerge or endure absent a hegemon. The distastefulness of such claims is self-evident: they imply that it is good for everyone the world over if one country has more wealth and power than others. More precisely, they imply that it has been good for the world that the United States has been so predominant. There is no obvious reason why hegemonic stability theory could not apply to other areas of international cooperation, including in security affairs, human rights, international law, peacekeeping (UN or otherwise), and so on. What I want to suggest here—suggest, not test—is that American hegemony might just be a deep cause of the steady decline of political deaths in the world. How could that be? After all, the report states that United States is the third most war-prone country since 1945. Many of the deaths depicted in Figure 10.4 were in wars that involved the United States (the Vietnam War being the leading one). Notwithstanding politicians’ claims to the contrary, a candid look at U.S. foreign policy reveals that the country is as ruthlessly self-interested as any other great power in history. The answer is that U.S. hegemony might just be a deeper cause of the proximate causes outlined by Professor Mack. Consider economic growth and openness to foreign trade and investment, which (so say some theories) render violence irrational. American power and policies may be responsible for these in two related ways. First, at least since the 1940s Washington has prodded other countries to embrace the market capitalism that entails economic openness and produces sustainable economic growth. The United States promotes capitalism for selfish reasons, of course: its own domestic system depends upon growth, which in turn depends upon the efficiency gains from economic interaction with foreign countries, and the more the better. During the Cold War most of its allies accepted some degree of market-driven growth. Second, the U.S.-led western victory in the Cold War damaged the credibility of alternative paths to development—communism and import-substituting industrialization being the two leading ones—and left market capitalism the best model. The end of the Cold War also involved an end to the billions of rubles in Soviet material support for regimes that tried to make these alternative models work. (It also, as Professor Mack notes, eliminated the superpowers’ incentives to feed civil violence in the Third World.) What we call globalization is caused in part by the emergence of the United States as the global hegemon. The same case can be made, with somewhat more difficulty, concerning the spread of democracy. Washington has supported democracy only under certain conditions—the chief one being the absence of a popular anti-American movement in the target state—but those conditions have become much more widespread following the collapse of communism. Thus in the 1980s the Reagan administration—the most anti-communist government America ever had—began to dump America’s old dictator friends, starting in the Philippines. Today Islamists tend to be anti-American, and so the Obama administration is skittish about democracy in Egypt and other authoritarian Muslim countries. But general U.S. material and moral support for liberal democracy remains strong.

**Neolib inevitable**

**Mead 09** – Walter Russell, Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations and the author of God and Gold: Britain, America and the Making of the Modern World. Lauren Gottlieb provided research assistance for this article. February 04, 2009 <http://www.tnr.com/article/only-makes-you-stronger> “[Only Makes You Stronger: Why the recession bolstered America”](http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/news/2169866/posts)

But, in many other countries where capitalism rubs people the wrong way, this is not the case. On either side of the Atlantic, for example, the Latin world is often drawn to anti-capitalist movements and rulers on both the right and the left. Russia, too, has never really taken to capitalism and liberal society--whether during the time of the czars, the commissars, or the post-cold war leaders who so signally failed to build a stable, open system of liberal democratic capitalism even as many former Warsaw Pact nations were making rapid transitions. Partly as a result of these internal cultural pressures, and partly because, in much of the world, capitalism has appeared as an unwelcome interloper, imposed by foreign forces and shaped to fit foreign rather than domestic interests and preferences, many countries are only half-heartedly capitalist. When crisis strikes, they are quick to decide that capitalism is a failure **and look for alternatives**.

So far, **such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position**, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies.

As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises **often reinforce rather than challenge** the global distribution of power and wealth. This may be happening yet again.

None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises.

**Catastrophic warming reps are good and key to solve**

**Romm ‘12**

(Joe Romm is a Fellow at American Progress and is the editor of Climate Progress, which New York Times columnist Tom Friedman called "the indispensable blog" and Time magazine named one of the 25 “Best Blogs of 2010.″ In 2009, Rolling Stone put Romm #88 on its list of 100 “people who are reinventing America.” Time named him a “Hero of the Environment″ and “The Web’s most influential climate-change blogger.” Romm was acting assistant secretary of energy for energy efficiency and renewable energy in 1997, where he oversaw $1 billion in R&D, demonstration, and deployment of low-carbon technology. He is a Senior Fellow at American Progress and holds a Ph.D. in physics from MIT., 2/26/2012, “Apocalypse Not: The Oscars, The Media And The Myth of ‘Constant Repetition of Doomsday Messages’ on Climate”, http://thinkprogress.org/romm/2012/02/26/432546/apocalypse-not-oscars-media-myth-of-repetition-of-doomsday-messages-on-climate/#more-432546)

The two greatest myths about global warming communications are 1) constant repetition of doomsday messages has been a major, ongoing strategy and 2) that strategy doesn’t work and indeed is actually counterproductive! These myths are so deeply ingrained in the environmental and progressive political community that when we finally had a serious shot at a climate bill, the powers that be decided not to focus on the threat posed by climate change in any serious fashion in their $200 million communications effort (see my 6/10 post “Can you solve global warming without talking about global warming?“). These myths are so deeply ingrained in the mainstream media that such messaging, when it is tried, is routinely attacked and denounced — and the flimsiest studies are interpreted exactly backwards to drive the erroneous message home (see “Dire straits: Media blows the story of UC Berkeley study on climate messaging“) The only time anything approximating this kind of messaging — not “doomsday” but what I’d call blunt, science-based messaging that also makes clear the problem is solvable — was in 2006 and 2007 with the release of An Inconvenient Truth (and the 4 assessment reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and media coverage like the April 2006 cover of Time). The data suggest that strategy measurably moved the public to become more concerned about the threat posed by global warming (see recent study here). You’d think it would be pretty obvious that the public is not going to be concerned about an issue unless one explains why they should be concerned about an issue. And the social science literature, including the vast literature on advertising and marketing, could not be clearer that only repeated messages have any chance of sinking in and moving the needle. Because I doubt any serious movement of public opinion or mobilization of political action could possibly occur until these myths are shattered, I’ll do a multipart series on this subject, featuring public opinion analysis, quotes by leading experts, and the latest social science research. Since this is Oscar night, though, it seems appropriate to start by looking at what messages the public are exposed to in popular culture and the media. It ain’t doomsday. Quite the reverse, climate change has been mostly an invisible issue for several years and the message of conspicuous consumption and business-as-usual reigns supreme. The motivation for this post actually came up because I received an e-mail from a journalist commenting that the “constant repetition of doomsday messages” doesn’t work as a messaging strategy. I had to demur, for the reasons noted above. But it did get me thinking about what messages the public are exposed to, especially as I’ve been rushing to see the movies nominated for Best Picture this year. I am a huge movie buff, but as parents of 5-year-olds know, it isn’t easy to stay up with the latest movies. That said, good luck finding a popular movie in recent years that even touches on climate change, let alone one a popular one that would pass for doomsday messaging. Best Picture nominee The Tree of Life has been billed as an environmental movie — and even shown at environmental film festivals — but while it is certainly depressing, climate-related it ain’t. In fact, if that is truly someone’s idea of environmental movie, count me out. The closest to a genuine popular climate movie was the dreadfully unscientific The Day After Tomorrow, which is from 2004 (and arguably set back the messaging effort by putting the absurd “global cooling” notion in people’s heads! Even Avatar, the most successful movie of all time and “the most epic piece of environmental advocacy ever captured on celluloid,” as one producer put it, omits the climate doomsday message. One of my favorite eco-movies, “Wall-E, is an eco-dystopian gem and an anti-consumption movie,” but it isn’t a climate movie. I will be interested to see The Hunger Games, but I’ve read all 3 of the bestselling post-apocalyptic young adult novels — hey, that’s my job! — and they don’t qualify as climate change doomsday messaging (more on that later). So, no, the movies certainly don’t expose the public to constant doomsday messages on climate. Here are the key points about what repeated messages the American public is exposed to: The broad American public is exposed to virtually no doomsday messages, let alone constant ones, on climate change in popular culture (TV and the movies and even online). There is not one single TV show on any network devoted to this subject, which is, arguably, more consequential than any other preventable issue we face. The same goes for the news media, whose coverage of climate change has collapsed (see “Network News Coverage of Climate Change Collapsed in 2011“). When the media do cover climate change in recent years, the overwhelming majority of coverage is devoid of any doomsday messages — and many outlets still feature hard-core deniers. Just imagine what the public’s view of climate would be if it got the same coverage as, say, unemployment, the housing crisis or even the deficit? When was the last time you saw an “employment denier” quoted on TV or in a newspaper? The public is exposed to constant messages promoting business as usual and indeed idolizing conspicuous consumption. See, for instance, “Breaking: The earth is breaking … but how about that Royal Wedding? Our political elite and intelligentsia, including MSM pundits and the supposedly “liberal media” like, say, MSNBC, hardly even talk about climate change and when they do, it isn’t doomsday. Indeed, there isn’t even a single national columnist for a major media outlet who writes primarily on climate. Most “liberal” columnists rarely mention it. At least a quarter of the public chooses media that devote a vast amount of time to the notion that global warming is a hoax and that environmentalists are extremists and that clean energy is a joke. In the MSM, conservative pundits routinely trash climate science and mock clean energy. Just listen to, say, Joe Scarborough on MSNBC’s Morning Joe mock clean energy sometime. The major energy companies bombard the airwaves with millions and millions of dollars of repetitious pro-fossil-fuel ads. The environmentalists spend far, far less money. As noted above, the one time they did run a major campaign to push a climate bill, they and their political allies including the president explicitly did NOT talk much about climate change, particularly doomsday messaging Environmentalists when they do appear in popular culture, especially TV, are routinely mocked. There is very little mass communication of doomsday messages online. Check out the most popular websites. General silence on the subject, and again, what coverage there is ain’t doomsday messaging. Go to the front page of the (moderately trafficked) environmental websites. Where is the doomsday? If you want to find anything approximating even modest, blunt, science-based messaging built around the scientific literature, interviews with actual climate scientists and a clear statement that we can solve this problem — well, you’ve all found it, of course, but the only people who see it are those who go looking for it. Of course, this blog is not even aimed at the general public. Probably 99% of Americans haven’t even seen one of my headlines and 99.7% haven’t read one of my climate science posts. And Climate Progress is probably the most widely read, quoted, and reposted climate science blog in the world. Anyone dropping into America from another country or another planet who started following popular culture and the news the way the overwhelming majority of Americans do would get the distinct impression that nobody who matters is terribly worried about climate change. And, of course, they’d be right — see “The failed presidency of Barack Obama, Part 2.” It is total BS that somehow the American public has been scared and overwhelmed by repeated doomsday messaging into some sort of climate fatigue. If the public’s concern has dropped — and public opinion analysis suggests it has dropped several percent (though is bouncing back a tad) — that is primarily due to the conservative media’s disinformation campaign impact on Tea Party conservatives and to the treatment of this as a nonissue by most of the rest of the media, intelligentsia and popular culture.

**PACE solves brownfield redevelopment – key to the economy**

**Alpert and White 12**, Isaac and Alicia, Northwestern University, “Using the Sun to Make Brownfields Green,” http://www.rooseveltcampusnetwork.org/sites/all/files/Energy2012.pdf#page=10

Brownfields represent a serious economic problem because potentially productive land sits empty, releasing toxic waste and decreasing adjacent property values. Deterred by the initial cost of renovating these unused and contaminated commercial properties, landowners opt to leave such fallow sites untouched. Further, the extent of contamination on brownfields is hard to gauge prior to refurbishing. Cleanup efforts on heavily contaminated sites can cost $150,000 per acre, leaving even large commercial redevelopers fearful of brownfield restoration. 1 The advent of Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) funding, a unique form of municipal government financing, can encourage the redevelopment of brownfields with renewable energy projects. Through PACE, a property owner can receive financing from a city to install renewable energy infrastructure. Solar panels are ideal for brownfields because they fit nearly any sized property. The preliminary funding is repaid through an assessment, or lien, on the owner’s property taxes and future profits from their new energy technology. 2 Because the lien is assessed on the property, the loan is not attached to the original owner, regardless of ownership changes. Local governments already encourage the installation of solar panels on brownfields. In 2009, the City of Chicago partnered with a utility, Exelon, to develop the nation’s largest solar array on a former brownfield. 3 For brownfield restoration to have lasting impact, a permanent system must help small developers. PACE removes financial barriers to constructing solar arrays, turning abandoned land into profitable sources of electricity; by spreading installation costs over the panels’ lifetime, property owners would not fear bankruptcy during renovations. Analysis Given that brownfields bring in neither revenue nor private sector activity, municipalities should develop them as assets instead. An often under-utilized resource due to prohibitive cost, solar panels provide a solution. The nation’s 2010 summer net electricity demand (763 gigawatts) 7 was 0.4 percent of the energy potentially collected by photovoltaic arrays (206,000 gigawatts). 8 While the sun offers abundant energy, solar power generates only 0.08 percent of America’s energy In this proposal, a property owner works with a municipally-approved contractor to submit an application for cleanup and solar array construction. The municipality issues a lien on the property and gives the owner financing to begin cleanup and construction. Once the arrays are operational, the owner sells energy back to the grid. One square foot of solar panels averages 16.5 kilowatt-hours per year. 9 An average brownfield is 6.5 acres 10 , meaning its solar array could produce 700,000 kilowatt-hours per year. By selling back electricity at the average national rate of 12 cents per kilowatt-hours 11 , it would make $86,000 per year. For reference, a 2003 brownfield cleanup in Denver, CO, cost $80,000. 12 Additionally, as manufacturing costs of solar panels decrease, solar energy may cost $1 per watt by 2013. Although cleanup and solar installation costs vary by brownfield, a property owner could feasibly pay back a PACE loan and cover future maintenance costs using energy profits. Next Steps PACE funding for brownfield revitalization solves the issues of funding and open space, which are two of the biggest roadblocks preventing implementation of solar panels on a large-scale. Receiving backing from PACE, landowners could not only redevelop harmfully unproductive land, but also rejuvenate entire communities through the presence of green zones in industrial areas. Unfortunately, due to a ruling on the part of the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA), the federal government has put PACE funding on hold. Before this policy can be executed, the FHFA’s ruling against PACE financing must be overturned
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#### Scenario 1 is Coal:

#### We are all invited to Pittsburgh to discuss energy production- but as a child raised in the “Steel City of the South” aka Birmingham pollution and smog have become a common facet of everyday life and caused me to develop Asthma- but

#### SMR’s are a sustainable method to solve global problems- SMR’s resolve dumping/ waste/ pollution and trades-off with COAL which is worse- this comes from James Hansen in a personal letter to Obama

Hansen ‘8 (James and Anniek Hansen, That really smart climate dude, <http://www.pdfdownload.org/pdf2html/pdf2html.php?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.columbia.edu%2F~jeh1%2Fmailings%2F20081229_DearMichelleAndBarack.pdf&images=yes>, December 29, 2008, LEQ)

(3) Urgent R&D on 4th generation nuclear power with international cooperation. Energy efficiency, renewable energies, and a "smart grid" deserve first priority in our effort to reduce carbon emissions. With a rising carbon price, renewable energy can perhaps handle all of our needs. However, most experts believe that making such presumption probably would leave us in 25 years with still a large contingent of coal-fired power plants worldwide. Such a result would be disastrous for the planet, humanity, and nature. 4 th generation nuclear power (4 th GNP) and coal-fired power plants with carbon capture and sequestration (CCS) at present are the best candidates to provide large baseload nearly carbon-free power (in case renewable energies cannot do the entire job). Predictable criticism of 4 th GNP (and CCS) is: "it cannot be ready before 2030." However, the time needed could be much abbreviated with a Presidential initiative and Congressional support. Moreover, improved (3 rd generation) light water reactors are available for near-term needs. In our opinion, 4 th GNP ii deserves your strong support, because it has the potential to help solve past problems with nuclear power: nuclear waste, the need to mine for nuclear fuel, and release of radioactive material iii . Potential proliferation of nuclear material will always demand vigilance, but that will be true in any case, and our safety is best secured if the United States is involved in the technologies and helps define standards. Existing nuclear reactors use less than 1% of the energy in uranium, leaving more than 99% in long-lived nuclear waste. 4 th GNP can "burn" that waste, leaving a small volume of waste with a half-life of decades rather than thousands of years. Thus 4 th GNP could help solve the nuclear waste problem, which must be dealt with in any case. Because of this, a portion of the $25B that has been collected from utilities to deal with nuclear waste justifiably could be used to develop 4 th generation reactors. The principal issue with nuclear power, and other energy sources, is cost. Thus an R&D objective must be a modularized reactor design that is cost competitive with coal. Without such capability, it may be difficult to wean China and India from coal. But all developing countries have great incentives for clean energy and stable climate, and they will welcome technical cooperation aimed at rapid development of a reproducible safe nuclear reactor.

#### SMRs can burn uranium

Szondy 12, David, writes for charged and iQ magazine, award-winning journalist [“Feature: Small modular nuclear reactors - the future of energy?” February 16th, <http://www.gizmag.com/small-modular-nuclear-reactors/20860/>]

SMRs can help with proliferation, nuclear waste and fuel supply issues because, while some modular reactors are based on conventional pressurized water reactors and burn enhanced uranium, others use less conventional fuels. Some, for example, can generate power from what is now regarded as "waste", burning depleted uranium and plutonium left over from conventional reactors. Depleted uranium is basically U-238 from which the fissible U-235 has been consumed. It's also much more abundant in nature than U-235, which has the potential of providing the world with energy for thousands of years. Other reactor designs don't even use uranium. Instead, they use thorium. This fuel is also incredibly abundant, is easy to process for use as fuel and has the added bonus of being utterly useless for making weapons, so it can provide power even to areas where security concerns have been raised.

####  And status quo nuclear dumping is causing a global genocide on multiple indigenous groups

Endres 9 (Danielle, Associate Professor of Communication at the University of Utah, “From wasteland to waste site: the role of discourse in nuclear power’s environmental injustices,” Local Environment Vol. 14, No. 10, November 2009, 917–937)

As mentioned above, nuclear colonialism describes how the nuclear production process – including both nuclear weapons production and nuclear power – disproportionately harms indigenous people worldwide.3 The Indigenous Environmental Network (2002) wrote: The nuclear industry has waged an undeclared war against our Indigenous peoples and Pacific Islanders that has poisoned our communities worldwide. For more than 50 years, the legacy of the nuclear chain, from exploration to the dumping of radioactive waste has been proven, through documentation, to be **genocide and ethnocide** and a deadly enemy of Indigenous peoples. . . United States federal law and nuclear policy has not protected Indigenous peoples, and in fact has been created to allow the nuclear industry to continue operations at the expense of our land, territory, health and traditional ways of life. . . . This disproportionate toxic burden – called environmental racism – has culminated in the current attempts to dump much of the nation’s nuclear waste in the homelands of the Indigenous peoples of the Great Basin region of the United States. Examples of nuclear colonialism in the United States include Uranium mining and milling on reservation lands in the Black Hills and Four Corners regions, nuclear testing on land claimed under the 1863 Treaty of Ruby Valley by the Western Shoshone, and HLWstorage sites con- sidered on Western Shoshone, Southern Paiute, and Skull Valley Band of Goshute lands (Nelkin 1981, Grinde and Johansen 1995, Kuletz 1998, La Duke 1999, Hoffman 2001). The phenomenon of nuclear colonialism is empirically documented. The book Nuclear Wastelands, edited by Makhijani et al. (1995), reveals that indigenous people in the USA and globally are disproportionately burdened by the production of nuclear weapons. Further, Hooks and Smith (2004, p. 572) demonstrate that US military sites are dispropor- tionately located on or near Native American lands. While these studies focus primarily on military applications of nuclear technologies, there is also evidence to suggest that Uranium mining for nuclear power production and HLW storage also fall within the pattern of **nuclear colonialism** (Nelkin 1981, Hoffman 2001). Hoffman (2001, p. 462) details the “extraordinary unequal distribution of benefits and burdens at each stage of the [nuclear fuel] cycle” imposed upon Native American nations in the USA, particularly by Uranium mining and HLW disposal. Nuclear colonialism is a type of environmental injustice. In part, nuclear colonialism is environmental racism. According to Bullard (1999, p. 6), “environmental racism combines with public policies and industry practices to provide benefits for whites while shifting costs to people of color”. Yet, nuclear colonialism is also a form of colonialism. Native Americans, unlike other marginalised racial groups in the USA, are members of over 150 distinct sovereign tribal nations and each holds a unique legal relationship with the federal government. As Suagee (2002, p. 227) notes, “Although Indian people have suffered much discriminatory treatment from people who apparently define Indian identity in primar- ily racial–ethnic terms, the fact that Native American governments are sovereign govern- ments is a significant distinction between them and other kinds of minorities”. Although Native Americans in the USA are sovereign governments, they are still faced with a system of colonialism. Gedicks (1993, p. 13) argues that Native Americans are embedded within a system of resource colonialism under which “native peoples are under assault on every continent because their lands contain a wide variety of valuable resources needed for industrial development”. Nuclear colonialism is a form of resource colonialism that faces Native Americans in the USA and other indigenous peoples worldwide.4

**Coal plants destroy low income neighborhoods and minority communities**

**NAACP, No Date**. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, *NAACP commends Agreement to Close Two Chicago Coal Plants,* In between 2009- 2012. <http://www.naacp.org/news/entry/naacp-commends-agreement-to-close-two-chicago-coal-plants>

(Chicago, IL) – NAACP leaders commended the agreement between Midwest Generation, Chicago officials and environmental groups that will lead to the closure of Fisk Generating Station and Crawford Generating Station. Fisk and Crawford ranked as two of the worst environmental justice offenders in an NAACP report released last year. The report, “Coal Blooded: Putting Profits Before People in Illinois”, analyzed emissions and demographic factors – including race, income, and population density – to rank plants’ “environmental justice performance”. Fisk and Crawford both received an “F”. “This agreement means a cleaner, healthier environment for the communities around these coal plants,” stated NAACP President and CEO Benjamin Todd Jealous. “Environmental justice is a civil rights issue, and the NAACP is committed to strong regulation and monitoring of toxic coal emissions. For too long, Fisk and Crawford have been literally choking some of Chicago’s most diverse neighborhoods, and some of its poorest.” “Coal-fired power plants are disproportionately located in low-income communities and communities of color, and Fisk and Crawford represent two of the most egregious offenders,” stated Jacqueline Patterson, Director of NAACP Environmental and Climate Justice Programs. “The Little Village Environmental Justice Organization and Mayor Emanuel were effective in raising the health concerns felt by so many Chicago citizens. Though it was a long time coming, it is heartening to see Midwest Generation take the socially responsible path.” “The 600,000 Chicago residents living within three miles of Fisk or Crawford have suffered long enough,” stated Rose Joshua, President of the NAACP South Side Chicago unit. “This is a true victory for grassroots democracy – a group of citizens who refused to be marginalized and spoke up for the health and wellbeing of their families and their environment.” Proximity to coal emissions can lead to a variety of respiratory diseases, including asthma and bronchitis, and can lead to premature death. The average income within three miles of Crawford is $11,097, and 83.9% of that population is composed of people of color. In the three miles surrounding Fisk, the average income is $15,065, and people of color make up 83.1% of the population. “Coal Blooded” was a coalition effort initiated by NAACP, Little Village Environmental Justice Organization and the Indigenous Environmental Network. Founded in 1909, the NAACP is the nation's oldest and largest civil rights organization. Its members throughout the United States and the world are the premier advocates for civil rights in their communities, conducting voter mobilization and monitoring equal opportunity in the public and private sectors.

#### These minority communities suffer the worst because coal plants dump their waste on the immediate surrounding areas

BLF, SOC, GCPA, and Clear Air, 2002. Black Leadership forum- Black leaders to grapple with issues of the deepest significance to African Americans, particularly civil rights and major public policy issues, BLF sponsored two international forums in Durban, South Africa, Today focuses on environmental justice. The Southern Organizing Committee for Economic and Social Justice- SOC was in the vanguard promoting community empowerment, capacity building and grassroots organizing, particularly in the South. Under the leadership of Connie Tucker who has served as the Executive Council of the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council, its Waste and Facility Siting Sub-committee, The Georgia Coalition for The Peoples’ Agenda- an advocacy organization that includes all of the major Civil Rights/Human Rights/Peace & Justice organizations around the state of Georgia. Dr. Joseph E. Lowery is the convener of this coalition. Dr. Joseph E. Lowery is minister in the [United Methodist Church](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Methodist_Church) and leader in the [American](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States) [civil rights](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Civil_Rights_Movement_%281955-1968%29) movement and effectively became Martin Luther King’s Immediate successor , Clear the Air- A joint project of three tasks forces: Clean Air Task Force, National Environmental Trust and U.S. PIRG Education Fund. The Clean Air Task Force is a non-profit organization dedicated to restoring clean air and healthy environments through scientific research, public education and legal advocacy. The National Environmental Trust is a non-profit, non-partisan organization dedicated to applying modern communications and public education techniques to environmental education and advocacy. The U.S. PIRG Education Fund is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that conducts independent research, and educates and organizes the public about a wide variety of environmental, consumer and government reform problems. *Air of injustice*. <http://www.catf.us/resources/publications/files/Air_of_Injustice.pdf>

People living near power plants can also be exposed to contaminants in power plant wastes. Power plant waste is largely made up of ash and other unburned materials that are left after the coal is burned. Each year more than 100 million tons of waste are generated from burning coal and oil. (32) These wastes contain high levels of metals like mercury, arsenic, lead, chromium, and cadmium. Disposal of power plant waste in unlined lagoons and landfills can contaminate groundwater (a source of drinking water) as can mine filling (dumping large volumes of combustion waste in abandoned mines). Power plant wastes are sometimes applied to agricultural fields, a practice that can directly contaminate the soil and can contaminate nearby areas with windblown dust.

#### Scenario 2: Warming

#### Climate change is coming now and is bearing a hugely disproportionate impact on those already at the greatest socioeconomic disadvantage, causing widespread physical displacement and death

Byravan and Rajan ’10 Sujatha Byravan and Sudhir Chella Rajan, “The Ethical Implications of Sea-Level Rise Due to Climate Change,” Ethics & International Affairs 24, No. 3, 9/20/2010, only accessible on some exclusive database

As scientific evidence for the adverse effects of human-induced climate change grows stronger, it is becoming increasingly clear that these questions are of urgent practical interest and require concerted international political action. In the course of this century and the next, the earth’s climate will almost surely get warmer as a direct result of the emissions accumulated in the atmosphere from the burning of fossil fuels since the Industrial Revolution. This warming will very likely result in heat waves, heavy precipitation in some areas, extreme droughts in others, increased hurricane intensity, and sea-level rise of about one meter—although recent findings suggest this rise could quite plausibly be greater than that by century’s end.1 Forecasts of how many people will be displaced by 2050 by climate change vary widely, from about 25 million to 1 billion. The difficulty in accurate forecasting lies not only in the uncertainty regarding future climate change impacts and adaptation measures but also in estimating the outcome of the several complex factors driving migration.2 No other form of environmentally induced human migration will likely be as permanent as that caused by climate-induced SLR; and there are special reasons why its victims deserve unique moral consideration. SLR will affect coastal populations in a variety of ways, including inundation, flood and storm damage, erosion, saltwater intrusion, and wetland loss. Together, these will greatly reduce available land for cultivation, water resources, and fodder, causing severe hardship in terms of livelihood and habitat loss. Worst of all, SLR and the associated changes in the coastal zone will add burdens to many who are already poor and vulnerable. The physical changes associated with SLR may themselves take place in abrupt, nonlinear ways as thresholds are crossed. In turn, the least resilient communities— that is, those dependent on subsistence fishing—will be the first to experience ‘‘tipping points’’ in their life systems, so that the only option available to them would be to abandon their homes and search for better prospects elsewhere. As the average sea level continues to rise, coastal inundation, saltwater intrusion, and storm surges will become more intense and people will find it increasingly difficult to stay in their homes and will look for ways to migrate inland. As ever larger numbers pass thresholds in their ability to cope, more societal tipping points will be crossed, resulting in the sudden mass movements of entire villages, towns, and cities in coastal regions.3 On small islands and in countries with heavily populated delta regions, the very existence of the nation-state may become jeopardized, so that the extremely vulnerable will no longer have state protection they can rely on. The extent of vulnerability to sea-level rise in any given country will depend on more than just its terrain and climatic conditions: the fraction of the population living in low-lying regions, the area and proportion of the country inundated, its wealth and economic conditions, and its prevailing political institutions and infrastructure will all be of relevance. Thus, in a large country, such as the United States or China, coastal communities would be able to move inland, given adequate preparation and government response. In the case of small islands in the South Pacific, however, such an option does not exist, since it is expected that most or even the entire land area will sink or become uninhabitable. In such cases as Bangladesh, Egypt, Guyana, and Vietnam, where nearly half or more of the populations live in low-lying deltaic regions that support a major fraction of their economies, SLR will threaten the very functioning of the state. Moreover, it is increasingly clear that for tens to hundreds of millions of people living in low-lying areas and on small islands, no physical defense is realistically possible or can be fully protective. A recent report by the Dutch Delta Committee proposes annual investments of about 1.5 billion Euros for the rest of the century just to protect the Netherlands’ 200-mile coastline, and indicates that 20–50 percent of coastal land worldwide cannot be protected, especially under conditions where SLR takes place rapidly—as a result, say, of a collapse of major ice sheets in Greenland or Antarctica.4 Even if greenhouse gases are removed from the atmosphere through some future technology, we are already committed to a certain degree of warming and sea-level rise because of the thermal inertia of the oceans. In addition, most residents of small island nations and other low-lying coastal regions around the world will not be able to avail themselves of the sorts of conventional adaptation remedies that are conceivable for the victims of drought, reduced crop yields, desertification, and so on. Apart from exceptional cases where adequate engineering solutions can be developed to prevent inundation, coastal erosion, saltwater intrusion, and other challenges associated with rising seas, people living in these vulnerable regions will be forced to flee, generally with no possibility of return to their original homes. Indeed, migration and permanent resettlement will be the only possible ‘‘adaptation’’ strategy available to millions. Existing international law provides no solution for these individuals, for whom, we will argue, the only just remedy is in the form of special rights of free global movement and resettlement in regions and countries on higher ground in advance of disaster. What Needs to Be Done The issue of climate change and migration has received considerable scholarly attention, primarily in terms of its political and legal implications, but there has been little focus on the ethical aspects.5 In an earlier paper we suggested that the responsibility of absorbing ‘‘climate exiles’’ should be shared among host countries in a manner that is proportional to a host’s cumulative emissions of greenhouse gases.6 Here, we try to develop the ethical basis for the international community, first, to recognize that displaced persons, and in particular those whose nation states will have become physically nonexistent or will face an unendurable burden, should have a special right to free movement to other countries; and, second, to formulate institutional means for providing them political, social, and economic rights. We define the victims’ unbearable burden in the following terms: they will face a breakdown or total forfeiture of prevailing physical, economic, and social support systems; and they will have no effective state to endow them with rights and alleviate their pain. It is not our intention to provide a particular formula for how individual countries should be made responsible for the victims’ habitation and citizenship, but to suggest instead that once the basic principle of shared responsibility based on each country’s contribution to climate change is accepted, there could be several ways to determine precisely how the costs of policy implementation should be distributed, how rights could be exercised by the climate exiles and migrants, and what other institutional and political mechanisms should be established to avert a massive refugee crisis. The fairest solution, we therefore propose, is for the international community to grant, in the first instance, the individual right to migrate to safe countries for those who will be displaced forcibly by SLR. We then recommend that an international treaty begin to address this issue so that climate migrants and future exiles will be able to find homes well in advance of the actual emergency.7 Indeed, unlike in the case of natural disasters, such as the Asian tsunami of December 2004, the world is already sufficiently forewarned about the need to prepare for the effects of SLR and has ample time and opportunity to make reasoned judgments about how best to respond.8 We contend that the alternative—to ignore potential victims until after they become ‘‘environmental refugees’’—is morally indefensible as well as impractical. For one thing, the victims in the case of SLR cannot even be classified as ‘‘refugees’’ since there are no legal instruments that give them this option. Notably, the Refugee Convention, designed to protect those forced to flee their homes as a result of war or persecution, in force since 1954, recognizes as a refugee someone who is ‘‘unable [or] unwilling to avail himself of the protection’’ of his country of nationality and is outside that country ‘‘owing to well-grounded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion’’—a definition that does not extend to those adversely affected by environmental disasters, including climatic change. In this paper and elsewhere we therefore reserve the terms ‘‘climate migrants’’ and ‘‘climate exiles’’ to refer to the victims of SLR attributed to climate change. The former includes all those who are displaced because of the effects of climate change, while the latter refers to a special category of climate migrants who will have lost their ability to remain well-functioning members of political societies in their countries, often through no fault of their own. Further, while most climate migrants will be internally displaced people, or have the opportunity of returning to their countries or regions of origin if adequate adaptation measures were taken, climate exiles will be forced to become permanently stateless in the absence of other remedies. Duties to Climate Exiles Our fundamental argument is that humanity carries a special obligation to present and future generations of people whose homes, means of livelihood, and membership in states will be lost specifically as a result of sea-level rise caused by climate change. We draw upon the principle of intergenerational equity, wherein each generation is collectively responsible for protecting and using natural resources in a sustainable manner so that future generations are not unduly harmed by their present misuse. The recognition of this duty implies, as Joerg Tremmel suggests, that ‘‘in spite of the difficulties such as opportunity costs, restricted human ability and foresight, modern collective agents (present governments and leading industrial companies) have to take their responsibility for future generations seriously.’’9 This responsibility is carried over to representative agents in the future who share the legacy of causing harm with their forebears but who now have the ability to recognize the suffering that ensues as a result of historical (if not continuing) actions and can therefore make amends to the sufferers who live in their midst. As we discuss later, this is not always equivalent to an argument for making reparations for past injury.

#### Small Modular Reactors achieve significant GHG reductions

Rosner, Goldberg, and Hezir et. al. ‘11 (Robert Rosner, Robert Rosner is an astrophysicist and founding director of the Energy Policy Institute at Chicago. He was the director of Argonne National Laboratory from 2005 to 2009, and Stephen Goldberg, Energy Policy Institute at Chicago, The Harris School of Public Policy Studies, Joseph S. Hezir, Principal, EOP Foundation, Inc., Many people have made generous and valuable contributions to this study. Professor Geoff Rothwell, Stanford University, provided the study team with the core and supplemental analyses and very timely and pragmatic advice. Dr. J’Tia Taylor, Argonne National Laboratory, supported Dr. Rothwell in these analyses. Deserving special mention is Allen Sanderson of the Economics Department at the University of Chicago, who provided insightful comments and suggested improvements to the study. Constructive suggestions have been received from Dr. Pete Lyons, DOE Assistant Secretary of Nuclear Energy; Dr. Pete Miller, former DOE Assistant Secretary of Nuclear Energy; John Kelly, DOE Deputy Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Reactor Technologies; Matt Crozat, DOE Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy; Vic Reis, DOE Senior Advisor to the Under Secretary for Science; and Craig Welling, DOE Deputy Office Director, Advanced Reactor Concepts Office, as well as Tim Beville and the staff of DOE’s Advanced Reactor Concepts Office. The study team also would like to acknowledge the comments and useful suggestions the study team received during the peer review process from the nuclear industry, the utility sector, and the financial sector. Reviewers included the following: Rich Singer, VP Fuels, Emissions, and Transportation, MidAmerican Energy Co.; Jeff Kaman, Energy Manager, John Deere; Dorothy R. Davidson, VP Strategic Programs, AREVA; T. J. Kim, Director—Regulatory Affairs & Licensing, Generation mPower, Babcock & Wilcox; Amir Shahkarami, Senior Vice President, Generation, Exelon Corp.; Michael G. Anness, Small Modular Reactor Product Manager, Research & Technology, Westinghouse Electric Co.; Matthew H. Kelley and Clark Mykoff, Decision Analysis, Research & Technology, Westinghouse Electric Co.; George A. Davis, Manager, New Plant Government Programs, Westinghouse Electric Co.; Christofer Mowry, President, Babcock & Wilcox Nuclear Energy, Inc.; Ellen Lapson, Managing Director, Fitch Ratings; Stephen A. Byrne, Executive Vice President, Generation & Transmission Chief Operating Officer, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company; Paul Longsworth, Vice President, New Ventures, Fluor; Ted Feigenbaum, Project Director, Bechtel Corp.; Kennette Benedict, Executive Director, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist; Bruce Landrey, CMO, NuScale; Dick Sandvik, NuScale; and Andrea Sterdis, Senior Manager of Strategic Nuclear Expansion, Tennessee Valley Authority. The authors especially would like to acknowledge the discerning comments from Marilyn Kray, Vice-President at Exelon, throughout the course of the study, “Small Modular Reactors – Key to Future Nuclear Power”, <http://epic.uchicago.edu/sites/epic.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/SMRWhite_Paper_Dec.14.2011copy.pdf>, November 2011, LEQ)

As stated earlier, SMRs have the potential to achieve significant greenhouse gas emission reductions. They could provide alternative base load power generation to facilitate the retirement of older, smaller, and less efficient coal generation plants that would, otherwise, not be good candidates for retrofitting carbon capture and storage technology. They could be deployed in regions of the U.S. and the world that have less potential for other forms of carbon-free electricity, such as solar or wind energy. There may be technical or market constraints, such as projected electricity demand growth and transmission capacity, which would support SMR deployment but not GW-scale LWRs. From the on-shore manufacturing perspective, a key point is that the manufacturing base needed for SMRs can be developed domestically. Thus, while the large commercial LWR industry is seeking to transplant portions of its supply chain from current foreign sources to the U.S., the SMR industry offers the potential to establish a large domestic manufacturing base building upon already existing U.S. manufacturing infrastructure and capability, including the Naval shipbuilding and underutilized domestic nuclear component and equipment plants. The study team learned that a number of sustainable domestic jobs could be created – that is, the full panoply of design, manufacturing, supplier, and construction activities – if the U.S. can establish itself as a credible and substantial designer and manufacturer of SMRs. While many SMR technologies are being studied around the world, a strong U.S. commercialization program can enable U.S. industry to be first to market SMRs, thereby serving as a fulcrum for export growth as well as a lever in influencing international decisions on deploying both nuclear reactor and nuclear fuel cycle technology. A viable U.S.-centric SMR industry would enable the U.S. to recapture technological leadership in commercial nuclear technology, which has been lost to suppliers in France, Japan, Korea, Russia, and, now rapidly emerging, China.

#### This debate space is key- *repeated messages* in the public sphere are necessary – the status quo de-emphasizes warming- incorrect information is running rampant

**Romm ‘12** (Joe Romm is a Fellow at American Progress and is the editor of Climate Progress, which New York Times columnist Tom Friedman called "the indispensable blog" and Time magazine named one of the 25 “Best Blogs of 2010.″ In 2009, Rolling Stone put Romm #88 on its list of 100 “people who are reinventing America.” Time named him a “Hero of the Environment″ and “The Web’s most influential climate-change blogger.” Romm was acting assistant secretary of energy for energy efficiency and renewable energy in 1997, where he oversaw $1 billion in R&D, demonstration, and deployment of low-carbon technology. He is a Senior Fellow at American Progress and holds a Ph.D. in physics from MIT., 2/26/2012, “Apocalypse Not: The Oscars, The Media And The Myth of ‘Constant Repetition of Doomsday Messages’ on Climate”, <http://thinkprogress.org/romm/2012/02/26/432546/apocalypse-not-oscars-media-myth-of-repetition-of-doomsday-messages-on-climate/#more-432546>)

The two greatest myths about global warming communications are 1) constant repetition of doomsday messages has been a major, ongoing strategy and 2) that strategy doesn’t work and indeed is actually counterproductive! These myths are so deeply ingrained in the environmental and progressive political community that when we finally had a serious shot at a climate bill, the powers that be decided not to focus on the threat posed by climate change in any serious fashion in their $200 million communications effort (see my 6/10 post “Can you solve global warming without talking about global warming?“). These myths are so deeply ingrained in the mainstream media that such messaging, when it is tried, is routinely attacked and denounced — and the flimsiest studies are interpreted exactly backwards to drive the erroneous message home (see “Dire straits: Media blows the story of UC Berkeley study on climate messaging“) The only time anything approximating this kind of messaging — not “doomsday” but what I’d call blunt, science-based messaging that also makes clear the problem is solvable — was in 2006 and 2007 with the release of An Inconvenient Truth (and the 4 assessment reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and media coverage like the April 2006 cover of Time). The data suggest that strategy measurably moved the public to become more concerned about the threat posed by global warming (see recent study here). You’d think it would be pretty obvious that the public is not going to be concerned about an issue unless one explains why they should be concerned about an issue. And the social science literature, including the vast literature on advertising and marketing, could not be clearer that only repeated messages have any chance of sinking in and moving the needle. Because I doubt any serious movement of public opinion or mobilization of political action could possibly occur until these myths are shattered, I’ll do a multipart series on this subject, featuring public opinion analysis, quotes by leading experts, and the latest social science research. Since this is Oscar night, though, it seems appropriate to start by looking at what messages the public are exposed to in popular culture and the media. It ain’t doomsday. Quite the reverse, climate change has been mostly an invisible issue for several years and the message of conspicuous consumption and business-as-usual reigns supreme. The motivation for this post actually came up because I received an e-mail from a journalist commenting that the “constant repetition of doomsday messages” doesn’t work as a messaging strategy. I had to demur, for the reasons noted above. But it did get me thinking about what messages the public are exposed to, especially as I’ve been rushing to see the movies nominated for Best Picture this year. I am a huge movie buff, but as parents of 5-year-olds know, it isn’t easy to stay up with the latest movies. That said, good luck finding a popular movie in recent years that even touches on climate change, let alone one a popular one that would pass for doomsday messaging. Best Picture nominee The Tree of Life has been billed as an environmental movie — and even shown at environmental film festivals — but while it is certainly depressing, climate-related it ain’t. In fact, if that is truly someone’s idea of environmental movie, count me out. The closest to a genuine popular climate movie was the dreadfully unscientific The Day After Tomorrow, which is from 2004 (and arguably set back the messaging effort by putting the absurd “global cooling” notion in people’s heads! Even Avatar, the most successful movie of all time and “the most epic piece of environmental advocacy ever captured on celluloid,” as one producer put it, omits the climate doomsday message. One of my favorite eco-movies, “Wall-E, is an eco-dystopian gem and an anti-consumption movie,” but it isn’t a climate movie. I will be interested to see The Hunger Games, but I’ve read all 3 of the bestselling post-apocalyptic young adult novels — hey, that’s my job! — and they don’t qualify as climate change doomsday messaging (more on that later). So, no, the movies certainly don’t expose the public to constant doomsday messages on climate. Here are the key points about what repeated messages the American public is exposed to: The broad American public is exposed to virtually no doomsday messages, let alone constant ones, on climate change in popular culture (TV and the movies and even online). There is not one single TV show on any network devoted to this subject, which is, arguably, more consequential than any other preventable issue we face. The same goes for the news media, whose coverage of climate change has collapsed (see “Network News Coverage of Climate Change Collapsed in 2011“). When the media do cover climate change in recent years, the overwhelming majority of coverage is devoid of any doomsday messages — and many outlets still feature hard-core deniers. Just imagine what the public’s view of climate would be if it got the same coverage as, say, unemployment, the housing crisis or even the deficit? When was the last time you saw an “employment denier” quoted on TV or in a newspaper? The public is exposed to constant messages promoting business as usual and indeed idolizing conspicuous consumption. See, for instance, “Breaking: The earth is breaking … but how about that Royal Wedding? Our political elite and intelligentsia, including MSM pundits and the supposedly “liberal media” like, say, MSNBC, hardly even talk about climate change and when they do, it isn’t doomsday. Indeed, there isn’t even a single national columnist for a major media outlet who writes primarily on climate. Most “liberal” columnists rarely mention it. At least a quarter of the public chooses media that devote a vast amount of time to the notion that global warming is a hoax and that environmentalists are extremists and that clean energy is a joke. In the MSM, conservative pundits routinely trash climate science and mock clean energy. Just listen to, say, Joe Scarborough on MSNBC’s Morning Joe mock clean energy sometime. The major energy companies bombard the airwaves with millions and millions of dollars of repetitious pro-fossil-fuel ads. The environmentalists spend far, far less money. As noted above, the one time they did run a major campaign to push a climate bill, they and their political allies including the president explicitly did NOT talk much about climate change, particularly doomsday messaging Environmentalists when they do appear in popular culture, especially TV, are routinely mocked. There is very little mass communication of doomsday messages online. Check out the most popular websites. General silence on the subject, and again, what coverage there is ain’t doomsday messaging. Go to the front page of the (moderately trafficked) environmental websites. Where is the doomsday? If you want to find anything approximating even modest, blunt, science-based messaging built around the scientific literature, interviews with actual climate scientists and a clear statement that we can solve this problem — well, you’ve all found it, of course, but the only people who see it are those who go looking for it. Of course, this blog is not even aimed at the general public. Probably 99% of Americans haven’t even seen one of my headlines and 99.7% haven’t read one of my climate science posts. And Climate Progress is probably the most widely read, quoted, and reposted climate science blog in the world. Anyone dropping into America from another country or another planet who started following popular culture and the news the way the overwhelming majority of Americans do would get the distinct impression that nobody who matters is terribly worried about climate change. And, of course, they’d be right — see “The failed presidency of Barack Obama, Part 2.” It is total BS that somehow the American public has been scared and overwhelmed by repeated doomsday messaging into some sort of climate fatigue. If the public’s concern has dropped — and public opinion analysis suggests it has dropped several percent (though is bouncing back a tad) — that is primarily due to the conservative media’s disinformation campaign impact on Tea Party conservatives and to the treatment of this as a nonissue by most of the rest of the media, intelligentsia and popular culture.

#### Students interrogating environmental issues is critical to developing sustainable solutions

Cotgrave and Alkhaddar 6– Alison Cotgrave has a PhD in Sustainability Literacy, she is currently the Deputy Director of the School of the Built Environment and a researcher in construction education, she is also a Fellow of the Higher Education Academy, Rafid Alkhaddar has a PhD in Civil Engineering and currently teaches at the School of the Built Environment John Moores University in Liverpool as a Professor of Water and Environmental Engineering (March 2006, “Greening the Curricula within Construction Programmes,” Journal for Education in the Built Environment, Vol.1, Issue 1, March 2006 pp. 3-29, http://131.251.248.49/jebe/pdf/AlisonCotgrave1(1).pdf)

Environmental education

Many writers have determined that the main aim of environmental education is to change attitudes, that will in turn change behaviour. As long ago as 1976, Ramsey and Rickson identified that it has long been known that the basis for many environmental problems is irresponsible behaviour. Without a doubt, one of the most important influences on behaviour is attitude, that in turn is influenced by education. Campbell Bradley et al. (1999) stress the need for trying to change young people’s environmental attitudes because young people ultimately will be affected by, and will need to provide, solutions to environmental problems arising from present day actions. As future policymakers, the youth of today will be responsible for ‘fixing’ the environment and they will be the ones who must be persuaded to act now in order to avoid paying a high price to repair damage to the environment in the future, if indeed it is repairable. Therefore it appears that effective environmental education, which changes the attitudes of young people, is crucial. The (then) Department for Education (DFE) report, commonly known as the ‘Toyne Report’ (DFE, 1993), concluded that as education seeks to lead opinion, it will do so more effectively if it keeps in mind the distinctive nature of its mission, which is first and foremost to improve its students’ understanding. Their concern may well be awakened as a result; but it must be a properly informed concern. This does not necessarily mean treating the environment as a purely scientific issue, but does mean that the respective roles of science and ethics need to be distinguished, and the complexities of each need to be acknowledged. **Failure to do this may lead all too readily to an ‘environmentalism’ which**, by depicting possibilities as certainties, **can only discredit itself in the long run** and feed the complacency which it seeks to dispel. McKeown-Ice and Dendinger (2000) have identified the fact that scientific knowledge and political intervention will not solve the environmental problem on their own, thus implying that something additional is required to change behaviour. As has already been discussed, behaviour changes can only occur if attitudes change and this can be achieved through education. As Fien (1997) identifies, environmental education can play a key role by creating awareness, and changing people’s values, skills and behaviour. Introducing environmental elements into the curriculum can therefore be seen as a potentially effective way of transferring knowledge. This should in turn improve attitudes that will lead to improvements in environmental behaviour. Graham (2000) believes that it is crucial that building professionals not only participate in the creation of projects that have low environmental impact, but equally it is important that they learn to conceive, nurture, promote and facilitate the kind of paradigm changes seen as necessary to create a sustainable society. There are however limitations as to what education can achieve on its own, for as Jucker (2002) believes, if we do not do everything we can to transform our political, economic and social systems into more sustainable structures, we might as well forget the educational part.

# Solvency

#### Thorium reactors resolve status quo waste

Lerner 12 (George, president of Lerner Consulting, a consulting firm, "Can Use LFTRs to Consume Nuclear Waste," Jan 17, [liquidfluoridethoriumreactor.glerner.com/2012-can-use-lftrs-to-consume-nuclear-waste/], jam)

A LFTR can use all three of the available nuclear fuels: uranium-235 (what most reactors use, only 0.72% of naturally occurring uranium), uranium-233 (which is bred in the reactor from thorium-232), or plutonium-239 (bred from uranium-238, 99.28% of natural uranium). LFTRs can consume long-term nuclear waste from other reactors, nuclear weapons, or depleted uranium (any isotope of U, Pu or transuranic elements). Because a LFTR fissions 99%+ of the fuel (whether from Thorium or nuclear waste), it consumes all the uranium and transuranics leaving no long-term radioactive waste. 83% of the waste products are safely stabilized within 10 years. The remaining 17% need to be stored less than 350 years to become completely benign. “LFTR technology can also be used to reprocess and consume the remaining fissile material in spent nuclear fuel stockpiles around the world and to extract and resell many of the other valuable fission byproducts that are currently deemed hazardous waste in their current spent fuel rod form. The U.S. nuclear industry has already allocated $25 billion for storage or reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel and the world currently has over 340,000 tonnes of spent LWR fuel with enough usable fissile material to start one 100 MWe LFTR per day for 93 years. (A 100 MW LFTR requires 100 kg of fissile material (U-233, U-235, or Pu-239) to start the chain reaction). LFTR can also be used to consume existing U-233 stockpiles at ORNL ($500 million allocated for stockpile destruction) and plutonium from weapons stockpiles.” FLiBe Energy FS-MSRs essentially avoid the entire fuel qualification issue in that they are tolerant of any fissile material composition, with their inherent strong negative thermal reactivity feedback providing the control necessary to accommodate a shifting fuel feed stream. Fast Spectrum Molten Salt Reactor Options, Oak Ridge National Laboratory Transuranics (Np, Pu, Am, Cm) are the real reason for “Yucca Mountain” repositories [with PWR/LWR]. All MSR designs can take TRUs from other reactors into the reactor to fission off. TEAC3 Dr. David LeBlanc A 1GW MSR would consume almost 1 ton of “spent” nuclear fuel/year. 340,000 tons of spent nuclear fuel in the world (and more each year). Although costly to extract from fuel rods, 6600 tons of it in MSRs could replace all the coal, oil, natural gas, and uranium the world used in 2007. Since MSRs can be built on assembly lines, build 6600 x 1GW Molten Salt Reactors, have them operate for 30 years and rebuild once, and we eliminate All current spent nuclear fuel stockpiles. Generates 6600 GW electricity for 60 years, and/or use heat from the reactors, water and CO2, to make carbon-neutral car and truck fuel!

#### Therefor: Jacob and I believe that The United States Federal Government should not have restrictions on thorium small modular reactors.

# 2ac

# cards

**“you have to fix the energy source because you’re not going to fix warming”**

Tat ‘12 (Chee Hong Tat, Chief Executive, Energy Market Authority of Singapore, “Singapore International Market Week Publication”, “SECURING OUR ENERGY FUTURE APRIL 2012”, LEQ)

Nuclear Faces The Long Road Back For the nuclear industry, recovery will depend on turning around public opinion u For the nuclear industry, Fukushima will stand as the fault line dividing two eras. Before the catastrophic events of March 2011, nuclear energy had been reborn as the clean energy of choice, having emerged from decades as the pariah of the energy family. But the earthquake and tsunami that ripped through the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant changed all of that, radically altering the energy landscape. For the atomic energy sector, it will be a long, hard and expensive road back. "Since the Fukushima disaster in Japan, the EU has begun to carry out comprehensive stress tests at its nuclear power plants," European Commissioner for Energy Mr GÜnther Oettinger said in a video pre- recorded for the Singapore International Energy Week (SIEW) 2011. "It [also] aims to put in place the most advanced legal framework for the sustainable use of nuclear energy." If anything, the Fukushima disaster has shown that nuclear power cannot operate in isolation, requiring instead a comprehensive and global approach to safety. "To strengthen nuclear safety world- wide, we would welcome other countries operating nuclear power plants to carry out similar assessments as soon as pos- sible," Mr Oettinger added. The International Energy Agency (IEA) has painted a gloomy picture of a world with what it calls a "low nuclear case". A reduced nuclear output will lead to "increased import bills, heightened energy security concerns, and make it harder and more expensive to combat climate change." In the immediate aftermath of the Fukushima disaster, Germany, Europe's biggest economy, closed eight of its 17 reactors permanently. It later formally announced plans to shut down its nuclear programme within 11 years. While nuclear has made a muted comeback since Fukushima – the US recently reaffirmed its commitment to nuclear by opening two new nuclear units, the first in 15 years, experts see continuing challenges that will make it very difficult for the nuclear power industry to expand beyond a small handful of reactor projects. China promises that nuclear can be made safer. In particular, its research into safer thorium fuel cycle technology has been applauded by the nuclear lobby. Despite this, experts say nuclear programmes worldwide are set to contract rather than expand. The low nuclear case foresees the total amount of nuclear power capacity fall- ing from 393GW at the end of 2010 to 335GW in 2035, a little more than half the levels previously set out in IEA's New Policies Scenario. New Policies Scenario The share of nuclear power in total gen- eration will drop from 13 per cent in 2010 to just seven per cent in 2035, with implications for energy security, diversity of the fuel mix, spending on energy imports, and energy-related CO2 emissions. "It is clear now that without nuclear, we cannot meet CO2 reduction targets," said IEA's former Executive Director, Mr Nobuo Tanaka, when he opened SIEW 2011 with his keynote lecture. Or, as the agency’s Chief Economist, Dr Fatih Birol, posits – make power in general "viciously more expensive" and close the door to 2°C forever. A shift away from nuclear power "would definitely be bad news for energy security, for climate change and also for the eco- A shift away from nuclear power would definitely be bad news for energy security, for climate change, and also for the economics of the electricity price nomics of the electricity price," he added. Research into small modular reactors (SMR) is still in its infancy although the reduced cost of a 10MW modular unit that could power about 7,000 homes, compared with the one million homes from a conven- tional reactor, is receiving attention. ThE EvEr- ShriNkiNG piE The drastically-altered landscape can be seen in IEA projections for nuclear. Under its 2010 outlook, there was to be a 90 per cent increase in nuclear capacity. This compares with its latest projection of 60 per cent for the same period from 2011. While there will now be heavy reliance on the lighter emissions of gas to meet green house targets, the nuclear disaster has been an unexpected fillip for the renewables and alternative energy sector. The rise was driven by the solar power industry, where the value of transac- tions jumped by 56 per cent to $15.8 billion, to account for almost one-third of take-overs, according to advisory firm PricewaterhouseCoopers. Nevertheless, analysts say any surge in renewable energy is likely to be eclipsed by a return to coal, with a powerfully negative effect on CO2 emissions. Even before the Japanese earthquake, the nuclear industry was struggling. Weak power demand due to the reces-sion and cheaper alternatives such as gas and coal made it difficult to justify the hefty investment in reactors. Only those plants with strong government backing were going ahead. With nuclear-agnostic countries dropping plans for civil nuclear indus- tries, China remains the last hope of the beleaguered sector. While China froze approvals of new nuclear plants follow- ing Fukushima, it has already restarted its programme and the country is set to dominate the nuclear landscape. The PRC's 2020 target of reaching 80,000MW of nuclear capacity, from 10,000MW last year, may have been reduced due to delays caused by Fukush- ima. Nevertheless, its ambitious projects are putting most of the other countries' nuclear plans in the shade. Meanwhile, other emerging econo- mies, including India and the United Arab Emirates, are also planning signifi- cant investments in new reactors. Nuclear’s share of electricity generation is also likely to slip as other forms of generation grow more quickly. In the developed world, the emphasis is on finding alternatives to nuclear power. In Japan, which derived some 30 per cent of its electricity from nuclear power plants prior to Fukushima, efforts to regain public support for restarting the re- actors have made little headway. Since the tsunami, 52 out of the nation's 54 reactors have been offline as of March 2012. One important litmus of the industry's health has been companies that service the nuclear energy marketplace. They, too, have been repositioning themselves in an increasingly unattractive market. Shaw, the US civil engineering com- pany, has sold its 20 per cent stake in nuclear engineering group Westinghouse Electric Company to Toshiba of Japan. Toshiba, for its part, plans to sell the holding to another investor. General Electric, the US industrial group that is one of the world's lead- ing nuclear engineers through its joint venture with Hitachi of Japan, has said it does not hold out much hope for market growth in the immediate future. It now expects nuclear power to decline in importance as other parts of the business grow more rapidly.

**The aff is holding the federal government accountable for warming – that’s critical to sustainable solutions to climate change**

George Monbiot, journalist, academic, and political and environmental activist, 2004, Manifesto for a New World Order, p. 11-13

The quest for global solutions is difficult and divisive. Some members of this movement are deeply suspicious of all institutional power at the global level, fearing that it could never be held to account by the world’s people. Others are concerned that a single set of universal prescriptions would threaten the diversity of dissent. A smaller faction has argued that all political programmes are oppressive: our task should not be to replace one form of power with another, but to replace all power with a magical essence called ‘anti-power’.  But most of the members of this movement are coming to recognize that if we propose solutions which can be effected only at the local or the national level, we remove ourselves from any meaningful role in solving precisely those problems which most concern us. Issues such as climate change, international debt, nuclear proliferation, war, peace and the balance of trade between nations can be addressed only globally or internationally. Without global measures and global institutions, it is impossible to see how we might distribute wealth from rich nations to poor ones, tax the mobile rich and their even more mobile money, control the shipment of toxic waste, sustain the ban on landmines, prevent the use of nuclear weapons, broker peace between nations or prevent powerful states from forcing weaker ones to trade on their terms. If we were to work only at the local level, we would leave these, the most critical of issues, for other people to tackle. Global governance will take place whether we participate in it or not. Indeed, it must take place if the issues which concern us are not to be resolved by the brute force of the powerful. That the international institutions have been designed or captured by the dictatorship of vested interests is not an argument against the existence of international institutions, but a reason for overthrowing them and replacing them with our own. It is an argument for a global political system which holds power to account. In the absence of an effective global politics, moreover, local solutions will always be undermined by communities of interest which do not share our vision. We might, for example, manage to persuade the people of the street in which we live to give up their cars in the hope of preventing climate change, but unless everyone, in all communities, either shares our politics or is bound by the same rules, we simply open new road space into which the neighbouring communities can expand. We might declare our neighbourhood nuclear-free, but unless we are simultaneously working, at the international level, for the abandonment of nuclear weapons, we can do nothing to prevent ourselves and everyone else from being threatened by people who are not as nice as we are. We would deprive ourselves, in other words, of the power of restraint. By first rebuilding the global politics, we establish the political space in which our local alternatives can flourish. If, by contrast, we were to leave the governance of the necessary global institutions to others, then those institutions will pick off our local, even our national, solutions one by one. There is little point in devising an alternative economic policy for your nation, as Luis Inacio ‘Lula’ da Silva, now president of Brazil, once advocated, if the International Monetary Fund and the financial speculators have not first been overthrown. There is little point in fighting to protect a coral reef from local pollution, if nothing has been done to prevent climate change from destroying the conditions it requires for its survival.

**Further action is necessary**

**Cuomo ’11**

(Chris Professor of Philosophy and Women's Studies, and an affiliate faculty member of the Environmental Ethics Certificate Program and the Institute for African-American Studies. The author and editor of many articles and several books in feminist, postcolonial, and environmental philosophy, Cuomo served as Director of the Institute for Women's Studies from 2006-2009. Her book, The Philosopher Queen, a reflection on post-9/11 anti-war feminist politics, was nominated for a Lambda Award and an APA book award, and her work in ecofeminist philosophy and creative interdiciplinary practice has been influential among those seeking to bring together social justice and environmental concerns, as well as theory and practice. She has been a recipient of research grants from the Rockefeller Foundation, the National Science Foundation, the Ms. Foundation, the National Council for Research on Women, and the Institute for Sustainability and Technology Policy, and she has been a visiting faculty member at Cornell University, Amherst College, and Murdoch University in Perth, Australia, “Climate Change, Vulnerability, and Responsibility,” Hypatia 26 no4 Fall 2011 p. 690-714, AM)

It is an important but rarely emphasized fact that reductions that average consumers can control, such as household emissions and personal transportation, are insufficient to bring greenhouse gas concentrations down to safer levels, because household consumption and personal transportation account for a significant but minority slice of total greenhouse gas emissions worldwide (see Figure 1). I’ll call this the “insufficiency” problem. Globally, emissions from the residential sector coupled with transportation equals less than 20% of total emissions. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency reports that in 2008, 21% of American CO2 emissions were from the residential sector, 19% were commercial, 27% were industrial, and 32% were from transportation, with just over half of that attributable to personal vehicle use. In addition, nearly all non-carbon greenhouse gas emissions (methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, etc.) are from the agricultural, industrial, and commercial sectors (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2010). Even if personal sphere reductions that can be directly controlled by individuals and households are ethically imperative, they are insufficient for adequate mitigation.9 If a miracle were to occur and all automobile use was replaced by carbon-neutral transportation, larger-scale reductions that can only be achieved by metalevel emitters such as corporations and governments would still be necessary to avert climate disaster. Perhaps the easiest way to contribute to carbon mitigation is to stop eating beef and pork, but if our vegetable-based diets are produced through fuel- and chemical-intensive agricultural and commercial processes, the policies, practices, and profit motives of meta-level actors and decision- makers still dramatically limit the efficacy of individual efforts (Carlsson-Kanyama 1998; Carlsson-Kanyama and Gonza´lez, 2009). In addition to the insufficiency problem there is also a problem of widespread disempowerment associated with personal and household efforts, because fossil-fuel consumption is rarely simply a personal decision. The options that most individuals are able to consider regarding energy and technology use are determined externally, and fossil-fuel use is woven into any household routine or local culture in ways that are very difficult to change without causing other problems. Again, power and control are relevant, for many people have little control over their general energy consumption options, such as the accessibility of public transportation, locally grown food, or renewable energy sources. When suggesting actions for those who care about climate change, popular environmentalist discourse tends to emphasize personal responsibility, or the need to shift desires on the demand side, but instant replacements for existing technologies, materials, and forms of transportation are not readily available everywhere. Any one individual or household’s contributions to greenhouse-gas emissions represents a drop in the bucket of total emissions, but eliminating or drastically reducing them can require a great deal of effort in the context of an individual life, including significant investments of time or money. The force of daily pressures can make it very difficult even to curb appliance use or change travel patterns. Moreover, the exertion of effort required to adequately reduce personal emissions does not promise an equally high payoff, because one is assured that her reductions will matter only if many others act in accord. One may feel a sense of responsibility about climate change and want to do her part to address it, but if she has few alternatives available, she may end up feeling disempowered and more frustrated than enabled by her sense of personal responsibility. The awareness that one’s efforts are costly but of potentially very low impact can intensify disempowerment and erode one’s motivation to keep up the effort. Also contributing to the problem is the public’s lack of faith in higher-level decision-makers. It is arguably a sign of disempowerment in the extreme that the “things to do” list accompanying the film starring the environmentalist former Vice President Al Gore includes nary a suggestion about political action or involvement. Disempowerment and awareness of the insufficiency of one’s own actions can be psychologically and cognitively debilitating. Studies show that there is a tendency for people to develop coping strategies such as denial in the face of cognitive dissonance or information about situations they have little power to change, and avoidant denial is all the more attractive when the truth is painful, depressing, or costly, as the truth about climate change certainly seems to be. According to conservation psychologists Susan Clayton and Gene Myers, If … (one) perceives high threat and believes they have low coping ability, they will use emotion-focused coping. In emotionfocused coping, the person tries to lessen or tolerate fear, anxiety, and helplessness by emotional means such as avoidance, denial, wishful thinking, religious faith, fatalism, and normalization/desensitization— believing the situation is normal and becoming numb. (Clayton and Myers 2009, 27) Perhaps we are not to blame for going numb in relation to global warming and climate change, for if individual consumers cannot directly reduce emissions to a sufficient degree, and higher-level ethical agents seem bent on carrying on with business as usual, then why not just check out, or party like it’s the end of the world?

Even if they want to change they can’t – personal narratives alone are insufficient – a coupling of strategies is key

**Jackson**, 20**12** (Tim, Fairly bright guy, *Prosperity Without Growth: Economics for a Finite Planet*, Kindle Locations 2803-2854)

The downshifting movement now has a surprising allegiance across a number of developed economies. A recent survey on downshifting in Australia found that 23 per cent of respondents had engaged in some form of downshifting in the five years prior to the study. A staggering 83 per cent felt that Australians are too materialistic. An earlier study in the US found that 28 per cent had taken some steps to simplify and 62 per cent expressed a willingness to do so. Very similar results have been found in Europe.23 Research on the success of these initiatives is quite limited. But the findings from studies that do exist are interesting. In the first place, the evidence confirms that ‘simplifiers’ appear to be happier. Consuming less, voluntarily, can improve subjective well-being – completely contrary to the conventional model.24 At the same time, intentional communities remain marginal. The spiritual basis for them doesn’t appeal to everyone, and the secular versions seem less resistant to the incursions of consumerism. Some of these initiatives depend heavily on having sufficient personal assets to provide the economic security needed to pursue a simpler lifestyle. More importantly, even those in the vanguard of social change turn out to be haunted by conflict – internal and external.25 These conflicts arise because people find themselves at odds with their own social world. Participation in the life of society becomes a challenge in its own right. People are trying to live, quite literally, in opposition to the structures and values that dominate society. In the normal course of events, these structures and values shape and constrain how people behave. They have a profound influence on how easy or hard it is to behave sustainably.26 The Role of Structural Change Examples of the perverse effect of dominant structures are legion: private transport is incentivized over public transport; motorists are prioritized over pedestrians; energy supply is subsidized and protected, while demand management is often chaotic and expensive; waste disposal is cheap, economically and behaviourally; recycling demands time and effort: ‘bring centres’ are few and far between and often overflowing with waste. Equally important are the subtle but damaging signals sent by government, regulatory frameworks, financial institutions, the media and our education systems: business salaries are higher than those in the public sector, particularly at the top; nurses and those in the caring professions are consistently less well paid; private investment is written down at high discount rates making longterm costs invisible; success is counted in terms of material status (salary, house size and so on); children are brought up as a ‘shopping generation’ – hooked on brand, celebrity and status.27 Policy and media messages about the recession underline this point. Opening a huge new shopping centre at the height of the financial crisis in October 2008, Mayor of London Boris Johnson spoke of persuading people to come out and spend their money, despite the credit crunch. Londoners had made a ‘prudent decision to give Thursday morning a miss and come shopping’, he said of the huge crowds who attended the opening.28 George W. Bush’s infamous call for people to ‘go out shopping’ in the wake of the 9/11 disaster is one of the most staggering examples of the same phenomenon. Little wonder that people trying to live more sustainably find themselves in conflict with the social world around them. These kinds of asymmetry represent a culture of consumption that sends all the wrong signals, penalizing pro-environmental behaviour, and making it all but impossible even for highly motivated people to act sustainably without personal sacrifice. It’s important to take this evidence seriously. As laboratories for social change, intentional households and communities are vital in pointing to the possibilities for flourishing within ecological limits. But they are also critical in highlighting the limits of voluntarism. Simplistic exhortations for people to resist consumerism are destined to failure. Particularly when the messages flowing from government are so painfully inconsistent. People readily identify this inconsistency and perceive it as hypocrisy. Or something worse. Under current conditions, it’s tantamount to asking people to give up key capabilities and freedoms as social beings. Far from being irrational to resist these demands, it would be irrational not to, in our society. Several lessons flow from this. The first is the obvious need for government to get its message straight. **Urging people to Act on CO2**, to insulate their homes, turn down their thermostat, put on a jumper, drive a little less, walk a little more, holiday at home, buy locally produced goods (and so on) **will either go unheard or be rejected as manipulation for as long as all the messages about high-street consumption point in the opposite direction**.29 Equally, **it’s clear that changing the social logic of consumption cannot simply be relegated to the realm of individual choice. In spite of a growing desire for change, it’s almost impossible for people to simply choose sustainable lifestyles, however much they’d like to. Even highly-motivated individuals experience conflict as they attempt to escape consumerism. And the chances of extending this behaviour across society are negligible without changes in the social structure**.

**time constraints make addressing every inequality in a single speech impossible and we shouldn’t lose because of it**

Rorty ‘2 (Professor of Comparative Literature @ Stanford, `02 (Richard, Peace Review, vol. 14, no. 2, p. 152-153)

I have no quarrel with Cornell's and Spivak's claim that "what is missing in a literary text or historical narrative leaves its mark through the traces of its expulsion." For that seems simply to say that any text will presuppose the existence of people, things, and institutions that it hardly mentions. So the readers of a literary text will always be able to ask themselves questions such as: "Who prepared the sumptuous dinner the lovers enjoyed?" "How did they get the money to afford that meal?" The reader of a historical narrative will always be able to wonder about where the money to finance the war came from and about who got to decide whether the war would take place. "Expulsion," however, seems too pejorative a term for the fact that no text can answer all possible questions about its own background and its own presuppositions. Consider Captain Birch, the agent of the East Indian Company charged with persuading the Rani of Sirmur not to commit suicide. Spivak is not exactly "expelling" Captain Birch from her narrative by zeroing in on the Rani, even though she does not try to find out much about Birch's early days as a subaltern, nor about the feelings of pride or shame or exasperation he may have experienced in the course of his conversations with the Rani. In the case of Birch, Spivak does not try to "gently blow precarious ashes into their ghostly shape," nor does she speculate about the possible sublimity of his career. Nor should she. S.ivak has her own fish to and her own witness to bear just as Kipling had his when he spun tales of the humiliations to which newly arrived subalterns were subjected in the regimental messes of the Raj. So do all authors of literary texts and historical narratives, and such texts and narratives should not always be read as disingenuous exercises in repression. They should be read as one version of a story that could have been told, and should be told, in many other ways.

# Aff is good

Waste – disproportionally affects minorities

Martin-Schramm 2005 (Jim, “Skull Valley: Nuclear Waste, Tribal Sovereignty, and Environmental Racism,” Journal of Lutheran Ethics (JLE) Volume 5, Issue 10 http://www.elca.org/What-We-Believe/Social-Issues/Journal-of-Lutheran-Ethics/Issues/October-2005/Skull-Valley-Nuclear-Waste-Tribal-Sovereignty-and-Environmental-Racism.aspx)

[24] From this overview, it is clear that the storage and ultimate disposal of high-level nuclear waste is a major public policy issue on the verge of becoming a national crisis. From California to New York, people all around the nation are saying, "Not in my backyard!" This NIMBY syndrome is behind the decision of Congress to focus solely on Yucca Mountain as a permanent repository. The NIMBY syndrome also fuels political and legal battles around the nation aimed at rejecting pleas by utilities to increase the amount of spent nuclear fuel that can be stored on a temporary basis in casks above ground. **All citizens of the United States must shoulder some of the reblame for failing to muster the political will to deal with this problem in an effective way. In many respects, U.S. citizens driven by the NIMBY syndrome have helped to drop this issue in the laps of the Goshutes**. After all, no other community in the nation has stepped forward to store high-level nuclear waste on either an interim or a permanent basis. Over 50 million people in the nation enjoy the benefits of nuclear power but refuse to accept the burdens associated with its waste. [25] Some environmentalists see this waste bottleneck as the most effective way to bring to an end the nuclear energy industry in the United States. When utilities run out of places to store spent nuclear fuel on an interim basis, federal law requires them to shut down the reactors. Over time, this means that people of the United States will have to find other ways to either produce or conserve twenty percent of the nation's current energy supply. Investments in renewable energy production, energy-efficient technologies, and changes in patterns of consumption could go a long way to meet this challenge, but none of these measures resolve the issue of what to do with the nuclear waste. [26] **Even if nuclear waste is not produced in the future, the United States is still faced with the challenge of storing temporarily or disposing permanently the high-level nuclear waste that has been produced to date**. This raises the question of whether it would be better to store existing stockpiles at over seventy locations around the country, or to consolidate these stockpiles in one place. PFS contends that it would be more cost-effective and easier to provide a high level of security if spent nuclear fuel was all stored in one place. The state of Utah, however, argues that if it is safe to store spent nuclear fuel where it is now, then it should remain where it is-presumably in perpetuity. [27] There lies the rub. The radioactivity of some elements in spent nuclear fuel has a half-life of at least 10,000 years. Is it morally responsible to store thousands of steel and concrete casks containing this waste above ground at dozens of locations around the nation for thousands of years? Is it safer to entomb such highly radioactive waste in a geological repository deep under ground? Like it or not, and absent any new alternative strategies, disposal underground still appears to be the best option.6 But Yucca Mountain is not open, and it is not clear it will open any time soon. If the NRC awards a license for the PFS/Goshute interim storage facility, this could give the nation forty more years to figure out how to dispose of the waste permanently. At the same time, once the waste has been transferred to an Indian reservation, it is possible that the nation would forget that a long-term disposal problem still exists. [28] So, who should bear the burden (and reap the benefits) from storing the nation's high-level nuclear waste, either on an interim or a permanent basis? On the face, it seems clear that those who benefit the most from nuclear energy should also shoulder most of the waste burden. But how realistic is it to expect that millions of people in 31 states will abandon the NIMBY syndrome in order to muster the courage and political will to address this problem in a responsible manner? Isn't it more likely that they will still try to externalize the costs by dumping the problem on others?

**The plan forces the United States federal government taking responsibility for its actions**

Claussen 6 (Eileen, October 5, “Climate Change: The State of The Question and The Search For The Answer”, President of the PEW center for climate change, http://www.pewclimate.org/press\_ room/speech\_transcripts/stjohns2of2.cfm)

But Africa produces just 2 to 3 percent of worldwide emissions of greenhouse gases. The United States, by contrast, with just 5 percent of the global population, is responsible for more than 20 percent of worldwide emissions. And there is also the issue of cumulative emissions. The fact is that climate change is a problem that has been decades in the making as carbon dioxide and other gases have accumulated in the atmosphere over time. These gases have a long life and can remain in the atmosphere for decades or even centuries. And, in the span of the last century or so, it was the United States and other already developed countries that were producing the lion’s share of these emissions. Looking only at carbon dioxide, the United States was responsible for more than 30 percent of global emissions between 1850 and 2000. The comparable figure for China: just 7 or 8 percent. Even considering the high rates of projected growth in China’s and India’s emissions, the cumulative contributions of developed and developing countries to climate change will not reach parity until sometime between 2030 and 2065. Clearly all of the major emitting countries need to be a part of the solution to climate change. But saying that all of today’s big emitters should be equally responsible for reducing their emissions is like going to a restaurant and having a nice dinner and then running into a friend who joins you for coffee. And, when the check comes, you make your friend who only had the coffee split the cost of the entire dinner. Yes, developing countries need to do their part, but there is no denying that the developed world, including the United States, has a moral and ethical responsibility to act first. We also have a responsibility to help developing nations adapt to a warming world. No matter what we do, some amount of global warming already is built into the climate system. There will be impacts; there already are impacts. And it is people living in poverty in the developing world who will face the most serious consequences. So it really comes down, again, to a question of responsibility. What is our responsibility? And it is not just our responsibility to our fellow man (or woman). There is also our responsibility to the natural world, to the earth. Beyond human societies, the natural world also will suffer from the effects of climate change. In fact, we are already seeing changes in the natural world due to climate change. Coral reefs are at risk because of warmer and more acidic ocean waters. Polar bears are threatened by declines in sea ice. Species already are disappearing because of new diseases connected to climate change. In short, climate change holds the potential of inflicting severe damage on the ecosystems that support all life on earth. So why, then, have we failed to take responsibility? Why has there been such an absence of political will?

**Demanding that the state reform is key- can’t solve environmental destruction without it**

**Eckersly ‘4** (Robyn Eckersly, professor of political science at the School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Melbourne, Australia, 2004 the green state: rethinking democracy and sovereignty, p.5-6

While acknowledging the basis for this antipathy toward the nation-state, and the limitations of state-centric analyses of global ecological degradation, I seek to draw attention to the positive role that states have played, and might increasingly play, in global and domestic politics. Writing more than twenty years ago, Hedley Bull (a proto-constructivist and leading writer in the English school) outlined the state’s positive role in world affairs, and his argument continue to provide a powerful challenge to those who somehow seek to “get beyond the state,” as if such a move would provide a more lasting solution to the threat of armed conflict or nuclear war, social and economic injustice, or environmental degradation.10 As Bull argued, given that the state is here to stay whether we like it or not, then the call to “get beyond the state a counsel of despair, at all events if it means that we have to begin by abolishing or subverting the state, rather than that there is a need to build upon it.”11 In any event, rejecting the “statist frame” of world politics ought not prohibit an inquiry into the emancipatory potential of the state as a crucial “node” in any future network of global ecological governance. This is especially so, given that one can expect states to persist as major sites of social and political power for at least the foreseeable future and that any green transformations of the present political order will, short of revolution, necessarily be state-dependent. Thus, like it or not, those concerned about ecological destruction must contend with existing institutions and, where possible, seek to “rebuild the ship while still at sea.” And if states are so implicated in ecological destruction, than an inquiry into the potential for their transformation or even their modest reform into something that is at least more conducive to ecological sustainability would be compelling. Of course, it would be unhelpful to become singularly fixated on the redesign of the state at the expense of other institutions of governance. States are not the only institutions that limit, condition, shape, and direct political power, and it is necessary to keep in view the broader spectrum of formal and informal institutions of governance (e.g., local, national, regional, and international) that are implicated in global environmental change. Nonetheless, while the state constitutes only one modality of political power, it is an especially significant one because its historical claims to exclusive rule over territory and peoples – as expressed in the principle of state sovereignty. As Gianfranco Poggi explains, the political power concentrated in the state “is a momentous, pervasive, critical phenomenon. Together with other forms of social power, it constitutes an indispensable medium for constructing and shaping larger social realities, for establishing, shaping and maintaining all broader and more durable collectivities”12 States play, in varying degrees, significant roles in structuring life chances, in distributing wealth, privilege, information, and risks, in upholding civil and political rights, and in securing private property rights and providing the legal/regulatory framework for capitalism. Every one of these dimensions of state activity has, for good or ill, a significant bearing on the global environmental crisis. Given that the green political project is one that demands far-reaching chances to both economies and societies, it is difficult to imagine how such changes might occur on the kind of scale that is needed without the active support of states. While it is often observed that stats are too big to deal with local ecological problems and too small to deal with global ones, the state nonetheless holds, as Lennart Lundqvist puts it, “a unique position in the constitutive hierarchy from individuals through villages, regions and nations all the way to global organizations. The state is inclusive of lower political and administrative levels, and exclusive in speaking for its whole territory and population in relation to the outside world.”13 In short, it seems to me inconceivable to advance ecological emancipation without also engaging with and seeking to transform state power.

**Combining multiple strategies is the best approach- key to solve oppression**

**Roithmayr, 1 --** Illinois law professor

(Daria, “ARTICLE: Left (Over) Rights”, 2001, 5 LTC 407, lexis)

This essay has proposed that rights talk might yet be rhetorically useful for communities of color, either as a mode of strategic action, or as transgressive performance. This contingent and instrumental use of rights talk may help to make a broader point about an ad hoc, contingency-oriented approach to social action that elsewhere I have described a radical or postmodern pragmatism. (Roithmayr 1998) Postmodern pragmatism looks quite different from the (neo) pragmatism of Rorty or Fish or Radin, or, farther back, the pragmatisms of Pierce and Dewey. n29 Pragmatism in either form has defined "truth" as those practices that collectively proved useful for a particular society or community--something that has some sort of cash value for a community--in contrast to the more conventional definitions of truth that anchor their foundation in logic, moral imperatives or some other sort of objective sounding meta-discourse. (Rorty 1989: 5) Critical race theory appears to adopt a slightly modified version of neo-pragmatism, one which is based on the relationship between usefulness and identity. Like the neo-pragmatists, CRT anchors pragmatic strategies in the needs of a community, but CRT focuses on the needs of a particular identity-based subset of the community. CRT scholar Mari Matsuda has argued that "the perspective from the bottom"--from outsider communities who are at the bottom of the economic, social and political ladder-should drive pragmatic strategies for social change. (Matsuda 1987) But regardless of whether the common thread is disempowerment or cultural [\*441] practices, truth for CRT scholars appears to be that which is useful for communities of color. (Powell 1997: 789; Yamamot 1997: 821) In contrast to both neo-pragmatism and CRT pragmatism, postmodern pragmatism explicitly abandons the CRT notion that it is possible to pinpoint some common identity to unite communities of color, or that policymakers can derive notions of usefulness from whatever that identity may be. But radical pragmatism also abandons the neo-pragmatist idea that usefulness can be determinately defined apart from specific questions about history, geography, community identity and a whole host of other factors. Instead, **postmodern pragmatism adopts a contingent, non universalist conception of both usefulness and identity**. First, many purportedly collective answers about usefulness--both at the general level and for communities of color--contain the potential for disruption, suppressed dissent, alternative interpretations, pockets of resistance, or deviant and unruly meanings.. (Laclau 1996: 60-61) Moreover, this potential for disruption is structured at least partly on identity-based lines. As Richard Rorty points out, usefulness is a socially-constructed, wholly situated and inevitably contingent concept (Rorty 1989: 48). When one says a strategy is useful, one must also ask, "useful for whom?" Second, and by the same token, as Kennedy highlighted earlier, the idea of community identity is similarly a contested concept that contains suppressed dissent and pockets of resistance**. Not only do group members and non-group members often disagree about what constitutes the group's defining features at any particular point in time but communities of color also contain fractured and intersecting sub-communities with conflicting perspectives**, as Crenshaw's theory of inter-sectionality illustrates. (Crenshaw 1991: 1241) Moreover, even if common experiences (like the experience of racialized oppression) or cultural practices could define the identity of a particular community, **those experiences and investments do not necessarily dictate the kinds of political commitments that such [\*442] a community would find useful**. Thus, the concept of community is too contingent to completely determine usefulness, and usefulness is equally unable to serve as the foundation for definitions of community. Postmodern pragmatism embraces this contingency and conflict, to make the following claim: Truth is that which advances contingently defined purposes or political commitments for contingently defined communities of color at a particular time and place (also contingently defined) and for a contingently defined period of time. In this definition, not only are the concepts of identity contingent, but more importantly, they partly reflect and partly constitute one another at the same time. That is, a community is defined at a particular moment in time by a whole host of factors, which includes the set of political commitments that a group finds useful. n30 By the same token, the political commitments that a group finds useful are constructed by a whole host of factors, one of which is the community's pre-existing identity. Of course, in particular circumstances, community identity might itself be understood, like rights discourse, as a rhetorical strategy designed to advance particular political commitments. Ian Haney Lopez has urged Latino/as to embrace an explicitly racialized identity as opposed to an identity based on ethnicity, nationality or culture, because such an identity will advance shared political commitments to anti-subordination. (Haney-Lopez 1998: 1154) In his view, an identity framed in racial terms will draw critical attention to the way in which Latino/as have been oppressed on the basis of the same sort of racialized assumptions about intelligence, virtue and productivity that blacks and other racialized groups have suffered. (1154) Haney Lopez's vision of identity is neither naturalized nor essentialized, but explicitly political, in that it relies on shared political commitments to anti-subordination. But a political commitment to anti-subordination may mean many different things to different groups of Latino/as, depending [\*443] on their nationality, their gender, their sexual orientation, the color of their skin, their history, their age. Adopting a racialized identity for anti-subordination purposes may have far more appeal for dark-skinned Mexican-Americans of indigenous descent than for light-skinned Cubans, who may think of themselves as white and may consider anti-subordination primarily in terms of political resistance to Fidel Castro. Thus, although political commitments, identity and notions of usefulness can all contribute to the pragmatic value of a particular strategy, none can serve as the foundation because each is contingently shaped by the other, and by interaction with many other factors. (Scott 1991: 773) This essay advocates using rights discourse as a mode of strategic action or transgressive performance. Although outcomes cannot be guaranteed in advance, because contingency often precludes closure in advance, that fact should not foreclose engaged activity. To that end, people of color should engage, as Charles Taylor advises, in an "inspired ad hoccery," "regarding each situation of crisis as an opportunity for improvisation." (Taylor 1989: 121) People of color should, from their unstable positions within language and history, **generate as many different species of transgressive and strategic performances as possible, using whatever tools we might have at our disposal, to advance our vision of social change.**

# 1AC Round 6

# Solvency

#### Property Assessed Clean Energy works and the tech is ready

Hidari 10, Jack, writer for the Harvard Business Review, Chairman of PrimaryInsight.com, National steering committee, PACENow.org “A Market Solution for Achieving “Green”, in The HBR List: Breakthrough Ideas for 2010,” HARV. BUS. REV. 41, 50-51 (Jan./Feb. 2010).

The Problem It's easy to get excited about the promise of clean technology--especially new high-efficiency and solar devices that can significantly reduce the energy use of existing homes and commercial buildings. But the retrofitting challenge we face is immense, and if we hope to see major progress, we must help home and building owners overcome the barrier of up-front costs. Few of today's owners have the necessary capital on hand, or can tie it up until the break-even point is reached and payback begins. In theory they could tap into lines of credit and home equity to pay for clean tech, but in practice they are reluctant or unable to do so. Institutional investors, meanwhile, have the capital and the appetite for the sure and steady returns of clean-tech installations; but they are set up to write large checks, not to finance disaggregated, small-scale projects. And, as smart investors, they are leery of opportunities where borrowers can default but improvements can't be undone and funds recouped. Already we are at the point--thanks to falling prices from large-scale production in China and other manufacturing hubs, and thanks to government rebates--where some clean-tech retrofits **achieve cash payback in less than three years**. But unless we can provide the necessary assurance to investors and tap into private capital markets, the improved economics of clean technology won't make enough difference. The Breakthrough Idea Enter PACE (Property Assessed Clean Energy) bonds, which are just being introduced in 15 states across the country. PACE bonds are debt instruments issued by a municipality and backed by property-tax liens on buildings whose owners take PACE loans from the bond pool. Here's an example: Suppose a commercial building in Annapolis, Maryland, has utility costs of $20,000 a month, which include electricity and natural gas. The building owner, Annapolis Management, has done an energy audit and concluded that a $300,000 investment in energy efficiency (retrofitting windows, lighting, and HVAC) would bring monthly utilities down to $13,000. Annapolis Management takes a $300,000 loan from the city's PACE program and retrofits the building. The owner repays the loan over 20 years through an increase in the building's annual property taxes equal to one-twentieth of the loan amount plus interest. In this example, assuming an 8% interest rate, that means additional taxes of $1,350 a month. Because this expense is markedly less than the utility cost savings of $7,000, **the owner is cash-flow positive from day one** after retrofit. The Promise Let's examine PACE bonds from the perspective of the city. The municipality issues the bonds, which are bought by institutional investors. Investors are drawn to bonds backed by property taxes, because they have **very low default rates**. The obligation to pay them survives foreclosure, so even if a property owner defaults on a mortgage, the new owner who buys the building at a bank fire sale must immediately bring the tax payments up to date.

#### And, no risk of loan deficiency – the plan is a functional lifting of a federal restriction that is necessary to the program

Hiskes 10, Jonathan, staff writer at Grist.org “PACE Rescue Bill Could Get Republican Help,” “Why won’t Team Obama save a clean-energy program from Fannie and Freddie?” August 5th, <http://grist.org/article/2010-08-05-why-wont-team-obama-save-a-clean-energy-program-from-fannie-and/>

PACE works by letting homeowners pay for rooftop solar arrays and energy-saving retrofits through a surcharge on their property tax bills, paid back over 10 to 20 years. In this way it removes high upfront costs and ensures that property owners don’t lose out if it they sell — the new buyer inherits both the home improvements and the tax assessment. The Berkeley-born model creates work for building contractors, cuts carbon pollution, and essentially runs on private capital, since cities and towns that offer PACE fund it through municipal bonds. Until late spring, PACE was spreading at a steady clip: Twenty-two states had endorsed the model and encouraged municipalities to set up programs. San Francisco had just launched a program and Los Angeles was preparing for one later in the year. The Obama administration backed the model with $150 million in stimulus-act funding and an endorsement from the vice president’s Middle Class Task Force. Then Fannie and Freddie threw the nation’s first programs into confusion in May by warning lenders to stay away from properties with PACE assessments. The mortgage-finance corporations object to the liens that PACE puts on properties, which get paid off ahead of mortgages if a borrower defaults. That adds a theoretical risk into an already jittery credit market. But it’s an unfounded fear, since well-designed energy retrofits can add to a homeowner’s financial security, cutting their utility bills and making them a safer bet for lenders. A report commissioned by a major financial institution last year found that energy-efficient homes had default and delinquency rates 11 percent lower than other homes. PACE advocates have worked to integrate standards to ensure the quality of energy retrofits, but that work can’t continue with programs stalled out.

#### Plan spills over to broader solar adoption even if not many people initially take up the program

Higgins 11/19, Ben, Director of Government Affairs for Mainstream Energy “The Psychology of Small-Scale Solar,” November 19th, <http://energy.aol.com/2012/11/19/the-psychology-of-small-scale-solar/?icid=related4>

Further evidence that consumer awareness is key to solar's growth comes from a recent Yale and New York University study, "Peer Effects in the Diffusion of Solar Photovoltaic Panels," which found that residents are clearly more likely to install solar if other solar systems are already present in their area and on their street. "We looked at the influence that the number of cumulative adoptions - the number of people who already installed solar panels in a zip code - had on the probability there would be a new adoption in that zip code," said Kenneth Gillingham, the study's co-author and Professor at the Yale University School of Forestry & Environmental Studies. "Our approach controls for a variety of other possible explanations, including clustering of environmental preferences or marketing activity." The study also showed that the visibility of the solar system and word-of-mouth were both critical in generating interest. "**If my neighbor installs solar and tells me he's saving money** and he's really excited about it, **it's likely I'll go ahead and do the same** thing," said Gillingham. This is simultaneously a simple concept – people need to actually see firsthand and hear from people they trust about the real-world benefits of new technology – and a maddeningly complex one – even after enormous effort to make commercial and residential solar simple, accessible and without upfront costs, there are still fundamental awareness issues to tackle. One can perhaps debate whether solar companies have developed the right product yet – after all, MP3 players were widely available (if not widely popular) before the IPod and ITunes revolutionized the digital music scene – but regardless, there's a clear takeaway here. Policy matters. Economics matter. Technology matters. The solar industry has made enormous progress in recent years on these fronts. Above all, people matter. If solar can get the human element of solar just right, we'll be making an enormous step towards our country's clean energy future.

#### Government incentives are key

Hiskes 11, Jonathan, staff writer at Grist.org “Cost Savings Are Biggest Motivator for Commercial Retrofits,” June 22nd, <http://sustainableindustries.com/articles/2011/06/cost-savings-are-biggest-motivator-commercial-retrofits>

Cash still rules when it comes to **motivating commercial building owners** to take on energy efficiency retrofits. That’s the top-line finding of a new survey from the Institute For Building Efficiency, which talked to nearly 4,000 owners and property managers of commercial buildings on six continents. The institute, a project of building management heavyweight Johnson Controls, asked owners and managers an array of questions about their latest thinking on energy efficiency investments. It’s valuable information for the company, which operates in 150 countries – but it’ll be useful for competitors working in the space too. After cost savings, government and utility rebates and incentives were the next most powerful motivator, according to respondents in Europe and North America (although those too are purely financial incentives). In India and China, however, respondents said increasing energy security was the second most important factor. Branding/public image was most important in North America, suggesting property owners are more image-conscious here, or they believe tenants are more likely to shop around for greener spaces. And greenhouse gas reductions fell from second-most important in a somewhat different 2010 survey to fourth-most important in this year’s survey. A full 80 percent of respondents expected energy prices to rise by double digits in the coming year, and they said capital costs were the largest barrier to investing in efficiency. “This year’s survey clearly shows that there’s growing urgency in making buildings more energy efficient, and large strides have been made with the help of government incentives,” Dave Myers, vice president and president of building efficiency for Johnson Controls, said in a news release.“However, building owners continue to tell us that access to capital remains the top barrier for improving energy consumption. By making funding more accessible, policymakers have a **tremendous opportunity to influence** the achievement of their energy and environmental goals.”

#### However, the federal housing finance agency issued a ruling that ended state PACE programs

Saha 11/13, Devashree, senior policy analyst and associate fellow at the Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program,” “Enact Legislation Supporting Residential Property Assessed Clean Energy Financing,” November 13th, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Research/Files/Papers/2012/11/13%20federalism/13%20housing%20energy%20efficiency.pdf>

And yet, for all their promise, neither energy retrofit projects in general nor residential PACE programs specifically have achieved their full potential. Part of the problem owes to the well-known market barriers that depress demand, including: a status quo bias, difficulty in quantifying energy savings from retrofits and upgrades, lack of information about existing energy inefficiency in homes and what can be done about it, high up-front costs, and difficulty identifying quality contractors. In addition, and perhaps more significantly, the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) has blocked the scale-up of residential PACE programs. In July 2010, just as residential PACE programs were gathering momentum, the FHFA issued a statement asserting that PACE programs constituted first liens over pre-existing mortgages, thereby creating significant risks for lenders, servicers, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and other mortgage holders. Despite evidence to the contrary, the FHFA deemed these risks unacceptable and instructed Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to restrict the kind of loans that homeowners could get if they live in a PACE designated area. This ruling **effectively ended residential PACE financing**, with many local governments suspending their programs as a result. Commercial PACE programs were not affected by the FHFA decision and have been moving forward in various places. The FHFA ruling on residential PACE financing has resulted in:  The cessation of almost all existing PACE programs focused on the residential sector out of concern that mortgages in PACE-designated areas would fail to receive the backing of Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac  Redirection of nearly $150 million in federal Recovery Act funds that had originally been designated to support the implementation and operation of residential PACE programs throughout the U.S. Despite efforts by advocates of PACE to address FHFA concerns, the FHFA ruling against residential PACE financing persists. Meanwhile, some states have challenged the FHFA ruling in federal court, though such efforts have thus far proven unsuccessful in changing FHFA’s stance. A federal district court in California—while not ordering the FHFA to reverse its current position on underwriting mortgages for properties with a PACE assessment—directed the agency to proceed with a notice and comment period for rulemaking. The FHFA took comments on proposed rules until September 2012 and it is not clear how long it will take to finalize the proposed rules or what the outcome will be. In addition, there have been a number of attempts to resolve the residential PACE issue through legislative action, including the PACE Assessment Protection Act (H.R. 2599), introduced in July 2011, that would prevent the FHFA and mortgage underwriters from discriminating against localities participating in or implementing a PACE program. To date, however, no legislation supporting residential PACE programs has been passed. Proposal The Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings therefore proposes that Congress enact legislation that would require the FHFA to allow Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to purchase residential mortgages with PACE assessments and incorporate underwriting standards protecting lenders and program standards for states and local governments offering PACE programs. These underwriting standards should be aligned with the PACE guidelines released by the Department of Energy in May 2010.

# Finance

#### Contention [ ] is Finance

#### First is the impact:

#### Economic decline causes war

Green and Schrage ‘9 (Michael J Green is Senior Advisor and Japan Chair at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) and Associate Professor at Georgetown University. Steven P Schrage is the CSIS Scholl Chair in International Business and a former senior official with the US Trade Representative's Office, State Department and Ways & Means Committee, Asia Times, 2009 <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Asian_Economy/KC26Dk01.html>)

Facing the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, analysts at the World Bank and the US Central Intelligence Agency are just beginning to contemplate the ramifications for international stability if there is not a recovery in the next year. For the most part, the focus has been on fragile states such as some in Eastern Europe. However, the Great Depression taught us that a downward global economic spiral can even have jarring impacts on great powers. It is no mere coincidence that the last great global economic downturn was followed by the most destructive war in human history. In the 1930s, economic desperation helped fuel autocratic regimes and protectionism in a downward economic-security death spiral that engulfed the world in conflict. This spiral was aided by the preoccupation of the United States and other leading nations with economic troubles at home and insufficient attention to working with other powers to maintain stability abroad. Today's challenges are different, yet 1933's London Economic Conference, which failed to stop the drift toward deeper depression and world war, should be a cautionary tale for leaders heading to next month's London Group of 20 (G-20) meeting. There is no question the US must urgently act to address banking issues and to restart its economy. But the lessons of the past suggest that we will also have to keep an eye on those fragile threads in the international system that could begin to unravel if the financial crisis is not reversed early in the Barack Obama administration and realize that economics and security are intertwined in most of the critical challenges we face. A disillusioned rising power? Four areas in Asia merit particular attention, although so far the current financial crisis has not changed Asia's fundamental strategic picture. China is not replacing the US as regional hegemon, since the leadership in Beijing is too nervous about the political implications of the financial crisis at home to actually play a leading role in solving it internationally. Predictions that the US will be brought to its knees because China is the leading holder of US debt often miss key points. China's currency controls and full employment/export-oriented growth strategy give Beijing few choices other than buying US Treasury bills or harming its own economy. Rather than creating new rules or institutions in international finance, or reorienting the Chinese economy to generate greater long-term consumer demand at home, Chinese leaders are desperately clinging to the status quo (though Beijing deserves credit for short-term efforts to stimulate economic growth). The greater danger with China is not an eclipsing of US leadership, but instead the kind of shift in strategic orientation that happened to Japan after the Great Depression. Japan was arguably not a revisionist power before 1932 and sought instead to converge with the global economy through open trade and adoption of the gold standard. The worldwide depression and protectionism of the 1930s devastated the newly exposed Japanese economy and contributed directly to militaristic and autarkic policies in Asia as the Japanese people reacted against what counted for globalization at the time. China today is similarly converging with the global economy, and many experts believe China needs at least 8% annual growth to sustain social stability. Realistic growth predictions for 2009 are closer to 5%. Veteran China hands were watching closely when millions of migrant workers returned to work after the Lunar New Year holiday last month to find factories closed and jobs gone. There were pockets of protests, but nationwide unrest seems unlikely this year, and Chinese leaders are working around the clock to ensure that it does not happen next year either. However, the economic slowdown has only just begun and nobody is certain how it will impact the social contract in China between the ruling communist party and the 1.3 billion Chinese who have come to see President Hu Jintao's call for "harmonious society" as inextricably linked to his promise of "peaceful development". If the Japanese example is any precedent, a sustained economic slowdown has the potential to open a dangerous path from economic nationalism to strategic revisionism in China too. Dangerous states It is noteworthy that North Korea, Myanmar and Iran have all intensified their defiance in the wake of the financial crisis, which has distracted the world's leading nations, limited their moral authority and sown potential discord. With Beijing worried about the potential impact of North Korean belligerence or instability on Chinese internal stability, and leaders in Japan and South Korea under siege in parliament because of the collapse of their stock markets, leaders in the North Korean capital of Pyongyang have grown increasingly boisterous about their country's claims to great power status as a nuclear weapons state. The junta in Myanmar has chosen this moment to arrest hundreds of political dissidents and thumb its nose at fellow members of the 10-country Association of Southeast Asian Nations. Iran continues its nuclear program while exploiting differences between the US, UK and France (or the P-3 group) and China and Russia - differences that could become more pronounced if economic friction with Beijing or Russia crowds out cooperation or if Western European governments grow nervous about sanctions as a tool of policy. It is possible that the economic downturn will make these dangerous states more pliable because of falling fuel prices (Iran) and greater need for foreign aid (North Korea and Myanmar), but that may depend on the extent that authoritarian leaders care about the well-being of their people or face internal political pressures linked to the economy. So far, there is little evidence to suggest either and much evidence to suggest these dangerous states see an opportunity to advance their asymmetrical advantages against the international system. Challenges to the democratic model The trend in East Asia has been for developing economies to steadily embrace democracy and the rule of law in order to sustain their national success. But to thrive, new democracies also have to deliver basic economic growth. The economic crisis has hit democracies hard, with Japanese Prime Minister Aso Taro's approval collapsing to single digits in the polls and South Korea's Lee Myung-bak and Taiwan's Ma Ying Jeou doing only a little better (and the collapse in Taiwan's exports - particularly to China - is sure to undermine Ma's argument that a more accommodating stance toward Beijing will bring economic benefits to Taiwan). Thailand's new coalition government has an uncertain future after two years of post-coup drift and now economic crisis. The string of old and new democracies in East Asia has helped to anchor US relations with China and to maintain what former secretary of state Condoleezza Rice once called a "balance of power that favors freedom". A reversal of the democratic expansion of the past two decades would not only impact the global balance of power but also increase the potential number of failed states, with all the attendant risk they bring from harboring terrorists to incubating pandemic diseases and trafficking in persons. It would also undermine the demonstration effect of liberal norms we are urging China to embrace at home. Protectionism The collapse of financial markets in 1929 was compounded by protectionist measures such as the Smoot-Hawley tariff act in 1932. Suddenly, the economic collapse became a zero-sum race for autarkic trading blocs that became a key cause of war. Today, the globalization of finance, services and manufacturing networks and the World Trade Organization (WTO) make such a rapid move to trading blocs unlikely. However, protectionism could still unravel the international system through other guises. Already, new spending packages around the world are providing support for certain industries that might be perceived by foreign competitors as unfair trade measures, potentially creating a "Smoot-Hawley 2.0" stimulus effect as governments race to prop up industries. "Buy American" conditionality in the US economic stimulus package earlier this year was watered down somewhat by the Obama administration, but it set a tempting precedent for other countries to put up barriers to close markets.

#### Statistics agree- diversionary war theory

Royal ‘10 (Director of CTR Jedediah, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction – U.S. Department of Defense, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises”, Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, Ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. "Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

#### Few internal links

#### First is property values – they’re declining now and key to the economy

#### Hughes 11/15, Sam, intern with the Housing team at the Center for American Progress “A Strong Housing Market Is Critical to Our Economic Recovery,” 11/15, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/housing/news/2012/11/15/45042/a-strong-housing-market-is-critical-to-our-economic-recovery/

In reality, the housing market is where the Great Recession of 2007­–2009 began and we’re not likely to see a robust economic recovery until the housing market heals. We’re beginning to see the early stages of a housing recovery with the housing sector finally starting to contribute positively to economic growth, but the housing market remains far from healthy. Below are six reasons why lawmakers need to focus on housing to help spur further growth, rather than ignore this important business sector and hope for the best: Housing booms lead the way to broader economic growth, not vice versa. During our three previous recessions—in 1980, 1991, and 2001—residential investment led the way to recovery, growing more than 30 percent on average in the first years of the recovery. Despite recent gains, the housing market has so far lagged behind growth in the broader economy, translating into billions of dollars in lost economic output and millions of missing jobs. If home construction were near its historic norm, it would create an additional 3 million jobs. The housing sector traditionally accounts for roughly one-fifth of the U.S. economy, but construction on new homes today is currently about half of the historic norm. Since each home built creates three new full-time jobs and $90,000 in tax revenue, an upturn in home construction would be a significant boost for the economy and alleviate some pressure on state and local budgets. Demand for homes is down primarily because of tight lending standards, not the economy. According to a recent survey from Fannie Mae, 72 percent of Americans believe that now is a good time to buy a home, but many are having a hard time getting approved for a home loan, thanks to excessively tight credit standards at banks. In August 2012 a typical rejected applicant for a Fannie- or Freddie-backed loan had a FICO credit score of 734 and a down payment of 19 percent. Data show that more than 50 percent of credit scores are below 734. Consumer spending will not come back until housing recovers. High-debt households generally consume 15 percent less than low-debt households. In particular, underwater borrowers—those who owe more on their house than their house is worth—spend less on home maintenance and renovations, chilling demand in home-related industries. Lack of home equity constrains small-business formation and investment. Roughly one in four small-business owners uses home equity as a source of capital or collateral. Each foreclosure results in enormous spillover costs to investors, borrowers, and local communities. Foreclosures not only harm borrowers and investors but they also devastate communities. One recent study estimates that spillover costs of foreclosures have reached nearly $2 trillion. Plus, each vacant home brings down the value of neighboring homes by more than $20,000, costs state and local governments $34,000 in tax revenues and associated services, and can also become a hotbed for crime and other social problems. Fixing our housing problems will not be easy but it is crucial to our economic recovery. With that in mind, policymakers should stop waiting for the housing sector to fix itself and should put in place policies to get the market back to full strength.

#### Declining housing sector guarantees double dip recession that none of their impact defense assumes

#### Isidore ‘11

(Chris, writer at CNNMoney, “Recession 2.0 would hurt worse,” 2011, [http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/10/news/economy/double\_dip\_recession\_economy/index.htm)](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/10/news/economy/double_dip_recession_economy/index.htm%29)

The risk of double dip recession is rising. And while economists disagree on just how likely the U.S. economy is to fall into another downturn, they generally agree on one thing -- a new recession would be worse than the last and very difficult to pull out of. "Going back into recession now would be scary, because we don't have the resources or the will to respond, and our initial starting point is such a point of weakness," said Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Analytics. "It won't feel like a new recession. It would likely feel like a depression."Zandi said the recent sell-off in stocks have caused him to raise the odds of a new recession to 33% from 25% only 10 days ago. Other economists surveyed by CNNMoney are also [raising their recession risk estimates](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/03/news/economy/recession_risk_economy/index.htm?iid=EL). The survey found an average chance of a new recession to be about 25%, up from a [15% chance](http://money.cnn.com/2011/06/10/news/economy/recession_economic_survey/index.htm?iid=EL) only three months ago. Of the 21 economists who responded to the survey, six have joined Zandi in increasing their estimates in just the last few days. The main reason: the huge slide in stocks. Standard & Poor's [downgrade of the U.S. credit rating](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/06/news/economy/sp_rating_fallout/index.htm?iid=EL) is another concern. "The correction in equity markets raises the risk of recession due to the negative [hit to wealth](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/08/markets/stock-market-loss/index.htm?iid=EL) and [confidence](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/08/pf/expert/investing_cash.moneymag/index.htm?iid=EL)," said Sal Guatieri, senior economist for BMO Capital Markets. Even with a [430-point rebound](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/09/markets/markets_newyork/index.htm?iid=EL) in the Dow Jones industrial average Tuesday following the Federal Reserve meeting, major U.S. stock indexes have lost more than 11% of their value over the last 12 trading days. [Recovery at risk](http://money.cnn.com/news/economy/recovery_at_risk/?iid=EL) A plunge in stocks doesn't necessarily mean a new recession. The economy avoided a recession after the stock market crash of 1987. "Stock price declines are often misleading indicators of future recessions," said David Berson, chief economist of BMI Group. But with the economy already so fragile, the shock of another stock market drop and resulting [loss of wealth](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/08/markets/stock-market-loss/index.htm?iid=EL) could be the tipping point. "It really does matter where the economy is when it gets hit by these shocks," said Zandi. "If we all [pull back on spending](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/02/news/economy/personal_income_spending/index.htm?iid=EL), that's a prescription for a long, painful recession," he said. Most economists say they aren't worried that S&P's downgrade makes recession more likely, although a few said any bad news at this point increases the risk. "The downgrade has a psychological impact in terms of hurting consumer confidence," said Lawrence Yun, chief economist with the National Association of Realtors. On shakier ground Another recession could be **even worse** thanthe last one for a few reasons. For starters, the economy is more vulnerable than it was in 2007 when the Great Recession began. In fact, the economy would enter the new recession much weaker than the start of any other downturn since the end of World War II. Unemployment currently stands at 9.1%. In November 2007, the month before the start of the Great Recession, it was just 4.7%. And the large number of Americans who have stopped looking for work in the last few years has left the [percentage of the population with a job](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/08/news/economy/unemployment_jobs/index.htm?iid=EL) at a 28-year low. Various parts of the economy also have yet to recover from the last recession and would be at serious risk of lasting damage in a new downturn. [Home values continue to lose ground](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/09/real_estate/home_price_recovery/index.htm?iid=EL) and are projected to continue their fall. While manufacturing has had a nice rebound in the last two years, industrial production is still 18% below pre-recession levels.There are nearly 900 banks on the [FDIC's list of troubled institutions](http://finance.fortune.cnn.com/2011/05/24/problem-banks-list-hits-888/?iid=EL), the highest number since 1993. Only 76 banks were at risk as the Great Recession took hold. But what has economists **particularly worried** is that the tools generally used to try to jumpstart an economy teetering on the edge of recession aren't available this time around. "The reason we didn't go into a depression three years ago is the policy response by Congress and the Fed," said Dan Seiver, a finance professor at San Diego State University. "**We won't see that this time**." Three times between 2008 and 2010, Congress approved massive spending or temporary tax cuts to try to stimulate the economy. But fresh from the [bruising debt ceiling battle](http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/02/news/economy/debt_ceiling_senate_vote/?iid=EL) and credit rating downgrade, and with elections looming, the federal government has shown little inclination to move in that direction. So **this new recession would likely have virtually no policy effort to counteract it.**

#### The plan solves – increases property values and decreases default risk

#### Hale 10, Greg, Director of Efficiency Finance at NRDC's Center for Market Innovation “PACE program is good for banks & property owners,” March 29th, http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ghale/pace\_program\_is\_good\_for\_banks.html

On March 25th, the Wall Street Journal published an article titled “Fannie and Freddie Resist Loans for Energy Efficiency” that looks at an innovative financing vehicle for clean energy retrofits called PACE (Property Assessed Clean Energy). While we were glad to see coverage of this exciting new mechanism, we were disappointed that the article focused narrowly on concerns about PACE that the mortgage banking industry raised a year ago. These concerns were valid, but they are old news and have been fully addressed. Perhaps more importantly, the WSJ article doesn’t mention the significant business opportunities that PACE presents for the mortgage banking community: the banks themselves can participate in various stages of the PACE financing system. The article correctly asserts that PACE makes clean energy retrofits easier for property owners, by allowing them to undertake retrofits at no upfront cost, and repay PACE financing through incremental assessments on their property taxes over terms as long as 20 years. And it correctly asserts that PACE has faced resistance from the government’s mortgage finance agencies - Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac and their regulator, the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) - which are concerned about PACE lien priority over existing mortgage holders in the event of foreclosure. But here the article omits an essential point: if a property with a PACE lien goes into foreclosure, the entire PACE-financed amount does not become due. Instead, only the past-due portion of the PACE financing is paid out before the existing lender’s mortgage. Thus, the risk to existing lenders of PACE lien seniority in foreclosure is actually extremely small. In response to the very same mortgage industry concerns that are rehashed by this WSJ article, the White House created an inter-agency task force last summer, including senior representatives from FHFA, the National Economic Council, and the Departments of Energy, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development. Following an in-depth analysis of the issues, the task force published the federal PACE Policy Framework last October, which establishes a set of best practices for PACE programs, specifically designed to resolve the mortgage bankers’ issues. Large and small communities alike (e.g., San Francisco, CA and Montgomery County, MD) are adopting the task force’s best practice guidelines as they launch their PACE programs this spring. Planned programs in Los Angeles, San Diego, New Mexico and Louisiana are also expected to adhere to the task force guidelines. When properly designed to include these best practices, PACE programs will benefit virtually all stakeholders, including homeowners and existing lenders, while creating large job growth and all with no credit risk to municipalities. In particular, the position of existing lenders is actually improved by PACE-financed clean energy retrofits because: PACE lowers the risk that mortgage holders will default on their mortgages. PACE financing is designed so that the annual energy savings resulting from clean energy retrofits will be greater than the corresponding annual PACE assessments, so property owners have more cash to make their mortgage payments. This increased cash on hand, combined with property owners’ lower vulnerability to energy price spikes, reduces mortgage default risk, consistent with prudent underwriting practices (contrary to critics’ claims otherwise). PACE projects increase property value, benefitting both owners and lenders. As noted by the article, PACE financing can only be used to make qualified energy saving improvements to the owners’ property. According to this recent article in the Appraisal Journal, every utility-bill dollar saved annually by energy improvements yields an increase of approximately $20 in property value, so reducing a property owner’s annual utility bill by $1,000 would return about $20,000 in property value. In other words, PACE projects substantially increase the value of the existing mortgage lenders’ collateral. In the case of foreclosure, the incremental risk PACE causes for lenders is very low. As noted above, in the event that a property with a PACE lien goes into foreclosure, the good news for mortgage lenders is that only the past-due PACE assessments are paid prior to the lender’s claim. Contrary to the inference raised by the article, PACE best practices include various underwriting criteria to further protect existing lenders and property owners, including: (a) the sum of existing mortgage debt plus proposed PACE financing should not exceed the fair value of the property; (b) the PACE financing should be limited to a certain percentage of property value (generally 10%); and (c) property owners must be current on property taxes and have no unsatisfied liens, notices of default or other material property-based delinquencies. Finally, the WSJ article alluded to the “legal challenges” that critics of PACE say cities will face, but in reality, PACE financing presents very little that is out of the ordinary. PACE is simply a variation on municipal financing districts which have a 100+ year history in the U.S. to pay for improvements in the public interest, such as sewer systems, parks and street lights. PACE programs support important public purposes, including job creation, advancement of a clean energy economy, improved energy independence, and global climate change mitigation. In fact, PACE programs should be even less of a concern to mortgage lenders than traditional municipal financing districts because PACE is 100% voluntary – no property owner pays additional tax assessments or fees unless they opt to have clean energy improvements made to their property as part of the program. Certainly, we agree that now is not a time to take any lending concerns lightly – but these issues have all been addressed. It’s also not the time to turn our back on creative, responsible and financially sound ideas like PACE. PACE gets to the core of energy efficiency, while increasing property value and creating jobs. We hope mortgage bankers will begin to see the financial opportunity that PACE presents, and will help scale up this innovative program.

#### Second is mortgage defaults – they collapse the economy

#### AFR 11, citing Joesph Tracy, Federal Reserve Governor, Americans For Financial Reform “We All Pay A Price For the Foreclosure Crisis,” 2-28, http://ourfinancialsecurity.org/blogs/wp-content/ourfinancialsecurity.org/uploads/2011/02/AFR-The-Price-of-Foreclosures-2-28-112.pdf

“The growing inventory of defaulted mortgages continues to weigh down any recovery in the housing market….Problems in housing markets can impact economic growth. Housing directly effects growth through incentives for builders to build new houses… Falling house prices can also negatively impact consumption growth to the extent that homeowners increase their savings in an effort to offset declines in their housing wealth…the protracted process of resolving the overhang of negative equity resulting from the overvaluation of housing during the boom will remain a headwind restraining economic growth for years to come.” Numerous peer-reviewed research studies have measured the impact of foreclosures and demonstrated the ways their spillover effects harm local neighborhoods and economies. Foreclosures Harm Housing Values: Multiple studies have demonstrated that foreclosures have a negative impact on local property values, particularly during periods of recession. Each foreclosure leads to a drop of about 1 percent in the value of nearby homes.[ii] Using these estimates, the Center for Responsible Lending has calculated that over the 2009-2012 period foreclosures will cut house values by some $1.9 trillion in total. Each foreclosure leads to total home value losses of about $70,000 across the surrounding neighborhood.[iii] Some of the reasons for these effects include “distress sales” of foreclosed properties, the blight effect of abandoned homes, vandalism, and increases in crime. Foreclosures Harm the Broader Economy: The negative economic effect of foreclosures doesn’t end with declines in home values. Falling home prices have strong negative effects on both consumer spending and investment in new construction.[iv] Declines in consumer spending and declines in construction spending are both major drivers of job loss and unemployment. This increase in unemployment in turn drives further declines in foreclosures, as well as further independent declines in spending and investment. This cycle creates a large “multiplier effect” for the negative economic impacts of foreclosures. [See Figure 1].

#### Mortgage defaults cause security clearance revocation

#### Aftergood 10, Steven, senior research analyst at the Federation of American Scientists, “Home Foreclosures and Security Clearances,” September 20th, http://www.fas.org/blog/secrecy/2010/09/home\_foreclosures.html

The crisis affecting the U.S. economy has made a discernible mark on security clearance disputes, according to a new study of clearance revocation cases. “Since the collapse of the housing market in 2008, debt resulting from job losses and home foreclosures has had a devastating effect on people holding national security clearances. That, more than any other factor today, is causing the revocation or denial of security clearances, resulting in the loss of good paying jobs, and putting skilled workers further and further behind in their effort to dig out of debt.” The new study (pdf), by attorney Sheldon I. Cohen, examined cases before the Department of Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA), which is the only one of the eleven clearance adjudicating bodies to publish its decisions. [Correction: The Department of Energy also publishes its clearance adjudication decisions.] The author found a growing trend, though the actual number of cases involved remains fairly small.

#### The squo will solve STEM shortages but security clearances are key

#### Sucio 12, “Cyber Security Expert Warns Of Shortage Of Security Pros In U.S.,” Peter, writer for redorbit, June 13th, http://www.redorbit.com/news/technology/1112554085/cyber-security-expert-warns-of-shortage-of-security-pros-in-u-s/

On Wednesday a leading cyber expert warned that a shortage of talented computer security experts in the United States could prove a challenge to protect corporate and government networks, notably at a time when such attacks are actually on the rise. “We don’t have enough security professionals and that’s a big issue,” said Symantec Corp CEO Enrique Salem at the Reuters Media and Technology Summit in New York. “What I would tell you is it’s going to be a bigger issue from a national security perspective than people realize.” Salem noted that his company was working with the U.S. military, as well as other government agencies and universities to help develop new programs to train security professionals. And this really shouldn’t come as news say experts. “I think this is very legitimate concern,” said Fred H. Cate, professor of law at the Indiana University School of Law in Bloomington. “This has been a long standing concern.” Cate, who is also senior policy advisor to the Center for Information Policy Leadership at Hunton & Williams, and is a member of Microsoft’s Trustworthy Computing Academic Advisory Board, told redOrbit that the U.S. Federal Government is very much aware of this issue as it helps sponsor security programs to encourage training. “This is like any business need,” said Cate. “This one in particular is challenging because it requires specific skills.” Schools are stepping up to address the challenges. Reuters reported that U.S. defense contractor Northrop Grumman Corp just this week launched the first undergraduate honors program in cybersecurity with the University of Maryland to help train more workers. But it is much more than just training noted Cate. “There is the added challenge that to work in some government sectors security clearance is also required. So those looking to work in cyber security also need to have a background that is consistent with this clearance.” This means being an American citizen or resident that can pass the background checks, and while not all security pros – notably those in the private sector – need the clearance, in some growing industries it is being required.

#### Key to air force effectiveness

Givhan, Trias & Allen, 11 [Walter D. Givhan, Eric D. Trias, William H. Allen, QUALS, “The Criticality of Defense-Focused Technical Education,” Air & Space Power Journal, Vol XXVI, No. 2, Summer 2011 Edition, <http://www.airpower.au.af.mil/airchronicles/apj/2011/2011-2/2011_2_02_givhan.pdf>, DA 7/13/11]//RS

New Domains, New Challenges As the Air Force mission expands, the breadth and depth of technical education requirements for our leaders continue to grow as well. Just as Schriever led the Air Force into space, so is a new generation of leaders pointing the way into cyberspace. This new war-fighting domain needs enormous amounts of STEM investment at all ranks and skill levels. Unlike air and space domains, the cost of entry to exploit cyberspace is low, yet the potential damage to the national security and economy is enormous. The complex cyberspace domain evolves at an astonishing pace. 4 Training is essential but not sufficient to ensure success. Therefore, we must also educate our force to anticipate, evaluate, and develop solutions to unforeseen problems in order to guarantee superiority in cyberspace. In response to the demands of Air Force Space Command, AFIT expanded its frontline role in educating these rising technical leaders by adding cyber professional continuing education to cyber graduate education and developmental education. This targeted, multitiered education delivers cyber-focused research projects and, more importantly, degree- or certificate-holding graduates who are technically prepared to move the Air Force into the cyber domain. The Air Force continues to face difficult challenges as well as ever-growing pressure to become more efficient. One area of renewed focus stems from the Air Force’s prioritization of its nuclear enterprise. Air Force Global Strike Command leads the charge but receives support from numerous entities that have an interest in the nuclear arena. The Secretary of Defense Task Force on Department of Defense (DOD) Nuclear Weapons Management singled out the underlying importance of education and training as key tools for generating a culture of nuclear excellence. 5 AFIT responded by revitalizing its nuclear engineering programs and offering certificate programs in addition to traditional graduate degrees with a revamped curriculum. It remains the sole source for defense-focused graduate degrees in nuclear engineering for both the Air Force and Army. Unlike civilian nuclear engineering programs that emphasize power generation or medical applications, those offered by AFIT address the essential task of solving unique defense problems. Besides safety and security of nuclear materials, the DOD has special requirements to study nuclear weapons’ effects and their applications. Those demands drive the need for the corresponding defense-focused education and research readily available at AFIT. Globalization, accompanied by reliance on resources, solutions, and human capital outside our borders, increasingly challenges our effort to maintain technical dominance. Technical innovation is at risk unless we continue to develop an indigenous pool of scientists and engineers from which the DOD and Air Force can draw to meet their needs. …IT CONTINUES… These kinds of examples show the value of a core technological education capability and of highly educated technical graduates in ensuring that the modern Air Force remains on the edge of innovation. Their research and classroom projects feed into war-fighting operations and research programs around the country. At the same time, state-of-the-art research reaches back to inform and refresh the classroom. This symbiotic relationship between research and curriculum requires a critical mass of students, faculty, and funding to thrive and generate the intended results. A robust technical program will produce capable technical leaders and show the way to potentially game-changing technology. Without a steady stream of defense-focused, technically educated individuals, every aspect of the technologically demanding Air Force mission will suffer. With graduates in such high demand, AFIT has transformed our educational methods by using Internet and satellite technology to bring itself to the Airman in addition to bringing the Airman to AFIT. These efforts produced 28,000 graduates of professional continuing education last year alone, in addition to 320 graduates with MS degrees, 31 with PhDs, and 2,600 from civilian institutions. The Future A recent report by the National Research Council of the National Academies identified the loss of technical competence within the Air Force as an underlying problem in several areas of science, engineering, and acquisitions. 7 At the same time, the Report on Technology Horizons, Headquarters US Air Force’s vision for science and technology, recognizes that the capabilities we need also lie within the reach of potential adversaries because of their access to the same science and technology. 8 In the midst of budgetary constraints, advances in technology are imperative to increase manpower efficiencies as well as enhance the Air Force’s capabilities. Several areas in which AFIT research and education directly support the Report on Technology Horizons vision include cyber resilience, adaptable autonomous systems, operating in an environment without benefit of the Global Positioning System (GPS), rapidly composable satellite systems, and improvement of space situational awareness. In the spirit of the Report on Technology Horizons, this edition of Air and Space Power Journal contains a small sampling of articles covering critical areas of research in cyberspace, energy and fuels, GPS alternatives, and technology that can improve wartime effectiveness and operational efficiencies. As was the case with General Schriever and development of the ICBM force, these advances can occur efficiently and effectively only with the guidance and vision of leaders who have a solid grounding in science and technology that includes technologically focused education. Early on, Gen Henry “Hap” Arnold realized that scientists and engineers were the kind of people who would bring him the ideas he needed. 9 According to the Air Force Science and Technology Strategy, which serves as the cornerstone of all of the service’s science and technology activities, maintaining our technological dominance faces a challenge from globalization and other nations’ ready access to the technology and human capital that make possible the development of advanced capabilities. Furthermore, innovation is at risk unless the United States can develop scientists and engineers well grounded in STEM and attract them to careers in the Air Force. 10 AFIT serves as a key resource in meeting the need for well qualified STEM professionals

#### Solves conflict in the south china sea

#### Stokes 11 (Mark, Executive Director Project 2049 Institute Before The U.S.­China Economic and Security Review Commission, “ Hearing on the Implications of China’s Military and Civil Space Program”, 5-11, http://www.uscc.gov/hearings/2011hearings/written\_testimonies/11\_05\_11\_wrt/11\_05\_11\_stokes\_testimony.pdf//greenhill-sb)

The PLA is investing in aerospace capabilities that may offset shortcomings in the face of a more technologically advanced adversary. Long range precision strike assets could offer the PLA a decisive advantage in resolving conflicts on terms favorable to PRC interests. Extended range conventional precision strike assets, supported by sensor architecture that is inclusive of space­ based surveillance assets, could facilitate attainment of air superiority in the event of disputes over territorial or sovereignty claims around China's periphery. In a future contingency requiring U.S. intervention, space­enabled long range precision strike assets could seek to suppress U.S. operations from forward bases in Japan, from U.S. aircraft battle groups operating in the Western Pacific, and perhaps over the next five to 10 years from U.S. bases on Guam. PRC interests may expand beyond its immediate periphery. Space­based capabilities also could enhance China’s ability to conduct other missions, such as peacekeeping or humanitarian relief.

#### That escalates

#### Rogers 12, Will, Bacevich Fellow at the Center for a New American Security, “How to Neutralize Energy Competition in the South China Sea,” September 11th, http://www.consumerenergyreport.com/2012/09/11/how-to-neutralize-energy-competition-in-the-south-china-sea/

During her visit to the Asia Pacific last week, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton spoke to the dispute over the South China Sea, arguably one of the region’s most intractable challenges that, left unmanaged, could uproot stability in East Asia. Those countries at the heart of the dispute — particularly China, Vietnam and the Philippines — need to “establish rules of the road and clear procedures for peacefully addressing disagreements,” Secretary Clinton urged. High Stakes at Sea The dispute is complex. States ringing the sea are becoming increasingly assertive in their claims, driven by concerns of nationalism, sovereignty, and even the need to stake claims to the region’s lucrative (but dwindling) fish stocks. And then there are the potential petroleum resources. Estimates of the region’s energy potential ranges widely, according to the independent U.S. Energy Information Agency: U.S. estimates suggest the region could contain roughly 28 billion barrels of oil; while Chinese estimates are much more optimistic, projecting more than 200 billion barrels of oil beneath the sea. Despite much uncertainty about the size of the region’s oil and natural gas resources, countries in the region are increasingly **behaving as though** access to those potential petroleum reserves is zero-sum — a winner take all and leave none for the loser approach — that is **pitting countries against each other** to tap into those resources first. Indeed, China, Vietnam and the Philippines are actively soliciting bids from petroleum companies to explore for oil and gas in contested waters, **escalating tensions** and reinforcing this zero-sum perspective. This continued competition **is destabilizing** and countries in the region need to take efforts to tilt the balance of behavior toward cooperation so that countries across the region can benefit from the sea’s potential resource wealth.

Also solves nuclear terrorism

Finel 99 (Dr. Bernard, BA, Tufts University; MA, PhD, Georgetown University) is the associate director of the National Security Studies Program and visiting assistant professor of national security and international affairs at the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University. Dr. Finel has written extensively on proliferation, the revolution in military affairs, and international politics. He has coedited and contributed to a book titled Power and Conflict in the Age of Transparency, “ The Role of Aerospace Power in US Counterproliferation Strategy”, http://www.airpower.au.af.mil/airchronicles/apj/apj99/win99/finel.htm#finel//greenhill-sb)

The process of deterring WMD use is also likely to rely heavily on aerospace power.13 There are two forms of deterrence: deterrence by punishment and deterrence by denial.14 Although the former is more obviously within the realm of aerospace power, aerospace power can also play a role in deterrence by denial. The important thing to remember about deterring the use of WMDs is that **WMDs are not primarily military weapons but rather terror weapons**. WMDs are probably not particularly effective in achieving traditional military goals such as the destruction of enemy military capabilities and the conquest and control of territory. To deter the use of WMDs , deterrence by punishment requires the ability to threaten credibly to inflict severe pain on a potential adversary. Fundamentally, given US power-projection capabilities, this sort of punishment will rely on aerospace power in its various forms--from aircraft to cruise missiles. However, the United States's ability to punish an adversary by airpower is variable. The key to punishment is to destroy assets the opponent particularly values. Are these assets targetable through aerospace power? The answer is not clear. Ultimately, many hostile regimes may only value their own leadership.15 Aerospace power may be able to undermine some of the bases of an adversary's leadership, but as the case of Iraq suggests, it is difficult to bring down a regime with airpower alone.16 Even adjusting for the equivocal commitment to bringing down the regime in the Bush and Clinton administrations, it is difficult to conceive of an alternate target set that could have finished off the regime without some sort of intervention on the ground. It is difficult to undermine a regime by bombing it. Numerous studies have shown that civilians usually either rally around a leader or respond to bombings by becoming passive.17 The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) bombing of Serbia over the Kosovo situation has apparently weakened the regime of Slobodan Milosevic; however, virtually all the large-scale demonstrations against Milosevic occurred after the bombing stopped and are as much a response to the failure of his policies as the suffering inflicted by the bombing. Deterrence by denial is also more difficult than it might seem on the surface. Deterring the use of WMDs by denial does not only mean preventing an adversary from achieving military goals since WMDs are most likely to be used for political effect rather than narrow military missions. Rather, deterrence by denial in this context refers to steps which nullify the effects of WMDs. Since these effects are both military and political, the deterrence calculus is difficult to examine simply and precisely. That said, the inherent passive defense capabilities of aerospace power seem to make it an ideal basis for denying an adversary the ability to constrain US use-of-force decisions. **Aerospace assets are difficult to target and hence can be used without exposing American soldiers to the effects of terror weapons**. Certainly, the passive defense capability of aerospace assets does not prevent the use of WMDs against civilian targets, but it does limit the forward-deploying military assets that can be targeted. In this sense, the ability to fly high and fast is itself a form of deterrence by denial.

#### Extinction

#### Ayson 10, Robert Ayson, Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand at the Victoria University of Wellington, 2010 (“After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects,” Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, Volume 33, Issue 7, July, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via InformaWorld)

But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a massive exchange of nuclear weapons between two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today’s and tomorrow’s terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a catalytic nuclear war between the superpowers started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem. It may require a considerable amount of imagination to depict an especially plausible situation where an act of nuclear terrorism could lead to such a massive inter-state nuclear war. For example, in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack on the United States, it might well be wondered just how Russia and/or China could plausibly be brought into the picture, not least because they seem unlikely to be fingered as the most obvious state sponsors or encouragers of terrorist groups. They would seem far too responsible to be involved in supporting that sort of terrorist behavior that could just as easily threaten them as well. Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thought or discovered that the fissile material used in the act of nuclear terrorism had come from Russian stocks,40 and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”41 Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors. Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington’s early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack, the U.S. president might be expected to place the country’s armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, on a higher stage of alert. In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that any preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response.

#### The third is financial reform – Obama standing up to financial regulators is key

#### Merkley 10 – (Jeff, “Limits on Risky Trading Crucial to Righting American Financial System”, 1-21 Congressional Documents and Publications, l/n)

"For months, I've been pushing for the reestablishment of a firewall between risky activities and depository lending. This is an **absolutely necessary** step in shutting down the casino-like gambling that **destroyed our economy** and endangered the jobs, homes and savingsof the American people. **The president's support is a critical turning point** in the effort to see these firewalls enacted in a financial reform package this year. "Proprietary trading, where banks bet with their own capital, is a recent innovation and has turned out to be a bad deal for both our financial institutions and the taxpayer. Over the last fifteen years, as the legal and ethical prohibitions on high-risk trading were removed, banks raced to increase their leverage and gamble with their balance sheets. As recent history has demonstrated, these dangerous bets resulted in **financial collapse**, both for Wall Street and American families. Common-sense limits on high risk activities will make our **economy more stable** and less reliant on government intervention. "To succeed, banks have to return to their mission of providing customers with prudent lending and investment opportunities instead of aspiring to be hedge funds. Success for the American financial system isn't defined by record profits or massive bonuses. Success is the ability to lend to small businesses, to create jobs, and to drive real economic growth. "The restoration of rules that prevent banks from gambling with their depositors' money **is crucial to righting our economic ship and ensuring the future stability of our financial system**. I look forward to working with President Obama, Banking Committee Chairman Dodd, and my Senate colleagues to reestablish the firewall between risky activities and depository lending and make banking boring again."

#### Plan is Obama standing up to financial regulators

#### Hiskes 10, Jonathan, staff writer at Grist.org “PACE Rescue Bill Could Get Republican Help,” “Why won’t Team Obama save a clean-energy program from Fannie and Freddie?” August 5th, http://grist.org/article/2010-08-05-why-wont-team-obama-save-a-clean-energy-program-from-fannie-and/

Why isn’t the Obama team trying harder to save the promising PACE clean-energy model? Mortgage giants Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac have essentially quashed Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) programs, which have been launched in local communities around the U.S. to make green improvements more affordable to homeowners. The Obama administration has taken modest measures to help out, but it hasn’t put its top people on the case. If it did, there’s reason to think PACE could be quickly restored. Instead, Fannie and Freddie are undermining administration priorities like clean energy, energy efficiency, job creation, homeowner relief, and economic stimulus. “If [the White House] wanted Fannie and Freddie to look at it, Fannie and Freddie would look at it,” said John McIlwain, who spent five years at Fannie and is now a senior fellow for housing at the Urban Land Institute. “It hasn’t reached a high enough policy level within the White House. … It’s just a shame.” PACE works by letting homeowners pay for rooftop solar arrays and energy-saving retrofits through a surcharge on their property tax bills, paid back over 10 to 20 years. In this way it removes high upfront costs and ensures that property owners don’t lose out if it they sell — the new buyer inherits both the home improvements and the tax assessment. The Berkeley-born model creates work for building contractors, cuts carbon pollution, and essentially runs on private capital, since cities and towns that offer PACE fund it through municipal bonds. Until late spring, PACE was spreading at a steady clip: Twenty-two states had endorsed the model and encouraged municipalities to set up programs. San Francisco had just launched a program and Los Angeles was preparing for one later in the year. The Obama administration backed the model with $150 million in stimulus-act funding and an endorsement from the vice president’s Middle Class Task Force. Then Fannie and Freddie threw the nation’s first programs into confusion in May by warning lenders to stay away from properties with PACE assessments. The mortgage-finance corporations object to the liens that PACE puts on properties, which get paid off ahead of mortgages if a borrower defaults. That adds a theoretical risk into an already jittery credit market. But it’s an unfounded fear, since well-designed energy retrofits can add to a homeowner’s financial security, cutting their utility bills and making them a safer bet for lenders. A report commissioned by a major financial institution last year found that energy-efficient homes had default and delinquency rates 11 percent lower than other homes. PACE advocates have worked to integrate standards to ensure the quality of energy retrofits, but that work can’t continue with programs stalled out. FHFA declined to comment except to say that it “continues to work with federal and state officials regarding potential revisions to the PACE programs.” California’s attorney general and Sonoma County, Calif., have sued to defend the model, but resolution from the courts could take years. Democrats in the House and the Senate have introduced bills that would restore PACE, but Senate dysfunction makes a legislative solution unlikely. Rep. Steve Israel (D-N.Y.), sponsor of one of the bills to save PACE, says negotiation is actually the best near-term option, but that hasn’t worked so far either. Israel proposed a PACE pilot program to the Federal Housing Finance Agency, which regulates Fannie and Freddie, but FHFA hasn’t responded (at least publicly). Mid-level administration officials have tried to step in too. Cathy Zoi, an assistant secretary at the Energy Department, made a bid to save the program, but was flatly rejected. The Energy Department even offered FHFA a two-year reserve fund to guarantee against losses, according to The New York Times. That offer was refused. Officials from other agencies — White House National Economic Council, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Treasury Department’s Office of the Comptroller of the Currency — have been part of talks attempting to resolve the standoff. But so far no administration bigwigs have made any public efforts to save PACE. Carol Browner, Timothy Geithner, Lawrence Summers, Rahm Emanuel — where are you? Any one of them could get FHFA’s attention fast. The unusual structure of Fannie and Freddie does complicate the situation. The government-sponsored mortgage corporations, which back about 75 percent of all home loans in the U.S., were bailed out by the feds in September 2008 and placed under the conservatorship of the newly formed FHFA. FHFA is an independent agency — the president appoints its director, and the appointment requires confirmation from Congress. (President Obama hasn’t yet nominated a permanent director.) Though the relationship between Fannie and Freddie and the U.S. government is murky, the Obama administration has a lot of power to make change. The Treasury Department has injected $146 billion into the corporations over the past two years — talk about power of the purse. And the administration is working up a plan to overhaul Fannie and Freddie. But Team Obama’s hands-off approach on PACE fits a broader trend of bowing to regulators on financial policy, according to Alyssa Katz, who reported on the housing finance collapse for her book Our Lot: How Real Estate Came to Own Us. “My sense is that this administration, on questions of banking and finance, has deferred to regulators and not tried to run policy from the White House, at least openly,” she said.

#### Reform is key to the economy

#### Timimi 9 (Keith, Economy Watch, “Fix the banks – before they fix us completely,” 11/18/09, http://www.economywatch.com/economy-business-and-finance-news/fix-the-banks-before-they-fix-us-completely-18-11.html)

It is the way the banks control the western political and financial system, and through that the way they control the world. **Put simply the banks need to be fixed, or they will end up bankrupting us all.** This is not idle speculation. It is not a 'moral hazard' that might happen. It is what the system is designed to do.That is why something that sounds extremely dull, 'banking regulatory reform', is actually the most important political and economic event of the day, possibly of our age. There are so many fascinating things happening around the world, but we have to ignore many of them and keep coming back to this elephant, who is stamping his feet ever more impatiently in our little living room. The financial weapons of mass destruction that Warren Buffet talked about when derivatives were just starting to grow exponentially in 2003 have only just started to explode. The Financial Crisis was not the end; it was the beginning. There are hundreds of trillions dollars of [derivatives](http://www.economywatch.com/economy-business-and-finance-news/fix-the-banks-before-they-fix-us-completely-18-11.html)

 in circulation. Derivatives are worth many times the total value of world GDP, which stood at $60 by the end of 2000. The derivatives market is unregulated, and derivative trades happen secretly between two [financial institutions](http://www.economywatch.com/economy-business-and-finance-news/fix-the-banks-before-they-fix-us-completely-18-11.html) or 'counter-parties'. That is why we now have Too Big to Fail. We now have institutions who are party to derivatives contracts that are worth more than the entire productive capacity of the world. The bailouts and guarantees have only made them bigger.

# Climate

#### Warming causes extinction- tipping point

Dyer ‘12 (London-based independent journalist, PhD from King's College London, citing UC Berkeley scientists (Gwynne, "Tick, tock to mass extinction date," The Press, 6-19-12, l/n, accessed 8-15-12, mss)

Meanwhile, a team of respected scientists warn that life on Earth may be on the way to an irreversible "**tipping point"**. Sure. Heard that one before, too. Last month one of the world's two leading scientific journals, Nature, published a paper, "Approaching a state shift in Earth's biosphere," pointing out that more than 40 per cent of the Earth's land is already used for human needs. With the human population set to grow by a further two billion by 2050, that figure could soon exceed 50 per cent. "It really will be a new world, biologically, at that point," said the paper's lead author, Professor Anthony Barnofsky of the University of California, Berkeley. But Barnofsky doesn't go into the details of what kind of new world it might be. Scientists hardly ever do in public, for fear of being seen as panic-mongers. Besides, it's a relatively new hypothesis, but it's a pretty convincing one, and it should be more widely understood. Here's how bad it could get. The scientific consensus is that we are still on track for 3 degrees C of warming by 2100, but that's just warming caused by human greenhouse- gas emissions. The problem is that +3 degrees is well past the point where the major feedbacks kick in: natural phenomena triggered by our warming, like melting permafrost and the loss of Arctic sea-ice cover, that will add to the heating and that we cannot turn off. The trigger is actually around 2C (3.5 degrees F) higher average global temperature. After that we lose control of the process: ending our own carbon- dioxide emissions would no longer be enough to stop the warming. We may end up trapped on an escalator heading up to +6C (+10.5F), with no way of getting off. And +6C gives you the **mass extinction**. There have been five mass extinctions in the past 500 million years, when 50 per cent or more of the species then existing on the Earth vanished, but until recently the only people taking any interest in this were paleontologists, not climate scientists. They did wonder what had caused the extinctions, but the best answer they could come up was "climate change". It wasn't a very good answer. Why would a warmer or colder planet kill off all those species? The warming was caused by massive volcanic eruptions dumping huge quantities of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere for tens of thousands of years. But it was very gradual and the animals and plants had plenty of time to migrate to climatic zones that still suited them. (That's exactly what happened more recently in the Ice Age, as the glaciers repeatedly covered whole continents and then retreated again.) There had to be a more convincing kill mechanism than that. The paleontologists found one when they discovered that a giant asteroid struck the planet 65 million years ago, just at the time when the dinosaurs died out in the most recent of the great extinctions. So they went looking for evidence of huge asteroid strikes at the time of the other extinction events. They found none. What they discovered was that there was indeed major warming at the time of all the other extinctions - and that the warming had radically changed the oceans. The currents that carry oxygen- rich cold water down to the depths shifted so that they were bringing down oxygen- poor warm water instead, and gradually the depths of the oceans became anoxic: the deep waters no longer had any oxygen. When that happens, the sulfur bacteria that normally live in the silt (because oxygen is poison to them) come out of hiding and begin to multiply. Eventually they rise all the way to the surface over the whole ocean, killing all the oxygen-breathing life. The ocean also starts emitting enormous amounts of lethal hydrogen sulfide gas that destroy the ozone layer and directly poison land- dwelling species. This has happened many times in the Earth's history.

#### It will be rapid

Light ‘12 (Malcolm, PhD, University of London – Earth science and climate consultant, “Global Extinction within one Human Lifetime as a Result of a Spreading Atmospheric Arctic Methane Heat wave and Surface Firestorm,” <http://arctic-news.blogspot.com/p/global-extinction-within-one-human.html>)

Although the sudden high rate Arctic methane increase at Svalbard in late 2010 data set applies to only a short time interval, similar sudden methane concentration peaks also occur at Barrow point and the effects of a major methane build-up has been observed using all the major scientific observation systems. Giant fountains/torches/plumes of methane entering the atmosphere up to 1 km across have been seen on the East Siberian Shelf. This methane eruption data is so consistent and aerially extensive that when combined with methane gas warming potentials, Permian extinction event temperatures and methane lifetime data it paints a frightening picture of the beginning of the now uncontrollable global warming induced destabilization of the subsea Arctic methane hydrates on the shelf and slope which started in late 2010. This process of methane release will **accelerate exponentially**, release huge quantities of methane into the atmosphere and lead to the demise of all life on earth before the middle of this century. Introduction The 1990 global atmospheric mean temperature is assumed to be 14.49 oC (Shakil, 2005; NASA, 2002; DATAWeb, 2012) which sets the 2 oC anomaly above which humanity will lose control of her ability to limit the effects of global warming on major climatic and environmental systems at 16.49 oC (IPCC, 2007). The major Permian extinction event temperature is 80 oF (26.66 oC) which is a temperature anomaly of 12.1766 oC above the 1990 global mean temperature of 14.49 oC (Wignall, 2009; Shakil, 2005). Results of Investigation Figure 1 shows a huge sudden atmospheric spike like increase in the concentration of atmospheric methane at Svalbard north of Norway in the Arctic reaching 2040 ppb (2.04 ppm)(ESRL/GMO, 2010 - Arctic - Methane - Emergency - Group.org). The cause of this sudden anomalous increase in the concentration of atmospheric methane at Svalbard has been seen on the East Siberian Arctic Shelf where a recent Russian - U.S. expedition has found widespread, continuous powerful methane seepages into the atmosphere from the subsea methane hydrates with the methane plumes (fountains or torches) up to 1 km across producing an atmospheric methane concentration 100 times higher than normal (Connor, 2011). Such high methane concentrations could produce local temperature anomalies of more than 50 oC at a conservative methane warming potential of 25. Figure 2 is derived from the Svalbard data in Figure 1 and the methane concentration data has been used to generate a Svalbard atmospheric temperature anomaly trend using a methane warming potential of 43.5 as an example. The huge sudden anomalous spike in atmospheric methane concentration in mid August, 2010 at Svalbard is clearly evident and the methane concentrations within this spike have been used to construct a series of radiating methane global warming temperature trends for the entire range of methane global warming potentials in Figure 3 from an assumed mean start temperature of -3.575 degrees Centigrade for Svalbard (see Figure 2) (Norwegian Polar Institute; 2011). Figure 3 shows a set of radiating Arctic atmospheric methane global warming temperature trends calculated from the steep methane atmospheric concentration gradient at Svalbard in 2010 (ESRL/GMO, 2010 - Arctic-Methane-Emergency-Group.org). The range of extinction temperature anomalies above the assumed 1990 mean atmospheric temperature of 14.49 oC (Shakil, 2005) are also shown on this diagram as well as the 80 oF (26.66 oC) major Permian extinction event temperature (Wignall, 2009). Sam Carana (pers. com. 7 Jan, 2012) has described large December 2011 (ESRL-NOAA data) warming anomalies which exceed 10 to 20 degrees centigrade and cover vast areas of the Arctic at times. In the centres of these regions, which appear to overlap the Gakkel Ridge and its bounding basins, the temperature anomalies may exceed 20 degrees centigrade. See this site:<http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/map/images/fnl/sfctmpmero1a30frames.fnl.anim.html> The temperature anomalies in this region of the Arctic for the period from September 8 2011 to October 7, 2011 were only about 4 degrees Centigrade above normal (Carana, pers. com. 2012) and this data set can be seen on this site: <http://arctic-newsblogspot.com/p/arctic-temperatures.html> Because the Svalbard methane concentration data suggests that the major spike in methane emissions began in late 2010 it has been assumed for calculation purposes that the 2010 temperature anomalies peaked at 4 degrees Centigrade and the 2011 anomalies at 20 degrees Centigrade in the Gakkel Ridge region. The assumed 20 degree Centigrade temperature anomaly trend from 2010 to 2011 in the Gakkel Ridge region requires a methane gas warming potential of about 1000 to generate it from the Svalbard methane atmospheric concentration spike data in 2010. Such high methane warming potentials could only be active over a very short time interval (less than 5.7 months) as shown when the long methane global warming potential lifetimes data from the IPCC (2007; 1992) and Dessus, Laponte and Treut (2008 ) are used to generate a global warming potential growth curve with a methane global warming potential of 100 with a lifespan of 5 years. Because of the high methane global warming potential (1000) of the 2011, 20 oC temperature anomalies in the Gakkel Ridge region, the entire methane global warming potential range from 5 to 1000 has been used to construct the radiating set of temperature trends shown in Figure 3. The 50, 100, 500 and 1000 methane global warming potential (GWP) trends are red and in bold. The choice of a high temperature methane peak with a global warming potential near 1000 is in fact very conservative because the 16 oC increase is assumed to occur over a year. The observed ESRL-NOAA Arctic temperature anomalies varied from 4 to 20 degrees over less than a month in 2011 (Sam Carana, pers. comm. 2012). […] . This very narrow temperature range includes all the mathematically and visually determined extinction times and their means for the northern and southern hemispheres which were calculated quite separately (Figure 7; Table 1). Once the world's ice caps have completely melted away at temperatures above 22.49 oC and times later than 2051.3, the Earth's atmosphere will heat up at an extremely fast rate to reach the Permian extinction event temperature of 80oF (26.66 oC)(Wignall, 2009) by which time all life on Earth will have been completely extinguished. The position where the latent heat of ice melting curve intersects the 8 oC extinction line (22.49 oC) at 2051.3 represents the time when 100 percent of all the ice on the surface of the Earth will have melted. If we make this point on the latent heat of ice melting curve equal to 1 we can determine the time of melting of any fraction of the Earth's icecaps by using the time\*temperature function at each time from 2051.3 back to 2015, the time the average Arctic atmospheric temperature curve is predicted to exceed 0 oC. The process of melting 1 kg of ice and heating the produced water up to a certain temperature is a function of the sum of the latent heat of melting of ice is 334 kilo Joules/kg and the final water temperature times the 4.18 kilo Joules/Kg.K (Wikipedia, 2012). This however represents the energy required over a period of one second to melt 1 kg of ice to water and raise it to the ambient temperature. Therefore the total energy per mass of ice over a certain time period is equal to (334 +(4.18\*Ambient Temperature)\*time in seconds that the melted water took to reach the ambient temperature. From the fractional time\*temperature values at each ambient temperature the fractional amounts of melting of the total global icecaps have been calculated and are shown on Figure 9. The earliest calculated fractional volume of melting of the global ice caps in 2016 is 1.85\*10^-3 of the total volume of global ice with an average yearly rate of ice melting of 2.557\*10^-3 of the total volume of global ice. This value is remarkably similar to, but slightly less than the average rate of melting of the Arctic sea ice measured over an 18 year period of 2.7\*10^-3 (1978 to 1995; 2.7% per decade - IPCC 2007).This close correlation between observed rates of Arctic ice cap and predicted rates of global ice cap melting indicates that average rates of Arctic ice cap melting between 1979 and 2015 (which represents the projected time the Arctic will lose its ice cover - Masters, 2009) will be continued during the first few years of melting of the global ice caps after the Arctic ice cover has gone in 2015 as the mean Arctic atmospheric temperature starts to climb above 0 oC. However from 2017 the rate of melting of the global ice will start to accelerate as will the atmospheric temperature until by 2049 it will be more than 9 times as fast as it was around 2015 (Table 2). The mean rate of melting of the global icecap between 2017 and 2049 is some 2\*10^-2, some 7.4 times the mean rate of melting of the Arctic ice cap (Table 2). In concert with the increase in rate of global ice cap melting between 2017 and 2049, the acceleration in the rate of melting also increases from 7\*10^-4 to 9.9\*10^-4 with a mean value close to 8.6\*10^-4 (Table 2). The ratio of the acceleration in the rate of global ice cap melting to the Arctic ice cap melting increases from 3.4 in 2017 to 4.8 by 2049 with a mean near 4.2. This fast acceleration in the rate of global ice cap melting after 2015 compared to the Arctic sea ice cap melting before 2015 is because the mean Arctic atmospheric temperature after 2017 is spiraling upward in temperature above 0 oC adding large amounts of additional energy to the ice and causing it to melt back more quickly. The melt back of the Arctic ice cap is a symptom of the Earth's disease but not its cause and it is the cause that has to be dealt with if we hope to bring about a cure. Therefore a massive cut back in carbon dioxide emissions should be mandatory for all developed nations (and some developing nations as well). Total destruction of the methane in the Arctic atmosphere is also mandatory if we are to survive the effects of its now catastrophic rate of build up in the atmospheric methane concentration However cooling of the Arctic using geoengineering methods is also vitally important to reduce the effects of the ice cap melting further enhancing the already out of control destabilization of the methane hydrates on the Arctic shelf and slope. · Developed (and some developing) countries must cut back their carbon dioxide emissions by a very large percentage (50% to 90%) by 2020 to immediately precipitate a cooling of the Earth and its crust. If this is not done the earthquake frequency and methane emissions in the Arctic will continue to grow exponentially leading to our inexorable demise between 2031 to 2051. · Geoenginering must be used immediately as a cooling method in the Arctic to counteract the effects of the methane buildup in the short term. However these methods will lead to further pollution of the atmosphere in the long term and will not solve the earthquake induced Arctic methane buildup which is going to lead to our annihilation. · The United States and Russia must immediately develop a net of powerful radio beat frequency transmission stations around the Arctic using the critical 13.56 MHZ beat frequency to break down the methane in the stratosphere and troposphere to nanodiamonds and hydrogen (Light 2011a) . Besides the elimination of the high global warming potential methane, the nanodiamonds may form seeds for light reflecting noctilucent clouds in the stratosphere and a light coloured energy reflecting layer when brought down to the Earth by snow and rain (Light 2011a). HAARP transmission systems are able to electronically vibrate the strong ionospheric electric current that feeds down into the polar areas and are thus the least evasive method of directly eliminating the buildup of methane in those critical regions (Light 2011a). The warning about extinction is stark. It is remarkable that global scientists had not anticipated a giant buildup of methane in the atmosphere when it had been so clearly predicted 10 to 20 years ago and has been shown to be critically linked to extinction events in the geological record (Kennett et al. 2003). Furthermore all the experiments should have already been done to determine which geoengineering methods were the most effective in oxidising/destroying the methane in the atmosphere in case it should ever build up to a concentration where it posed a threat to humanity. Those methods need to be applied immediately if there is any faint hope of reducing the catastrophic heating effects of the fast building atmospheric methane concentration.

#### Its anthro- 500 studies go aff

Romm ‘10 (Jon, Editor of Climate Progress, Senior Fellow at the American Progress, former Acting Assistant Secretary of Energy for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, “Disputing the “consensus” on global warming,” <http://climateprogress.org/2010/06/16/scientific-consensus-on-global-warming-climate-science/>,)

A good example of how scientific evidence drives our understanding concerns how we know that humans are the dominant cause of global warming. This is, of course, the deniers’ favorite topic. Since it is increasingly obvious that the climate is changing and the planet is warming, the remaining deniers have coalesced to defend their Alamo — that human emissions aren’t the cause of recent climate change and therefore that reducing those emissions is pointless. Last year, longtime Nation columnist [Alexander Cockburn wrote](http://www.counterpunch.org/cockburn04282007.html), “There is still zero empirical evidence that anthropogenic production of CO2 is making any measurable contribution to the world’s present warming trend. The greenhouse fearmongers rely entirely on unverified, crudely oversimplified computer models to finger mankind’s sinful contribution.” In fact, the evidence is amazingly strong. Moreover, if the relatively complex climate models are oversimplified in any respect, it is by omitting amplifying feedbacks and other factors that suggest human-caused climate change will be worse than is widely realized. The [IPCC concluded](http://ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/Report/AR4WG1_Print_Ch09.pdf) last year: “Greenhouse gas forcing has very likely (>90 percent) caused most of the observed global warming over the last 50 years. This conclusion takes into account … the possibility that the response to solar forcing could be underestimated by climate models.” Scientists have come to understand that “forcings” (natural and human-made) explain most of the changes in our climate and temperature both in recent decades and over the past millions of years. The primary human-made forcings are the heat-trapping greenhouse gases we generate, particularly carbon dioxide from burning coal, oil and natural gas. The natural forcings include fluctuations in the intensity of sunlight (which can increase or decrease warming), and major volcanoes that inject huge volumes of gases and aerosol particles into the stratosphere (which tend to block sunlight and cause cooling)…. Over and over again, scientists have demonstrated that observed changes in the climate in recent decades can only be explained by taking into account the observed combination of human and natural forcings. Natural forcings alone just don’t explain what is happening to this planet. For instance, in April 2005, one of the nation’s top climate scientists, NASA’s James Hansen, led a team of scientists that made “precise measurements of increasing ocean heat content over the past 10 years,” which revealed that the Earth is absorbing far more heat than it is emitting to space, confirming what earlier computer models had shown about warming. [Hansen called](http://www.columbia.edu/~jeh1/imbalance_release.pdf) this energy imbalance the “smoking gun” of climate change, and said, “There can no longer be genuine doubt that human-made gases are the dominant cause of observed warming.” Another 2005 study, led by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, compared actual ocean temperature data from the surface down to hundreds of meters (in the Atlantic, Pacific and Indian oceans) with climate models and [concluded](http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/abstract/1112418): A warming signal has penetrated into the world’s oceans over the past 40 years. The signal is complex, with a vertical structure that varies widely by ocean; it cannot be explained by natural internal climate variability or solar and volcanic forcing, but is well simulated by two anthropogenically [human-caused] forced climate models. We conclude that it is of human origin, a conclusion robust to observational sampling and model differences. Such studies are also done for many other observations: land-based temperature rise, atmospheric temperature rise, sea level rise, arctic ice melt, inland glacier melt, Greeland and Antarctic ice sheet melt, expansion of the tropics (desertification) and changes in precipitation. Studies compare every testable prediction from climate change theory and models (and suggested by paleoclimate research) to actual observations. How many studies? Well, the IPCC’s definitive treatment of the subject, “Understanding and Attributing Climate Change,” has 11 full pages of references, some 500 peer-reviewed studies. This is not a consensus of opinion. It is what scientific research and actual observations reveal. And the science behind human attribution has gotten much stronger in the past 2 years (see a recent literature review by the Met Office [here](http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/pressoffice/2010/pr20100305.html)). That brings us to another problem with the word “consensus.” It can mean “unanimity” or “the judgment arrived at by most of those concerned.” Many, if not most, people hear the second meaning: “consensus” as majority opinion. The scientific consensus most people are familiar with is the IPCC’s “Summary for Policymakers” reports. But those aren’t a majority opinion. Government representatives participate in a line-by-line review and revision of these summaries. So China, Saudi Arabia and that hotbed of denialism — the Bush administration — get to veto anything they don’t like. The deniers call this “politicized science,” suggesting the process turns the IPCC summaries into some sort of unscientific exaggeration. In fact, the reverse is true. The net result is unanimous agreement on a conservative or watered-down document. You could argue that rather than majority rules, this is “minority rules.” Last April, in an article titled “Conservative Climate,” [Scientific American](http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?chanID=sa006&articleID=5B9E73AD-E7F2-99DF-3F71280BCE41ED77&colID=5) noted that objections by Saudi Arabia and China led the IPCC to remove a sentence stating that the impact of human greenhouse gas emissions on the Earth’s recent warming is five times greater than that of the sun. In fact, lead author Piers Forster of the University of Leeds in England said, “The difference is really a factor of 10.” Then I discuss the evidence we had even back in 2008 that the IPCC was underestimating key climate impacts, a point I [update here](http://climateprogress.org/2010/02/18/ipcc-lowballs-impacts-pachauri-disband/). The bottom line is that recent observations and research make clear the planet almost certainly faces a greater and more imminent threat than is laid out in the IPCC reports. That’s why climate scientists are so desperate. That’s why they keep begging for immediate action. And that’s why the “consensus on global warming” is a phrase that should be forever retired from the climate debate. The leading scientific organizations in this country and around the world, including all the major national academies of science, aren’t buying into some sort of consensus of opinion. They have analyzed the science and observations and expressed their understanding of climate science and the likely impacts we face on our current emissions path — an understanding that has grown increasingly dire in recent years (see “[An illustrated guide to the latest climate science](http://climateprogress.org/2010/02/17/an-illustrated-guide-to-the-latest-climate-science/)” and “[An introduction to global warming impacts: Hell and High Water](http://climateprogress.org/2009/03/22/an-introduction-to-global-warming-impacts-hell-and-high-water/)“).

#### Two internal links – the first is climate leadership

#### The plan is key

Saha 11/13, Devashree, senior policy analyst and associate fellow at the Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program,” “Enact Legislation Supporting Residential Property Assessed Clean Energy Financing,” November 13th, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Research/Files/Papers/2012/11/13%20federalism/13%20housing%20energy%20efficiency.pdf>

Along these lines, a first priority for unleashing clean economy growth in the nation must be to catalyze stronger market demand for energy efficiency and renewable energy products and services in the residential, commercial, and institutional markets. Of particular note here is the market potential of energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades and retrofits in buildings. Since buildings consume nearly half (48.7 percent) of the nation’s primary energy and are also responsible for half of the carbon emissions, such upgrades and retrofits offer the potential for significant economic, employment, and climate benefits. Given that, it has been estimated that scaling up energy efficiency retrofits offers a $279 billion investment opportunity with potential for energy savings totaling more than $1 trillion over a period of 10 years—of which $182 billion of investment potential is tied to residential energy efficiency upgrades alone. Cities and states across the nation—motivated by challenges of escalating energy costs and the significant economic benefits of energy efficient solutions—have led the nation through their efforts to retrofit the residential, commercial, and public buildings in their jurisdictions. At the same time though, cities and states have contended with a number of challenging market barriers that prevent the energy retrofit market from scaling up, including perceived risk of investing in energy retrofit projects, high transaction costs, and inadequate access to capital. Given these financing challenges, property assessed clean energy (PACE) programs have attracted attention as an innovative financing mechanism for energy retrofit upgrades. PACE is a financing structure that enables states and local governments to use money raised through bond issues or other sources of capital to fund energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades. These funds are used as upfront financing for upgrades to residential and commercial properties, recovered by the governmental entity through a special property tax assessment that runs with the land for up to 20 years. The PACE special district structure thus overcomes market barriers to energy upgrades by spreading cost recovery with savings realized over the life of the improvement. First piloted in 2008, PACE programs quickly spread throughout the country and today 28 states and the District of Columbia have passed PACE-enabling legislation. As a result, PACE programs have enjoyed significant success in many cities and counties. Palm Desert, CA’s PACE program, for example, has approved $8.5 million in projects to date. Sonoma County’s program, meanwhile, has financed over $55 million in projects for 1,600 residential and 50 non-residential property owners. What’s more, studies analyzing the economic effects of PACE programs suggest that they have the potential of generating significant positive economic and fiscal benefits. One study found that $4 million in total PACE spending can generate on average $10 million in gross economic output; $1 million in combined federal, state, and local tax revenue; and 60 new jobs. Extrapolating from this study, if just one percent of the 75 million owner-occupied homes in the U.S. were to invest in a PACE project that cost an average of $20,000 each, the economic impact would translate to $15 billion in gross economic output; $4 billion in combined federal, state, and local tax revenue; and 226,000 new jobs. The Problem And yet, for all their promise, neither energy retrofit projects in general nor residential PACE programs specifically have achieved their full potential. Part of the problem owes to the well-known market barriers that depress demand, including: a status quo bias, difficulty in quantifying energy savings from retrofits and upgrades, lack of information about existing energy inefficiency in homes and what can be done about it, high up-front costs, and difficulty identifying quality contractors. In addition, and perhaps more significantly, the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) has blocked the scale-up of residential PACE programs. In July 2010, just as residential PACE programs were gathering momentum, the FHFA issued a statement asserting that PACE programs constituted first liens over pre-existing mortgages, thereby creating significant risks for lenders, servicers, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and other mortgage holders. Despite evidence to the contrary, the FHFA deemed these risks unacceptable and instructed Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to restrict the kind of loans that homeowners could get if they live in a PACEdesignated area. This ruling effectively ended residential PACE financing, with many local governments suspending their programs as a result. Commercial PACE programs were not affected by the FHFA decision and have been moving forward in various places. The FHFA ruling on residential PACE financing has resulted in:  The cessation of almost all existing PACE programs focused on the residential sector out of concern that mortgages in PACE-designated areas would fail to receive the backing of Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac  Redirection of nearly $150 million in federal Recovery Act funds that had originally been designated to support the implementation and operation of residential PACE programs throughout the U.S. Despite efforts by advocates of PACE to address FHFA concerns, the FHFA ruling against residential PACE financing persists. Meanwhile, some states have challenged the FHFA ruling in federal court, though such efforts have thus far proven unsuccessful in changing FHFA’s stance. A federal district court in California—while not ordering the FHFA to reverse its current position on underwriting mortgages for properties with a PACE assessment—directed the agency to proceed with a notice and comment period for rulemaking. The FHFA took comments on proposed rules until September 2012 and it is not clear how long it will take to finalize the proposed rules or what the outcome will be. In addition, there have been a number of attempts to resolve the residential PACE issue through legislative action, including the PACE Assessment Protection Act (H.R. 2599), introduced in July 2011, that would prevent the FHFA and mortgage underwriters from discriminating against localities participating in or implementing a PACE program. To date, however, no legislation supporting residential PACE programs has been passed. Proposal The Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings therefore proposes that Congress enact legislation that would require the FHFA to allow Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to purchase residential mortgages with PACE assessments and incorporate underwriting standards protecting lenders and program standards for states and local governments offering PACE programs. These underwriting standards should be aligned with the PACE guidelines released by the Department of Energy in May 2010. Along these lines, Congressional support of residential PACE programs would:  Send a strong signal that the U.S. remains fiercely committed to investing in smart, innovative financing structures that can catalyze the energy retrofit market  Enable states and local governments—many of which suspended their residential PACE programs in the wake of the FHFA ruling—to design and implement such programs in their communities  Save money for homeowners by reducing energy costs  Create new jobs and career opportunities in both the energy efficiency and renewable energy industries  Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and so produce significant climate benefits

#### Obama taking visible action is key to climate leadership – solves warming – the brink is now

#### Traub 12/14, James, fellow of the Centre on International Cooperation. He writes Terms of Engagement for Foreign Policy,” “Transforming the future lies in our hands,” December 14th, <http://gulfnews.com/opinions/columnists/transforming-the-future-lies-in-our-hands-1.1118704>

Despite President Barack Obama’s vow, in his first post-reelection press conference, to take decisive action on climate change, the global climate talks in Doha dragged to a close with the US, as usual, a target of activists’ wrath. The Obama administration has shown no interest in submitting to a binding treaty on carbon emissions and refuses to increase funding to help developing countries reduce their own emissions, even as the US continues to behave as a global scofflaw on climate change. Actually, that is not true — the last part, anyway. According to the International Energy Agency, US emissions have dropped 7.7 per cent since 2006 — “the largest reduction of all countries or regions”. Yes, you read that correctly. The US, which has refused to sign the Kyoto Accords establishing binding targets for emissions, has reduced its carbon footprint faster than the greener-than-thou European countries. The reasons for this have something to do with climate change itself (warm winters mean less heating oil — something to do with market forces — the shift from coal to natural gas in power plants) and something to do with policy at the state and regional levels. And in the coming years, as both new gas-mileage standards and new power-plant regulations, championed by the Obama administration kick in, policy will drive the numbers further downwards. US emissions are expected to fall 23 per cent between 2002 and 2020. Apparently, Obama’s record on climate change is not quite as calamitous as reputation would have it. The West has largely succeeded in bending downwards the curve of carbon emissions. However, the developing world has not. Last year, China’s emissions rose 9.3 per cent; India’s, 8.7 per cent. China is now the world’s No 1 source of carbon emissions, followed by the US, the European Union (EU) and India. The emerging powers have every reason to want to emulate the energy-intensive economic success of the West — even those, like China, who have taken steps to increase energy efficiency, are not prepared to do anything to harm economic growth. The real failure of US policy has been, first, that it is still much too timid; and second, that it has not acted in such a way as to persuade developing nations to take the truly difficult decisions which would put the world on a sustainable path. There is a useful analogy with the nuclear nonproliferation regime. In an earlier generation, the nuclear stockpiles of the US and the Soviet Union posed the greatest threat to global security. Now, the threat comes from the proliferation of weapons to weak or rogue states or to non-state actors. However, the only way that Washington can persuade other governments to join in a tough nonproliferation regime is by taking the lead in reducing its own nuclear stockpile — which the Obama administration has sought to do, albeit with very imperfect success. In other words, where power is more widely distributed, US action matters less in itself, but carries great weight as a demonstration model — or anti-demonstration model. Logic would thus dictate that the US bind itself in a global compact to reduce emissions, as through the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) it has bound itself to reduce nuclear weapons. However, the Senate would never ratify such a treaty. And even if it did, would China and India similarly bind themselves? Here the nuclear analogy begins to break down because the NPT mostly requires that states submit to inspections of their nuclear facilities, while a climate change treaty poses what looks very much like a threat to states’ economic growth. Fossil fuels are even closer to home than nukes. Is it any wonder that only EU countries and a few others have signed the Kyoto Accords? A global version of Kyoto is supposed to be readied by 2015, but a growing number of climate change activists — still very much a minority — accept that this may not happen and need not happen. So what can Obama do? It is possible that much tougher action on emissions will help persuade China, India and others that energy efficiency need not hinder economic growth. As Michael Levi, a climate expert at the Council on Foreign Relations points out, the US gets little credit abroad for reducing emissions largely — thanks to “serendipitous” events. Levi argues, as do virtually all policy thinkers and advocates, that the US must increase the cost of fossil fuels, whether through a “carbon tax” or cap-and-trade system, so that both energy efficiency and alternative fuels become more attractive and also to free-up money to be invested in new technologies. This is what Obama’s disappointed supporters thought he would do in the first term and urge him to do now. Obama is probably not going to do that. In his post-election news conference, he insisted that he would find “bipartisan” solutions to climate change and congressional Republicans are only slightly more likely to accept a sweeping change in carbon pricing than they are to ratify a climate-change treaty. The president also said that any reform would have to create jobs and growth, which sounds very much like a signal that he will avoid new taxes or penalties (even though advocates of such plans insist that they would spur economic growth). All these prudent political calculations are fine when you can afford to fail. But we cannot afford to fail. Global temperatures have already increased 0.7 degrees Celsius. Disaster really strikes at a 2 degree Celsius increase, which leads to large-scale drought, wildfires, decreased food production and coastal flooding. However, the current global trajectory of coal, oil and gas consumption means that, according to Fatih Birol, the International Energy Agency’s chief economist, “the door to a 2 degree Celsius trajectory is about to close.” That is how dire things are. What, then, can Obama do that is equal to the problem? He can invest. Once the fiscal cliff negotiations are behind him, and after he has held his planned conversation with “scientists, engineers and elected officials,” he can tell the American people that they have a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to transform the future — for themselves and for people everywhere. He can propose — as he hoped to do as part of the stimulus package of 2009 — that the US build a “smart grid” to radically improve the efficiency of electricity distribution. He can argue for large-scale investments in research and development of new sources of energy and energy-efficient construction technologies and lots of other whiz-bang things. This, too, was part of the stimulus spending; it must become bigger and permanent. The reason Obama should do this is, first, because the American people will (or could) rally behind a visionary programme in a way that they never will get behind the dour mechanics of carbon pricing. Second, because the way to get to a carbon tax is to use it as a financing mechanism for such a plan. Third, because oil and gas are in America’s bloodstream; as Steven Cohen, executive director of the Earth Institute, puts it: “The only thing that’s going to drive fossil fuels off the market is cheaper renewable energy.” Fourth, the US cannot afford to miss out on the gigantic market for green technology. Finally, there’s leverage. China and India may not do something sensible but painful, like adopting carbon pricing, because the US does so, but they will adopt new technologies if the US can prove that they work without harming economic growth. Developing countries have already made major investments in reducing air pollution, halting deforestation and practising sustainable agriculture. They are just too modest. It is here, above all, that the US can serve as a demonstration model — the world’s most egregious carbon consumer showing the way to a low-carbon future. Global warming-denial is finally on the way out. Three-quarters of Americans now say they believe in global warming and more than half believe that humans are causing it and want to see a US president take action. President Obama does not have to do the impossible. He must, however, do the possible.

#### Obama’s environmental leadership’s key to solve the collapse of Biodiversity, Oceans, and Soil

Khosla 9 – Ashok, IUCN President, International Union for Conservation of Nature, A new President for the United States: We have a dream, 1-29-09, <http://cms.iucn.org/news_events/?uNewsID=2595>

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

#### Biodiversity loss causes extinction

Young 10 – PhD coastal marine ecology, [Ruth, “Biodiversity: what it is and why it’s important”, February 9th, <http://www.talkingnature.com/2010/02/biodiversity/biodiversity-what-and-why/>]

Different species within ecosystems fill particular roles, they all have a function, **they all have a niche**. They interact with each other and the physical environment to provide ecosystem services that are **vital for our survival**. For example plant species convert carbon dioxide (CO2) from the atmosphere and energy from the sun into useful things such as food, medicines and timber. Pollination carried out by insects such as bees enables the [production of ⅓ of our food crops](http://www.talkingnature.com/2010/01/biodiversity/bees-pollination/). Diverse mangrove and coral reef ecosystems provide a wide variety of habitats that are essential for many fishery species. To make it simpler for economists to comprehend the magnitude of services offered by biodiversity, a team of researchers estimated their value – it amounted to $US33 trillion per year. “By protecting biodiversity we maintain ecosystem services” Certain species play a *“keystone”* role in maintaining ecosystem services. Similar to the removal of a keystone from an arch, the removal of these species can result in the collapse of an ecosystem and the subsequent removal of ecosystem services. The most well known example of this occurred during the 19th century when sea otters were almost hunted to extinction by fur traders along the west coast of the USA. This led to a population explosion in the sea otters’ main source of prey, sea urchins. Because the urchins graze on kelp their booming population decimated the underwater kelp forests. This loss of habitat led to declines in local fish populations. Sea otters are a keystone species once hunted for their fur (Image: Mike Baird) Eventually a treaty protecting sea otters allowed the numbers of otters to increase which inturn controlled the urchin population, leading to the recovery of the kelp forests and fish stocks. In other cases, ecosystem services are maintained by entire functional groups, such as apex predators (See [Jeremy Hance’s post at Mongabay)](http://news.mongabay.com/2010/0202-hance_toppredators.html). During the last 35 years, over fishing of large shark species along the US Atlantic coast has led to a population explosion of skates and rays. These skates and rays eat bay scallops and their out of control population has led to the closure of a century long scallop fishery. These are just two examples demonstrating how biodiversity can maintain the services that ecosystems provide for us, such as fisheries. One could argue that to maintain ecosystem services we don’t need to protect biodiversity but rather, we only need to protect the species and functional groups that fill the**keystone roles**. However, there are a *couple of problems with this idea*. First of all, for most ecosystems **we don’t know which species are the keystones**! *Ecosystems are so complex* that we are still discovering which species play vital roles in maintaining them. In some cases its *groups of species* not just one species that are *vital for the ecosystem*. Second, even if we did complete the enormous task of identifying and protecting all keystone species, **what back-up plan would we have** if an unforseen event (e.g. pollution or disease) led to the demise of these ‘keystone’ species? **Would there be another species to save the day** and take over this role? Classifying some species as ‘keystone’ implies that the others are not important. This may lead to the non-keystone species being considered ecologically worthless and subsequently over-exploited. Sometimes we may not even know which species are likely to fill the keystone roles. An example of this was discovered on Australia’s Great Barrier Reef. This research examined what would happen to a coral reef if it were over-fished. The “over-fishing” was simulated by fencing off coral bommies thereby excluding and removing fish from them for three years. By the end of the experiment, the reefs had changed from a coral to an algae dominated ecosystem – the coral became overgrown with algae. When the time came to remove the fences the researchers expected herbivorous species of fish like the parrot fish (Scarus spp.) to eat the algae and enable the reef to switch back to a coral dominated ecosystem. But, surprisingly, the shift back to coral was driven by a supposed ‘unimportant’ species – the bat fish (Platax pinnatus). The bat fish was previously thought to feed on invertebrates – small crabs and shrimp, but when offered a big patch of algae it turned into a hungry herbivore – a cow of the sea – grazing the algae in no time. So a fish previously thought to be ‘unimportant’ is actually a keystone species in the recovery of coral reefs overgrown by algae! *Who knows how many other species are out there with unknown ecosystem roles!* In some cases it’s easy to see who the keystone species are but in many ecosystems seemingly unimportant or redundant species are also capable of changing niches and maintaining ecosystems. The **more biodiverse** an ecosystem is, the more likely these species will be present and the **more resilient** an ecosystem is to future impacts. Presently we’re only scratching the surface of understanding the full importance of biodiversity and how it helps maintain ecosystem function. The scope of this task is immense. In the meantime*, a wise insurance policy for maintaining ecosystem services would be to conserve biodiversity*. In doing so, we increase the chance of maintaining our ecosystem services in the event of future impacts such as disease, invasive species and of course, climate change. This is the international year of biodiversity – a time to recognize that biodiversity makes **our survival on this planet** possible and that our protection of biodiversity maintains this service.

#### Ocean collapse causes extinction

Craig ‘3 – Assc Prof Law Indiana. (34 McGeorge Law Rev 155, 2003 ln)

Biodiversity and ecosystem function arguments for conserving marine ecosystems also exist, just as they do for terrestrial ecosystems, but these arguments have thus far rarely been raised in political debates. For example, besides significant tourism values - the most economically valuable ecosystem service coral reefs provide, worldwide - coral reefs protect against storms and dampen other environmental fluctuations, services worth more than ten times the reefs' value for food production. n856 Waste treatment is another significant, non-extractive ecosystem function that intact coral reef ecosystems provide. n857 More generally, "ocean ecosystems play a major role in the global geochemical cycling of all the elements that represent the basic building blocks of living organisms, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, and sulfur, as well as other less abundant but necessary elements." n858 In a very real and direct sense, therefore, human degradation of marine ecosystems impairs the planet's ability to support life. Maintaining biodiversity is often critical to maintaining the functions of marine ecosystems. Current evidence shows that, in general, an ecosystem's ability to keep functioning in the face of disturbance is strongly dependent on its biodiversity, "indicating that more diverse ecosystems are more stable." n859 Coral reef ecosystems are particularly dependent on their biodiversity.  [\*265]   Most ecologists agree that the complexity of interactions and degree of interrelatedness among component species is higher on coral reefs than in any other marine environment. This implies that the ecosystem functioning that produces the most highly valued components is also complex and that many otherwise insignificant species have strong effects on sustaining the rest of the reef system. n860 Thus, maintaining and restoring the biodiversity of marine ecosystems is critical to maintaining and restoring the ecosystem services that they provide. Non-use biodiversity values for marine ecosystems have been calculated in the wake of marine disasters, like the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. n861 Similar calculations could derive preservation values for marine wilderness. However, economic value, or economic value equivalents, should not be "the sole or even primary justification for conservation of ocean ecosystems. Ethical arguments also have considerable force and merit." n862 At the forefront of such arguments should be a recognition of how little we know about the sea - and about the actual effect of human activities on marine ecosystems. The United States has traditionally failed to protect marine ecosystems because it was difficult to detect anthropogenic harm to the oceans, but we now know that such harm is occurring - even though we are not completely sure about causation or about how to fix every problem. Ecosystems like the NWHI coral reef ecosystem should inspire lawmakers and policymakers to admit that most of the time we really do not know what we are doing to the sea and hence should be preserving marine wilderness whenever we can - especially when the United States has within its territory relatively pristine marine ecosystems that may be unique in the world. We may not know much about the sea, but we do know this much: if we kill the ocean we kill ourselves, and we will take most of the biosphere with us.

#### Soil erosion causes extinction

Globe and Mail 7- John Allemang, feature writer, 12 May 2007, “Planet Earth has a dirty little secret,” Journal: Globe and Mail, pg. F4

Dirt is disappearing, and when it goes, we go. It's a simple fact that we're using up our finite supply of good soil faster than it can be made, and whatever our eyes choose to tell us, a crisis is looming. Of course, like so much else about dirt, even its do-or-die crisis manages to be barely perceptible. In a world prepared to welcome the inconvenient truths of environmental degradation, and even make them the markers of intellectual fashion, poor old untrendy dirt somehow falls to the bottom of the global to-do list.Air pollution, water contamination, the limited lifespan of fossil fuels, the urgent need to confront climate change no matter how far away its worst threats may be - we get it, whatever don't-worry governments and vested interests like to pretend to the contrary. But erosion as the ultimate catastrophe**, the** dusty death blow? Somehow it's hard to feel apocalyptic about something you buy at a garden centre, scrape off your boots before walking through the door or scrub off your lettuce before the salad can be made. "We take it for granted," agrees David R. Montgomery - which is a pretty hard admission for a man who has made it his goal to alert a distracted world to the crisis of lost soil. To his practised eyes, at least, the best part of the Earth is eroding and the danger signs are everywhere**:** bare plowed soil carried off by wind or rain, rivers choked by sediment from clear-cut forests, over-irrigated fields turned into salt-contaminated deserts, huge unprotected tracts of wheat or corn dependent on chemical fertilizer to replace the nutrients corporate agriculture discards, the constant stripping of topsoil to create new suburbias. Our complacency is so instinctive, our wastefulness so extreme, that Dr. Montgomery has come up with a disturbing new name for modern agriculture: soil mining. "We only have a fixed amount of soil - and we're digging it up,"he says. Dr. Montgomery is a geomorphologist at the University of Washington in Seattle, a well-travelled and well-read monitor of Earth's thin skin who knows that a civilization's lifespan depends on how it treats - or mistreats - its dirt. As a student of the Earth's eons of slow but certain transformations, he is trained to spot the big-picture inevitabilities the rest of us miss, and of this he is certain: "We're on track to lose most of our agricultural soils. And even if we solve the water crisis and the climate crisis, if we don't conserve soil, then that will do us in."You hear that, and you look around at the lushness of life in the spring, and the doomsday scenario seems unconvincing. Dirt is everywhere, the fields are full of crops, the supermarket shelves have their usual cornucopia look of gross overabundance and, if there's a famine in a far-off place, as there always is, can it really all come down to a few inches of topsoil that has gone missing? Yes is the short answer, according to Dr. Montgomery's wide-ranging new book, Dirt: The Erosion of Civilizations, which is to be published this week and has been deemed "a compelling manifesto" by New Scientist magazine. He takes pains to demonstrate the key role played by soil degradation in almost every civilization that once claimed to dominate the Earth - a useful antidote to the Golden Age nostalgia for a more harmonious past that afflicts many in the environmental movement. Wrecking soil, he implies, is something humans do, given the opportunity, because we're programmed to think of immediate issues such as personal survival rather than forgoing our inheritance to benefit the farmers of the future. And one reason we can do this with a clear conscience is our belief that soil is everywhere. "People just don't realize that not all soils are good agricultural soils," Dr. Montgomery says. "And even with good soils, the pace at which it's being lost is slow by human standards even if it's quite rapid by geologic standards." You don't have to be a geologist to spot the problem. At least since the Dust Bowl crisis of the Depression era, when much of North America was blanketed by thick clouds of soil eroded off the drought-ridden prairie, soil specialists have put forward strong arguments for conservation - arguments that are all the more crucial since the western plains, as Dr. Montgomery observes, "are one of the few places on the planet that can produce agricultural surpluses and feed the world."

#### The second is the plan – it independently solves warming

Hoops 12, Jeffrey, J.D. Candidate (2012), Washington University School of Law; B.A. cum laude in English (2007), Truman State University “Setting The Pace For Energy Efficiency: The Rise, Fall, And (Potential) Return Of Property Assessed Clean Energy,” Volume 89 | Issue 4, <http://lawreview.wustl.edu/inprint/89/4/hoops.pdf>

Concerns about climate change and future energy shortfalls have spurred energy conservation and efficiency initiatives at a rate not seen since the 1970s oil-shortage crisis. 15 Both private and state actors are moving to facilitate, encourage, and in some cases, require energy conservation measures. 16 While lasting and long-term solutions to climate change and future energy shortfalls will likely entail a major overhaul of the global energy economy, simpler and more easily implemented steps can be taken in the short-term to ease this transition. Specifically, energy efficiency measures, often described as the “low-hanging fruit” of potential energy conservation efforts, can offer **dramatic results** in terms of reducing energy use and greenhouse gas emissions (“GHG”) through the application of commonly available technology and techniques. 17 Simple home energy efficiency retrofits can help homeowners **significantly reduce** their utility bills while at the same time reducing **GHG emissions** and energy use. 18 Energy efficiency initiatives can also serve to stimulate the economy through the creation of “green” jobs. 19 However, many homeowners are reluctant to take such measures due to the requisite initial net capital outlay and the relatively long period of time required to recoup this cost. 20 Some homeowners are unable to afford these upfront costs, while others may be unwilling to make this long-term investment if they believe they may sell the property before their energy efficiency investments result in a net gain. Policymakers in all levels of government can do much to incentivize homeowners to nevertheless take the plunge and retrofit their homes for increased energy efficiency. While a wide variety of such policies and laws have been enacted throughout the United States, 21 this Note will focus on PACE and its implementation throughout the country. PACE is a popular and innovative solution to obstacles preventing the widespread implementation of energy efficiency measures. Originating in California in 2007, 22 PACE is a form of legislation that allows municipalities to create special assessment districts for the purpose of financing homeowners’ upfront costs for energy efficiency improvements. 23 Many states already have statutes in place that allow municipalities to create assessment districts for the purpose of improving local infrastructure. 24 Under such a statute, for example, a city may issue bonds for the purpose of financing sewer lines in a given area. The bonds are repaid through property assessments by property owners who benefit from the improvement. 25 PACE legislation typically expands the language of this type of statute to include energy efficiency improvements within its ambit. 26 The legislation also generally provides that local governments may prescribe the types of energy efficiency improvements that the municipality will be willing to finance, 27 as well as underwriting standards for the program. 28 Finally, in the vast majority of states that have enacted PACE programs, PACE legislation provides that a first priority lien will be placed on the property in the event of default or delinquency on the part of the homeowner in paying the special assessment. 29 In a typical PACE scenario, a municipality first sells bonds to raise starting capital for energy efficiency project financing. 30 Then, a homeowner seeking to finance energy efficiency improvements to her home applies to the city for the financing. 31 Assuming the applicant shows that she will be able to pay the special assessment by meeting designated underwriting criteria, the municipality then finances approved energy efficiency projects. 32 The municipality recovers this cost and pays back the bonds by placing a special assessment on the property for a period of time equal to or less than the lifetime of the energy efficiency improvements made to the property, typically no more than twenty years. 33 PACE legislation allows property owners to reap the benefits of energy efficiency improvements while minimizing or eliminating the usual barriers to implementation. 34 Since the municipality provides the initial funding, there is no initial outlay of capital on the part of the homeowner. 35 And since the special assessment attaches to and runs with the property rather than the homeowner, a homeowner is not penalized if she moves before the energy efficiency investments result in an overall net gain; instead, the homeowner merely pays for the benefit she derives and no more. 36 The next owner of the property continues to enjoy the benefits of energy efficiency while paying their proportionate share of the costs, depending on how long they own the property. 37 Moreover, PACE programs are generally designed so that the homeowners’ savings in the form of utility bill reductions will be greater than the amount the homeowners pay the city through the special assessment; that is, the Savings-to-Investment ratio is greater than one. 38 PACE programs therefore **make energy efficiency improvements a winning proposition** for both homeowners and municipalities.

#### Building integrated solar revitalizes the whole market

O’Connor 12, Mary Catherine, written for Fast Company, Wired, Outside, Entrepreneur, Earth2Tech, Earth Island Journal and The Bold Italic “Will building-integrated solar take off?” August 15th, <http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/design-architecture/will-building-integrated-solar-take-off/8189>

**The solar industry has been taking a beating** in recent months, thanks to falling costs and falling trust in the industry, a’la Solyndra. But a new report from Pike Research examines whether building-integrated photovoltaics — that is, energy-generating solar cells integrated into windows and other building facades — might **infuse the solar industry with new energy**. The report examines the “demand drivers and economics, technology issues, and key industry players” for both building-integrated photovoltaics (BIPV) and building-applied photovoltaics (BAPV), which refers to panels integrated into building facades retroactively. It concludes that BIPV is one of the fastest-growing industry sectors, globally. In the United States the technology is coming along quite slowly, however, especially compared to BIPV hotspots in Western Europe. One reason for slow adoption, says Paula Mints, the principal analyst for the solar services program at Navigant, Pike’s parent company, is how BIPV vendors are approaching customers. “Essentially the way the industry wants to move is toward a green building philosophy. They want PV integrated into buildings because distributed generation is seen as the backbone of solar industry and will really start to change things if buildings can become self-sustaining. The problem has been that as an industry we don’t understand how architects and builders think, and what kind of products they want.”

# XO Mech

#### The President of the United States federal government should issue an executive order requiring the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation to provide loan guarantees for solar Property Assessed Clean Energy assessments levied on new or refinanced mortgages in the United States.

#### That’s key

Kelly 11, William J, staff correspondent for CaCurrent,“PACE Backers Eye Administrative Fix,” March 11th, <http://www.cacurrent.com/storyDisplay.php?sid=5219>

Property Assessed Clean Energy program proponents may pursue an administrative strategy to revive their innovative solar and energy efficiency financing strategy in the months ahead after last year's failed legislative effort. **Getting** President **Obama to** **use his** executive power **to clear away federal policy hurdles for the financing strategy could be the** quickest and easiest **way to jump start the** largely **stalled program**, according to PACE champion Jim Ferguson. The former Palm Desert city council member addressed PACE backers March 3-4. They met in Palm Desert-the first city to institute a PACE program under Ferguson's leadership-to strategize on how to expand the nascent financing effort, admitting their present course of litigation promises to be slow and that the outlook for federal legislation is uncertain. Property Assessed Clean Energy is a financing program in which home and business owners borrow funds for solar and energy efficiency upgrades and pay off the loans as part of their property tax assessments. Municipalities arrange or make the loans and administer the program. Just as the property assessment program was set for dramatic expansion after successful use by some communities in California and other states, the Federal Housing Finance Agency undercut it last summer. In response to concerns about the safety and soundness of the nation's banking system, the agency issued a policy statement that effectively blocked federally-backed mortgage loans for properties that have PACE program assessments. The federal housing agency said the property assessment loans-because they represent senior indebtedness ahead of actual mortgages in the event of defaults-could harm banks when foreclosures occur. Ferguson, noted that the default rate in existing programs has been less than 1 percent. He added that the immediate savings on energy bills for home and business owners usually are greater than the actual annual increases in property tax assessments. Nevertheless, legislation to undo the federal housing agency's pronouncement is unlikely in this Congress, according to David Gabrielson, PACE Now executive director. He observed that bills in both the Senate and House last year failed, even with extensive Democratic support in a Democratically-controlled Congress. The problem, according to Gabrielson, is that only two Republicans signed onto the legislation and now the Republican Party controls the House. This means, he said, any Property Assessed Clean Energy legislation in this Congress "has to be a Republican-supported bill" to succeed. It's not impossible, he added. For instance, Representatives Mike Thompson (D-CA) and Dan Lundgren (R-CA) are co-chairing a House working group to see if they can put together consensus-based PACE legislation that could pass. Meanwhile, litigation that California, Sonoma County, and others filed against the federal housing agency's policy is moving slowly, according to the plaintiffs' attorneys. A trial is not expected before April 2012. The upshot is that 24 states and municipalities throughout California remain on hold with property assessment financing programs put together just before the federal housing agency issued its policy. With no clear road ahead on litigation or legislation, Ferguson thinks **the quickest way to advance solar property assessments is to** lobby the White House **for an executive order requiring the federal agency to modify its policy.**
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Aerospace takes out command systems which prevents all their impacts from escalating

Chun 2k1

(Clayton, PhD in public policy analysis, MS in systems management and MA in economics, Chair for the Department of Distance Education at the U.S. Army War College specializing in assignments to missile, space, acquisition, education, strategy development, and command positions, “Aerospace Power in the Twenty-First Century A Basic Primer” July 2001, Air University Press, pg online @ Proquest//greenhill-au)

Another mission that aerospace forces can readily accomplish is decapitation . Aerospace forces deliver lethal, precision weapons at great speeds and range that make them weapons of choice to isolate top enemy leadership from its sources of power (i.e., its military and population). A single jet bomber might destroy a telecommunications center, thus preventing the enemy leader from transmitting vital commands to his forces and his nation’s citizens. The objective of decapitation is to separate the “brain” (national leader) from the “body” (nation) so that the body is paralyzed and cannot take effective action. Because the body might not be able to function sufficiently to exist, it may no longer remain a threat.

# 2ac courts

**Timeframe DA – court resolution takes years at best – traub says the window to solving warming is closing and we’re on the brink of econ collapse**

**FHFA blocks solvency**

**Hoops 12**, Jeffrey, J.D. Candidate (2012), Washington University School of Law; B.A. cum laude in English (2007), Truman State University “Setting The Pace For Energy Efficiency: The Rise, Fall, And (Potential) Return Of Property Assessed Clean Energy,” Volume 89 | Issue 4, <http://lawreview.wustl.edu/inprint/89/4/hoops.pdf>

Since direct negotiation and legislative solutions have failed, 120 judicial action may be the only recourse for proponents of PACE. This approach is far from ideal, as it makes an adversary out of the agency that will continue to have a strong say in the future of PACE no matter what the outcome of such a lawsuit might be. However, such a lawsuit would appear to be the only means for restarting PACE at this juncture. In fact, numerous parties initiated lawsuits against the FHFA along these lines. 121 These parties include the State of California, the Sierra Club, and the National Resources Defense Council (“NRDC”), among others. 122 All of these parties sought to enjoin the FHFA from further blocking the enactment or implementation of PACE legislation. 123

**Agent CPs bad**

**The courts won’t overrule the FHFA – they’ll just force the FHFA to have a notice and comment period**

**Hoops 12**, Jeffrey, J.D. Candidate (2012), Washington University School of Law; B.A. cum laude in English (2007), Truman State University “Setting The Pace For Energy Efficiency: The Rise, Fall, And (Potential) Return Of Property Assessed Clean Energy,” Volume 89 | Issue 4, <http://lawreview.wustl.edu/inprint/89/4/hoops.pdf>

However, it is less likely that a court will rule that the FHFA’s Statement is arbitrary and capricious than it is that the FHFA was required to comply with the notice and comment provisions of the APA. First, courts are, as a rule, generally quite deferential to agency decision making when they are employing the arbitrary and capricious standard. 163 Second, although the FHFA is departing from past precedent in treating PACE assessments differently than it has other special assessment districts in the past, it does provide some explanation. 164 This explanation may not hold up to intense scrutiny, but it may be enough to satisfy a court. 165 Therefore, a realistic outcome for a litigant challenging the FHFA’s Statement under the APA would be for a court to vacate and remand the Statement to the FHFA so that the FHFA may comply with the notice and comment provisions before it puts the Statement into effect.

**That means they kill the process**

**Hoops 12**, Jeffrey, J.D. Candidate (2012), Washington University School of Law; B.A. cum laude in English (2007), Truman State University “SETTING THE PACE FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY: THE RISE, FALL, AND (POTENTIAL) RETURN OF PROPERTY ASSESSED CLEAN ENERGY,” Volume 89 | Issue 4, <http://lawreview.wustl.edu/inprint/89/4/hoops.pdf>

Shortly after the Statement was issued, the DOE, which has thus far strongly backed PACE as an effective means to reduce energy consumption, 107 entered into negotiations with the FHFA with the hope of convincing the agency that PACE programs, properly structured, present no special risk to lenders and thereby to FHFA regulated entities Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. 108 However, these negotiations proved unsuccessful, with the FHFA indicating that the first priority status of PACE liens was simply unacceptable, regardless of how they were “structured, accelerated, or insured.” 109 As a final gambit for convincing the FHFA to change its mind, Congressman Steve Israel proposed a PACE pilot program, under which 300,000 homes would be allowed to obtain PACE financing pursuant to the DOE’s best practice guidelines. 110 This pilot program could have allowed the FHFA to see if their predictions of the dire consequences of allowing PACE to go forward would be realized in a controlled manner. However, the FHFA refused to allow such a program to proceed. 111 At this point, therefore, it would appear that direct negotiations with the agency have broken down.

**Perm do both – either**

**A – shields the blame**

OR

**B – Courts link to politics – Obama politicized the court – also it’s perceived as Obama**

**Copland ‘9** James, Director of the Center for Legal Policy at the Manhattan Institute “Why Politicized Judges Spark Rancorous Confirmations” 7/15, http://washingtonexaminer.com/op-eds/2009/07/james-r-copland-whypoliticized-judges-spark-rancorous-confirmations

No one following this process seriously doubts its outcome. As Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-SC) noted, President Obama’s pick for the Supreme Court, Appeals Court Judge Sonia Sotomayor, will be confirmed unless she has “a complete meltdown.” But notwithstanding the near-certainty that the theatrical confirmation hearings are irrelevant to the Senate’s ultimate vote, the process opens a public window onto a very real conflict over the proper role of the courts and the rule of law. These disagreements are hardly new: The judiciary’s power to overturn congressional statutes as unconstitutional is itself far from clear in the plain text of the Constitution, and the Supreme Court’s decision to this effect in the seminal 1803 case Marbury v. Madison was anything but uncontroversial. In the last century, President Franklin D. Roosevelt flirted with a constitutional crisis when he threatened to “pack” the Supreme Court with new justices after the Court rejected various elements of his New Deal on constitutional grounds. The early twentieth-century critiques of judicial overreach thus came from the Left, who only turned away from their democratic-populist message in the civil rights era. This history helps to expose the opening statements of some Senate Democrats, including Franken, which caricatured conservative critiques of “judicial activism.” The senators’ arguments run essentially as follows: Republican-appointed justices have proven as likely, or more likely, to overturn the “will of the people” as expressed through laws enacted by Congress; thus, “activism” is merely in the eye of the beholder. This argument only makes sense if one defines judicial activism as the “counter-majoritarian difficulty” in overturning the majority will, an implicit critique of the power of judicial review itself. But while some of the liberal philosopher-kings of the legal academy have wrestled mightily with the counter-majoritarianism inherent in judicial review, this has never been the concern of serious conservatives. Instead, the conservative critique of judicial activism is rooted in concern for the rule of law, i.e., the application of known principles to resolve cases, without arbitrary discretion. Written constitutionalism with judicial review necessarily implies that the courts police the political branches, but such policing should flow from the written text; when courts instead venture into “penumbras” and “emanations,” they turn themselves into but another political branch and undermine their legitimacy and the rule of law itself. Deconstructing the rule of law has been the major project of leftists in the legal academy over the last century. The legal realists rejected the notion of objectivity in judging and purposely sought to de-legitimatize judicial constraints on Progressive- and New Deal-era government expansion. Later, various scholars under the “critical legal studies” umbrella specifically embraced race- and gender-conscious interpretations of the law. When President Obama advocates “empathy” in judging and Judge Sotomayor flirts with race and gender as acceptable drivers of judicial outcomes, they echo these leftist academic movements and thus understandably provoke conservative reaction. No one questions that legal ambiguities abound, and mainline conservatives differ over the proper decision rules for resolving such cases, but tipping the scales of justice for a particular party in litigation is antithetical to the rule of law as traditionally understood. In deconstructing the rule of law, however, the Left has openly embraced the notion that judging is merely an extension of the political process. It should hardly be surprising, then, that the judicial confirmation process has devolved into little more than politically charged theater.

# 2ac efficiency

**Perm do both**

**Perm do the cp**

**Doesn’t solve warming – solar is key**

**Doesn’t solve econ – solar’s key to boost property values**

**solar solves brownfield redevelopment – key to the economy**

**Alpert and White 12**, Isaac and Alicia, Northwestern University, “Using the Sun to Make Brownfields Green,” http://www.rooseveltcampusnetwork.org/sites/all/files/Energy2012.pdf#page=10

Brownfields represent a serious economic problem because potentially productive land sits empty, releasing toxic waste and decreasing adjacent property values. Deterred by the initial cost of renovating these unused and contaminated commercial properties, landowners opt to leave such fallow sites untouched. Further, the extent of contamination on brownfields is hard to gauge prior to refurbishing. Cleanup efforts on heavily contaminated sites can cost $150,000 per acre, leaving even large commercial redevelopers fearful of brownfield restoration. 1 The advent of Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) funding, a unique form of municipal government financing, can encourage the redevelopment of brownfields with renewable energy projects. Through PACE, a property owner can receive financing from a city to install renewable energy infrastructure. Solar panels are ideal for brownfields because they fit nearly any sized property. The preliminary funding is repaid through an assessment, or lien, on the owner’s property taxes and future profits from their new energy technology. 2 Because the lien is assessed on the property, the loan is not attached to the original owner, regardless of ownership changes. Local governments already encourage the installation of solar panels on brownfields. In 2009, the City of Chicago partnered with a utility, Exelon, to develop the nation’s largest solar array on a former brownfield. 3 For brownfield restoration to have lasting impact, a permanent system must help small developers. PACE removes financial barriers to constructing solar arrays, turning abandoned land into profitable sources of electricity; by spreading installation costs over the panels’ lifetime, property owners would not fear bankruptcy during renovations. Analysis Given that brownfields bring in neither revenue nor private sector activity, municipalities should develop them as assets instead. An often under-utilized resource due to prohibitive cost, solar panels provide a solution. The nation’s 2010 summer net electricity demand (763 gigawatts) 7 was 0.4 percent of the energy potentially collected by photovoltaic arrays (206,000 gigawatts). 8 While the sun offers abundant energy, solar power generates only 0.08 percent of America’s energy In this proposal, a property owner works with a municipally-approved contractor to submit an application for cleanup and solar array construction. The municipality issues a lien on the property and gives the owner financing to begin cleanup and construction. Once the arrays are operational, the owner sells energy back to the grid. One square foot of solar panels averages 16.5 kilowatt-hours per year. 9 An average brownfield is 6.5 acres 10 , meaning its solar array could produce 700,000 kilowatt-hours per year. By selling back electricity at the average national rate of 12 cents per kilowatt-hours 11 , it would make $86,000 per year. For reference, a 2003 brownfield cleanup in Denver, CO, cost $80,000. 12 Additionally, as manufacturing costs of solar panels decrease, solar energy may cost $1 per watt by 2013. Although cleanup and solar installation costs vary by brownfield, a property owner could feasibly pay back a PACE loan and cover future maintenance costs using energy profits. Next Steps PACE funding for brownfield revitalization solves the issues of funding and open space, which are two of the biggest roadblocks preventing implementation of solar panels on a large-scale. Receiving backing from PACE, landowners could not only redevelop harmfully unproductive land, but also rejuvenate entire communities through the presence of green zones in industrial areas. Unfortunately, due to a ruling on the part of the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA), the federal government has put PACE funding on hold. Before this policy can be executed, the FHFA’s ruling against PACE financing must be overturned

**solar power’s key to sustainable desalination – solves extinction**

Al Gobaisi 12 (Darwish, <http://www.desware.net/Desalination-Continuity-Human-Civilization.aspx>, “Desalination Continuity in Human Civilization”, Darwish Al Gobaisi is a member of the International Study Group for Water and Energy Systems (ISGWES) and International Centre for Water and Energy Systems (ICWES)

DESALINATION AND THE CONTINUITY OF HUMAN CIVILIZATION Water, Population and Development To support the growing human population, which has already crossed the 6 billion mark and is expected to reach 8.3 billion in 2025, and 10 - 12 billion in 2050, humanity must rely on industrial development within a framework of socio-economic development. The Dublin Principles and also Agenda-21, particularly its Freshwater Chapter, make it clear that water is a key to sustainable development. The World Health Organization (WHO) has estimated that 1000 cubic meters per person per year is the benchmark level below which chronic water scarcity is considered to impede development and harm human health.  97.5% of the total global stock of water is saline and only 2.5% is fresh water. Approximately 70% of this global freshwater stock is locked up in polar icecaps and a major part of the remaining 30% lies in remote underground aquifers. In effect, only a miniscule fraction of freshwater (less than 1% of total freshwater, or 0.007% of the total global water stock) that is available in rivers, lakes and reservoirs is readily accessible for direct human use. Furthermore, the spatial and temporal distribution of the freshwater stocks and flows is hugely uneven. Hydrologists estimate the average annual flow of all the world's rivers to be about 41,000 km3/yr. Less than a third of this potential resource can be harnessed for human needs. This is further reduced by pollution such as discharges from industrial processes, drainage from mines and leaching of the residues of fertilizers and pesticides used in agriculture.  Sun is the Source of Renewable Energy and the Oceans are a Major Alternative Source of Water Just as the sun is an alternative source of energy to meet future demands, the oceans are an alternative water resource. However, extraction of fresh water from the oceans requires significant development of desalination infrastructure. Desalination is very energy-intensive, and sustainable energy systems urgently need to be developed. The most arid lands are also those blessed with abundant solar energy and this needs to be exploited for large-scale production of freshwater from the oceans. Human engineered desalination systems actually mimic the hydrologic cycle, which is itself a grand process of distillation. If these systems are driven by the sun, they will augment the fresh water supplies of the global hydrologic cycle. The resulting process will add a human engineered, sustainable and very controllable, contribution to the natural hydrological cycle. There is a clear need for further research and development, and adequate funding towards this end. The oil-rich and water-poor Arab nations must, and they can afford at present, take significant steps in this direction. They are strangely living in a false paradise without adequate concern about the inevitable crisis they will have to face in the not too distant a future when their oil reserves will be exhausted. Commercial Potential of Desalination The world has seen a 22-fold increase in desalination capacity since 1972 and the figure continues to rise. Desalinated water is still expensive and one way of bringing down the cost is by building large-scale units with appropriate technology. There were ambitious studies in the 1960s and 1970s on large-scale thermal desalination units with a capacity of 50 million gallons per day, but little came of this. Economics of desalination continues to be based on a flawed accounting system, which disregards fundamental life support systems. Remember that main stream economists (neoclassical economics) are still unwilling and unable to internalize external costs in marketprices. However 'natural capitalism' would certainly mean that natural ressources and environmental costs need to be part of the economic calculations. *See The Economics of Life and Death (John McMurtry )* *and Energy Economics: Deep Breath or http://www.eroei.com/articles/the\_chain/energy\_economics/* The 'dismal science' of economics has developed in isolation from other sciences, in particular those that concern the living world. As a result, what is necessary to preserve our planet's life processes is all too likely to be 'irrational' from an economic standpoint. The choice is simple: to rewrite economics or to destroy the natural world". (*Goldsmith, 2003*) The current structures of the energy market and domestic energy prices are major barriers to increasing the use of renewables. However, policy dimensions, and cultural issues all are challenges confronting decision makers worldwide at local, regional and global levels. As it is well known that oil and gas are running out and soon or later, every type of fossil energy will run out – including fossil uranium ore which is used by nuclear power plants. According to the findings of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), climate gases will have to be reduced by at least 60 per cent by 2050 if earth ecological system collapse is to be avoided. The sun, with its by-products (renewable and non-renewable resources) supplies our planet with many times more energy per day than the earth consumes, as for example if we assume the world energy demand for electric power in 2004 is about 14.5 Terawatts and considering the total solar energy potential of earth is about 165000 Terawatts the result is about 11400 times the world energy demands. If we consider just 3% of the Arab region surface area, it is equivalent to about 127.7 Terawatts. This is indeed what may be classified as true sustainable wealth of the Arab region, however the sad story is that Arab governments have unfortunately failed to realize the proper utilization of this enormous clean energy. The apparent abundance of fossil fuels brings the energy prices deceitfully to low levels that are surely unsustainable. This is tantamount to robbing future generations, and is in breach of the principle of intergenerational equity. The result is a situation in which decision makers have been satisfied with a performance ratio of around 6 to 10. With suitable motivation, the industry should be capable of achieving performance ratios of 20 or even 30 for thermal desalination processes. Market forces tell us that the costs of conventional water supplies from freshwater flows are expected to rise sharply. In urban water management, most of the cost goes into distribution and sewage treatment, whereas a significant decline has been noticed in recent years in the costs of desalination. In the last fifty years, a reduction of nearly 90% has been achieved in energy usage for seawater desalting. By 2025 the costs of desalination are likely to be of the same order as those of urban water supply and sanitation. Furthermore, water quality improvement can be achieved at the local level as well as by means of large industrial plants. Of late, there has been an increasing focus on the installation of small-scale distillation plants at the community and household level, in order to remove contaminants in supply lines. Thus small-scale distillation units for water purification (particularly solar based ones) offer good commercial potential. Desalination and Sustainable Development: Desalination has already made a major contribution to quality of life in the most arid regions of the world, particularly the Arab region and North Africa. Without desalination, many of these regions would have remained uninhabited. With rising global demand, uneven distribution of freshwater and increasing population, Malthusian apocalypse would have already come true. Desalination technology is providing safe drinking water even to some 'water-rich' nations where pollution reduced the quality of natural waters. Thus, as a means of augmenting fresh water supplies, desalination contributes significantly to global sustainability. The desalination associations and institutions have a pivotal role to play here, encouraging the scientific and industrial communities to make efforts to meet world water requirements through environmentally sustainable technologies. Investments in this direction are not impossible; the annual global expenditures for arms and advertisement are currently about US$780 billion (SIPRI 1998) and US$435 billion respectively. Just 1% of this over ten years would be a prudent diversion of resources enough to provide safe water and decent sanitation facilities for all human beings.  Solar Energy for Desalination in the Arab World The Arab World (AW) stretches across well over 12.9 million square kilometers of area including North Africa and the part of Western Asia known as the Arab Region. This is a region of highest water scarcity and arid climate with annual precipitation ranging from 100 mm to 400 mm. The total annual renewable water resources (TARWR) vary tremendously between the different Arab countries ranging between 0.1 km3/yr for Qatar and 75 billion m3/yr for Iraq. With a current total population of around 325 million people and a very high growth rate of 2.7%, the per capita share of TARWR has dropped well below the UN threshold for water poverty (1000 m3 per year) with most of the Gulf Arab countries reaching per capita TARWR below 200 m3/yr.  In order to meet the rising water demand required by an expanding population and developing economy and to fill the gap between supply and demand, it was found that desalination of seawater and brackish water could provide a portion of the shortfall in water supply. The growing technology of desalination is currently providing enormous quantities of water to meet the escalating needs for domestic and industrial sectors in many water scarce Arab countries. Based on recent published estimates, the current water deficit in the region amounts to 60 billion m3/year and this is expected to grow to 160 billion m3/year by 2050. A significant amount of the current 60 billion m3/year deficit is provided by desalination and it is expected that desalination will also provide more to make up for the 160 billion m3/year needed by 2050. Desalination processes, however, are energy intensive and are responsible for a good portion of GHG emissions in the region. To produce 1 m3of desalted water from a typical cogeneration plant results in 12 kg of CO2gas emission (at an energy consumption rate of 24 kWh/m3 using thermal processes). The current CO2emission due to desalination can therefore be estimated as 720 million ton CO2 per year. With business-as-usual, this amount is expected to increase to 1600 million ton CO2 by 2050. This is an unacceptable situation and cannot be allowed to continue from both population health viewpoint and from the global warming point of view. Fortunately, the AW is blessed with a renewable energy resource that is matched only in very few areas of the world, namely, Solar Energy. The region lies in the so called “sun belt” area which is the area of the globe that has the highest solar radiation intensity. The solar radiation intensity in the region lies in the range 2000 – 2800 kWh/m2 yr. The major advantage of using solar energy for desalination is that the GHG emissions produced by solar desalination plants is almost zero and the resource is available almost everywhere in the AW. The current issue of high capital cost for solar collectors and solar PV fields is a temporary problem that will be eventually solved by new technology, mass production and engineering innovation. The total installed capacity of desalinated water systems in the world in 2006 was about 37 million m3/d, which is expected to increase drastically in the next decades. The dramatic increase in desalinated water supply will create a series of problems, the most significant of which are those related to energy consumption. It has been estimated that production of 25 million m3/d requires about 338.4 million barrels of oil per year (considering specific energy consumption 24 kWh/m3). Even if oil were much more widely available, could we afford to burn it on the scale needed to provide everyone with fresh water? Given the current understanding of the greenhouse effect and the importance of CO2 levels, this use of oil is debatable. Thus, apart from satisfying the additional energy demand, environmental pollution would be a major concern. If desalination is accomplished by conventional technology, then it will require burning of substantial quantities of fossil fuels]. Fortunately, the Arab world (AW), as many other regions of the world, is blessed with a non-polluting resource of energy and is renewable, namely Solar Energy.  Problems relevant to the use of fossil fuels, in part, could be resolved by considering possible utilization of renewable resources, such as solar energy. In fact, most developing countries, with vast areas but having no access to the electric grid, appear to be well versed in renewable energies. Such sources, able to be used directly even at far remote and isolated areas, could be exploited to power low to medium scale desalination plants. A meaningful contribution from the above mentioned environmentally friendly energy resources would certainly be to extend the foreseen duration of fossil fuels store as well as attenuate the socially negative impacts caused by sudden increases in oil price. It is to be noted that nearly 3 kg of CO2generated for each m3 of water produced (at an energy consumption rate of 6 kWh/m3 with the alternative desalination technology currently used on large scale) could be avoided if the conventional fuel is replaced by a renewable one. Security policy should be Renewable Energy Policy  Our dependency on exhaustible fossil and uranium resources leads to the vulnerability of societies. Remember that there are many hidden costs associated with fossil and nuclear energy such as, undermining health, destabilizing the climate system, disposal of radioactive nuclear waste and pollution of water resources. This may lead to irreversible damage to Earth's Life Support Systems. Global life-support systems, incorporate the environmental resources (healthy environment) that sustain the economy as well as those - such as water and air , that support life on earth . At present, critical stress suffered by our environment is manifest in the air, water, and soil, our climate, and plant and animal species. Should this deterioration be allowed to continue, we can expect to alter the living world to the extent that it will be unable to sustain life as we know it. Just imagine the enormous expenditures on international security associated with safeguarding of fossil and atomic fuels including processing. All these are bad enough but an even worse aspect of nuclear technology is the creation of massive security risks such as nuclear weapons proliferation and nuclear terrorism. All of the financial expenditures should wisely be used to promote the use renewable energy resources for eternal peace and protection of life support systems. Therefore humanity should consider seriously the total replacement of fossil and atomic energy by renewable energy in the next 40-50 years. Atomic and fossil energy prices will inevitably increase due to the exhaustion of natural resources as well as the additional costs from environmental damages. Renewable energy prices will continue to drop due to the increase in mass production and improvement of technology. As there are no fuel costs for wind, solar, the renewable energy system is more cost effective, perhaps exception to this is biomass. *However Most of biomass is the energy source for the bottom half of the global economic ladder, three billion people or so. A great deal of that was unsustainably burned vegetation, cow dung, and other materials that are used where modern energy is not available or affordable*(*Richard Smalley).  See also  [Solar Energy-The Availability Perspective for Meeting the Future Energy Demands of the Arab as well as the Entire World.](http://www.desware.net/Solar-Energy-Availability-Perspective-Meeting-Future-Energy-Demands-Arab-Entire-World.aspx)* Let us hope that the entire world rises to meet this requirement of faith in the survival of life on earth.

**Green innovation key to US economy primacy**

Klarevas, 9 -- NYU Center for Global Affairs professor (Louis, "Securing American Primacy While Tackling Climate Change: Toward a National Strategy of Greengemony," Huffington Post, 12-15-9, www.huffingtonpost.com/louis-klarevas/securing-american-primacy\_b\_393223.html, accessed 10-19-12, mss)

As national leaders from around the world are gathering in Copenhagen, Denmark, to attend the United Nations Climate Change Conference, the time is ripe to re-assess America's current energy policies - but within the larger framework of how a new approach on the environment will stave off global warming and shore up American primacy. By not addressing climate change more aggressively and creatively, the United States is squandering an opportunity to **secure** its global **primacy for** the next few **generations** to come. To do this, though, the U.S. must rely on innovation to help the world escape the coming environmental meltdown. Developing the key technologies that will save the planet from global warming will allow the U.S. to **outmaneuver** potential **great power rivals** seeking to replace it as the international system's hegemon. But the greening of American strategy must occur soon. The U.S., however, seems to be stuck in time, unable to move beyond oil-centric geo-politics in any meaningful way. Often, the gridlock is portrayed as a partisan difference, with Republicans resisting action and Democrats pleading for action. This, though, is an unfair characterization as there are numerous proactive Republicans and quite a few reticent Democrats. The real divide is instead one between realists and liberals. Students of realpolitik, which still heavily guides American foreign policy, largely discount environmental issues as they are not seen as advancing national interests in a way that generates relative power advantages vis-à-vis the other major powers in the system: Russia, China, Japan, India, and the European Union. Liberals, on the other hand, have recognized that global warming might very well become the greatest challenge ever faced by mankind. As such, their thinking often eschews narrowly defined national interests for the greater global good. This, though, ruffles elected officials whose sworn obligation is, above all, to protect and promote American national interests. What both sides need to understand is that by becoming a lean, mean, green fighting machine, the U.S. can actually bring together liberals and realists to advance a collective interest which benefits every nation, while at the same time, securing America's global primacy well into the future. To do so, the U.S. must re-invent itself as not just your traditional hegemon, but as history's first ever green hegemon. Hegemons are countries that dominate the international system - bailing out other countries in times of global crisis, establishing and maintaining the most important international institutions, and covering the costs that result from free-riding and cheating global obligations. Since 1945, that role has been the purview of the United States. Immediately after World War II, Europe and Asia laid in ruin, the global economy required resuscitation, the countries of the free world needed security guarantees, and the entire system longed for a multilateral forum where global concerns could be addressed. The U.S., emerging the least scathed by the systemic crisis of fascism's rise, stepped up to the challenge and established the postwar (and current) liberal order. But don't let the world "liberal" fool you. While many nations benefited from America's new-found hegemony, the U.S. was driven largely by "realist" selfish national interests. The liberal order first and foremost benefited the U.S. With the U.S. becoming bogged down in places like Afghanistan and Iraq, running a record national debt, and failing to shore up the dollar, the future of American hegemony now seems to be facing a serious contest: potential rivals - acting like sharks smelling blood in the water - wish to challenge the U.S. on a variety of fronts. This has led numerous commentators to forecast the U.S.'s imminent fall from grace. Not all hope is lost however. With the impending systemic crisis of global warming on the horizon, the U.S. again finds itself in a position to address a transnational problem in a way that will benefit both the international community collectively and the U.S. selfishly. The current problem is two-fold. First, the competition for oil is fueling animosities between the major powers. The geopolitics of oil has already emboldened Russia in its 'near abroad' and China in far-off places like Africa and Latin America. As oil is a limited natural resource, a nasty zero-sum contest could be looming on the horizon for the U.S. and its major power rivals - a contest which threatens American primacy and global stability. Second, converting fossil fuels like oil to run national economies is producing irreversible harm in the form of carbon dioxide emissions. So long as the global economy remains oil-dependent, greenhouse gases will continue to rise. Experts are predicting as much as a 60% increase in carbon dioxide emissions in the next twenty-five years. That likely means more devastating water shortages, droughts, forest fires, floods, and storms. In other words, if global competition for access to energy resources does not undermine international security, global warming will. And in either case, oil will be a culprit for the instability. Oil arguably has been the most precious energy resource of the last half-century. But "black gold" is so 20th century. The key resource for this century will be green gold - clean, environmentally-friendly energy like wind, solar, and hydrogen power. **Climate change leaves no alternative**. And the sooner we realize this, the better off we will be. What Washington must do in order to avoid the traps of petropolitics is to convert the U.S. into the world's first-ever green hegemon. For starters, the federal government must drastically increase investment in energy and environmental research and development (E&E R&D). This will require a serious sacrifice, committing upwards of $40 billion annually to E&E R&D - a far cry from the few billion dollars currently being spent. By promoting a new national project, the U.S. could develop new technologies that will assure it does not drown in a pool of oil. Some solutions are already well known, such as raising fuel standards for automobiles; improving public transportation networks; and expanding nuclear and wind power sources. Others, however, have not progressed much beyond the drawing board: batteries that can store massive amounts of solar (and possibly even wind) power; efficient and cost-effective photovoltaic cells, crop-fuels, and hydrogen-based fuels; and even fusion. Such innovations will not only provide alternatives to oil, they will also give the U.S. an edge in the global competition for hegemony. If the U.S. is able to produce technologies that allow modern, globalized societies to escape the oil trap, those nations will eventually **have no choice** but to adopt such technologies. And **this will give the U.S. a tremendous economic boom**, while simultaneously **providing it with** means of leverage **that can** be employed to **keep** potential **foes in check**. The bottom-line is that the U.S. needs to become green energy dominant as opposed to black energy independent - and the best approach for achieving this is to promote a national strategy of greengemony.

**Zhang and Shi 11** - 1/22 – \*Yuhan Zhang is a researcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D.C.; Lin Shi is from Columbia University. She also serves as an independent consultant for the Eurasia Group and a consultant for the World Bank in Washington, D.C. (America’s decline: A harbinger of conflict and rivalry, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/01/22/americas-decline-a-harbinger-of-conflict-and-rivalry/>)

 Thus, the global distribution of power is shifting, and the inevitable result will be a world that is less peaceful, liberal and prosperous, burdened by a dearth of effective conflict regulation. Over the past two decades, no other state has had the ability to seriously challenge the US military. Under these circumstances, motivated by both opportunity and fear, many actors have bandwagoned with US hegemony and accepted a subordinate role. Canada, most of Western Europe, India, Japan, South Korea, Australia, Singapore and the Philippines have all joined the US, creating a status quo that has tended to mute great power conflicts. However, as the hegemony that drew these powers together withers, so will the pulling power behind the US alliance. The result will be an international order where power is more diffuse, American interests and influence can be more readily challenged, and conflicts or wars may be harder to avoid. As history attests, power decline and redistribution result in military confrontation. For example, in the late 19th century America’s emergence as a regional power saw it launch its first overseas war of conquest towards Spain. By the turn of the 20th century, accompanying the increase in US power and waning of British power, the American Navy had begun to challenge the notion that Britain ‘rules the waves.’ Such a notion would eventually see the US attain the status of sole guardians of the Western Hemisphere’s security to become the order-creating Leviathan shaping the international system with democracy and rule of law. Defining this US-centred system are three key characteristics: enforcement of property rights, constraints on the actions of powerful individuals and groups and some degree of equal opportunities for broad segments of society. As a result of such political stability, free markets, liberal trade and flexible financial mechanisms have appeared. And, with this, many countries have sought opportunities to enter this system, proliferating stable and cooperative relations. However, what will happen to these advances as America’s influence declines? Given that America’s authority, although sullied at times, has benefited people across much of Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans, as well as parts of Africa and, quite extensively, Asia, the answer to this question could affect global society in a profoundly detrimental way. Public imagination and academia have anticipated that a post-hegemonic world would return to the problems of the 1930s: regional blocs, trade conflicts and strategic rivalry. Furthermore, multilateral institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank or the WTO might give way to regional organisations. For example, Europe and East Asia would each step forward to fill the vacuum left by Washington’s withering leadership to pursue their own visions of regional political and economic orders. Free markets would become more politicised — and, well, less free — and major powers would compete for supremacy. Additionally, such power plays have historically possessed a zero-sum element. In the late 1960s and 1970s, US economic power declined relative to the rise of the Japanese and Western European economies, with the US dollar also becoming less attractive. And, as American power eroded, so did international regimes (such as the Bretton Woods System in 1973). A world without American hegemony is one **where great power wars** re**-emerge**, the liberal international system is supplanted by an authoritarian one, and trade protectionism devolves into restrictive, anti-globalisation barriers. This, at least, is one possibility we can forecast in a future that will inevitably be devoid of unrivalled US primacy.

# 2ac vc

**Plan is the smart grid**

**No link – venture capitalists don’t use the PACE program – that’s 1ac solvency cards**

**No investment now**

**Loki 9-19**, Reynard, Justmeans staff writer for Sustainable Finance and Corporate Social Responsibility [“With Uncertain Financial Future, Cloudy Skies Ahead for American Cleantech,” 9-19, http://www.justmeans.com/With-Uncertain-Financial-Future-Cloudy-Skies-Ahead-for-American-Cleantech/56050.html]

Looking at 2011 VC investment figures, it seems like the cleantech industry in the United States is doing just fine. According to the Cleantech Group, a market intelligence advisory group based in San Francisco that has been tracking cleantech investments for the past decade, 2011 is the first year that saw more than $2 billion in cleantech venture investment in all four quarters. 4Q11 saw an impressive $2.21 billion in cleantech VC investments.[1] But if you take a closer—and wider—view, the bigger story isn't all that great. For one thing, the numbers for seed-stage deals were flat as investor focus turned to re-investing in firms already in their portfolios, firms that needed later-stage growth capital. In dollar terms, the news for early-stage startups across all industries is even worse. In 2011, VCs invested just $919 million in seed capital in 396 companies, a decrease of almost 50 percent from the previous year. In fact, seed-stage deals were the only stage of VC funding in 2011 to experience a decrease in average size. On the other side, late-stage VC investments in 2011 experienced a 37 percent increase.[2] TROUBLED TIMES FOR CLEANTECH VC That change in focus is part of a worrisome trend: According to Third Way, a Washington DC-based think tank, there were twice as many late-stage deals than early-stage deals in the cleantech sector in 2010—the first time that late-stage financing overtook early-stage development since 1999.[3] The trend has sounded alarm bells about the state of cleantech innovation in the United States: If VCs are targeting re-investments in portfolio companies, where does that leave innovative start-ups in dire need of financing? One concern is that without VC interest in committing seed money to new ideas, America's start-ups will look overseas for funding, leaving the nation in a cleantech innovation drag. For investors, the move away from start-up financing towards companies that are closer to turning a profit is understandable, particularly considering the nation's uncertain economic state. Untested ideas, though they may have merit, are left to the wayside. "Cleantech hasn't been a failure," noted Daniel Yates, CEO of Opower, a customer engagement platform for the utility industry. "It's VC investment in cleantech that has been troubled."[4] The Valley Of Death: only Uncle Sam can help build the bridge to clean energy The answer, according to some analysts, isn't to stimulate the VC industry, but to look to Uncle Sam. Indeed, over the past few years, the federal government's investment in cleantech has dwarfed that of venture capitalists. Between 2009 and 2014, Washington will have spent more than $150 billion in cleantech—more than three times the amount spent during the previous five-year period.[5] But, according to researchers from the Brookings Institution, the World Resources Institute and the Breakthrough Institute, in the excellent 2012 report Beyond Boom and Bust: Putting Clean Tech on a Path to Subsidy Independence, "To ensure a fully competitive energy market, the federal government must also do more to speed the demonstration and commercialization of new advanced energy technologies." The authors—Jesse Jenkins, Director of Energy and Climate Policy, Breakthrough Institute; Mark Muro, Senior Fellow, Metropolitan Policy Program, Brookings Institution; Ted Nordhaus and Michael Shellenberger, Cofounders, Breakthrough Institute; Letha Tawney, Senior Associate, World Resources Institute; and Alex Trembath, Policy Associate, Breakthrough Institute—note that "private sector financing is typically insufficient to move new energy innovations from early-stage laboratory research on to proof-of-concept prototype and then to full commercial scale."[6] They cite two financing gaps that they say "kill off too many promising new technologies before they have a chance to develop." One is known as the "technological valley of death," in which investors are hesitant to invest in early-stage R&D, hampering a start-up's ability to develop breakthrough concepts into marketable products. The other is the "commercialization valley of death," when young firms cannot find financing to take them from the pilot or demonstration phase of their product's tech development cycle to full commercial readiness.[7] "To avoid locking America's entrepreneurs and innovators out of energy markets, Congress should implement new policies to navigate the clean energy valleys of death," the authors recommend. "Without such policies, conventional fossil energy technologies are effectively insulated from new challengers, preventing a fully competitive US energy market."[8] THE WELL IS RUNNING DRY: FEDERAL CLEAN ENERGY INVESTMENT TO ENTER STEEP DECLINE The problem, however, is that federal cleantech funding, as described by The New York Times editorial board, "is about to drop off a cliff."[9] The reason for this is simple: The clean energy incentives and subsidies provided by President Obama's 2009 economic stimulus bill—amounting to $65 billion, including loan guarantees for wind and solar power—will largely be dismantled by 2014. To make matters worse, other longer-standing subsidies, like the mission-critical Production Tax Credit (PTC), are expiring.[10] For the cleantech industry, the numbers are hard to swallow. By 2014, annual federal cleantech spending is set to decline 75 percent to $11 billion (the high, in 2009, was $44.3 billion). In addition, 70 percent of all federal clean energy policies that were active in 2009 are set to expire at the end of 2014.[11] There's also the effect that the expiries will have on jobs. According to a Brookings Institute report, Obama's stimulus package was the cause of an 8.3-percent increase in jobs in the renewable energy sector, an impressive figure especially considering it happened at the height (or rather, depth) of the recession.[12] The thought of renewing such incentives is a bit pie-in-the-sky. Obama's stimulus bill was passed when Democrats controlled both houses of Congress. While the clean energy-friendly side of the aisle still controls the Senate, "the Republican wrecking crew in the House," as The New York Times notes, "remains generally hostile to programs that threaten the hegemony of the oil and gas interests."[13] DRILL, BABY, DRILL: THE GOP WILL KILL CLEAN ENERGY The House, for example, recently defeated an amendment proposed by Rep. Ed Markey (D-Mass.) to extend the wind energy PTC, mostly along party lines. Many analysts say the loss of the PTC is a significant blow to America's wind sector.[14][15] "There's such uncertainty in the market right now," said Laura Arnold, who sits on the board of directors of the Indiana Renewable Energy Association. "Uncertainty is not a positive stimulus for the growth of the industry…It's not completely over, but it's going to be on life support until we have another policy in its place to give the right inducement to the industry."[16] And if Mitt Romney wins the presidency, more dark days for the nation's cleantech sector are certain. The GOP hopeful's recently unveiled energy plan calls for opening up oil and gas development along the Atlantic Coast and—much to the chagrin of environmentalists and conservationists—the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR), while ending much-needed subsidies for wind and solar.[17]

**No impact to blackouts**

Douglas Birch 10-1, former foreign correspondent for the Associated Press and the Baltimore Sun who has written extensively on technology and public policy, 10/1/12, “Forget Revolution,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/10/01/forget\_revolution?page=full

Government officials sometimes describe a kind of Hieronymus Bosch landscape when warning of the possibility of a cyber attack on the electric grid. Imagine, if you will, that the United States is blindsided by an epic hack that interrupts power for much of the Midwest and mid-Atlantic for more than a week, switching off the lights, traffic signals, computers, water pumps, and air conditioners in millions of homes, businesses, and government offices. Americans swelter in the dark. Chaos reigns! Here's another nightmare scenario: An electric grid that serves two-thirds of a billion people suddenly fails in a developing, nuclear-armed country with a rich history of ethnic and religious conflict. Rail transportation is shut down, cutting off travel to large swathes of the country, while many miners are trapped underground. Blackouts on this scale conjure images of civil unrest, overwhelmed police, crippled hospitals, darkened military bases, the gravely injured in the back of ambulances stuck in traffic jams. The specter of what Defense Secretary Leon Panetta has called a "digital Pearl Harbor" led to the creation of U.S. Cyber Command, which is tasked with developing both offensive and defensive cyber warfare capabilities, and prompted FBI Director Robert Mueller to warn in March that cyber attacks would soon be "the number one threat to our country." Similar concerns inspired both the Democrats and Republicans to sound the alarm about the cyber threat in their party platforms. But are cyber attacks really a clear and present danger to society's critical life support systems, capable of inflicting thousands of casualties? Or has fear of full-blown cybergeddon at the hands of America's enemies become just another feverish national obsession -- another of the long, dark shadows of the 9/11 attacks? Worries about a large-scale, devastating cyber attack on the United States date back several decades, but escalatedfollowing attacks on Estonian government and media websites during a diplomatic conflict with Russia in 2007. That digital ambush was followed by a cyber attack on Georgian websites a year later in the run-up to the brief shooting war between Tbilisi and Moscow, as well as allegations of a colossal, ongoing cyber espionage campaign against the United States by hackers linked to the Chinese army. Much of the concern has focused on potential attacks on the U.S. electrical grid. "If I were an attacker and I wanted to do strategic damage to the United States...I probably would sack electric power on the U.S. East Coast, maybe the West Coast, and attempt to cause a cascading effect," retired Admiral Mike McConnell said in a 2010 interview with CBS's 60 Minutes. But the scenarios sketched out above are not solely the realm of fantasy. This summer, the United States and India were hit by **two massive electrical outages** -- caused not by ninja cyber assault teams but by force majeure. And, for most people anyway, the results were **less terrifying than imagined.** First, the freak "derecho" storm that barreled across a heavily-populated swath of the eastern United States on the afternoon of June 29 knocked down trees that crushed cars, bashed holes in roofs, blocked roads, and sliced through power lines. According to an August report by the U.S. Department of Energy, 4.2 million homes and businesses lost power as a result of the storm, with the blackout stretching across 11 states and the District of Columbia. More than 1 million customers were still without power five days later, and in some areas power wasn't restored for 10 days. Reuters put the death tollat 23 people as of July 5, all killed by storms or heat stroke. The second incident occurred in late July, when 670 million people in northern India, or about 10 percent of the world's population, lost power in the largest blackout in history. The failure of this huge chunk of India's electric grid was attributed to higher-than-normal demand due to late monsoon rains, which led farmers to use more electricity in order to draw water from wells. Indian officials told the media there were no reports of deaths directly linked to the blackouts. But this cataclysmic event **didn't cause widespread chaos** in India -- indeed, for some, it didn't even interrupt their daily routine. "[M]any people in major cities barely noticed the disruption because localized blackouts are so common that many businesses, hospitals, offices and middle-class homes have backup diesel generators," the New York Timesreported. The most important thing about both events is what didn't happen. Planes didn't fall out of the sky. **Governments didn't collapse**. Thousands of people weren't killed. Despite disruption and delay, harried public officials, emergency workers, and beleaguered publics mostly muddled through. The summer's blackouts strongly suggest that a cyber weapon that took down an electric grid even for several days could turn out to be little more than a weapon of mass **inconvenience**. That doesn't mean the United States can relax. James Lewis, director of the technology program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, believes that hackers threaten the security of U.S. utilities and industries, and recently penned an op-ed for the New York Times calling the United States "defenseless" to a cyber-assault. But he told Foreign Policy the recent derecho showed that even a large-scale blackout **would not** necessarily **have catastrophic consequences.**

no impact to nuke accidents

# 2ac immigration

Aerospace solves bioterror

Finel ’99 (Dr. Bernard I. Finel (BA, Tufts University; MA, PhD, Georgetown University) is the associate director of the National Security Studies Program and visiting assistant professor of national security and international affairs at the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University. Dr. Finel has written extensively on proliferation, the revolution in military affairs, and international politics. “The Role of Aerospace Power,” pg online @ http://www.airpower.au.af.mil/airchronicles/apj/apj99/win99/finel.htm)

Detecting WMDs **In terms of detecting the possession of WMDs and** the **intention to use them, aerospace power will be** similarly **important**. Aerospace-based sensors will be crucial in detecting WMD manufacturing facilities and stockpiles. Furthermore, aerospace-based sensors will be crucial in developing timely warning about WMD stores being dispersed to combat units or fitted on long-range delivery systems. Although aerospace power will not be foolproof, in the absence of a comprehensive inspection regime it will form the best hope for avoiding the surprise use of WMDs. Ultimately, of course, aerospace power is only one part of a comprehensive transparency-building system. While aerospace assets can significantly increase the amount of information available, the difficult task is in interpretation and analysis.12 The human element is thus crucial. Aerospace assets might thus be seen as a necessary but not sufficient element in a strategy based on transparency. Preemptive Attacks Aerospace power is also a potent tool if the United States chooses to destroy WMDs before they can be used. This sort of military preemption will require four basic characteristics. It will have to be (1) flexible, (2) capable of rapid response, (3) precise, and (4) able to strike targets deep within an enemy's territory. These characteristics are also the strengths of aerospace power. However, preemption is also an inherently limited option. Preemption involves escalating a conflict or crisis and may not be politically possible for the United States. In addition, the requirements of preemption differ depending on whether it occurs in peacetime, crisis, or war. Furthermore, there is a fundamental difference between preempting WMD manufacturing plants and actual WMD munitions. While plants make visible, concentrated, high-value targets, WMD stores could be dispersed, hidden, and may (in the case of items such as chemical artillery shells) be too small and cheap to warrant the use of expensive platforms and munitions to eliminate them. Deterrence The process of deterring WMD use is also likely to rely heavily on aerospace power.13 There are two forms of deterrence: deterrence by punishment and deterrence by denial.14 Although the former is more obviously within the realm of aerospace power, aerospace power can also play a role in deterrence by denial. The important thing to remember about deterring the use of WMDs is that WMDs are not primarily military weapons but rather terror weapons. WMDs are probably not particularly effective in achieving traditional military goals such as the destruction of enemy military capabilities and the conquest and control of territory. To deter the use of WMDs , deterrence by punishment requires the ability to threaten credibly to inflict severe pain on a potential adversary. Fundamentally, given US power-projection capabilities, this sort of punishment will rely on aerospace power in its various forms--from aircraft to cruise missiles. However, the United States's ability to punish an adversary by airpower is variable. The key to punishment is to destroy assets the opponent particularly values. Are these assets targetable through aerospace power? The answer is not clear. Ultimately, many hostile regimes may only value their own leadership.15 Aerospace power may be able to undermine some of the bases of an adversary's leadership, but as the case of Iraq suggests, it is difficult to bring down a regime with airpower alone.16 Even adjusting for the equivocal commitment to bringing down the regime in the Bush and Clinton administrations, it is difficult to conceive of an alternate target set that could have finished off the regime without some sort of intervention on the ground. It is difficult to undermine a regime by bombing it. Numerous studies have shown that civilians usually either rally around a leader or respond to bombings by becoming passive.17 The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) bombing of Serbia over the Kosovo situation has apparently weakened the regime of Slobodan Milosevic; however, virtually all the large-scale demonstrations against Milosevic occurred after the bombing stopped and are as much a response to the failure of his policies as the suffering inflicted by the bombing. Deterrence by denial is also more difficult than it might seem on the surface. Deterring the use of WMDs by denial does not only mean preventing an adversary from achieving military goals since WMDs are most likely to be used for political effect rather than narrow military missions. Rather, deterrence by denial in this context refers to steps which nullify the effects of WMDs. Since these effects are both military and political, the deterrence calculus is difficult to examine simply and precisely. That said, the inherent passive defense capabilities of aerospace power seem to make it an ideal basis for denying an adversary the ability to constrain US use-of-force decisions. Aerospace assets are difficult to target and hence can be used without exposing American soldiers to the effects of terror weapons. Certainly, the passive defense capability of aerospace assets does not prevent the use of WMDs against civilian targets, but it does limit the forward-deploying military assets that can be targeted. In this sense, the ability to fly high and fast is itself a form of deterrence by denial.

**No extinction from bioweapons**

**O’Neill 04 –** (Brendan, 8-19 “Weapons of Minimum Destruction” http://www.spiked-online.com/Articles/0000000CA694.htm)

David C Rapoport, professor of political science at University of California, Los Angeles and editor of the Journal of Terrorism and Political Violence, has examined what he calls 'easily available evidence' relating to the historic use of chemical and biological weapons. He found something surprising - such weapons do not cause mass destruction. Indeed, whether used by states, terror groups or dispersed in industrial accidents, they tend to be far less destructive than conventional weapons. 'If we stopped speculating about things that might happen in the future and looked instead at what has happened in the past, we'd see that our fears about WMD are misplaced', he says. Yet such fears remain widespread. Post-9/11, American and British leaders have issued dire warnings about terrorists getting hold of WMD and causing mass murder and mayhem. President George W Bush has spoken of terrorists who, 'if they ever gained weapons of mass destruction', would 'kill hundreds of thousands, without hesitation and without mercy' (1). The British government has spent £28million on stockpiling millions of smallpox vaccines, even though there's no evidence that terrorists have got access to smallpox, which was eradicated as a natural disease in the 1970s and now exists only in two high-security labs in America and Russia (2). In 2002, British nurses became the first in the world to get training in how to deal with the victims of bioterrorism (3). The UK Home Office's 22-page pamphlet on how to survive a terror attack, published last month, included tips on what to do in the event of a 'chemical, biological or radiological attack' ('Move away from the immediate source of danger', it usefully advised). Spine-chilling books such as Plague Wars: A True Story of Biological Warfare, The New Face of Terrorism: Threats From Weapons of Mass Destruction and The Survival Guide: What to Do in a Biological, Chemical or Nuclear Emergency speculate over what kind of horrors WMD might wreak. TV docudramas, meanwhile, explore how Britain might cope with a smallpox assault and what would happen if London were 'dirty nuked' (4). The term 'weapons of mass destruction' refers to three types of weapons: nuclear, chemical and biological. A chemical weapon is any weapon that uses a manufactured chemical, such as sarin, mustard gas or hydrogen cyanide, to kill or injure. A biological weapon uses bacteria or viruses, such as smallpox or anthrax, to cause destruction - inducing sickness and disease as a means of undermining enemy forces or inflicting civilian casualties. We find such weapons repulsive, because of the horrible way in which the victims convulse and die - but they appear to be less 'destructive' than conventional weapons. 'We know that nukes are massively destructive, there is a lot of evidence for that', says Rapoport. But when it comes to chemical and biological weapons, 'the evidence suggests that we should call them "weapons of minimum destruction", not mass destruction', he says. Chemical weapons have most commonly been used by states, in military warfare. Rapoport explored various state uses of chemicals over the past hundred years: both sides used them in the First World War; Italy deployed chemicals against the Ethiopians in the 1930s; the Japanese used chemicals against the Chinese in the 1930s and again in the Second World War; Egypt and Libya used them in the Yemen and Chad in the postwar period; most recently, Saddam Hussein's Iraq used chemical weapons, first in the war against Iran (1980-1988) and then against its own Kurdish population at the tail-end of the Iran-Iraq war. In each instance, says Rapoport, chemical weapons were used more in desperation than from a position of strength or a desire to cause mass destruction. 'The evidence is that states rarely use them even when they have them', he has written. 'Only when a military stalemate has developed, which belligerents who have become desperate want to break, are they used.' (5) As to whether such use of chemicals was effective, Rapoport says that at best it blunted an offensive - but this very rarely, if ever, translated into a decisive strategic shift in the war, because the original stalemate continued after the chemical weapons had been deployed. He points to the example of Iraq. The Baathists used chemicals against Iran when that nasty trench-fought war had reached yet another stalemate. As Efraim Karsh argues in his paper 'The Iran-Iraq War: A Military Analysis': 'Iraq employed [chemical weapons] only in vital segments of the front and only when it saw no other way to check Iranian offensives. Chemical weapons had a negligible impact on the war, limited to tactical rather than strategic [effects].' (6) According to Rapoport, this 'negligible' impact of chemical weapons on the direction of a war is reflected in the disparity between the numbers of casualties caused by chemicals and the numbers caused by conventional weapons. It is estimated that the use of gas in the Iran-Iraq war killed 5,000 - but the Iranian side suffered around 600,000 dead in total, meaning that gas killed less than one per cent. The deadliest use of gas occurred in the First World War but, as Rapoport points out, it still only accounted for five per cent of casualties. Studying the amount of gas used by both sides from1914-1918 relative to the number of fatalities gas caused, Rapoport has written: 'It took a ton of gas in that war to achieve a single enemy fatality. Wind and sun regularly dissipated the lethality of the gases. Furthermore, those gassed were 10 to 12 times as likely to recover than those casualties produced by traditional weapons.' (7) Indeed, Rapoport discovered that some earlier documenters of the First World War had a vastly different assessment of chemical weapons than we have today - they considered the use of such weapons to be preferable to bombs and guns, because chemicals caused fewer fatalities. One wrote: 'Instead of being the most horrible form of warfare, it is the most humane, because it disables far more than it kills, ie, it has a low fatality ratio.' (8) 'Imagine that', says Rapoport, 'WMD being referred to as more humane'. He says that the contrast between such assessments and today's fears shows that actually looking at the evidence has benefits, allowing 'you to see things more rationally'. According to Rapoport, even Saddam's use of gas against the Kurds of Halabja in 1988 - the most recent use by a state of chemical weapons and the most commonly cited as evidence of the dangers of 'rogue states' getting their hands on WMD - does not show that unconventional weapons are more destructive than conventional ones. Of course the attack on Halabja was horrific, but he points out that the circumstances surrounding the assault remain unclear. 'The estimates of how many were killed vary greatly', he tells me. 'Some say 400, others say 5,000, others say more than 5,000. The fighter planes that attacked the civilians used conventional as well as unconventional weapons; I have seen no study which explores how many were killed by chemicals and how many were killed by firepower. We all find these attacks repulsive, but the death toll may actually have been greater if conventional bombs only were used. We know that conventional weapons can be more destructive.' Rapoport says that terrorist use of chemical and biological weapons is similar to state use - in that it is rare and, in terms of causing mass destruction, not very effective. He cites the work of journalist and author John Parachini, who says that over the past 25 years only four significant attempts by terrorists to use WMD have been recorded. The most effective WMD-attack by a non-state group, from a military perspective, was carried out by the Tamil Tigers of Sri Lanka in 1990. They used chlorine gas against Sri Lankan soldiers guarding a fort, injuring over 60 soldiers but killing none. The Tamil Tigers' use of chemicals angered their support base, when some of the chlorine drifted back into Tamil territory - confirming Rapoport's view that one problem with using unpredictable and unwieldy chemical and biological weapons over conventional weapons is that the cost can be as great 'to the attacker as to the attacked'. The Tigers have not used WMD since.

XO’s now trigger the link

Hollander, 1-24 – National Journal reporters [Catherine and Erin Mershon, "Obama's Climate Vow Could Make EPA a Political Target," National Journal, www.nationaljournal.com/whitehouse/obama-s-climate-vow-could-make-epa-a-political-target-20130124, accessed 1-25-13, mss]

President Obama’s second Inaugural Address left no doubt about his desire to put climate change front and center in his second term. He’s likely to pursue his agenda through executive actions rather than legislation, at least initially. That could put the Environmental Protection Agency at the center of a political battle, as Senate Republicans use the process of confirming a new head of the agency as a chance to weigh in on or even block what they see as regulatory overreach by the administration in pursuit of climate-change goals. Republicans have bristled in the last four years at regulations coming out of Obama's EPA—Rep. Michele Bachmann of Minnesota wanted to shut the agency altogether. Administrator Lisa Jackson was a particular target, criticized for her implementation of Clean Air Act regulations and, more recently, for conducting official business using an email alias. As Obama's second term begins, EPA might become an even bigger target as Republicans brace for the likelihood that Obama will use the agency's powers to pursue his climate agenda. Environmental groups have urged the administration to use EPA's authority under the Clean Air Act to limit the carbon emissions that power plants are allowed to produce and to implement stricter standards on leaks of methane, a greenhouse gas, both of which can be achieved without any further congressional approval. Brian Deese, deputy director of the White House National Economic Council, reiterated on Thursday the administration’s intent to pursue such an approach to energy policymaking. “[We will] continue to look for tools, administrative actions that we can take that don’t require Congress and in many cases don’t require federal dollars,” Deese said at an event hosted by National Journal and The Atlantic, citing regulatory authority as one such tool. Although EPA is the prime symbol of the Obama administration’s climate-change agenda, other departments will also play a role—departments that are expected to face confirmation fights in the coming months. The Energy Department, for example, can adopt new efficiency standards for home appliances. The State Department will rule on a permit for part of the Keystone XL pipeline that would cross into Canada. Each of those departments is likely to face or is already in the process of confirming a new director. The nominee for secretary of State, Sen. John Kerry, raised the issue of climate change as an international threat during his confirmation hearing on Thursday; the nominee for Energy secretary is also likely to be questioned on his or her views on pursuing the president's climate agenda. At EPA, Jackson announced she was stepping down last month, and the administration has yet to nominate a replacement. Among the leading candidates are former Washington Gov. Christine Gregoire, Deputy Administrator Bob Perciasepe, and Mary Nichols, chairwoman of the California Air Resources Board. Congress isn’t expected to take up climate legislation any time soon. It will be preoccupied in coming months by a series of looming budget fights, gun-control legislation, and immigration reform. A sweeping cap-and-trade bill that Obama had pushed in his first term never made it through Congress. This time, Senate Democrats have indicated they are ready to let the EPA run the show. So get ready for a show. Melinda Pierce, deputy director for national campaigns at the Sierra Club, said the hearing to replace Jackson at EPA might be "doubly contentious" if the agency is perceived as a key stakeholder in moving Obama's climate agenda forward. The focus on climate in Monday's Inaugural Speech surprised—and pleased—environmental groups. But it could also set up a tougher hearing, said Andrew Wheeler, a former Republican staff director and chief counsel for the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. “During the campaign, President Obama tried to appeal to the coal states. He never once mentioned climate change. He tried at one point to even go to the right of Mitt Romney on coal issues. He didn’t mention climate change until the night of the election after he won. In his acceptance speech, he mentioned climate change and then he mentioned it again this week.... I think that’s going to generate a lot of questions and concerns from members, not just Republicans, but also moderate Democrats,” Wheeler said. Especially vulnerable are the six Democratic senators from red states who will face tough reelection battles in 2014. What’s more, Wheeler said, now that Obama is in his second term, there won’t be the typical deference given to a new president’s Cabinet selections. Confirmation hearings are a good place for the minority to be heard on administration goals. “You’ll get good press out of it and, quite frankly, you might not have the administrator come back up to the Hill until the following year,” said David Banks, a former deputy staff director for Republicans on the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. But even if the EPA confirmation fight is nasty, it probably would not deter Obama from implementing his second-term climate agenda. Under the Clean Air Act, EPA has a legal duty to issue regulations limiting power-plant carbon emissions, said Conrad Schneider, advocacy director at the Clean Air Task Force, which recently sent an open letter to Obama outlining its recommendations for addressing climate change over the next four years. CATF also believes that EPA failed to do its duty with respect to regulating emissions of methane from the oil and gas industry during Obama’s first term. “Since those are statutory duties, it really doesn’t matter who is at the head of the agency. Those duties exist if the nominee is confirmed quickly and those duties exist if the nominee’s confirmation process drags out,” he said.

**Fiscal fights trigger the link**

Benac, 1-24 -- covered government and politics in Washington for more than three decades

[Nancy, "Obama's Uphill Agenda," Detroit News, 1-24-13, www.detroitnews.com/article/20130124/OPINION01/301240324/1008/opinion01/Obama-s-uphill-agenda, accessed 1-25-13, mss]

Obama's uphill agenda: President's second term, the legacy-maker, will be over before we know it

It's a good thing President Barack Obama considers himself a congenital optimist. **There are no easy "gets"** as he scrolls through his second-term to-do list and looks ahead to the uncertainties of the next four years. Many of the items already on his agenda aren't there of his own choosing. First up is certain battle with Congress in the next few months over deadlines on automatic budget cuts, expiring government spending authority and raising the debt limit. House Republicans last week agreed to bump up the debt limit slightly, but that just puts off that part of the fight for a few months. Obama's goal is to get through that trifecta and still have the political capital left for the things he'd rather focus on: Reducing gun violence, overhauling immigration policy, revamping tax laws, addressing climate change and more. With Republicans in Congress approaching the new year with very different goals, "**it's a formula for deadlock** and difficulty for the president," says James Thurber, director of the Center for Congressional and Presidential Studies at American University. "**I don't think this president has even a month of political capital."** The president also will have to devote significant energy simply to safeguarding the achievements of his first term, by keeping the economic recovery alive, making sure his health care law is properly put in place in the face of persisting objections from businesses and individuals, and ensuring new financial regulations have teeth. International worries, including the civil war in Syria, Iran's nuclear intentions and instability in Mali could complicate the president's Term Two game plan as well. "**Things are stacked up**," Obama senior adviser David Plouffe acknowledged Sunday on ABC's "This Week."

**Gun control derails immigration**

Rauch 1-20. [Jonathan, guest scholar at the Brookings Institution, "Tackle immigration first, Mr. President" NY Daily News -- www.nydailynews.com/opinion/tackle-immigration-mr-president-article-1.1242944?print]

So what does Obama do first? Gun control.¶ If ever there was a political sticky wicket, this is it. “Gun Agenda Faces an Uphill Battle,” headlined the Washington Post the other day. You can say that again. On the merits, in a magic-wand world, it makes sense to tighten some gun regulations, especially by closing the so-called “gun show loophole,” which allows non-dealers to buy firearms without background checks.¶ But let’s not kid ourselves: In a country with perhaps 250 million firearms already in private hands, even the deftest regulatory improvements will bring only marginal reductions in violence. No one likes to hear this, but it is true: the mass murder at Sandy Hook Elementary School was an atrocity of the first magnitude, and even one such atrocity is too many — but mass shootings in schools are very rare, and way, way down the list of causes of violent deaths. Moreover, there is little the federal government can do to prevent them.¶ No doubt, Obama was distraught by those murders. We all were. But this was a case when his more characteristic cold-blooded realism would have served him better.¶ None of what makes immigration so urgent and accomplishable is true of gun control. There is no bipartisan desire to get it done. In fact, not even Democrats are united. Republicans already smell blood: a chance to grind Obama down by stalling and obstructing in the usual way and to re-energize what has been, until now, a demoralized conservative base. The National Rifle Association will provide plenty of assistance with that project, fattening its coffers along the way.¶ Now, Obama is more popular today than Bush was in 2005, and he won a stronger reelection victory; nor is gun regulation as quixotic as was Bush’s effort to reform Social Security with only one party’s support. Obama may yet succeed where Bush failed.¶ Suppose he does succeed, though. What with the upcoming two (or is it three? four?) budgetary crises, the bandwidth for immigration was always narrow. It will be narrowed still further by diverting legislative time and energy toward guns. Gun control gives liberals a new crusade, but in doing so it opens an attention-distracting, resource-depleting two-front war.¶ Meanwhile, the window of opportunity for immigration might stay open for a while, but it might not, especially if Obama is weakened and conservatives regroup.¶ And if he loses on guns? Bush thought he could afford to lose on Social Security and move on to immigration. He was wrong. In fact, he never recovered. His political strength and strategic credibility were shaken, and he spent the rest of his second term playing defense. Also, of course, the immigration-reform window closed. Republican moderates were marginalized by conservatives who had no interest in any reform that Democrats might accept.¶ Unlike President Bill Clinton, Obama has never broken in any important way with his liberal base. Gun control, despite its poor return on investment as a policy matter, is catnip to liberals. They just can’t stay away from it. That might be all right if the opportunity cost weren’t so high — for Democrats and liberals, for the economy, and not least for immigrants.¶ One thing I have learned about Barack Obama: When he and I disagree, he is usually right and I am usually wrong. Maybe he sees something I don’t. Maybe it is true, as liberals seem to believe, that public opinion on guns has undergone a fundamental change (though more likely, based on the available facts, is that the public is undergoing a short-term reaction to a prominent news story).¶ As a supporter of both immigration reform and smarter gun regulation, I hope Obama, unlike Bush at the same point eight years ago, gets away with his off-center lurch. If not, in a few years senior administration officials will be scratching their heads, wondering why the heck they didn’t put immigration first.

**Plan’s popular – no spending link**

**Saha 11/13**, Devashree, senior policy analyst and associate fellow at the Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program,” “Enact Legislation Supporting Residential Property Assessed Clean Energy Financing,” November 13th, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Research/Files/Papers/2012/11/13%20federalism/13%20housing%20energy%20efficiency.pdf>

Congressional action to support residential PACE programs would have no budgetary impact. If legislation is passed, it will restore local governments’ ability to offer residential PACE programs and help homeowners finance energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades without any government subsidies or expenditures. State of Play Broad support for residential PACE programs exists across a wide group of entities and organizations, including local and county governments, state governments, state and federal elected representatives, national municipal associations, clean energy trade organizations, and businesses and business councils. The FHFA ruling notwithstanding, the federal government has strongly supported residential PACE programs and issued best practices guidelines in 2010 as a first step toward national standardization of PACE financing mechanisms. Congressional support for residential PACE financing exists on both sides of the aisle, as evidenced most recently by the PACE Assessment Protection Act (H.R. 2599), a bipartisan bill supported by 21 Republicans and 32 Democrats that was introduced in July 2011. Despite this broad support for residential PACE programs as well as court challenges and a federal district court ruling in California requiring the FHFA to initiate rulemaking on residential PACE financing, the FHFA maintains its opposition to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac purchasing otherwise conforming mortgages with PACE assessments.

**Pc not key**

**Edwards 9** – Distinguished Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M University, holds the George and Julia Blucher Jordan Chair in Presidential Studies and has served as the Olin Professor of American Government at Oxford (George, “The Strategic President”, Printed by the Princeton University Press, pg. 149-150)

Even presidents who appeared to dominate Congress were actually facilitators rather than directors of change. They understood their own limitations and explicitly took advantage of opportunities in their environments. Working at the margins, they successfully guided legislation through Congress. When their resources diminished, they reverted to the stalemate that usually characterizes presidential-congressional relations. As legendary management expert Peter Drucker put it about Ronald Reagan, "His great strength was not charisma, as is commonly thought, but his awareness and acceptance of exactly what he could and what he could not do."134 These conclusions are consistent with systematic research by Jon Bond, Richard Fleisher, and B. Dan Wood. They have focused on determining whether the presidents to whom we attribute the greatest skills in dealing with Congress were more successful in obtaining legislative support for their policies than were other presidents. After carefully controlling for other influences on congressional voting, they found no evidence that those presidents who supposedly were the most proficient in persuading Congress were more successful than chief executives with less aptitude at influencing legislators.135 Scholars studying leadership within Congress have reached similar conclusions about the limits on personal leadership. Cooper and Brady found that institutional context is more important than personal leadership skills or traits in determining the influence of leaders and that there is no relationship between leadership style and effectiveness.136 Presidential legislative leadership operates in an environment largely beyond the president's control and must compete with other, more stable factors that affect voting in Congress in addition to party. These include ideology, personal views and commitments on specific policies, and the interests of constituencies. By the time a president tries to exercise influence on a vote, most members of Congress have made up their mindson the basis of these other factors. Thus, a president's legislative leadership is likely to be critical only for those members of Congress who remain open to conversion after other influences have had their impact. Although the size and composition of this group varies from issue to issue, it will almost always be a minority in each chamber.

**Winners win for Obama --- inaction burns capital**

**Kuttner 11** (Robert, Co-Founder and Co-Editor – American Prospect and Distinguished Senior Fellow – Demos (Think Tank), “Barack Obama’s Theory of Power”, The American Prospect, 5-16,<http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=barack_obamas_theory_of_power>)

Obama’s critics contend that his prolonged fantasy of bipartisanship, his failure to lay the blame for the depressed economy squarely on the Republicans, and his reluctance to use his bully pulpit to tell a coherent story, particularly about jobs, needlessly weakened the Democrats and led to avoidable losses in the 2010 midterm. More fundamentally, under Obama government has lost credibility as a necessary force for economic recovery and fairness, undermining the Democrats’ core appeal to voters. At the very least, Obama failed to drive the agenda or exploit the full possibilities of presidential leadership in a crisis. In the formulation of the political historian James MacGregor Burns, Obama ran and inspired voters as a “transformational” figure but governed as a “transactional” one. Notwithstanding a vow to profoundly change Washington, Obama took the Washington power constellation as a given. Despite an economic emergency, he moved neither Congress nor public opinion very much and only seldom used his oratorical gifts. “He is so damned smart and confident that he thinks he just has to explain things to the American people once,” says former House Appropriations Chair David Obey. “He doesn’t appreciate that you have to reinforce a message 50 times.” Obama’s reticence, his reluctance to lay blame, make sharp partisan distinctions, or practice a politics of class, reflects the interplay of his personality and his tacit theory of power—one that emphasizes building bridges to opponents, defying ideological categories, shying away from the kind of mass mobilization that swept him into office, and practicing a kind of Zen detachment. At moments in American history, that conception of the presidency has suited the times. This doesn’t seem to be one of those moments. Yet in the third year of his presidency, there are signs of a learning curve. It may be that Obama is playing his own elegant brand of rope-a-dope, biding his time, letting the Republicans lead with their chins, waiting for just the right moment to dramatize their extremism and exploit their schisms—then demonstrating a toughness that has largely eluded him until now and reshaping the political center as a more progressive one. The hope of a new, more combative Obama was kindled by portions of his April 13 speech at George Washington University, which showed an Obama that we’ve seldom seen during his presidency. “The man America elected president has re-emerged,” exulted The New York Times’ lead editorial. Obama departed from his usual reluctance to be partisan, explicitly criticizing the self-annihilating Republican designs so usefully spelled out in Rep. Paul Ryan’s proposed 10-year budget. The president resorted to a formulation he seldom uses—the injustices of class: “The top 1 percent saw their income rise by an average of more than a quarter of a million dollars each. That’s who needs to pay less taxes?” Obama said. “They want to give people like me a $200,000 tax cut that’s paid for by asking 33 seniors each to pay $6,000 more in health costs. That’s not right. And it’s not going to happen as long as I’m president.” At last, Obama shifted the mind-numbing debate from the scale of the budget and its deficits to its content and political meaning. He did what his progressive critics have long advocated, drawing a clear, bright, partisan line and pledging to defend Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. But the budgetary details of the speech showed an Obama who was still the transactional leader of the Burns paradigm. Obama devoted most of the speech to his own plans for cutting the deficit. Jobs and recovery were hardly mentioned. Most of the proposed deficit reductions came from cuts to programs rather than from tax increases. And Obama was far too generous with the word, we. As in: But after Democrats and Republicans committed to fiscal discipline during the 1990s, we lost our way in the decade that followed. We increased spending dramatically for two wars and an expensive prescription-drug program—but we didn’t pay for any of this new spending. Instead, we made the problem worse with trillions of dollars in unpaid-for tax cuts. [Emphasis added.] As Tonto said to the Lone Ranger, What do you mean, we? This fiscal deterioration, of course, was the Republicans’ handiwork. Why not point that out? Obama seemed to come to his partisanship reluctantly, almost apologetically. At one point in the speech, having just flayed the Republicans for their sheer extremism, he added, “I’m eager to hear other ideas from all ends of the political spectrum.” He further mixed his own message by declaring, “We will all need to make sacrifices.” Indeed, the main ideological themes of the speech had been undermined by Obama’s earlier compromises. The left pole that Obama defined in the budget debate had already been moved to the right by his yearlong emphasis on deficit reduction; his prior concessions in the December 2010 tax deal, which failed to restore higher tax rates on the rich; and the 2011 budget deal, which cut $38 billion in programs. If the bipartisan Gang of Six, spawn of Obama’s own Bowles-Simpson commission, does reach agreement, it will only add pressure to alter Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid for the worse—thus fatally blurring Obama’s bright line. Was Obama’s speech—the most resolutely political, partisan, progressive, and effective in recent memory—a turning point or a one-off? Is Obama now revising his theory and practice of presidential power? As the political scientist Richard Neustadt observed in his classic work, Presidential Power, a book that had great influence on President John F. Kennedy, the essence of a president’s power is “the power to persuade.” Because our divided constitutional system does not allow the president to lead by commanding, presidents amass power by making strategic choices about when to use the latent authority of the presidency to move public and elite opinion and then use that added prestige as clout to move Congress. In one of Neustadt’s classic case studies, Harry Truman, a president widely considered a lame duck, nonetheless persuaded the broad public and a Republican Congress in 1947-1948 that the Marshall Plan was a worthy idea. As Neustadt and Burns both observed, though an American chief executive is weak by constitutional design, a president possesses several points of leverage. He can play an effective outside game, motivating and shaping public sentiment, making clear the differences between his values and those of his opposition, and using popular support to box in his opponents and move them in his direction. He can complement the outside bully pulpit with a nimble inside game, uniting his legislative party, bestowing or withholding benefits on opposition legislators, forcing them to take awkward votes, and using the veto. He can also enlist the support of interest groups to pressure Congress, and use media to validate his framing of choices. Done well, all of this signals leadership that often moves the public agenda. The most effective presidents have worked all these levers. Think of Franklin Roosevelt, or Ronald Reagan, or Lyndon B. Johnson during the era of the War on Poverty and the civil-rights crusade. But except in the endgame of the battle for health careand his recent turnabout in defending Medicare, Obama has been relatively disengaged on all of these fronts. He left the details of his signature legislation andattendant bargaining to his staff. Says a senior Democrat who speaks frequently to Obama, “He is just not someone who enjoys what most of presidential politics entails.” Reviewing Obama’s relatively short career, a few core principles emerge in which he deeply believes. These have remained constants. Building Bridges. Obama, famously, is convinced both by his life journey and his prior experience in politics that he can persuade almost any adversary to find areas of common ground. “Much of Obama’s self-confidence,” wrote David Remnick in his biography of Obama, The Bridge, “resided in his belief that he could walk into a room, with any sort of people, and forge a relationship and even persuade those people of the rightness of his position.” From the Harvard Law Review, to the Illinois Senate, to the Iowa precinct caucuses, Obama’s political life before his presidency only strengthened that conviction. Obama has a deep certitude that the voters, especially political independents, are sick of partisan division and want a leader who will rise above it to solve practical problems. In service of that goal, he has bent over backward to praise his opposition rather than attack it, frequently offering concessions in advance. Mostly, he has pursued common ground by giving ground. The experience of his first two years, when Republicans wanted nothing so much as to destroy him, did not shake Obama from these strategic beliefs. “He doesn’t have a fighter’s instinct, but he is in the middle of a hugely consequential fight,” says a veteran Senate Democrat. “They will keep pushing him as long as he keeps backing up.” His drawing of bright lines in the April 13 speech was very much the exception. Defying Categories. This core political instinct interacts with, and is reinforced by, Obama’s personal reticence and determination not to be the angry black man. From his first entry into electoral politics, he defined himself as a different sort of African American and a different sort of liberal. Even though his voting record as a U.S. senator was one of the most progressive, as president he has almost gone out of his way to distance himself from the liberal base. In an interview with The New York Times’ Peter Baker on the eve of the 2010 elections, Obama expressed regrets for looking too much like “the same old tax-and-spend liberal Democrat.” Courting Elites, Wary of Mass Mobilization. Obama and his campaign staff brilliantly enlisted an army of volunteers who thought of themselves as a movement built on the values of sweeping change and the tactics of community organizing. Obama repeatedly vowed that he would use these engaged citizens to press Congress to enact health reform and other urgent priorities. But once elected, Obama’s political staff quickly downgraded Obama for America into Organizing for America, a denatured arm of the Democratic National Committee—out of concern that an independent movement might be more of a pressure group than an amen chorus. While he has maintained a close—and politically damaging—alliance with Wall Street (and lately, under Chief of Staff Bill Daley’s tutelage, has reached out to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce), Obama has been detached from the one recent popular rising that could help him win lost ground in the crucial states of the Midwest—the backlash against union busting and draconian budget cuts by Midwestern Republican governors and legislators. Though the line attributed to FDR speaking to supporters—“Now, make me do it”—is probably apocryphal, Roosevelt did make good use of popular groups to his left, as did Lyndon Johnson in his complex alliance with Martin Luther King. Obama and his political staff are distinctly uncomfortable with independent mobilizations making him do anything. At a time when progressive movements lack the energy of the 1930s or 1960s, the president has not chosen to help animate them. Zen Leadership. The adjectives widely used to describe Obama are words like diffident, detached, aloof, professorial. Obama practices restraint to a fault. As a policy expert and intellectual, he is hands-on when it comes to White House deliberation but mostly hands-off with Congress. As Burns demonstrated, power is enhanced in the course of its exercise. But Obama, despite his eloquence and capacity to motivate, seems to believe that power should be conserved and presidential leadership reserved for emergencies. He waited long and disabling months beforebecoming personally engaged in the health-reform battle. This left the details obscure, voters anxious, and Democrats at the August 2009 town meetings playing the role of pinata. By the time the bill finally passed, the victory was politically Pyrrhic. An exasperated David Obey told me, “Obama sat and let Jubilation T. Cornpone tie up Max Baucus for all those months. Hell, Chuck Grassley made it clear to me that he’d never vote for the thing.” Obama and his team never embraced such strategies as forcing Republicans (and conservative Democrats) to take awkward votes or using the veto to define clear and principled differences. David Axelrod told me that the White House considered it futile and self-defeating to bring up measures in the Senate that couldn’t win. This stance, the opposite of Harry Truman’s, has infuriated Obama’s allies in the House. During the last session, important progressive legislation on jobs and energy independence passed the House but was never even brought to a vote in the Senate. In one emblematic episode in December 2009, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi pulled out all the stops to get the House to narrowly pass a $154 billion public-investment, jobs, and unemployment-extension bill. The White House, however, rebuffed Pelosi’s entreaties to urge Majority Leader Harry Reid to bring the measure to a vote in the Senate. At the time, Obama’s aides were convinced that job growth was around the corner, had already moved on to deficit reduction as the theme of the 2010 State of the Union address, and were laying plans for “Recovery Summer,” a conceit that entirely backfired. Except on such rare occasions at late stages of the health debate, it was not Obama’s style to call in wavering Democrats to give them an LBJ-style treatment—or to call them in at all, even to discuss major pending policy decisions. A number of senior Democrats were livid that they were kept in the dark about the April 13 budget speech, which had evidently been months in preparation. They first heard about it when David Plouffe, the White House political director, made the rounds of the Sunday talk shows, three days before the speech. “You’ve heard of the ‘great man’ theory,” says Robert Borosage, who co-directs the progressive Campaign for America’s Future. “They believe in the ‘great speech’ theory.” Obama’s stirring speech at the 2004 Democratic National Convention established the novice as presidential timber. During the campaign, his superb address on race, a subject he dearly wanted to avoid, saved his candidacy from being destroyed by the controversy over the Rev. Jeremiah Wright. But as president, much of the time Obama has been AWOL rather than a defining presence driving the debate. His great speeches, like April’s budget address, often come late in the game, after concessions have been made and damage done. Obama seems to relish demonstrating that he can score the occasional touchdown run starting from his own end zone. But politics, like football, is a game of cumulative scoring. If you keep giving ground, the clock eventually runs out. Hands off, above the fray, turning the other cheek, representing decency and common purpose, conserving rather than wielding power, uncomfortable with popular movements he doesn’t control—by some alchemy, this style of leadership is expected to produce the voter approval that puts polite pressure on the other party to join the quest for consensus. Reciprocity and compromise then result in effective government and popular adulation. This has been Obama’s operating theory of power. For the most part, it hasn’t worked.

# 2ac china coal

**No CCP collapse—the government represses instability**

**Pei 09 –** senior associate in the China Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, (Minxin, March 12, “Will the Chinese Communist Party Survive the Crisis?” Foreign Affairs, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/64862/minxin-pei/will-the-chinese-communist-party-survive-the-crisis>)

It might seem reasonable to expect that challenges from the disaffected urban middle class, frustrated college graduates, and unemployed migrants will constitute the principal threat to the party's rule. If those groups were in fact to band together in a powerful coalition, then the world's longest-ruling party would indeed be in deep trouble. But that is not going to happen. Such a revolutionary scenario overlooks two critical forces blocking political change in China and similar authoritarian political systems: the regime's capacity for repression and the unity among the elite. Economic crisis and social unrest may make it tougher for the CCP to govern, but they will not loosen the party's hold on power. A glance at countries such as Zimbabwe, North Korea, Cuba, and Burma shows that a relatively unified elite in control of the military and police can cling to power through brutal force, even in the face of abysmal economic failure. Disunity within the ruling elite, on the other hand, weakens the regime's repressive capacity and usually spells the rulers' doom. The CCP has already demonstrated its remarkable ability to contain and suppress chronic social protest and small-scale dissident movements. The regime maintains the People's Armed Police, a well-trained and well-equipped anti-riot force of 250,000. In addition, China's secret police are among the most capable in the world and are augmented by a vast network of informers. And although the Internet may have made control of information more difficult, Chinese censors can still react quickly and thoroughly to end the dissemination of dangerous news. Since the Tiananmen crackdown, the Chinese government has greatly refined its repressive capabilities. Responding to tens of thousands of riots each year has made Chinese law enforcement the most experienced in the world at crowd control and dispersion. Chinese state security services have applied the tactic of "political decapitation" to great effect, quickly arresting protest leaders and leaving their followers disorganized, demoralized, and impotent. If worsening economic conditions lead to a potentially explosive political situation, the party will stick to these tried-and-true practices to ward off any organized movement against the regime.

**China unsustainable- collapse inevitable**

Dickson ’12 (Micah Dickson, SeekingAlpha, Investor Trading Online News, “The Cracks In The Great Economic Wall Of China”, November 27, 2012)

China has just gone through their once in a decade power transition. While the transition of power has appeared to have gone smoothly, it does not mean that the challenges facing China have diminished at all. Xi Jinping and his regime face a host of challenges. These challenges vary from economic to societal in nature. The current course China is on is utterly unsustainable. The question is, can the new Chinese leadership make the necessary reforms to keep the country from a political and economic collapse? Investors must consider the size and scope of the challenges facing China as they make decisions on where to allocate their assets for the coming year. Economic Challenges Any true economic growth is based upon investors and consumers acting on information. The accuracy of that information can decide if that economic growth is sustainable or not. Many of the basic economic numbers coming from China have largely been called into question. Li Kepiang, possible future premier of China, said in 2012 that the GDP figures were "man-made". There has also been documented cases of the growth in many Chinese industries being quite different from the overall GDP numbers that are reported. Unfortunately, China's state owned enterprises are becoming a prime example of the failure of accurate information from China itself. State owned enterprises are filled with Communist Party leaders who use them to bolster the Party's power. Included in the list of state owned enterprises are banks that provide loans to businesses. These businesses include other non-financial state owned enterprises. These loans are given at lower interest rates and in unlimited amounts. This incestuous relationship gives state owned enterprises an advantage over other smaller enterprises inside the country. Besides being incredibly corrupt, this system has led to what has been referred to as "zombie companies". These are companies that should be going bankrupt because they are unable to repay their debt. The Chinese government is not allowing these companies to go bankrupt. Instead the state owned banks are being forced to continue to lend money to the enterprises despite their inability to repay the debt. Matthew Boesler from the Business Insider commented on the effects of these practices in this way, "This is causing a deterioration in asset quality on banks' balance sheets, and increases the chances that the government will have to bail them out down the road". Some estimate that the debt to equity ratio of many state owned enterprises exceed 230%. This is a staggering figure. Even with all of these negative developments, the "official" amount of non-performing loans in the Chinese banking sector is only 0.9%. This obvious contradiction is why so many of the numbers out of China are deceptions. The banking sector numbers are not the only numbers that are troubling. The state owned enterprises have been showing weakness for a while. These enterprises make up 40% to 50% of GDP. From 2001 to 2009, these state owned enterprises made 5.8 trillion Renminbi (RMB). This would equal $931.1 billion in the United States. Normally, this would be a tale of their success. But if you remove the government subsidies for that same time period, the real average return on equity for the state owned enterprises would be a negative 6.29%. These problems are compounded by a growing real estate bubble. Part of China's growth has come from the government's investment in the building of infrastructure. Robin Banerji and Patrick Jackson of the BBC describe the expansion like this, "The country is said to have built the equivalent of Rome every two months in the past decade". The problem with this rapid expansion is that supply is beginning to overtake demand. Satellite images are showing entire Chinese cities empty many years after their construction. The World Bank's Holly Krambeck gave a frightening example of this in the city of Chenggong. She says, "In Chenggong, there are more than 100,000 new apartments with no occupants". This is becoming the story all over China as new buildings, office spaces, and other projects are lying empty due to the lack of occupants able to fill these empty structures. These factors should cause investors to be cautious about their positions in China. A red flag to any investor should be the inability for Chinese companies to be audited by firms outside of China. If these large economic challenges are not addressed, China may see anemic economic growth as Japan did in the 1990s or worse, an economic catastrophe that could rock the world markets as investors begin to move their capital to other parts of the world. This could be hastened by the growing perception of many in the United States, China's largest customer, that companies that do business there are hurting American workers. Political Turmoil China is currently finishing their once in a decade transition of political leadership. This however has not come without serious hiccups in the road. There is serious tension inside the Chinese hierarchy which is beginning to reveal itself. As Dean Cheng reported about the 2012 National People's Congress session, "As this year's session came to a close, outgoing Premier Wen Jiabao warned of the potential for chaos and cited the Cultural Revolution of 1966-1976". This statement immediately preceded the ousting of Chongqing Party Secretary Bo Xilai from the Communist Party. Bo, his wife, and many extended family members were also charged with a variety of crimes including corruption, murder, and adultery. His populist tone and rising star in the Communist Party made him an attractive candidate for higher office and many reports say he was campaigning for a position on the CCP Politburo Standing Committee. This committee is the most important and power part of the Chinese leadership. Bo's rising star quickly extinguished after his former police chief tried to defect to the United States. Because of how common corruption is inside the Party, many find it strange that Bo Xilai was ousted and charged so quickly and publicly. Dean Cheng makes this comment regarding the scandal: "Such major developments-occurring in the midst of one of China's most public political events-suggest that Chinese politics are in major turmoil." While the event with Bo Xilai is scandalous, it is an extension of the ongoing concern of many inside the Party of the increasing corruption and the deterioration of the perceived legitimacy of the Party. Premier Wen, who is exited his position during this most recent transition has even publicly called for the power of the Communist Party to be reduced. In the 2011 World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, Premier Wen was quoted as saying: A ruling Party's most important duty is to follow the constitution and the law, and restrict its activities within the constitution and the law…. This requires changes in the use of the Party as a substitute for the government and in the phenomenon of over-concentration of power. For this, we need to reform the leadership system of the Party and the country. But these reforms will be close to impossible to carry out as the 70 wealthiest members of the National People's Congress are ten times wealthier than the top 660 government officials here in the United States. This is due to the fact that state owned enterprises are run by members of the National People's Congress or by a close relative of those members. Any reforms would mean these members would have to give up their sources of wealth and power. As we've seen in many cases, economic troubles can strain political relations even further. If China does not make changes, the corruption and decadence in the ruling Communist Party could become the scapegoat for any "hard landing" China experiences. If China experiences a hard landing, it would lead to the second largest economy in the world falling into political chaos. This would create uncertainty that would trump the uncertainty experienced from the problems in the European Union. Societal Challenges The political problems in China are compounded by the fact that there is growing unrest among the average citizen in China. The largest problem is that of forced evictions by the Chinese government. After the Financial Crisis of 2008, the Chinese government began implementing an extremely large stimulus package. The main thrust of the stimulus package is to build up infrastructure across the country. In order to do this, many Chinese cities are forcibly and violently evicting citizens who live on land that is going to be used for new government building projects. The stories of these forced evictions have caused outrage throughout the Chinese population. An example of how outraged many citizens are is the Chinese fishing village of Wukan. The citizens of the village became fed up with land grabs from the government. In response, they rushed the offices of the local government during a protest. After the protest, one of the protest leaders died while in custody. This led to the village ousting the Communist Party leadership in the village and democratically electing local leaders. While this rebellion is an extreme example, what caused the outrage is still there and is becoming prevalent among the Chinese people. Land grabs are not the only problems, income disparity, working conditions, and many more social ills are beginning to bubble over. In 2010, China experienced 180,000 protests, riots, and mass demonstration. This is staggering. Unfortunately, many of the complaints are too narrow to begin a nationwide movement that will cause sweeping reforms inside China. That will not last for long. More and more of the protest leaders admit that the underlying problem with the country is the one party system that has dominated the government for so long. This growing public anger combined with the political turmoil inside the country could combine to create a deadly chemical reaction. Conclusion The Chinese model is quickly becoming a potential Chinese nightmare. While it has created incredible wealth inside China, it has created a monster that does not seem to be able to make the necessary changes. China has to go back to the path of reforms that Deng began in 1970s in which their economy becomes freer. Unfortunately, the incredible corruption that has sprang up from China's economic growth is beginning to insulate itself. Communist Party leaders have shown hostility toward any change. Investors must consider these factors when looking toward China for the growth that is missing in the United States. While that growth may be advantageous in the short to medium term, it could be an incredibly risky bet in the long term. If China does not address its economic, political, and societal challenges, the Great Wall that is the rising Chinese economy may have a mighty fall.
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# Energy Investment Low

#### Energy venture capitalist are dead now- no investment- they are SCARED AWAY FROM GOVERNMENTS

WSJ 12/27 (Wall Street Journal, “Silicon Valley's Green Energy Mistake Political venture capital turns out to be a loser.”, [http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323401904578159660625274422.html#](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323401904578159660625274422.html), December 27, 2012)

Silicon Valley's investment wizards are fleeing the so-called green economy, and not a moment too soon for American prosperity. As painful as the era of enviro-investing has been for taxpayers and shareholders, there's an emerging silver lining. It's likely that in 2013 fewer people will spend their time trying to turn political projects into companies. A recent survey from our corporate cousins at Dow Jones VentureSource and the National Venture Capital Association finds that "clean technology" is inspiring pessimism among venture capitalists. Fully 61% expect less clean-tech investment in 2013 compared to 2012. On the flip side, a majority expect more investment next year in business information technology, a traditional U.S. economic strength. Fisker Automotive co-founder Henrik Fisker, left, and CEO Tony Posawatz in Los Angele in November. The survey reflects a natural and healthy shift in Silicon Valley. Talent and resources are moving back to the technologies that gave the valley its name—and away from trendy eco-projects that failed. When Silicon Valley was committed to addressing market needs, it enriched the world with Intel, Apple, Google GOOG -0.89% and Cisco. When venture investors tried to profit from political agendas, they saddled taxpayers with stinkers like Abound Solar, Range Fuels and the infamous Solyndra, which went bust last year after receiving more than half a billion dollars in federal loans. Success has proven elusive even for the smartest guys in the solar-heated room. Five years after Al Gore joined the prestigious venture-capital firm Kleiner Perkins to back environmentally correct companies, the collaboration has yielded few successful exits for Mr. Gore and his partners, along with some spectacular disasters. This week brought further embarrassment for a Kleiner-backed and taxpayer-subsidized project called Fisker Automotive. In an interview with Delaware's News Journal, the head of the state's economic development office, Alan Levin, discussed the $21.5 million that was provided by the state in return for a Fisker promise to build green cars there. "All we want are the jobs or our money back," Mr. Levin told the newspaper. Fisker, an electric-car maker, is currently not making any cars due to various design and production problems. Last year the Department of Energy stopped lending money to Fisker after the company missed development deadlines, but federal taxpayers were already on the hook for more than $190 million. Fisker's problems have lately been exacerbated by the October bankruptcy of a key supplier, A123 Systems, AONEQ -4.76% which also received federal loans. Last week another green company backed by Kleiner, Glori Energy, withdrew its plans for an initial public offering (IPO), blaming poor market conditions. Perhaps Glori will be able to go public next year, and IPOs are a great way for venture investors to cash out of an investment, but Kleiner has enjoyed very few of them in its clean-tech portfolio.

# Plan Popular

#### Republicans love the plan

**Elkind 11**, Ethan, Bank of America Climate Change Research Fellow with a joint appointment at the UC Berkeley School of Law and the UCLA School of Law “The Tea Party Embraces Local Energy Efficiency Financing?,” August 11th, http://legalplanet.wordpress.com/2011/08/11/the-tea-party-embraces-local-energy-efficiency-financing/

It looks like we’ve finally found an environmental issue that can attract strong bipartisan support. The PACE program allows municipal bond financing to pay for energy efficiency retrofits and solar panels, among other environmentally benign building improvements, to be repaid through property tax assessments. But the Federal Housing Finance Administration (FHFA) essentially squashed the residential version of this program, and lawsuits against FHFA have had mixed results. The only hope has been Congress, and now Republicans seem to be riding to the rescue. While Congress flailed during the debt ceiling deliberations, Republicans Nan Hayworth (NY) and Dan Lungren (CA) co-sponsored the PACE Assessment Protection Act of 2011, along with 12 other Republicans and 11 Democrats. The proposed law tells FHFA to rescind its policy of withholding mortgage insurance for residential properties with PACE assessments, provided that the PACE arrangements meet certain standards. These standards include the use of a locally approved contractor, a home energy audit or feasibility study by a certified auditor prior to the PACE deal, and eligibility limited to property owners who have not been delinquent for at least the past three years on property taxes, among other safeguards. Why would a Tea Party-supported member of Congress like Hayworth sponsor this bill? Much of it has to do with **preserving local control and staving off federal intervention** into local matters, typically a Republican ideal. But the benefits go beyond philosophy or political structure: energy efficiency retrofits save building owners money, create much-needed construction jobs, and clean our air. And they don’t require federal spending, since these measures pay for themselves over time. Certainly after the light bulb fiasco that Dan wrote about, it’s nice to see that some energy efficiency measures pass muster in a Republican-controlled House.

#### Both sides of the aisle love the plan

**Kirkpatrick 12**, Aubrey Justin, masters project submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of environmental management degree in the Nicholas school of the environment, Duke university “Closing The "Energy-Efficiency Gap": An Empirical Analysis Of Property Assessed Clean Energy,” April, http://pacenow.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Kirkpatrick\_PACE\_MP.pdf

Following the FHFA letter, a number of political coalitions formed to reverse the decision. Sonoma County filed suit to reverse the FHFA decision. The suit resulted in a requirement that the FHFA initiate formal rulemaking procedures for guidelines on PACE regulation. Public comments began in Winter of 2012 and are ongoing as of March 2012. A variety of bills were introduced in the 112th Congress to remove restrictions imposed by FHFA. HR2599, introduced by Republican Nan Hayworth of New York and co-sponsored by a bipartisan group of 51 Congresspersons would: “…prevent Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and other Federal residential and commercial mortgage lending regulators from adopting policies that contravene established State and local property assessed clean energy laws.” PACE loan programs have bipartisan support due mainly to the local and voluntary nature of the programs – they require no “command-and-control”, use markets, and do not force any individual or municipality to participate, a feature attractive to right-leaning political coalitions. They encourage externality-reducing green energy development, a feature attractive to left-leaning political coalitions.

#### Plan’s popular and a rider

**Collins 12**, Jordan M, Director of Government Relations at Mintz-Leven, “PACE-ing in Purgatory: Outlook for Property Assessed Clean Energy Financing,” January 19th, http://www.mintz.com/newsletter/2012/Advisories/1578-0112-NAT-ECT\_Collins/index.htm

In the 112th Congress, Rep. Nan Hayworth (R-NY) introduced H.R. 2599, the “PACE Assessment Protection Act of 2011” to prevent Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac and other federal residential and commercial mortgage lending regulators from adopting policies contravening established state and local property assessed clean energy laws.35 The bill received fifty-one (51) cosponsors, including thirty (30) Democrats, and twenty-one (21) Republicans. H.R. 2599 is identical to both H.R. 5766 and S.3462 introduced by Representatives Mike Thompson (D-CA), and Senator Barbara Boxer (D-CA), respectively in the 111th Congress.36 The legislation, if enacted, would prevent FHFA and mortgage underwriters from discriminating against communities implementing or participating in a PACE program, including a prohibition on lending within the community or requiring more restrictive underwriting criteria for properties within the community.37 Further, the legislation would also mandate the adoption of underwriting standards aligned with DOE’s PACE guidelines released in May 2010.38 These underwriting standards would explicit incorporate the aforementioned White House Policy Framework for PACE programs to provide that, “in the event that a tax or assessment under a PACE program is delinquent, only the unpaid delinquent amount along with applicable penalties, interests, and costs will be subject to foreclosure and not the entire amount.”39 While strong bipartisan support has been an unusual occurrence in the 112th Congress, so too has a clear legislative vehicle for meaningful energy legislation unrelated to tax policy. Despite the well-documented gridlock in Washington, H.R. 2599 remains one of the more promising pieces of energy legislation that could be enacted in an election year. A likely legislative scenario would be to incorporate H.R. 2599 into the most bipartisan energy bill introduced in the 112th Congress, “The Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2011”.40 Introduced by Senators Shaheen (D-NH) and with support from Sen. Portman (R-OH), Landrieu (D-LA) and Coons (D-DE), the bill has gone through several iterations, several hearings before the Senate Energy & Natural Resources Committee, and is a strong candidate for advancing through the legislative process in 2012.

# PC Not Key

#### Can’t change anything – research proves

Jacobs and King 10 – University of Minnesota, Nuffield College, (Lawrence and Desmond, “Varieties of Obamaism: Structure, Agency, and the Obama Presidency,” Perspectives on Politics (2010), 8: 793-802)

 But personality is not a solid foundation for a persuasive explanation of presidential impact and the shortfalls or accomplishments of Obama's presidency. Modern presidents have brought divergent individual traits to their jobs and yet they have routinely failed to enact much of their agendas. Preeminent policy goals of Bill Clinton (health reform) and George W. Bush (Social Security privatization) met the same fate, though these presidents' personalities vary widely. And presidents like Jimmy Carter—whose personality traits have been criticized as ill-suited for effective leadership—enjoyed comparable or stronger success in Congress than presidents lauded for their personal knack for leadership—from Lyndon Johnson to Ronald Reagan.7 Indeed, a personalistic account provides little leverage for explaining the disparities in Obama's record—for example why he succeeded legislatively in restructuring health care and higher education, failed in other areas, and often accommodated stakeholders. Decades of rigorous research find that impersonal, structural forces offer the most compelling explanations for presidential impact.8 Quantitative research that compares legislative success and presidential personality finds no overall relationship.9 In his magisterial qualitative and historical study, Stephen Skowronek reveals that institutional dynamics and ideological commitments structure presidential choice and success in ways that trump the personal predilections of individual presidents.10 Findings point to the predominant influence on presidential legislative success of the ideological and partisan composition of Congress, entrenched interests, identities, and institutional design, and a constitutional order that invites multiple and competing lines of authority. The widespread presumption, then, that Obama's personal traits or leadership style account for the obstacles to his policy proposals is called into question by a generation of scholarship on the presidency. Indeed, the presumption is not simply problematic analytically, but practically as well. For the misdiagnosis of the source of presidential weakness may, paradoxically, induce failure by distracting the White House from strategies and tactics where presidents can make a difference. Following a meeting with Obama shortly after Brown's win, one Democratic senator lamented the White House's delusion that a presidential sales pitch will pass health reform—“Just declaring that he's still for it doesn't mean that it comes off life support.”11 Although Obama's re-engagement after the Brown victory did contribute to restarting reform, the senator's comment points to the importance of ideological and partisan coalitions in Congress, organizational combat, institutional roadblocks, and anticipated voter reactions. Presidential sales pitches go only so far.

#### Journalists love constructing ‘pc key’ narratives – prefer academics

Dickinson 9 professor of political science at Middlebury College (Matthew, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” May 26, 2009 Presidential Power <http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/>]

What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee. If we want to measure Obama’s “power”, then, we need to know what his real preference was and why he chose Sotomayor. My guess – and it is only a guess – is that after conferring with leading Democrats and Republicans, he recognized the overriding practical political advantages accruing from choosing an Hispanic woman, with left-leaning credentials. We cannot know if this would have been his ideal choice based on judicial philosophy alone, but presidents are never free to act on their ideal preferences. Politics is the art of the possible. Whether Sotomayer is his first choice or not, however, her nomination is a reminder that the power of the presidency often resides in the president’s ability to dictate the alternatives from which Congress (or in this case the Senate) must choose. Although Republicans will undoubtedly attack Sotomayor for her judicial “activism” (citing in particular her decisions regarding promotion and affirmative action), her comments regarding the importance of gender and ethnicity in influencing her decisions, and her views regarding whether appellate courts “make” policy, they run the risk of alienating Hispanic voters – an increasingly influential voting bloc (to the extent that one can view Hispanics as a voting bloc!) I find it very hard to believe she will not be easily confirmed. In structuring the alternative before the Senate in this manner, then, Obama reveals an important aspect of presidential power that cannot be measured through legislative boxscores.

# Winners Win

#### Winners win- group it- wins generate momentum- immediate boost because political capital is intangible- based off perception- inaction burns capital- that’s Kuttner

#### Best evidence goes aff

**Lauter 1/19**, David, Washington Bureau LA Times, “Obama comes out swinging for second term,” 1/19, <http://touch.latimes.com/#section/-1/article/p2p-74090688/>

WASHINGTON — In President Obama's first term, a promise of bipartisanship withered on stony ground; as his second begins, he has openly embraced confrontation. On a parade of hot-button political issues, including the budget, gun control and immigration, Obama has begun to hammer on weak points in the Republican coalition. He has made little effort to woo members of the opposition in Congress, whose positions he has characterized publicly as "intransigent," "extreme" and "absurd." Instead, he appears intent on dividing them. That approach has unified Democrats, who remain staunchly supportive of the president, while exacerbating splits in Republican ranks, according to polls. While the strategy involves considerable risk, Obama and his aides seem convinced it offers their best hope of winning major legislative victories in an era of deep partisan divisions in Washington and in the wider electorate. The administration wants to "stay away from inside-the-Beltway, elite negotiations and try to pursue an outside-in strategy, where the president seeks to mobilize public opinion and put pressure on a minority of Republicans," said William Galston of the Brookings Institution, a public policy think tank. The idea, he said, is to find weak spots in the GOP coalition, then "stick a wedge into the crack and wiggle it back and forth until it breaks." During the first term, Obama and his aides engaged in lengthy negotiations and offered concessions aimed at winning a handful of Republican votes during battles over healthcare and the economic stimulus. That effort proved futile, whether because of Obama's inability to reach across the aisle (the Republican view), the intransigence of his opposition (the Democratic version) or the inherent problems of compromise in a divided country. During the presidential campaign, Obama and top aides suggested that the Republican determination to oppose him would wane if he won reelection. "The fever will break," became a favored White House metaphor. That hasn't happened, and the current White House strategy tacitly acknowledges that bridging the partisan gaps will probably remain beyond Obama's power. At the same time, Obama and his advisors feel more confident they can prevail — as they did during the "fiscal cliff" battle over tax rates in December. White House senior advisor Valerie Jarrett said Obama was not adopting "a confrontational strategy," but was acting confidently "with the experience of four years." "His intent isn't to cause fracases in the Republican party," she added, saying that the focus is on policy. "The way he looks at it is, these are causes that can actually bring our country together." Republicans disagree, of course, and say Obama's approach guarantees nothing will get done. "The president is really good at campaigning and really bad at governing," said Republican strategist Whit Ayres. "Anything that's going to get through this Congress is going to have to be done in a bipartisan way," he said, but Obama has shown "no inclination or ability" to accomplish that. "This White House hasn't seemed to have figured out that the election is over, and the time for governing has come," he added. Whichever view is right, the legislative clock runs quickly for second-term presidents. Next year, members of Congress will begin to focus on the 2014 midterm election. After that, the 2016 presidential contest will rapidly take shape. Even if he avoids the kinds of scandals or blunders that hindered the second terms of Dwight Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan, Bill Clinton and George W. Bush, history suggests Obama has a relatively short period in which to collect legislative victories. "In second terms the window of opportunity is pretty narrow, maybe 18 months," said University of Texas professor H.W. Brands, one of a group of historians who have met several times with Obama for off-the-record dinners to discuss the presidency. "After that, they are really lame ducks." Obama and his aides dismiss the idea that a softer approach to the opposing party would lead to a better result. Members of Congress chiefly vote based on their political self-interest, not personal relationships, Obama said at a recent news conference. "The reason that, you know, in many cases, Congress votes the way they do, or talks the way they talk, or takes positions and negotiations that they take — it doesn't have to do with me; it has to do with the imperatives that they feel in terms of their own politics," he said. Many outside experts agree. The biggest fear for many lawmakers is the risk of being challenged in a primary election if they cooperate with the other side, said Alan Abramowitz, professor of political science at Emory University, who has extensively studied the country's rising political partisanship. The gap between the two parties in the just-completed 112th Congress was bigger than at any time since the 1880s, according to data analyzed by University of Georgia political scientist Keith T. Poole. To convince members to break party discipline in such a divided body, the president has to provide significant counter-pressure. White House aides "see that they have the advantage" with public opinion on guns, taxes and other major issues Obama has tackled, Abramowitz said, and "that plays into this more confrontational approach." White House officials believe events have vindicated their strategy. In December's confrontation over the federal budget, Obama made an initial offer that embodied an extensive Democratic wish list. House Republicans denounced him for not negotiating seriously, vowed to block his plans to raise income tax rates on the wealthiest Americans, then gave in when the deadline arrived. Obama made some concessions, but far fewer than in previous negotiations. In the end, Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio) allowed a tax increase on the wealthy to come to the House floor and pass despite opposition from most of his caucus. The bill marked the first time any Republican in Congress had voted for an income tax hike in more than 20 years. Republican leaders then vowed to recoup their losses in a fight over the federal debt ceiling. On Friday, they backed away from that confrontation too, judging the risks too high, and proposed a new budget deadline later in the spring.

#### Specificity true for energy- empirically proven compromising fails

Gergen 1/19 – CNN Senior Political Analyst

(David, “Obama 2.0: Smarter – but wiser?”, CNN, 1-19-2013, <http://www.cnn.com/2013/01/18/opinion/gergen-obama-two/index.html>)

On the eve of his second inaugural, President Obama appears smarter, tougher and bolder than ever before. But whether he is also wiser remains a key question for his new term.¶ It is clear that he is consciously changing his leadership style heading into the next four years. Weeks before the November elections, his top advisers were signaling that he intended to be a different kind of president in his second term. "Just watch," they said to me, in effect, "he will win re-election decisively and then he will throw down the gauntlet to the Republicans, insisting they raise taxes on the wealthy. Right on the edge of the fiscal cliff, he thinks Republicans will cave."¶ What's your Plan B, I asked. "We don't need a Plan B," they answered. "After the president hangs tough -- no more Mr. Nice Guy -- the other side will buckle." Sure enough, Republicans caved on taxes. Encouraged, Obama has since made clear he won't compromise with Republicans on the debt ceiling, either. Obama 2.0 stepped up this past week on yet another issue: gun control. No president in two decades has been as forceful or sweeping in challenging the nation's gun culture. Once again, he portrayed the right as the enemy of progress and showed no interest in negotiating a package up front. In his coming State of the Union address, and perhaps in his inaugural, the president will begin a hard push for a comprehensive reform of our tattered immigration system. Leading GOP leaders on the issue -- Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Florida, for example -- would prefer a piecemeal approach that is bipartisan. Obama wants to go for broke in a single package, and on a central issue -- providing a clear path to citizenship for undocumented residents -- he is uncompromising.¶ After losing out on getting Susan Rice as his next secretary of state, Obama has also shown a tougher side on personnel appointments. Rice went down after Democratic as well as Republican senators indicated a preference for Sen. John Kerry. But when Republicans also tried to kill the nomination of Chuck Hagel for secretary of defense, Obama was unyielding -- an "in-your-face appointment," Sen. Lindsay Graham, R-South Carolina, called it, echoing sentiments held by some of his colleagues. Republicans would have preferred someone other than Jack Lew at Treasury, but Obama brushed them off. Hagel and Lew -- both substantial men -- will be confirmed, absent an unexpected bombshell, and Obama will rack up two more victories over Republicans. Strikingly, Obama has also been deft in the ways he has drawn upon Vice President Joe Biden. During much of the campaign, Biden appeared to be kept under wraps. But in the transition, he has been invaluable to Obama in negotiating a deal with Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell on the fiscal cliff and in pulling together the gun package. Biden was also at his most eloquent at the ceremony announcing the gun measures.¶ All of this has added up for Obama to one of the most effective transitions in modern times. And it is paying rich dividends: A CNN poll this past week pegged his approval rating at 55%, far above the doldrums he was in for much of the past two years. Many of his long-time supporters are rallying behind him. As the first Democrat since Franklin D. Roosevelt to score back-to-back election victories with more than 50% of the vote, Obama is in the strongest position since early in his first year.¶

Wins key to momentum

Green ’10 (Green 6/11/10 – professor of political science at Hofstra University (David Michael Green, 6/11/10, "The Do-Nothing 44th President ", http://www.opednews.com/articles/The-Do-Nothing-44th-Presid-by-David-Michael-Gree-100611-648.html)

Moreover, there is a continuously evolving and reciprocal relationship between presidential boldness and achievement. In the same way that nothing breeds success like success, nothing sets the president up for achieving his or her next goal better than succeeding dramatically on the last go around**.** This is absolutely a matter of perception, and you can see it best in the way that Congress and especially the Washington press corps fawn over bold and intimidating presidents like Reagan and George W. Bush. The political teams surrounding these presidents understood the psychology of power all too well. They knew that by simultaneously creating a steamroller effect and feigning a clubby atmosphere for Congress and the press, they could leave such hapless hangers-on with only one remaining way to pretend to preserve their dignities. By jumping on board the freight train, they could be given the illusion of being next to power, of being part of the winning team. And so, with virtually the sole exception of the now retired Helen Thomas, this is precisely what they did.

#### Obama WOULD know how to use the wins

Delamaide 1/18 – specialist in business, finance, and politics

(Darrell, “Obama poised to serve up legislative barrage”, Market Watch, 1-18-2013, <http://articles.marketwatch.com/2013-01-18/commentary/36403142_1_immigration-reform-illinois-democrat-luis-gutierrez-white-house>)

Just as President Barack Obama is poised to take his second oath of office, events seem to be pushing him to follow through on his full second-term agenda right away.¶ For starters, the half-measure on the fiscal cliff at the turn of the year left work to do on automatic spending cuts, and the debt ceiling debate raises other questions on fiscal policy that must be resolved in the next few weeks.¶ But the December massacre of schoolchildren in Connecticut has also moved forward the national debate on curbing gun violence. And Latino voters who helped boost Obama to re-election are impatient for immigration reform.¶ Buoyed by a solid election victory and backed by a relatively unified Democratic Party that sees momentum in favor of its agenda, Obama appears ready to throw a barrage of measures at Congress and let the Republican opposition figure out how to stop it if they can.¶ At the start of his second term, the president seems determined to gain the upper hand in setting the political agenda in Washington, rather than reacting, as he did during much of the past four years, to a continuous pattern of obstruction from Republicans.

#### It’s a defeat- Obama has to use PC for appealing

Bachner 1/25 (Wolff Bachner, “Federal Appeals Court Rules Obama’s Recess Appointment’s Unconstitutional”, <http://www.inquisitr.com/495390/federal-appeals-court-rules-obamas-recess-appointments-unconstitutional/>, January 25, 2013)

Despite the claims to the contrary by President Obama and his Justice Department, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit ruled today that Mr. Obama’s recess appointments to the National Labor Relations Board were unconstitutional. The three justices voted unanimously against the President and issued a strong statement emphasizing that Mr. Obama lacked the authority to decide when the Senate is in recess. The case may seem to ride on a legal technicality about what actually defines a Senate recess, but the justices held that the case was an important test of constitutional principals. Obama made the three appointments after the Senate adjoined for a short 20 day period. In order to prevent the President from making appointments during the break, the Senate met for Pro Forma sessions every few days to avoid a recess. Senate Republicans refused to confirm his candidates for the National Labor Relations Board due to their ties to labor unions. President Obama, in consultation with Eric Holder, declared unilaterally that the Senate was in recess and made the appointments anyway. Republicans were outraged, arguing the Constitution delegates the power to declare a recess solely to the Congress. After the President appointed union lawyer Richard Griffin, Labor Department official Sharon Block, both Democrats, and Republican NLRB lawyer Terence Flynn to the NLRB in January of 2012, Noel Canning, a bottling company, filed suit, claiming the NLRB ruling against the company was illegal because the recess appointments were unconstitutional. The suit was later joined by Minority Leader Mitch McConnel and the Senate’s Republicans. Critics of the President said the recess appointments by Obama were unprecedented and constituted a deliberate violation of the separation of powers. There has been an ongoing battle between the Obama Administration and the Republicans over the President’s use of Executive Privileges and today’s ruling is a major defeat for Obama. Making a bad day worse for the President, the three judges ruled that recess appointments can only be made when the Senate has recessed a session permanently, which only happens at the end of the year. This places a major limit on the use of recess appointments to sidestep the will of the Senate. The final twist of the legal knife for President Obama came when the three judges also found the Constitution restricted the use of recess appointments to filling vacancies that occur during an actual recess. If this ruling stands, it will prevent any future President from being able to use recess appointments to overrule the will of Congress. The court’s ruling is one of the strongest statements of support for the original intent of the Constitution we have heard from the Federal Appeals Court in many years. The judges made their opinions crystal clear with the following paragraphs: “An interpretation of “the Recess” that permits the President to decide when the Senate is in recess would demolish the checks and balances inherent in the advice-and-consent requirement, giving the President free rein to appoint his desired nominees at any time he pleases, whether that time be a weekend, lunch, or even when the Senate is in session and he is merely displeased with its inaction. This cannot be the law. The intersession interpretation of “the Recess” is the only one faithful to the Constitution’s text, structure, and history.” “The dearth of intra-session appointments in the years and decades following the ratification of the Constitution speaks far more impressively than the history of recent presidential exercise of a supposed power to make such appointments. Recent presidents are doing no more than interpreting the Constitution. While we recognize that all branches of government must of necessity exercise their understanding of the Constitution in order to perform their duties faithfully thereto, ultimately it is our role to discern the authoritative meaning of the supreme law.” “The power of a written constitution lies in its words. It is those words that were adopted by the people. When those words speak clearly, it is not up to us to depart from their meaning in favor of our own concept of efficiency, convenience, or facilitation of the functions of government. In light of the extensive evidence that the original public meaning of “happen” was “arise,” we hold that the President may only make recess appointments to fill vacancies that arise during the recess.” The White House has not commented yet on the ruling, but Mr. Obama is expected to instruct the Justice Department to appeal the case to the Supreme Court. Experienced observers of the high court expect the nine Justices to take the case rather quickly, as today’s ruling leaves the National Labor Relations Board without a quorum.