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**Observation 1 is the status quo –**

***Federal fracking restrictions are overlapping, impose unnecessary costs and stifle investment, causing massive price spikes and decreased production– Specifically:***

***A) EPA’s air pollution restrictions***

**Pyle ‘12**

Thomas J. Pyle, President, Institute for Energy Research (IER), National Journal, 4-23-12, Regulating Natural Gas: What's the Right Balance?, <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/04/regulating-natural-gas-whats-t.php>, jj

***EPA's Flawed Rule Warrants Scrutiny***

**EPA’s proposed rule, called** “Oil and Natural Gas Sector: ***N*ew *S*ource *P*erformance *S*tandards** **and *N*ational *E*mission *S*tandards for *H*azardous *A*ir *P*ollutants Reviews**,” was first proposed as a result of a deal with environmental groups and **will bring several sources that have never been subject to federal regulation before under the yoke of the agency.** In amending the NSPS and NESHAP standards in its rule, **the EPA will bring an estimated 1.1 million wells that are already producing oil and gas under regulation, as well as 500,000 existing gas wells and the 11,400 new gas wells being drilled each year.** **The proposed rules also apply to approximately 600 natural gas processing plants, 3,000 compressor stations and 1.5 million miles of pipelines.** The problems with EPA’s rationale for wanting to bring these new sources under regulation are numerous. For example, although the proposed rules do not purport to regulate methane emissions, EPA states that the rule will yield about $1.6 billion in health and environmental benefits by reducing methane. However, according to a 2011 study by IHS-CERA, **EPA’s analysis of how much methane is emitted by drilling and completing unconventional gas wells “lacks rigor” and “is at odds with industry practice and with health and safety considerations at the well site.”** Namely, IHS-CERA found that **EPA based its methane emissions estimates on just four unaudited data points, “each of which was generated on the basis on multiple assumptions and rounded to the nearest hundred, thousand, or ten thousand million cubic feet prior to averaging**.” Three of these data points describe methane that was captured for sale, rather than methane that was emitted. **EPA also incorrectly made the assumption that all gas produced during well completions is vented into the atmosphere, rather than flared, unless it is required by state regulation**. However, **the study notes that cold venting of methane into the atmosphere is not standard industry practice, nor would it be acceptable for the safe operation of drilling sites**. Because of these problems, IHS-CERA concluded that **the benefits of EPA’s proposed rule are “overstated in terms of reducing air pollution and emissions of GHG,” and indeed, EPA’s analysis does not model the atmospheric temperature impact its rule would have.** Moreover, **by EPA’s own omission, the agency cannot model the public health impacts that would be addressed by its regulations**—although this is supposedly the genesis of the deal it struck with environmental groups. EPA writes, “with the data available, we are not able to provide credible health benefit estimates for the reduction in exposure to [hazardous air pollutants], ozone and [particulate matter] (2.5 microns and less) (PM2.5) for these rules.” Supportive data prior to proposing new regulations should be prerequisite, and the mere assertion that there will be health benefits is insufficient proof that a need exists. According to President Obama’s own Executive Order 13563, the regulatory system must be based on the “best available science,” and EPA’s failure to quantitatively assess the health effects is prima facie evidence that its rule is based on false promises of health benefits. **Lastly, EPA’s rule seems to ignore economic realities** that seem blatantly obvious to even those unfamiliar with the concept of incentives. For example, the agency claims the capture of 3.4 million tons of recovered natural gas will actually benefit the natural gas industry to the tune of $30 million annually, which will end up offsetting the compliance costs**. If industry can make a profit off of capturing natural gas, however, why would it need government regulation to make it do so? It makes no logical sense for companies to ignore technology that allows them to earn higher profits through efficiency, if it were truly that easy**. In reality, **these rules divert investments from capital and energy development into regulatory compliance efforts, and impose onerous notification, record keeping, monitoring, reporting, and performance testing requirements that industry will necessarily incur costs to keep up with**. **These costs**, however, **do not figure in EPA’s cost-benefit analysis. These are but a few of the methodological problems that are rife in EPA’s proposed regulations for oil and natural gas well emissions, illustrating that the agency’s broken model cannot be expected to do what it says it will do**. **An infinitely more practical alternative that the agency did not consider would be to continue to make progress through the voluntary programs that already exist to encourage the development of better emissions curbing practices, such at the Natural Gas STAR program overseen by EPA since 1993**. EPA’s own website touts the successes of the program: “Since 1993, the Program's domestic partners have eliminated more than 904 billion cubic feet (Bcf) of methane emissions through the implementation of approximately 150 cost-effective technologies and practices.” **These successes in reductions and sequestrations call into question the need for a command and control regime like the one EPA has proposed.** Moreover, through both their proximity to the affected facilities and their intimate knowledge of local resources, **state regulators are in a much better position to regulate toxic air emissions than a federal agency**. In testimony before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Daniel Yergin, a member of the federal government’s Natural Gas Subcommittee of the Secretary of Energy’s Advisory Board, remarked, “**there is a tendency to assume that this isn’t going on but it’s been going on for decades. The states are the leader and bring that long experience to it**.” He also noted that **federal regulation can result in “a kind of super structure on top of a superstructure that would make investment more difficult, would take a much longer time to get things done, and move farther away from communities.**” Indeed, **because of the highly localized nature of air quality responses and the variances in well locations, the flexibility afforded by allowing states to tailor their own regulations according to their needs can result in the same reductions with better cost-effectiveness.** Modern energy production was pioneered and advanced in the United States, and **it is important that our regulatory system help—not harm—our ability to continue producing safe, affordable energy here at home**. **EPA’s proposed oil and gas emissions rule would impede the ability of industry to make use of the technology that has led to natural gas prices being the lowest in a decade, and imposes unnecessary costs on doing business based on shaky assumptions and vague authority.**

***B) Interior Department restrictions***

**Platts ‘12**

Platts is a leading global provider of energy, petrochemicals and metals information, and a premier source of benchmark price assessments for those commodity markets. Since 1909, Platts has provided information and insights that help customers make sound trading and business decisions and enable the markets to perform with greater transparency and efficiency.

6-18, Proposed BLM fracking rule has no scientific basis: IECA, <http://www.platts.com/RSSFeedDetailedNews/RSSFeed/NaturalGas/6394906>, jj

**The federal Interior Department's proposal to regulate hydraulic fracturing on federal lands has no scientific basis**, the president of the Industrial Energy Consumers of America said Monday. "**There is no scientific data to support the need for these regulations**," IECA President Paul Cicio said. Cicio said **the proposed rule, announced by Interior's Bureau of Land Management on May 4, would duplicate existing state regulation of fracking as well as the voluntary reporting of the chemical formulations of fracking fluid done by exploration-and-production companies.** "**What is of great concern to us is why the Department of the Interior is doing this without a good reason**," he said. "There is no science supporting this. **So why should we have new regulations**?" In a letter Friday to Interior Secretary Ken Salazar, Cicio urged the department to refrain from imposing additional fracking regulation on oil and gas producers operating on BLM-administered land. **The proposed rule is expected to apply to 700 million subsurface acres of federal estate and 56 million subsurface acres of Indian mineral estate, mostly across 12 Western states.** "It is of great concern to us that BLM provides no supporting scientific data on hydraulic fracturing, well-stimulation incidents, or problems that justify new overarching regulation," Cicio wrote to Salazar. Cicio told Platts that he worried that **the imposition of additional regulations on the production of energy from federal lands could result in a slowdown in gas and oil drilling and ultimately production from those lands.** "**We as consumers have been impacted before by BLM**," he said. From 2000 to 2005, "**natural gas prices doubled then tripled,**" Cicio said. "**During that time the DOI permitting system had thousands of drilling permit backlogs. There was plenty of gas, but regulations were preventing natural gas companies from drilling. This is a repeat performance**," he said. Since the Interior Department announced the proposed rule in May, a **number of oil and gas producer associations and state and federal politicians representing Western states have voiced their objections to the proposed new federal regulation of fracking**.

***C) Wastewater restrictions***

**Oil & Gas Monitor ‘12**

4-11, Industry Must Prepare for Fracking Wastewater Regulations, <http://www.oilgasmonitor.com/industry-prepare-fracking-wastewater-regulations/1723/>, jj

**The EPA continues to closely examine hydraulic fracturing practices and, therefore, the industry will soon be forced to come to terms with a** yet- to-be-defined **national standard for the management and treatment of wastewater flowback**. **The liability will likely be retroactive**. Companies that actively engage the government while it is developing these laws and regulations will be ahead of the curve and profit by establishing themselves as industry leaders. In a hearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Water and Power on October 20, 2012, Cynthia Dougherty, the EPA’s Director of Ground Water and Drinking Water Office, signaled that **the EPA should be expected to extend its reach in regulating wastewater produced by hydraulic fracturing**. **Currently, the natural gas industry conducts exploration and production under the assumption that they are protected from liability by an exemption to the Safe Drinking Water Act** (SDWA). However, fracking has not been exempted from the federal standards stipulated by Sections 301(b) and 402(a) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) nor from the SDWA’s Underground Injection Control (UIC) program. Shale gas and the practice of hydraulic fracturing used to harvest it has been identified as a necessary resource for the U.S. to become energy independent. It is also promoted heavily in halls of Washington, D.C., as a clean and environmentally sound energy resource that will develop hundreds of thousands of new jobs. However, an in depth analysis has yet to be completed by the federal government on the environmental impact of fracking wastewater or the impact that such heavy loads place on publicly owned treatment works (POTWs), or, more importantly, on the watersheds where they discharge. The EPA is set to release its congressionally mandated study on the effects of hydraulic fracturing in late 2012 with another report detailing “case studies and toxicological analysis” to be completed in 2014.[1] The fundamental research questions posed in this study revolve around fracking’s effects on water at all stages in the operational cycle of harvesting natural gas and will form the basis for a comprehensive regulatory effort. **While** President **Obama outlined in his 2012 State of the Union address that his Administration will promote the development of the shale gas as a key principle of his “Blueprint for an America Built to Last,” it is no secret in Washington that his energy policies are guided first and foremost by his environmental interests.** **A quick look at the recent** Bureau of Land Management (**BLM) proposed rule for fracking on public lands and the current hold on XL pipeline illustrate where this Administration really stands on energy independence and job creation**. **Natural gas may be clean burning, but it is still a fossil fuel and fodder for environmental groups and news outlets to generate highly emotional arguments based on few facts. The resulting feelings in Congress are mixed**. The need for energy independence and the desire for clean energy continue, but **environmental safety and public safety have become chief concerns**. On one hand, they hear the American Petroleum Institute Vice President Kyle Isakower say that ***in light of the states various regulatory authorities “adding potentially redundant and duplicative federal regulation would be unnecessary, costly, and could stifle investment.***[2]” On the other hand, they hear about environmental liability and public safety. Industry leaders and even some **public officials have citied the fact that there is no proven case that fracking has contaminated a water supply as evidence that current regulations are sufficient**. But the political reality is that regulatory changes can alter the entire liability landscape – even for operational practices that have been commonly accepted for a long time. Case in point: EPA’s recent pursuit of a hazardous waste classification for coal ash. Safety record or not, fracking companies have ultimate responsibility for the disposal of their wastewater and they will be held liable for any pollution or damages caused by that wastewater in perpetuity. ***The growth of the industry and expansion of operations across state lines guarantee that federal regulations are all but certain***. On March 6, 2012, BLM Director Bob Abbey testified before the House Appropriations Interior-Environment Subcommittee about pending regulations focused on wastewater from fracking on public lands and its management. Members of Congress in the hearing called for “one set of rules” for public and private lands.[3] Thus, **industry can expect to see every agency in the federal arsenal to be used to push regulations designed for public lands onto private lands as well**. Enter the EPA’s Clean Water Act.

***There’s a glut of natural gas now, but regulations will make prices volatile despite this.***

**Faulkner ‘12**

Chris Faulkner is the Founder, President and CEO of Breitling Oil and Gas, an independent oil and natural gas company based in Irving, Texas. Founded in 2004, Breitling Oil and Gas employs state-of-the-art petroleum and natural gas exploration and extraction technologies for the development of onshore oil and gas projects.

August 13, 2012, Breitling Oil & Gas, “Contemplating the Natural Gas Market: Start with the Fracking Facts” <http://www.breitlingoilandgas.com/contemplating-the-natural-gas-market-start-with-the-fracking-facts/>, jj

Regardless, the sad truth is that the facts have done little to quiet the hue and cry over fracking, so **it behooves us to look at the potential regulatory fallout of this controversy and how it could impact the natural gas market**. **It’s hard to overstate the importance of fracking to the natural gas industry—it is, quite simply, the only method that gives us access to US reserves today. There are no more domestic reserves accessible via old fashioned vertical drill methods, and there haven’t been for decades.** So, a big question on my mind when I’m making investment decisions is whether oil companies such as Atlas Energy (NYSE: ATLS), Continental Resources (NYSE: CLR), Chesapeake Energy (NYSE: CHK), Range Resource (NYSE: RRC), Southwestern Energy (NYSE: SWN), Carrizo Oil & Gas (NASDAQ: CRZO) and many others will be able to reach the reserves they’ve already included in their investor reports. **Over-regulation to the point that the cost of drilling outweighs the potential profit** or an outright moratorium **on fracking would wreck havoc on those company projections**. This is somewhat similar to what happened recently with the Marcellus shale, when the USGS lowered its natural gas reserve estimates by 60%. In the case of the restated Marcellus estimates, the result was an increase on the commodity price of natural gas. Counterbalanced by the oversupply in the market, the price increase was short-lived, but **if US reserves are completely cut off by unreasonable regulation, the supply glut won’t be enough to keep the price down.** The likelihood of increased regulation is uncertain. After the EPA concluded in 2004 that there was no credible evidence of environmental impacts from fracking operations and Congress exempted fracking from federal drinking water regulations in 2005, the issue was re-ignited by Josh Fox’s hyperbolic and inaccurate “Gasland” documentary. Riding the momentum of renewed notoriety and heightened media and public interest, fracking opponents successfully lobbied the EPA to once again study the environmental impacts and numerous bills have since been introduced to increase fracking regulation. Many states have opposed further federal regulation, however, and local municipalities have moved to regulate the practice within their own jurisdictions. Attempts to ban the practice have already been met with constitutional challenges. Most recently, President **Obama issued an executive order establishing an inter-agency working group to coordinate the 13 federal agencies studying and considering regulating the natural gas industry.** At the same time, **this country is deeply invested** – financially, politically, and emotionally **– in finding and using cleaner energy alternatives, and natural gas is among the cleanest and most cost-effective**. According to the EPA, natural gas produces half as much carbon dioxide as coal when burned for power generation, for example. Nuclear energy meets current standards for carbon emissions, but power generated through nuclear energy is 4 to 5 times more expensive than power generated by natural gas. And, though **natural gas-powered vehicles are still in their infancy**, I can’t recall ever seeing a market-ready nuclear-powered car. (Okay, Cadillac introduced a really futuristic-looking, sleek beauty at the 2009 Chicago Auto Show, but it didn’t actually have a working reactor. Truly a concept car, it was designed based on the theoretic possibility of using a thorium-fueled reactor. With natural gas-powered vehicles already on the road and in the production line, I think we have to give this green advancement to natural gas.) Naturally, I’m biased in favor of, and hoping and believing, that **a reasonable compromise can be reached that will allow operators to access domestic reserves in a cost-effective manner that meets government standards sufficient to protect the environment and the public**. And I think **we’ll get to that compromise by remembering to stay focused on the facts and paying attention to the actual standards already in place. In the meantime, this volatility over fracking regulation will continue to contribute to the volatility of natural gas commodity prices.**

***Investment helps companies survive the glut in the short term.***

**Kientz ‘12**

Robert has been an investor for many years and has 7 years experience working as a corporate auditor and has 13 years corporate working experience. Robert earned his Series 6, 63, and 7 licenses 10 years ago while working as a broker dealer for a large, multinational company. In addition, Robert earned a Series 3 options license in 2009 while working for a forex broker. Robert formed a real estate property management firm in 2000 to assist property owners in the North Texas area to increase their profits by providing high quality, best of market rentals for their tenants. Since founding, Robert has reduced vacancies by an average of 2 months per year per property, and increased cash flow by increasing rental demand and therefore timely rent payments. By renovating existing rental inventory to best of market and expanding property marketing techniques, the real estate company locates the best tenants and keeps revenues consistent in a tough real estate market. After working in finance and corporate audit for many years, Robert retired to become a full time property manager, real estate investor, trader, and author. Robert started the Drop Shadow website (http://www.thedropshadow.com) in 2010. As a former corporate auditor, Robert possesses a unique view into business operations and controls and how they affect and interact with the strategic business plans of the company. The experience in Audit taught Robert various best of business practices, whose application to his investment strategies increased revenues and efficiency while reducing costly overhead.

8-28, Forex Pros, Investing In Natural Gas, Part 2, [http://www.forexpros.com/analysis/investing-in-natural-gas,-part-2-134421](http://www.forexpros.com/analysis/investing-in-natural-gas%2C-part-2-134421), jj

Like **many** of the ***n*atural-*g*as companies** engaged in build-out phases, Golar **has a short term cash crunch that will need to be financed**, **which could put pressure on profits and share price near term**. In addition, **the company faces pressure from currency conversions and floating interest rates that may reduce margins in the wake of current global economic conditions.**

***And, regulatory certainty is key to exports.***

**Ebinger et. al ‘12**

Charles Ebinger is a senior fellow and director of the Energy Security Initiative at Brookings. He has more than 35 years of experience specializing in international and domestic energy markets (oil, gas, coal, and nuclear) and the geopolitics of energy, and has served as an energy policy advisor to over 50 governments. He has served as an adjunct professor in energy economics at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies and Georgetown University’s Walsh School of Foreign Service.

Kevin Massy is Assistant Director of the Energy Security Initiative at Brookings where he manages research into international energy relations and domestic energy policy. A former writer for the Economist magazine on energy and technology, he has an MSFS in International Business and Commerce from Georgetown University, an MA in International Journalism from City University, London, and a BA from the University of Newcastle.

Govinda Avasarala is a Senior Research Assistant in the Energy Security Initiative at Brookings. His research focuses on the geopolitics of energy in emerging markets, domestic and international oil and natural gas markets, and multilateral energy frameworks. He has a BSc in Economics from the University of Mary Washington.

Energy Security Initiative @ Brookings, Liquid Markets: Assessing the Case for U.S. Exports of Liquefied Natural Gas, May, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/1/natural%20gas%20ebinger/natural_gas_ebinger.pdf>, jj

Environment, Regulations, and the Feasibility of LNG Exports While several studies are ongoing into the effects of shale gas production on the environment, there has been no conclusive evidence found to date that links the practice of fracking to ground water contamination or increased seismic activity. **As long as the current regulatory environment re- mains, shale gas development is likely to continue to produce the volumes that will make LNG exports feasible.** However, **a change in the regulatory landscape that imposes additional costs on producers could make marginal shale gas prospects uneconomic, reducing the size of the economically recoverable resource, thereby negatively affecting the feasibility of LNG exports**. Conversely, well developed regulations, possibly based on sustainable best practice, could provide benefit to the public, the environment and industry. The recent announcement by the Obama Administration— in which it allocated $45 million to an interagency research and development program between the Department of Energy, Interior, and the EPA to identify ways to reduce the environmental impact of shale gas production—suggests that the Administration supports the sustainable development of shale gas resources.

***This keeps the industry healthy long term***

**Passwaters**, 6/18/20**12** (Mark, SNL Energy Gas Utility Week, “Shell executive: LNG exports to Asia hold key to breaking production glut, LexisNexis, ts)

HIGHLIGHT: **LNG exports to Asia could provide a way out of an oversupplied market for North America**, according to the director of Royal Dutch Shell plc's upstream division. LNG exports to Asia could provide a way out of an oversupplied market for North America, the director of Royal Dutch Shell plc's upstream division said in a recent speech. Speaking June 7 to the Canadian American Business Council in Washington, D.C., Marvin Odum said **the growing global demand for energy is being paced by Asia, with China leading the way. "China has said it will more than double natural gas as a percentage share of its primary energy use by 2015. It could triple by 2020**," he said. "We at Shell see China driving 50% of the world's growth in natural gas demand over that same period of time." Odum said the **increasing Asian demand for energy could be the boost gas producers**, primarily in western Canada, **need to survive the current supply glut in the U.S.** and Canada. "**How can we create more value for that supply? By going west**," he said. "**LNG exports to Asia can open a market for North America** - and especially Canada - **worth billions of dollars**."

**Thus, the plan:**

***The United States federal government should substantially reduce restrictions on natural gas production in the United States by repealing the Environmental Protection Agency’s New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Reviews for natural gas production. The United States federal government should issue a moratorium on further federal restrictions on natural gas production in the United States.***

**Advantage 1 is Coal**

***US CO2 emissions are dropping rapidly as natural gas replaces coal --- but regulations will reverse this***

**Zakaria, 10-25** (Fareed, PhD Poli Sci @ Harvard, Zakaria, Editor of Newsweek, The Nation (AsiaNet), 2012, “The new oil and gas boom,” lexisnexis, ts)

**The environmental impact of the natural-gas boom is already clear and positive**. **The USA's *g*reen*h*ouse-*g*as emissions in 2011 were 9 percent lower than in 2007**. **That's a larger drop than in the *E*uropean *U*nion, with all its focus on renewables**. Why? A slow recovery and lagging demand is one answer. But **the main reason is that** **natural gas is replacing coal** everywhere as an energy source, **and gas emits half as much carbon dioxide as coal**. **This point is crucial**. **The conversation about** **natural gas cannot be had in isolation from the alternative. If we shut down all** **fracking and stop using shale gas, we will get all that energy by burning coal, which is the world's dirtiest fossil fuel and is associated with mining deaths and respiratory illnesses as well.**

***Restrictions will cause a price spike that shifts us back to coal***

**Brady ‘12**

Phil Brady, 6-6-12, the Opportune Time, Chesapeake: Turning Point or Point of No Return? <http://www.theopportunetime.com/news/online/Chesapeake-Turning-Point-or-Point-of-No-Return.php>, jj

**With the current price situation, there may be an opportunity for natural gas to replace coal** in the long term. **Not only does natural gas provide more energy than coal, but natural gas does so at significantly lower prices**. **As a matter of fact, we are already seeing the switch from coal to natural gas take place in power plants, and in entire states**. For example, Pennsylvania’s leading environmental advocacy organization, PennFuture, plans on replacing coal plants with natural gas plants. **However, keep in mind that power plants**, like Penn Future, **understand the cyclical nature of commodities.** **Consequently, *the plants will be prepared to have the retired coal-fired units ready to be used again when natural gas prices spike***. Interestingly, **if low costs are not enough to cause a price spike down the road, then perhaps new regulations on fracking will**. In April of 2012, the **U.S. Energy Secretary**, Steven **Chu, called for more stringent fracking regulations**. **If the legislation passes, we may see the now abundant supply of natural gas bottleneck, which would send prices back up**. If natural gas drillers simply slow down production, and sell natural gas to coal-users, they can shift the supply curve lower and increase demand, causing natural gas prices to increase and possibly reach levels seen in early 2008.

***There’s no comparison --- natural gas is far cleaner than coal***

**Lu et al. ‘12**

Xi Lu , School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, United States Jackson Salovaara , School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, United States Michael B. McElroy\* School of Engineering and Applied Sciences and Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, United States

Implications of the Recent Reductions in Natural Gas Prices for Emissions of CO2 from the US Power Sector

Environmental Science & Technology201246 (5), 3014-3021, jj

Howarth et al.(24) have suggested that emissions of CH4 associated with the fracking process involved in the production of natural gas from shale, combined with release of CH4 in the gas transportation system, could largely offset the climate related advantages occasioned by the additional sources of low cost gas (CH4, the major component of natural gas, is a significantly more effective greenhouse gas than CO2). An earlier study by Lelieveld and Crutzen(25) quantitatively analyzing the indirect effects of methane on climate warming on the basis of available estimates of fossil-fuel-related leaks of methane, suggested that **switching from coal and oil to natural gas as an energy source would reduce climate warming.** They further concluded that considering the global warming potential (GWP) on a time scale of ten years, **the fractional natural gas leakage should be less than 4.3–5.7% to ensure a reduction in climate forcing associated with switching from coal to gas. The advantages of natural gas are even more favorable if the potential climate impact is assessed on time scales much longer than a decade**. **Jiang et al.(**26) **evaluated the** greenhouse gas (**GHG) emissions resulting from the use of gas extracted from the Marcellus shale considering the entire life cycle of the gas**. They offered a comparison with the average emissions resulting from US natural gas produced in 2008, prior to any significant development of the Marcellus system. Their results suggested that **the GHG emissions from shale gas over the entire life cycle including the final combustion process are at most 3% higher than emissions associated with production and consumption of conventional sources of gas**. They argued further, in contrast to Howarth et al.,(24) that **the climate impact of the greenhouse gases emitted in conjunction with exploitation of the Marcellus shale source to produce electricity are significantly lower than those associated with the production of power using coal**. They concluded that **relatively straightforward measures could be implemented to minimize the potential release of greenhouse gases associated with the extraction of gas from shale**.(26) A more recent study by Hultman et al.(27) adopting a transparent and consistent approach to comparing the GHG footprints of conventional natural gas, shale gas, and coal concluded that **in terms of electricity generation the GHG impacts of shale gas are 11% higher than those for conventional gas** (higher than the value reported by Jiang et al.) **but only 56% of the impact expected for coal.**

***Coal causes extinction from global warming***

**Hansen 9** - Director of Nasa's Goddard Institute for Space Studies [James Hansen (Professor of Earth and Environmental Sciences @ Columbia University and Ph.D. in Physics from the University of Iowa), “Coal-fired power stations are death factories. Close them,” The Observer, Sunday 15 February 2009, pg. http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2009/feb/15/james-hansen-power-plants-coal]

A year ago, I wrote to Gordon Brown asking him to place a moratorium on new coal-fired power plants in Britain. I have asked the same of Angela Merkel, Barack Obama, Kevin Rudd and other leaders. The reason is this **- *coal is the single greatest threat to civilisation and all life on our planet***. **The climate is nearing tipping points**. Changes are beginning to appear and **there is a potential for explosive changes, effects that would be irreversible**, **if we do not rapidly slow fossil-fuel emissions over the next few decades**. **As Arctic sea ice melts, the darker ocean absorbs more sunlight and speeds melting. As the tundra melts, methane, a strong greenhouse gas, is released, causing more warming**. **As species are exterminated by shifting climate zones, ecosystems can collapse, destroying more species.** The public, buffeted by weather fluctuations and economic turmoil, has little time to analyse decadal changes. How can people be expected to evaluate and filter out advice emanating from those pushing special interests? How can people distinguish between top-notch science and pseudo-science? Those who lead us have no excuse - they are elected to guide, to protect the public and its best interests. They have at their disposal the best scientific organisations in the world, such as the Royal Society and the US National Academy of Sciences. Only in the past few years did the science crystallise, revealing the urgency. **Our planet is in peril. If we do not change course, we'll hand our children a situation that is out of their control. One ecological collapse will lead to another, in amplifying feedbacks.** The amount of carbon dioxide in the air has already risen to a dangerous level. The pre-industrial carbon dioxide amount was 280 parts per million (ppm). Humans, by burning coal, oil and gas, have increased this to 385 ppm; it continues to grow by about 2 ppm per year. Earth, with its four-kilometre-deep oceans, responds only slowly to changes of carbon dioxide. So the climate will continue to change, even if we make maximum effort to slow the growth of carbon dioxide. Arctic sea ice will melt away in the summer season within the next few decades. **Mountain glaciers, providing fresh water for rivers that supply hundreds of millions of people, will disappear - practically all of the glaciers could be gone within 50 years - if carbon dioxide continues to increase at current rates. Coral reefs, harbouring a quarter of ocean species, are threatened. The greatest danger hanging over our children and grandchildren is initiation of changes that will be irreversible on any time scale that humans can imagine. If coastal ice shelves buttressing the west Antarctic ice sheet continue to disintegrate, the sheet could disgorge into the ocean, raising sea levels by several metres in a century. Such rates of sea level change have occurred many times in Earth's history in response to global warming rates no higher than those of the past 30 years. Almost half of the world's great cities are located on coastlines. The most threatening change**, from my perspective**, is extermination of species**. **Several times in Earth's history, rapid global warming occurred**, apparently spurred by amplifying feedbacks**. In each case, more than half of plant and animal species became extinct. New species came into being over tens and hundreds of thousands of years. But these are time scales and generations that we cannot imagine. If we drive our fellow species to extinction, we will leave a far more desolate planet for our descendants than the world we inherited from our elders. Clearly, if we burn all fossil fuels, we will destroy the planet we know.** Carbon dioxide would increase to 500 ppm or more. We would set the planet on a course to the ice-free state, with sea level 75 metres higher. Climatic disasters would occur continually. The tragedy of the situation, if we do not wake up in time, is that the changes that must be made to stabilise the atmosphere and climate make sense for other reasons. They would produce a healthier atmosphere, improved agricultural productivity, clean water and an ocean providing fish that are safe to eat. Fossil-fuel reservoirs will dictate the actions needed to solve the problem. Oil, of which half the readily accessible reserves have already been burnt, is used in vehicles, so it's impractical to capture the carbon dioxide. This is likely to drive carbon dioxide levels to at least 400 ppm. But **if we cut off the largest source of carbon dioxide - coal - it will be practical to bring carbon dioxide back to 350 ppm,** lower still if we improve agricultural and forestry practices, increasing carbon storage in trees and soil. **Coal is not only the largest fossil fuel reservoir of carbon dioxide, it is the dirtiest fuel. Coal is polluting the world's oceans and streams with mercury, arsenic and other dangerous chemicals.** The dirtiest trick that governments play on their citizens is the pretence that they are working on "clean coal" or that they will build power plants that are "capture-ready" in case technology is ever developed to capture all pollutants.

***Warming’s human-caused – consensus proves. Slowing the rate is key.***

**Deibel ‘7**

(Terry L, Professor of IR @ National War College, “Foreign Affairs Strategy: Logic for American Statecraft”, Conclusion: American Foreign Affairs Strategy Today – card starts on page 387 of this book)

Finally, **there is one major existential threat** to American security (as well as prosperity) of a nonviolent nature, which, though far in the future, demands urgent action. It is the threat of **global warming** to the stability of the climate upon which all earthly life depends. Scientists worldwide have been observing the gathering of this threat for three decades now, and what was once a mere possibility has passed through probability to near certainty. Indeed ***not one* of more than 900 articles on climate change** published in refereed scientific journals from 1993 to 2003 **doubted that anthropogenic warming is occurring**. “In legitimate scientific circles,” writes Elizabeth Kolbert, “it is virtually impossible to find evidence of disagreement over the fundamentals of global warming.” Evidence from a vast international scientific monitoring effort accumulates almost weekly, as this sample of newspaper reports shows: an international panel predicts “brutal droughts, floods and violent storms across the planet over the next century”; climate change could “literally alter ocean currents, wipe away huge portions of Alpine Snowcaps and aid the spread of cholera and malaria”; “glaciers in the Antarctic and in Greenland are melting much faster than expected, and…worldwide, plants are blooming several days earlier than a decade ago”; “rising sea temperatures have been accompanied by a significant global increase in the most destructive hurricanes”; “NASA scientists have concluded from direct temperature measurements that 2005 was the hottest year on record, with 1998 a close second”; “Earth’s warming climate is estimated to contribute to more than 150,000 deaths and 5 million illnesses each year” as disease spreads; “widespread bleaching from Texas to Trinidad…killed broad swaths of corals” due to a 2-degree rise in sea temperatures. “**The world is slowly disintegrating**,” concluded Inuit hunter Noah Metuq, who lives 30 miles from the Arctic Circle. “They call it climate change…but we just call it breaking up.” From the founding of the first cities some 6,000 years ago until the beginning of the industrial revolution, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere remained relatively constant at about 280 parts per million (ppm). At present they are accelerating toward 400 ppm, and by 2050 they will reach 500 ppm, about double pre-industrial levels. Unfortunately, atmospheric CO2 lasts about a century, so **there is no way immediately to reduce levels, only to slow their increase**, we are thus in for significant global warming**; the only debate is how much and how serious the effects will be.** As the newspaper stories quoted above show, we are already experiencing the effects of 1-2 degree warming in more violent storms, spread of disease, mass die offs of plants and animals, species extinction, and threatened inundation of low-lying countries like the Pacific nation of Kiribati and the Netherlands **at a** **warming of 5 degrees** or less the Greenland and West Antarctic **ice sheets could disintegrate**, **leading to a sea level** of **rise** of 20 feet that would cover North Carolina’s outer banks, **swamp the southern third of Florida**, and inundate Manhattan up to the middle of Greenwich Village. Another catastrophic effect would be the collapse of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation that keeps the winter weather in Europe far warmer than its latitude would otherwise allow. Economist William Cline once estimated the damage to the United States alone from moderate levels of warming at 1-6 percent of GDP annually; severe warming could cost 13-26 percent of GDP. But the most frightening scenario is runaway greenhouse warming, based on positive feedback from the buildup of water vapor in the atmosphere that is both caused by and causes hotter surface temperatures. **Past ice age transitions, associated** with **only 5-10 degree changes** in average global temperatures, took place in just decades, even though no one was then pouring ever-increasing amounts of carbon into the atmosphere. Faced with this specter, the best one can conclude is that “**humankind’s continuing enhancement of the** natural **greenhouse effect is akin to playing Russian roulette with** the earth’s climate and **humanity’s life support system**. At worst, says physics professor Marty Hoffert of New York University, “we’re just going to burn everything up; we’re going to heat the atmosphere to the temperature it was in the Cretaceous when there were crocodiles at the poles, and then everything will collapse.” During the Cold War, astronomer Carl Sagan popularized a theory of nuclear winter to describe how a thermonuclear war between the Untied States and the Soviet Union would not only destroy both countries but possibly end life on this planet. Global warming is the post-Cold War era’s equivalent of nuclear winter at least as serious and considerably better supported scientifically. Over the long run it puts dangers from terrorism and traditional military challenges to shame. It is a threat not only to the security and prosperity to the United States, but potentially to the continued existence of life on this planet.

***Warming is real, anthropogenic and reversible if we start mitigation now.***

**Nuccitelli 11** (Dana Nuccitelli is an environmental scientist at a private environmental consulting firm in the Sacramento, California area. He has a Bachelor's Degree in astrophysics from the University of California at Berkeley, and a Master's Degree in physics from the University of California at Davis. He has been researching climate science, economics, and solutions as a hobby since 2006, and has contributed to Skeptical Science since September, 2010., Updated 2011, Originally Posted 9/24/2010, “The Big Picture”, http://www.skepticalscience.com/big-picture.html)

**The Earth is Warming We know the planet is warming from surface temperature stations and satellites measuring the temperature of the Earth's surface and lower atmosphere**. We also have **various tools** which have **measured the warming of the Earth's oceans**. Satellites have measured an energy imbalance at the top of the Earth's atmosphere. **Glaciers, sea ice, and ice sheets are all receding**. **Sea levels are rising**. **Spring is arriving sooner** each year. **There's simply no doubt - the planet is warming** (Figure 1). Global Warming Continues And yes, **the warming is continuing**. **The 2000s were hotter than the 1990s, which were hotter than the 1980s, which were hotter than the 1970s**. 2010 tied for the hottest year on record. The 12-month running average global temperature broke the record three times in 2010, according to NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS) data. Sea levels are still rising, ice is still receding, spring is still coming earlier, there's still a planetary energy imbalance, etc. etc. Contrary to what some would like us to believe, the planet has not magically stopped warming. Those who argue otherwise are confusing short-term noise with long-term global warming (Figure 2). Foster and Rahmstorf (2011) showed that **when we filter out the short-term effects of the sun, volcanoes, and El Niño cycles, the underlying man-made global warming trend becomes even more clear** (Figure 3). For as much as atmospheric temperatures are rising, the amount of energy being absorbed by the planet is even more striking when one looks into the deep oceans and the change in the global heat content (Figure 4). Humans are Increasing Atmospheric Greenhouse Gases **The amount of** **greenhouse gases in the atmosphere** - particularly carbon dioxide (**CO2**) - **has been rising steadily** over the past 150 years. There are a number of lines of evidence which clearly demonstrate that **this increase is due to human activities**, primarily burning fossil fuels. The most direct of evidence involves simple accounting. Humans are currently emitting approximately 30 billion tons of CO2 per year, and the amount in the atmosphere is increasing by about 15 billion tons per year. Our emissions have to go somewhere - half goes into the atmosphere, while the other half is absorbed by the oceans (which is causing another major problem - ocean acidification). We also know the atmospheric increase is from burning fossil fuels because of the isotopic signature of the carbon in the atmosphere. Carbon comes in three different isotopes, and plants have a preference for the lighter isotopes. So if the fraction of lighter carbon isotopes in the atmosphere is increasing, we know the increase is due to burning plants and fossil fuels, and that is what scientists observe. **The fact that humans are responsible for the increase in atmospheric CO2 is settled science**. The evidence is clear-cut. Human Greenhouse Gases are Causing Global Warming **There is overwhelming evidence that humans are the dominant cause of the recent global warming**, mainly due to our greenhouse gas emissions. **Based on fundamental physics and math, we can quantify** the amount of warming human activity is causing, and verify **that we're responsible for essentially all of the global warming over the past 3 decades**. The aforementioned Foster and Rahmstorf (2011) found a 0.16°C per decade warming trend since 1979 after filtering out the short-term noise. In fact we expect human greenhouse gas emissions to cause more warming than we've thus far seen, due to the thermal inertia of the oceans (the time it takes to heat them). Human aerosol emissions are also offsetting a significant amount of the warming by causing global dimming. **Huber and Knutti** (2011) found that human greenhouse gas emissions have caused 66% more global warming than has been observed since the 1950s, because the cooling effect of human aerosol emissions have offset about 44% of that warming. They **found that overall, human effects are responsible for approximately 100% of the observed global warming** **over the past 60 years** (Figure 5). **There are also numerous 'fingerprints' which we would expect to see from an increased greenhouse effect** (i.e. **more warming at night, at higher latitudes, upper atmosphere cooling) that we have indeed observed** (Figure 6). **Climate models have projected the ensuing global warming to a high level of accuracy, verifying that we have a good understanding of the fundamental physics behind climate change**. Sometimes people ask "what would it take to falsify the man-made global warming theory?". Well, basically it would require that our fundamental understanding of physics be wrong, because that's what the theory is based on. This fundamental physics has been scrutinized through scientific experiments for decades to centuries. The Warming will Continue We also know that **if we continue to emit large amounts of *g*reen*h*ouse *g*ases, the planet will continue to warm**. We know that **the climate sensitivity to a doubling of atmospheric CO2** from the pre-industrial level of 280 parts per million by volume (ppmv) to 560 ppmv (we're currently at 390 ppmv) **will cause 2–4.5°C of warming. And we're headed for 560 ppmv in the mid-to-late 21st century if we continue business-as-usual emissions**. The precise sensitivity of the climate to increasing CO2 is still fairly uncertain: 2–4.5°C is a fairly wide range of likely values. However, even if we're lucky and the climate sensitivity is just 2°C for doubled atmospheric CO2, if we continue on our current emissions path, we will commit ourselves to that amount of warming (2°C above pre-industrial levels) within the next 75 years. **The Net Result will be Bad** There will be some positive results of this continued warming. For example, an open Northwest Passage, enhanced growth for some plants and improved agriculture at high latitudes (though this will require use of more fertilizers), etc. However, the negatives will almost certainly outweigh the positives, **by a long shot**. We're talking **decreased biodiversity, water shortages, increasing heat waves** (both in frequency and intensity), **decreased crop yields** due to these impacts, damage to infrastructure, displacement of millions of people, etc. Arguments to the contrary are superficial One thing I've found in reading skeptic criticisms of climate science is that they're consistently superficial. For example, the criticisms of James Hansen's 1988 global warming projections never go beyond "he was wrong," when in reality it's important to evaluate what caused the discrepancy between his projections and actual climate changes, and what we can learn from this. And **those who argue that "it's the Sun" fail to comprehend that we understand the major mechanisms by which the Sun influences the global climate, and that they cannot explain the current global warming trend**. And **those who argue "it's just a natural cycle" can never seem to identify exactly which natural cycle can explain the current warming**, **nor** can they explain **how our understanding of the fundamental climate physics is wrong**. There are legitimate unresolved questions Much ado is made out of the expression "the science is settled." **The science is settled in terms of knowing that the planet is warming rapidly, and that humans are the dominant cause**. There are certainly unresolved issues. As noted above, there's a big difference between a 2°C and a 4.5°C warming for a doubling of atmospheric CO2, and it's an important question to resolve, because we need to know how fast the planet will warm in order to know how fast we need to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. There are significant uncertainties in some feedbacks which play into this question. For example, will clouds act as a net positive feedback (by trapping more heat, causing more warming) or negative feedback (by reflecting more sunlight, causing a cooling effect) as the planet continues to warm? And exactly how much global warming is being offset by human aerosol emissions? These are the sorts of questions we should be debating, and the issues that most climate scientists are investigating. Unfortunately there is a there is a very vocal contingent of people determined to continue arguing the resolved questions for which the science has already been settled. And when climate scientists are forced to respond to the constant propagation of misinformation on these settled issues, it just detracts from our investigation of the legitimate, unresolved, important questions. Smart Risk Management Means Taking Action Pe**ople are usually very conservative when it comes to risk management**. Some of us buy fire insurance for our homes when the risk of a house fire is less than 1%, for example. When it comes to important objects like cars and homes, we would rather be safe than sorry. But **there is arguably no more important object than the global climate**. **We rely on the climate for our basic requirements**, like having enough accessible food and water. **Prudent risk management in this case is clear. The scientific evidence discussed above shows indisputably that there is a risk that we are headed towards very harmful climate change**. There are uncertainties as to how harmful the consequences will be, but **uncertainty is not a valid reason for inaction**. There's very high uncertainty whether I'll ever be in a car accident, but it would be foolish of me not to prepare for that possibility by purchasing auto insurance. Moreover, **uncertainty cuts both ways, and it's just as likely that the consequences will be worse than we expect** **as it is that the consequences won't be very bad**. **We Can Solve the Problem The good news is that we have the tools we need to mitigate the risk posed by climate change**. A number of plans have been put forth to achieve the necessary greenhouse gas emissions cuts (i.e. here and here and here). **We already have all the technology we need**. Opponents often argue that mitigating global warming will hurt the economy, but the opposite is true. Those who argue that reducing emissions will be too expensive ignore the costs of climate change - economic studies have consistently shown that mitigation is several times less costly than trying to adapt to climate change (Figure 7). This is why there is a consensus among economists with expertise in climate that we should put a price on carbon emissions (Figure 8). should US reduce emissions The Big Picture The big picture is that **we know the planet is warming, humans are causing it, there is a substantial risk to continuing on our current path**, but we don't know exactly how large the risk is. However, **uncertainty regarding the magnitude of the risk is not an excuse to ignore it**. We also know that **if we continue on a business-as-usual path, the risk of catastrophic consequences is very high.** In fact, **the larger the uncertainty, the greater the potential for the exceptionally high risk scenario to become reality**. We need to continue to decrease the uncertainty, but it's also critical to acknowledge what we know and what questions have been resolved, and that taking no action is not an option. The good news is that **we know how to solve the problem, and that doing so will minimize the impact not only on the climate, but also on the economy**. The bottom line is that **from every perspective - scientific, risk management, economic, etc. - there is no reason not to immeditately take serious action to mitigate climate change, and failing to do so would be exceptionally foolish**.

***Natural gas makes the transition to renewables effective***

**Frank et al ‘09**

Matthew Frank, Jenna Goodward, Sarah Ladislaw, and Kate Zyla, May 2009, CSIS, Crossing the Natural Gas Bridge, <http://csis.org/files/publication/090626_final_crossing_gas_bridge.pdf>, jj

Addressing climate change will require extensive changes in the ways that we produce, transport and use energy. **Given the scope, scale and complexity of the current energy system, the transition to a low carbon energy future will take time, significant investment and carefully crafted polices**. **During the transition, it is important for policymakers and the private sector to balance the need for aggressive action to reduce emissions with the need for reliable and affordable energy supplies**. **Natural gas can play a critical role in “building a bridge” to a secure, low-carbon energy system**. **It is the least carbon intensive fossil fuel** (burning gas emits less carbon dioxide than burning coal or oil), **and there are readily available supplies**, both within and outside of the United States. **New natural gas power generation facilities can be brought online quickly compared to other low-carbon sources such as nuclear power**. **They also enable more renewable energy by providing baseload power generation to complement the intermittent nature of renewables like wind and solar power**. There is already a great deal of existing infrastructure –from electric power plants and home furnaces to pipelines and ports – that is able to store, transport, and use natural gas.

***Bridge fuels key --- renewables can’t come close to displacing fossil fuels in the near term***

**Tour et al. ‘10**

James M. Tour, Carter Kittrell and Vicki L. Colvin are in the Department of Chemistry, Department of Mechanical Engineering and Materials Science, and the Green Carbon Center, Rice University. Nature Materials 9,871–874(2010), Green carbon as a bridge to renewable energy, <http://www.nature.com.proxy.lib.wayne.edu/nmat/journal/v9/n11/full/nmat2887.html>, jj

**A green use of carbon-based resources that minimizes the environmental impact of carbon fuels could allow a smooth transition from fossil fuels to a sustainable energy economy.** Carbon-based resources (coal, natural gas and oil) give us most of the world's energy today, but the energy economy of the future must necessarily be far more diverse. **Energy generation through solar, wind and geothermal means is developing now, but not fast enough to meet our expanding global energy needs.** **We advocate that 'green carbon'**, which enables us to use carbon-based sources with high efficiency and in an environmentally friendly manner**, will provide our society time to develop alternative energy technologies and markets without sacrificing environmental or economic quality**. Green carbon will help to reduce the loss of our precious carbon resources, which are better reserved for high-value chemicals, and it will ensure that those hydrocarbons used for fuels will minimize carbon emissions. Through intensive research and development in green carbon, our society can guarantee an energy future that uses carbon strategically, without smokestacks, greenhouse gases and extensive environmental damage. Building a solid bridge **There is a chasm between the diminutive proportions of renewable energy currently available and our overwhelming dependence on fossil fuels that currently propel society**. The energy policy review of the Obama administration makes this soberingly clear: “**The use of renewable energy today and even in the next 5 to 10 years is still extremely limited when put into the context of total world use of fossil fuels**. For example, **the world used the equivalent of 113,900 terawatts hours** [TWh] **of fossil energy to fuel** economic activity, human mobility, and global telecommunications, among other modern day **activities in 2007**. **Replacing those terawatts hours with non-fossil energy would be the equivalent of** constructing an extra 6,020 nuclear plants across the globe or 14 times the number of nuclear power plants in the world today. In renewable energy terms, it is **133 times the amount of solar, wind and geothermal energy currently in use on the planet.**”1 Barring a huge reduction in our global standard of living, **we will need to rely on carbon-based energy for some time**. Whether this will last for several decades or into the next century is unclear, but what is apparent is that renewable approaches to energy generation are increasing at an annual rate of 7.2% compared with 1.6% for non-renewable growth2, and the continued growth of renewables will demand sustained government support. **During this transition we propose a green carbon bridge that minimizes the environmental impact of carbon fuels and lowers our reliance on these resources for primary energy generation**. Ultimately, green carbon will use hydrogen from renewable sources, while at the same time producing basic chemical feedstocks.

***Natural gas’s net GHG emissions are negative***

Abby W. **Schachter** (Writer for the Weekly Standard and the New York Post) June 20**12** “We've got to become energy independent to slow terrorism-fracking is the key” [http://www.zimbio.com/Fracking+Lawsuits/articles/2ymubk5GzT3/ve+got+become+energy+independent+slow+terrorism](http://www.zimbio.com/Fracking%2BLawsuits/articles/2ymubk5GzT3/ve%2Bgot%2Bbecome%2Benergy%2Bindependent%2Bslow%2Bterrorism)

**As for Howarth’s research on fracking’s carbon footprint, his conclusions were quickly debunked by fellow researchers at Cornell as well as by other scientists**. As Lawrence M. **Cathles of Cornell’s Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences concluded in his rebuttal, “The data clearly shows that substituting natural gas for coal will have a substantial greenhouse benefit under almost any set of reasonable assumptions. Methane emissions must be five times larger than they currently appear to be before gas substitution for coal becomes detrimental from a global warming perspective on any time scale.”** The debate over fracking has gotten so extreme, in fact, that reasonable environmentalists are beginning to complain. As Andrew Revkin, one of the deans of environmental reporting in the United States, recently noted, **fracking opponents sound so intransigent that he questions whether there is any resource to which the anti-gas advocates would say yes. The great irony is that only a few short years ago, many environmentalists were promoting *n*atural *g*as as the cleaner alternative to oil and coal**. The theory was that **natural gas would provide a temporary bridge from pollutants such as oil and coal to so-called clean tech** (wind and solar electricity generation, some nuclear power, and electric cars). Now that natural gas is cheap and plentiful, however, many openly worry that there may never be a full-scale transition to wind and solar because there won’t be a need. Gas is cleaner than coal and oil, it is equally or more efficient, it has the same applications as coal and oil, and it can be exported. Wind and solar haven’t proven to be cost-effective, nor are they easy to transport or possible to export. This realization has led to near hysterical opposition to fracking. As Howarth himself argued recently, “It is pure folly to view shale gas [as] a bridge fuel to a green future.” These are the arguments, moreover, that help explain the otherwise inexplicable rejection of natural gas extraction in New York, a state that could desperately use new industry and new revenues. There is gas from the Marcellus Shale under the state’s southern tier, and there are gas companies that came into the state nearly five years ago to lease land for potential drilling. But in 2007, the state decided that, absent new regulations for hydraulic fracturing, no new permits for natural gas wells would be issued. The moratorium continues to this day, even as Andrew Cuomo, the state’s governor, keeps promising that his Department of Environmental Conservation will produce new drilling rules—once its experts have had sufficient time to study the issue.

**Advantage 2 is economy**

#### Natural gas production is spurring economic growth and a manufacturing renaissance now --- but restrictions will push us back into recession

Santa 11/12/12 Don Santa, not Santa Claus, President, Interstate Natural Gas Association of America, National Journal, 11/12/12, Natural Gas, Pipelines, Critical to Economic Growth, <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/11/the-art-of-the-possible-in-ene.php?mrefid=site_search>, jj

Many in Congress also now recognize the importance of U.S. oil and gas in America’s energy future. Four years ago, natural gas was viewed as little more than a “bridge fuel,” as a temporary stop-gap to a next generation of energy resources and technologies. Today, policymakers recognize that natural gas is a foundation fuel – a fuel that will help drive our nation’s energy future for many decades to come and that will complement emerging renewable energy sources.

We hope that the administration and the new Congress keep these new realities in mind as they work on the policies, laws and regulations that affect energy in the coming years. Just like the doctor’s ethical oath, we urge Congress and the administration to: “First, do no harm.” The U.S. is now the world’s largest producer of natural gas, and that abundant supply is driving an economic renaissance in our country.

Americans remain concerned about jobs, and natural gas and pipeline development supply them in spades. IHS Global Insight estimated that as of 2008, total natural gas production supported more than 2.8 million jobs in the United States. By increasing development of the nation's unconventional sources of natural gas alone—like shale gas and tight gas—the U.S. will add another 1.4 million jobs by 2035, according to the IHS study. Investment needed to build pipelines to transport domestic natural gas and oil production to market alone will support over 125,000 jobs each year from 2012 through 2035, according to a study done earlier this year by Black & Veatch on behalf of the INGAA Foundation.

The good news story about natural gas is not limited to jobs. A Bank of America/Merrill Lynch study estimated that the combined effect of lower U.S. energy costs, primarily attributable to natural gas, and increased exports of refined petroleum products and coal work out to a 2.2 percent increase in gross domestic product. When you consider how slowly the U.S. economy is growing, the case can be made that we would be on the brink of falling back into recession without the shot in the arm provided by abundant and affordable natural gas.

Moreover, lower cost natural gas is driving resurgence in American manufacturing and is bringing jobs that had been shipped overseas in past decades back to our shores. A recent study by PricewaterhouseCoopers for the National Association of Manufacturers forecasts an additional one million U.S. jobs in manufacturing by 2025, thanks to our nation's vast, affordable supplies of natural gas.

More U.S. manufacturing, more jobs, lower prices for natural-gas intensive products like plastics and fertilizer, combined with lower energy bills, all benefit American consumers that have been struggling to make ends meet during this long economic slowdown.

On top of that, the dramatic switch to natural gas (largely from coal) in U.S. power generation is being hailed as the reason behind carbon dioxide emissions in the United States dropping to their lowest level in 20 years.

As a nation, we cannot afford policies that retard this important economic and environmental driver. Because pipelines are what make the oil and gas revolution possible – serving as the indispensable link between the supply and the market – it is important that new polices also do not hinder pipeline development.

***Reducing restrictions is key***

**Bryce ‘11**

Robert Bryce has been writing about energy for nearly two decades. His articles have appeared in dozens of publications ranging from The Atlantic Monthly to The Guardian, and The Nation to The American Conservative. He is the author of Pipe Dreams: Greed, Ego, and the Death of Enron, and Cronies: Oil, the Bushes, and the Rise of Texas, America’s Superstate. Bryce is a fellow at the Institute for Energy Research, as well as the managing editor of Energy Tribune and a contributing writer for The Texas Observer.

Wall Street Journal, 6-13-11, Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, America Needs the Shale Revolution <http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/miarticle.htm?id=7188>, jj

**The drilling boom is the best U.S. energy news in generations and is crucial for reviving domestic manufacturing. The U.S. is on the verge of an industrial renaissance if—and it’s a big if—policy makers don’t foul it up by restricting the ability of drillers to use the technology that’s making a renaissance possible: hydraulic fracturing. The shale drilling boom now underway** in Texas, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma and other states **is already creating jobs, slashing natural-gas prices, and spurring billions of dollars of investment in new production capacity for critical commodities like steel and petrochemicals**. Better yet, it’s spurring a huge increase in domestic oil production, which has been falling steadily since the 1970s. Despite the myriad benefits of the low-cost hydrocarbons that are now being produced thanks to hydraulic fracturing, the media, environmental groups and politicians are hyping the possible dangers of the process, which uses high-pressure pumps to force water, sand and chemicals into shale formations. Doing so fractures the formation and allows the extraction of natural gas or petroleum. Although hydraulic fracturing has been used more than one million times in the U.S. over the past 60 years, environmental activists are hoping to ban the process or have it regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Opponents claim the process can harm groundwater even though drinking-water aquifers are separated by as much as two miles of impermeable rock from the shales that are being targeted by the fracturing process. New York currently has a moratorium on hydraulic fracturing. On May 31, New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman sued several federal agencies, claiming they had not done a proper environmental assessment on the possible effects of drilling in the New York City watershed. On June 6, the New York Assembly passed a bill that will ban all forms of hydraulic fracturing in the state until mid-2012. And the EPA has launched “a comprehensive research study” on the possible “adverse impact that hydraulic fracturing may have on water quality and public health” nationwide. Despite the opposition, some of America’s biggest industrial companies are evangelizing about the merits of natural gas. Among the most fervent advocates are John Surma, the CEO of U.S. Steel, and Dan DiMicco, the CEO of Nucor. Mr. Surma told me in an interview that **the shale revolution is “the first bit of good news in U.S. manufacturing in two decades.”** Mr. DiMicco went further, telling me that “**we could change the entire manufacturing base in the U.S. if we just embrace what’s happening in natural gas.”** In March, Nucor, America’s biggest steel producer, broke ground on a new $750 million direct-reduced-iron (DRI) plant in Louisiana. The plant’s key commodity is low-cost natural gas, which will be superheated and then mixed with iron ore pellets and scrap in a furnace. The DRI process allows companies to produce about the same amount of steel with about a quarter of the capital they’d need to build a conventional integrated steel plant. And they can produce that steel with lower carbon-dioxide emissions because they are replacing metallurgical coal with methane. Nucor may ultimately invest $3 billion in Louisiana on plants that could create as many as 1,000 permanent, high-paying jobs. Meanwhile, U.S. Steel may soon build a DRI plant of its own. **Thanks to hydraulic fracturing, U.S. drillers are producing lots of ethane and propane, which are key feedstocks for the petrochemical sector**. Last October, Chevron Phillips Chemical Company announced plans to build a new plant in Baytown, Texas that will provide components for the production of polyethylene, a plastic resin used to make milk jugs and beverage containers. A few months later, the company said it was examining the feasibility of building a major petrochemical plant on the Gulf Coast. In April, **Dow Chemical announced plant expansions at several facilities in Louisiana and Texas, including construction of a new ethylene plant on the Gulf Coast that will begin operating in 2017 and a new propylene production facility that will begin operating by 2015. Dow’s reason for the expansions: “competitively priced ethane and propane feedstocks.” And last week Shell announced that it is developing plans to build a large ethylene plant in the Appalachian region. Ethylene and propylene are building blocks for a wide variety of consumer products including plastics, fibers and lubricants. The drilling industry itself is creating jobs. Over the past 12 months, some 48,000 people were hired in Pennsylvania** by companies working in the Marcellus Shale, a massive deposit that underlies several Eastern states, including Pennsylvania and New York. While the Pennsylvania economy is getting a much-needed lift from drilling, opposition in New York may mean that the state loses out on jobs and investment. A new study by Tim Considine, an energy economist at the University of Wyoming, estimates that drilling in the Marcellus Shale could add as many as 15,000 new jobs to the New York economy by 2015. The study, conducted for the Manhattan Institute (a think tank where I am a senior fellow), estimated that shale drilling in New York could add some $1.7 billion to the state’s economy by 2015 and increase the state’s tax revenue by more than $200 million. Regardless of what happens in New York, hydraulic fracturing is unlocking huge quantities of oil from shale. In March, domestic crude production was 5.63 million barrels per day, the highest level since 2003. Amazingly, production is rising despite the Obama administration’s de facto moratorium on drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. And shale oil production will likely continue rising from deposits like the Bakken Shale in North Dakota, where state officials are predicting output will hit 700,000 barrels per day by 2018, double the state’s current production. **A vibrant industrial base requires cheap, abundant and reliable sources of energy. The shale revolution now underway is the best news for North American energy since the discovery of the East Texas Field in 1930. We can’t afford to let fear of a proven technology stop the much-needed resurgence of American industry.**

***Plan’s key to economy:***

***First --- production jumpstarts the recovery***

**Baily & Verleger ‘12**

Martin Neil Baily, Senior Fellow, Economic Studies , Philip K. Verleger Jr., Peterson Institute for International Economics, Brookings, June 27, 2012, Could Cheap Gas Save the Economy? <http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2012/06/27-cheap-gas-baily>, jj

**Something is badly needed to get the economy moving again and avoid another slowdown.** The good news is that **cheaper gas could be the answer. America has hit the energy jackpot with new techniques to extract** oil and **gas from shale. The recent widespread use of** a technique called hydraulic fracturing, or "**fracking," and improved drilling technologies such as horizontal completion to harvest gas from shale, could provide a much-needed economic boost. Shale extraction represents one of the most important developments for the economy in the last 60 years. It's pushing down energy prices and creating many new opportunities for jobs, investments and manufacturing. And the new innovations are unique to the United States. Although other countries will exploit shale, none will come close to the low costs in the U.S. That's because the U.S. has a unique governmental structure in which many powers remain with the states, along with a very competitive market for the product**, as opposed to the monopolies and oligopolies that control the market in almost every other country. **While it may sound like the latest energy fad, the shale boom is for real and a serious game changer because of its size and potential longevity.** Based on equivalent amounts of energy, natural gas has been about half as expensive as oil for many years. The Energy Information Administration now predicts gas will be only a quarter or a fifth of the cost of oil through 2030, a big enough price difference to overcome the disadvantages of gas, such as its lower energy intensity by volume. How did the situation change? Was it because of the tax advantages given to the large oil companies? In fact, no. Big oil largely gave up on drilling onshore in the U.S. to concentrate on finding big fields in other countries or offshore. But small, innovative companies continued to drill for gas and oil here at home and figured out how to drill sideways and use computer technology to find deposits and extract them. Financial markets helped make this happen because small drillers could sell oil and gas using futures contracts and protect themselves against wild price swings. An economic boom **The prospect of cheap gas for years to come is already spurring investment**. Waste Management Inc (WM, Fortune 500). is investing in natural gas trucks that cost $30,000 more but save $27,000 a year in fuel costs. The big engine manufacturers are developing long-haul trucks to operate on liquefied natural gas. **Eighty percent of future electricity generating capacity is expected to be from natural gas and many coal-fired plants may be shifted to gas. The market incentives are already there and jobs are flourishing. Government could throw gas on this economic fire by** allowing facilitation, better coordination and **cutting of red tape between federal and state agencies**. Working together, government at all levels can set clear standards that protect both people and profits, yet speed the approval process to create more jobs at a faster pace. The industry, too, needs to cooperate by disclosing the nature of the fluids they are injecting during the fracking process, and by limiting emissions from the thousands of wells they will drill to alleviate some environmental concerns. Environmentalists should recognize the longer-term benefits of abundant gas supplies -- burning gas emits a lot less carbon than burning oil and coal, and extracting it is far cleaner than extracting oil from Canadian tar sands -- and work to achieve a compromise that allows rapid development with the necessary safeguards. And President **Obama should help promote a cleaner fossil fuel that shows such promise and is already creating new jobs.** But government support isn't the main problem. Drilling is being authorized today at rates that exceed the industry's capacity to drill. The real problem is that drilling for shale gas and oil could be slowed or stopped if disputes over fracking are not resolved in a way that addresses the public's concerns. Activity has already been suspended in some promising areas. **Cheap gas** may not be enough to offset the drag of a slowing global economy this year, but it **will boost long-term investment, help the beleaguered manufacturing sector and increase exports. Building petrochemical plants could suddenly become attractive in the United States. Manufacturers will "reshore" production to take advantage of low natural gas and electricity prices. Energy costs will be lower** for a long time, **giving a competitive advantage to companies that invest in America, and also helping American consumers who get hit hard when energy prices spike.** Other countries like China will attempt to replicate America's good luck, but will fail because they lack the unique legal, political and market institutions which have led to our success. **After years of bad economic news, the natural gas windfall is very good news. Let's make the most of it.**

***Sustained low prices key***

**Casselman & Gold 10-24** (BEN CASSELMAN and RUSSELL GOLD, 10-24-12, Wall Street Journal, Cheap Natural Gas Gives New Hope to the Rust Belt, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390444549204578020602281237088.html>, jj)

**Between 1998 and 2004, fertilizer producers—which use natural gas to make ammonia, the key component in nitrogen fertilizer—shut down more than two dozen U.S. plants, representing close to half of U.S. capacity. Some facilities were literally taken apart and shipped overseas, where gas was cheaper. Now the trend is reversing**. In September, Egyptian industrial giant **Orascom Construction** Industries ORSCY -3.55% **announced plans for a $1.4 billion fertilizer plant in Iowa**, which the company says would be the first large-scale fertilizer facility built in the U.S. in more than 20 years. **Deerfield**, Ill.-based fertilizer maker CF Industries Inc. CF +0.59% **is planning to spend up to $2 billion boosting its U.S. production through 2016.** "It's been a complete 180-degree change in our thought process," says CF Industries CEO Steve Wilson. Mr. Wilson and other industry leaders stress that they aren't expecting prices to stay this low forever, but say U.S. plants will be competitive even if prices rise somewhat. **Uncertainty about the long-term direction of natural-gas prices remains one of the biggest obstacles to a gas-driven industrial renaissance.** "**Look how much the price has changed in the last few years**," says Mike Mullis, whose Memphis-based company, J.M. Mullis Inc., helps manufacturers choose sites for new factories. "**It's just a wild card right now."** **The chemical industry**, which like the fertilizer industry saw production shift overseas in the 1990s and early 2000s, **is now rushing back to the U.S.** Companies such as Dow Chemical Co. DOW -0.30% and Chevron Phillips Chemical Company LLC have announced plans to build multibillion-dollar chemical plants in Texas, Louisiana and other states. "We convinced ourselves that this is not a temporary thing," says Peter Cella, chief executive of Chevron Phillips. "**This is a** real, durable phenomenon, a **potential competitive advantage for the United States."** Such projects could have a bigger long-term economic impact than the drilling boom itself. Drilling activity ebbs and flows with prices, and the rigs themselves rarely stay in one community for long. But chemical plants, oil refineries and the factories that use their products can last for decades. **Other winners will be energy-intensive industries like glass manufacturers—as well as companies that will benefit from increased demand for natural gas, such as the makers of turbines for gas-fired power plants. Then there are industries that do both, such as metals manufacturing. Energy can account for anywhere from 10% to 20% of costs for the metals industry, enough that the decline in gas prices could save some marginal plants. At the same time, the** oil and **gas boom has led to new demand for drilling pipe and other metal products, further boosting companies' prospects.** A few miles east of Beaver County, in Brackenridge, metals manufacturer Allegheny Technologies Inc. ATI -2.23% is building a new $1.1 billion mill, which is set to open in 2014. The plant will produce metals for, among others, chemical plants and the oil and gas industry, which uses high-tech alloys in its pipes and drilling equipment. **The new plant will burn a huge amount of gas, giving it a key advantage against competitors in Europe and Asia.** Allegheny Technologies, which also runs metals-finishing facilities in Beaver County and is headquartered in nearby Pittsburgh, spends $200 million per year on energy. CEO Richard Harshman says U.S. manufacturers now enjoy the lowest natural-gas prices in the world, with the possible exception of Russia. Sitting in his office overlooking downtown Pittsburgh, Mr. Harshman gestures to the rivers that lead north to Brackenridge and Beaver County. It was the region's rich coal seams and powerful rivers that helped it emerge as an industrial powerhouse in the 19th century, he says. Now **the energy industry is again boosting the region's prospects.**

***Second --- price spikes will hurt consumers and cause recession***

**LAMMEY 7** [Alan, Energy Market Analyst @ Energy Intelligence Group, “High Oil, Gas Prices that Cause Recession Often Crushed in Turn” Natural Gas Week, April 2 -- LEXIS]

Alarm bells are going off everywhere regarding the state of the economy, from the crumbling subprime mortgage market to growing concern from the US Federal Reserve over stout energy prices. And a sluggish economy could take a toll on oil, and ultimately natural gas prices in the near future. "There's been a lot of concern that troubles in the US housing sector could infect the broader domestic economy and dent demand for energy," a gas futures trader in Houston said. "**Historically, when the country slips into recession, the price for oil and natural gas tends to fall." A direct link exists between energy costs and the economy. When prices go up, businesses and consumers put more of their money into keeping the lights on and keeping their gas tanks filled. That leaves less to spend on other goods and services, stifling growth.** Currently, high energy costs, growing consumer indebtedness, and now big troubles in the US housing market are the main catalysts of concern. The most recent signal: A huge fallout in the mortgage industry, as alarming numbers of subprime mortgage foreclosures were reported. While some economists think that the economy will weather this storm, others think recession is now inevitable; but almost **all view recent economic events and intractably high energy costs with trepidation.** "Last year, we saw prompt-month gas futures fall down to the $4 area, and we weren't even in recession during that time. So if a full-blown recession emerges, then that would seem reasonable. However, **supply and demand issues for natural gas will ultimately drive prices just like we've seen over years; but now we just have to add the recession element to the equation."**

***US decline causes global wars***

**Judis,** Carnegie Endowment, 20**11**, The New Republic, August 8, [John], p. <http://www.npr.org/2011/08/08/139080654/new-republic-a-lesson-from-the-great-depression>

The first consideration has to do with the sheer gravity of the situation. What is at stake goes beyond an abstract rate of unemployment, or the prospect of a Republican White House in 2012, or even the misery of the long-term unemployed. From the beginning, **this recession has been global**. Germany has to take leadership in Europe, but **the United States is still the world's largest economy, the principal source of consumer and investment demand, and the banking capital of the world. If the United States fails to revive its economy**, and to lead in the restructuring of the international economy, **then it's unlikely that other economies in the West will pull themselves out of the slump**. **And as the experience of the 1930s testified, a prolonged global downturn can have profound political and geopolitical repercussions**. In the U.S. and Europe, **the downturn has already inspired unsavory, right-wing populist movements**. **It could also bring about trade wars and intense competition over natural resources, and the eventual breakdown of important institutions like European Union and the World Trade Organization**. Even a shooting war is possible. So while the Obama administration would face a severe challenge in trying to win support for a boost in government spending, failing to do so would be far more serious than the ruckus that Tea Party and Republican opposition could create over the next year.

***Best studies prove growth solves conflict***

Jedidiah **Royal 10**, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, “Economic Integration, Economic Signalling And The Problem Of Economic Crises”, in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215

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-rein force each other**. (Blombcrj! & 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 Blombcrg. Mess, 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 arr 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**.

***No resiliency***

**RAMPELL ’11** – economics reporter for The New York Times; wrote for the Washington Post editorial pages and financial section (Catherine, “Second Recession in U.S. Could Be Worse Than First”. August 7. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/08/business/a-second-recession-could-be-much-worse-than-the-first.html?pagewanted=all)

**If the economy falls back into recession**, as many economists are now warning, **the *bloodletting could be a lot more painful* than the last time around**.

Given the tumult of the Great Recession, this may be hard to believe. **But the economy is much weaker than it was at the outset of the last recession in December 2007, with most major measures of economic health — including jobs, incomes, output and industrial production — worse today than they were back then**. **And growth has been so weak that almost no ground has been recouped**, even though a recovery technically started in June 2009.

“**It would be disastrous if we entered into a recession at this stage**, given that we haven’t yet made up for the last recession,” said Conrad DeQuadros, senior economist at RDQ Economics.

When the last downturn hit, the credit bubble left Americans with lots of fat to cut, but a new one would force families to cut from the bone. Making things worse, policy makers used most of the economic tools at their disposal to combat the last recession, and have few options available.

Anxiety and uncertainty have increased in the last few days after the decision by Standard & Poor’s to downgrade the country’s credit rating and as Europe continues its desperate attempt to stem its debt crisis.

President Obama acknowledged the challenge in his Saturday radio and Internet address, saying the country’s “urgent mission” now was to expand the economy and create jobs. And Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner said in an interview on CNBC on Sunday that the United States had “a lot of work to do” because of its “long-term and unsustainable fiscal position.”

But he added, “I have enormous confidence in the basic regenerative capacity of the American economy and the American people.”

Still, the numbers are daunting. In the four years since the recession began, **the civilian working-age population has grown by about 3 percent. If the economy were healthy, the number of jobs would have grown at least the same amount**.

**Instead, the number of jobs has shrunk**. Today the economy has 5 percent fewer jobs — or 6.8 million — than it had before the last recession began. The unemployment rate was 5 percent then, compared with 9.1 percent today.

**Even those Americans who are working are generally working less**; the typical private sector worker has a shorter workweek today than four years ago.

Employers shed all the extra work shifts and weak or extraneous employees that they could during the last recession. **As shown by unusually strong productivity gains, companies are now squeezing as much work as they can from their newly “lean and mean” work forces.** Should a recession return, it is not clear how many additional workers businesses could lay off and still manage to function.

**With fewer jobs and fewer hours logged, there is less income for households to spend, creating a huge obstacle for a consumer-driven economy**.

Adjusted for inflation, personal income is down 4 percent, not counting payments from the government for things like unemployment benefits. Income levels are low, and moving in the wrong direction: private wage and salary income actually fell in June, the last month for which data was available.

**Consumer spending, along with housing, usually drives a recovery**. But with incomes so weak, spending is only barely where it was when the recession began. If the economy were healthy, total consumer spending would be higher because of population growth.

And with construction nearly nonexistent and home prices down 24 percent since December 2007, the country does not have a buffer in housing to fall back on.

Of all the major economic indicators, industrial production — as tracked by the Federal Reserve — is by far the worst off. The Fed’s index of this activity is nearly 8 percent below its level in December 2007.

Likewise, and perhaps most worrisome, is the track record for the country’s overall output. According to newly revised data from the Commerce Department, the economy is smaller today than it was when the recession began, despite (or rather, because of) the feeble growth in the last couple of years.

If the economy were healthy, it would be much bigger than it was four years ago. **Economists refer to the difference between where the economy is and where it could be if it met its full potential as the “output gap.”** **Menzie Chinn, an economics professor at the University of Wisconsin, has estimated that the economy was about 7 percent smaller than its potential at the beginning of this year**.

**Unlike during the first downturn, there would be few policy remedies available if the economy were to revert back into recession**.

**Interest rates cannot be pushed down further — they are already at zero**. The Fed has already flooded the financial markets with money by buying billions in mortgage securities and Treasury bonds, and economists do not even agree on whether those purchases substantially helped the economy. So the Fed may not see much upside to going through another politically controversial round of buying.

“**There are only so many times the Fed can pull this same rabbit out of its hat,” said Torsten Slok, the chief international economist at Deutsche Bank**.

Congress had some room — financially and politically — to engage in fiscal stimulus during the last recession.

**But at the end of 2007, the federal debt was 64.4 percent of the economy. Today, it is estimated at around 100 percent of g**ross **d**omestic **p**roduct, **a share not seen since the aftermath of World War II**, and there is little chance of lawmakers reaching consensus on additional stimulus that would increase the debt.

“There is no approachable precedent, at least in the postwar era, for what happens when an economy with 9 percent unemployment falls back into recession,” said Nigel Gault, chief United States economist at IHS Global Insight. “**The *one precedent you might consider is 1937*, when there was also a premature withdrawal of fiscal stimulus, and the economy fell into another recession more painful than the first**.”

**Observation 2 is solvency**

***The EPA’s rule is counterproductive and increases air pollution --- it should be struck down***

**Peshek & Millican ‘12**

Adam Peshek, Research Associate Reason Foundation, Robin Millican, Policy Associate Institute for Energy Research, 2-28-12, Reason Foundation, Letter to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Administrator Lisa Jackson, <http://reason.org/files/oil_and_gas_nsps_and_neshap_comment.pdf>, jj

6) **The NSPS Incentivizes the Use of Outdated Equipment and Deters Development** **Because the NSPS standards apply only to new or modified facilities, the rule creates the inadvertent economic incentive for owners and operators to continue using outdated, lessefficient equipment rather than incurring new costs and regulations to change.** Furthermore, **because the proposed NSPS revisions would apply to new natural gas wells— approximately 11,400 of which are drilled each year—the rule may cause operators to undertake fewer projects.**

7) **Regulatory Alternatives Should Be Evaluated** Prior To Regulation Although EPA has indicated its openness to making modifications to a handful of provisions in its proposed rule—including evaluating ways to reduce reporting requirement burdens—**no evidence was presented in the proposed rule to indicate that EPA had evaluated the costs and benefits of regulatory alternatives**, such as positive incentives to achieve the desired result. The Agency is obligated to do so under Executive Order 12866 (EO 12866), which states: “**In deciding whether and how to regulate, agencies should assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives, *including the alternative of not regulating***.” Furthermore, EO 12866 directs that “each agency shall identify and assess available alternatives to direct regulation, including providing economic incentives to encourage the desired behavior, such as user fees or marketable permits, or providing information upon which choices can be made by the public.”

***De-regulation alleviates confusion and restores certainty***

**Russell ‘12**

Barry Russell, President, Independent Petroleum Association of America (IPAA), National Journal, 1-17-12, What's Ahead for Natural Gas? http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/01/whats-ahead-for-natural-gas.php?mrefid=site\_search, jj

Furthermore, as President **Obama** touts the benefits of natural gas, his administration **has embarked upon a double-flanked assault on the oil and natural gas industry, led by the *E*nvironmental *P*rotection *A*gency and the Interior Department. These federal agencies have sought to regulate hydraulic fracturing and instill unfounded fear about its side-effects and management at every turn. The states are well-equipped to handle the environmental issues surrounding development**. After all, **they have been regulating hydraulic fracturing for decades.** **More and more states have been utilizing FracFocus, the chemical registry website on which companies voluntarily disclose their hydraulic fracturing fluids to the public**. **The state regulatory systems can deal with each state’s different geological and environmental complexities**. ***Attempting to operate a federal regulatory regime out of Washington, with limited funds and regulators, would cause confusion and cost many jobs.*****America’s natural gas industry has quite a future – as long as it’s not impeded by politically motivated forces**. ***The administration must*** make its campaign rhetoric a reality and ***call off its massive federal overreach***. **If states remain empowered to continue their responsible regulation of hydraulic fracturing, natural gas will certainly power America’s future.**

***A moratorium is key to certainty***

**Loris ‘11**

Nicolas D. Loris is a Policy Analyst in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation. 9-8-11, Heritage, Energy Exploration Would Create Jobs and Raise Revenue Without Raising Taxes <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/09/energy-exploration-would-create-jobs-and-raise-revenue-without-raising-taxes>, jj

**Place a freeze on new environmental regulations**. Stressing the need for regulatory certainty, President Obama recently asked EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson to withdraw the agency’s draft for more stringent Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards. EPA’s regulatory overreach on this one rule would have destroyed 7.3 million jobs and nearly $700 billion in economic activity by 2020, and the rule had questionable environmental benefits.[8] That is a good start to helping the economy recover, but **if** **the President truly wants to provide regulatory certainty, he should tell the EPA to withdraw other new environmental regulations that all miserably fail the cost–benefit test**. If he does not act, then Congress should legislatively place a freeze on new environmental regulations. Time to Drill, Create, and Collect **Increasing the American energy supply should be low-hanging fruit** for the “super committee” charged with tackling the massive U.S. debt problem. Allowing access for exploration and **creating an efficient regulatory process that allows energy projects to move forward in a timely manner will not only increase revenue through more royalties, leases, and rent; it will also create jobs and help lower energy prices in the process. These are sensible policy ideas with or without a debt crisis, but given the fiscal situation, this is a no-brainer.**

***Certainty key to development of shale gas***

**Baker Institute ’11** (James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy of Rice University, October, Shale Gas and U.S. National Security, online, jj)

**To tap this benefit, it will be essential for the *U*nited *S*tates to promote a stable investment climate** **with regulatory certainty.** In particular, **the *U*nited *S*tates will need adopt policies that ensure shale gas exploitation can proceed steadily and predictably** with sound environmental oversight. The ***U*nited *S*tates should focus squarely on setting the policies needed to ensure that shale gas can play a significant role in the U.S. and global energy mix, thereby contributing to greater diversification of global energy supplies and to the long-term national interests of the United States.**

***Federal de-regulation won’t cause a race to the bottom.***

**Willie ‘12**

Matt Willie, J.D. candidate, April 2012, J. Reuben Clark Law School, Brigham Young University, Brigham Young University Law Review, 2011 B.Y.U.L. Rev. 1743, Hydraulic Fracturing and "Spotty" Regulation: Why the Federal Government Should Let States Control Unconventional Onshore Drilling, Lexis, jj

B. Federal v. State: Why "Spotty" Regulation is Better Regulation

 **The push for more federal control of hydraulic fracturing** seems at least partly motivated by differences in state approaches to the issue. Professor Wiseman, for example, argues that "the varying complexity and breadth of state oil and gas regulation suggests that some states are not adequately protecting underground sources of drinking water." n198 The flaw in such arguments, however, is that they [\*1772] **ignore the fact that the depth, accessibility, extraction techniques, and characteristics of oil and gas reserves vary from state to state**. In fact, **that fracking regulation in the United States has been "spotty**" n199 **may actually be a good thing.**

1. Regional differences

In many respects, ***the more local and specialized the regulation, the better***. This is true primarily because **oil and gas extraction methods**, and therefore hydrofracking techniques, **are** almost **always geologic-and region-specific**. n200 **This fact makes additional federal regulation unnecessary at best and** potentially ***extremely problematic*** **if it conflicts with local and state land use controls.** The Texas Supreme Court hinted at this idea in the Coastal Oil opinion. n201 A major basis for the court's decision was the desirability of deferring to the Texas Railroad Commission on oil and gas matters, especially where they involve questions of property boundaries and extraction techniques within specific reserves. n202 The Commission has the luxury of focusing all its time and manpower on oil and gas regulation (something the court lacks) and has sufficient remedial authority to enforce its rules in a way that both protects landowners n203 and promotes "the state's goals of preventing waste and conserving natural resources." n204 Such realities make the Commission, not the court, the appropriate entity for formulating effective regulatory provisions. For similar reasons, **federal intervention into state regulation of fracking seems unnecessary**. Just as a commission's staff of experts is better equipped than judges to promulgate rules for state oil and gas development, **state officials are** generally **more informed about local and regional production techniques than federal regulators**. n205 Not [\*1773] only do many energy-producing states operate under somewhat conflicting theories of oil and gas law, n206 but **the state commissions that design rules that conform to those theories must be aware of the location, form, and accessibility of their hydrocarbon reserves in order to effectively regulate.** Of course, federal agencies can set up regional offices, and federal regulators can familiarize themselves with local industry realities, but **federal employees will never be subject to the same kind of political accountability as state officials, and this may make them less receptive to local concerns**. Perhaps more importantly, **federal officials remain bound by federal directives drawn up by bureaucrats who reside far from most of the reserves their regulations affect.** Ironically, **even proponents of federal regulation acknowledge the need for region-specific fracking rules**. Professor Wiseman notes that, "**invariably, effects will differ by region, by the type of operation and disposal methods used, and the type of formation fracked**." n207 **State officials are arguably more familiar with these variables than federal employees, yet she promotes an additional, potentially burdensome layer of federal control**. n208 This seems shortsighted simply because ***what works well in one state may work poorly in another.*** This reality has long been a burr in the side of would-be federal mining regulators. Despite widespread expansion of national environmental protections throughout the twentieth century, n209 Congress struggled to craft effective mining legislation. This was primarily because geological and regional differences encouraged a [\*1774] state-centric regulatory scheme. n210 A former government attorney who helped draft the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 pointed out that coal regulation "differs significantly from other federal environmental regulatory statutes" primarily because of "the "diversity' in coal mining areas." n211 This concern eventually resulted in Congress admitting that "**the primary governmental authority for developing, authorizing, issuing, and enforcing [mining] regulations ... should rest with the States**." n212 Such **diversity is** even more **apparent among** oil and **gas formations**. A comparison of operations in the Bakken Shale with those in the Barnett Shale is illustrative. Bakken companies primarily drill for oil, n213 while Barnett operators produce gas. n214 **Typical spacing in the Bakken can be as much as 1280 acres per well**, n215 **as opposed to Barnett spacing, which rarely exceeds 100 acres**. n216 **This, of course, creates far fewer wells in the Bakken states and thus a better opportunity to avoid drilling near communities. Likewise, Bakken states** (Montana and North Dakota) **are largely rural to begin with, making land use decisions simpler and disputes regarding property lines and leasehold interests less common. Even the use of fracking fluids varies widely by field and formation. As the EPA noted, "on any one fracturing job, different fluids may be used in combination or alone at different stages in the fracturing process**. **Experienced service company engineers will devise the most effective fracturing scheme, based on formation** [\*1775] **characteristics, using the fracturing fluid combination they deem most effective**." n217 Fracking companies in Montana, for example, "have been using relatively non-intrusive fluids - mostly a gel water sand frack, with the gel consisting of a drilling mud or a polymer." n218 In Pennsylvania's Marcellus Shale, on the other hand, there have been reports of higher than expected levels of radiation in wastewater from fracked wells. n219 **Arguments for more federal intervention *consistently fail* to account for these realities**. Professor Wiseman writes, for example, that an "absence of regulation [would] not [be] of great concern if fracking [were] a relatively benign practice that could be sufficiently controlled through the general permitting process; but if fracking has significant environmental and public health impacts, the lack of regulation is problematic." n220 The problem with such an all-or-nothing analysis is that **fracking is both benign and environmentally hazardous - depending on its location**. n221 **In some states, the general permitting process provides adequate environmental protections; in others, more stringent rules are justified**. n222 But **these are decisions that ought to be left to state policymakers and state regulatory agencies, not federal employees who may be ignorant to specific local and regional practices and** may **thus** rely on articles like Wiseman's, which **downplay the importance of geological dissimilarities and variations in fracking technique. With state regulations already providing extensive environmental protections, additional federal fracking controls**, in all likelihood, **can** [\*1776] **have only one of two effects: either (1) they will "have little impact," representing "no more than ideological tinkering with state law";** n223 **or (2) they will alter the entire state-centric system, essentially voiding many workable state rules, creating overlapping controls that slow down domestic oil and gas production, and producing uniform standards for fracking techniques that ought to vary by field and region.** Should Congress opt for such a uniform system, the safest route would be to force all states to adopt stringent fracking rules. The problem is that while **such regulations** might be appropriate and welcomed in New York, they **could be unnecessarily restrictive in states like Montana and North Dakota.** At the same time, ***crafting a middle-of-the-road national standard could send the message that stricter requirements are unnecessary*.** n224

2. Federal regulatory failures

Obviously, only a shortsighted system would fail to account for at least some regional and geological differences. But **even if each state's reserves were identical, no evidence suggests that federal fracking regulation would be superior to state control**. In fact, **the BP spill and other recent energy industry problems have created concerns that the entire federal energy regulatory machine is simply too large, and too politically dominated, to be effective**. n225 As **the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Spill** and Offshore Drilling **described, from its outset "federal regulation of offshore drilling awkwardly combined" two competing priorities - environmental protection and energy independence - which were often difficult to reconcile "as a series of Congresses,** [\*1777] **Presidents, and Secretaries of the Interior" moved in and out of power**. n226 **The result was an odd**, and often ***irrational***, **set of rules**. "**In some offshore regions**," for example, "oil **drilling was essentially banned in response to environmental concerns. Elsewhere**, **most notably in the Gulf, some environmental protections and safety oversight were formally relaxed or informally diminished so as to render them ineffective**." n227 **As drilling moved further offshore and more money poured into federal coffers, safety and environmental risks increased**. Unfortunately, **these risks "were not matched by greater, more sophisticated regulatory oversight**." n228 Some problems were due to the fact that **the same federal agency, the** Minerals Management Service (**MMS**), **was "responsible for regulatory oversight of offshore drilling - and for collecting revenue from that drilling**." n229 **A 2008 study by the Interior Department revealed numerous ethical scandals involving MMS employees**, "including allegations of financial self-dealing, accepting gifts from energy companies, cocaine use and sexual misconduct." n230 **Another Interior Department report prepared after the BP spill cited communication problems at the Agency as well as unevenly staffed offices and inadequate training.** n231 As the National Commission put it: **The overall picture of MMS that has emerged since [the spill] is distressing. MMS became an agency systematically lacking the resources, technical training, or experience in petroleum engineering that is absolutely critical to ensuring that offshore** [\*1778] **drilling is being conducted in a safe and responsible manner. For a regulatory agency to fall so short of its essential safety mission is inexcusable**. n232 **In light of such failures, it is puzzling that critics of fracking believe so adamantly in the superiority of national controls over a state-centric system that has worked with relatively few problems for six decades.**

C. Financial Costs of Federal Regulation

Even if fracking regulators were somehow immune from the failures that have plagued other agencies, **additional federal regulation should not be adopted without a realistic assessment of its price tag**. Testifying before the House Committee on Energy and Commerce in 2005, Victor Carrillo, chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission, argued that **stricter federal fracking standards "would not result in cleaner water but only in adding significant cost**. **Such unnecessary regulation and the concomitant cost can only serve to ~~retard~~ the development of much needed natural gas in this country**." n233 This statement seems even more appropriate six years later, as **additional research has revealed just how significant those costs could be. Merely studying the issue at the federal level can be expensive**. As part of its Science to Achieve Results Program, **the EPA requested $ 4.3 million for fracking research alone in fiscal year 2011**. n234 The amount constitutes a $ 2.5 million increase from 2010. n235 **The costs of actually administering a federal fracking regulatory program, after research is completed and rules are drafted, would undoubtedly be *astronomically higher*. Compounding this concern is the serious potential for federal financial waste**. According to a study completed in early 2011 by the Government Accountability Office, "**overlapping and duplicative** [\*1779] [**federal] programs ... cost taxpayers billions of dollars each year**." n236 **The nonpartisan office uncovered a staggering number of federal inefficiencies, including "82 federal programs to improve teacher quality; 80 to help disadvantaged people with transportation**; 47 for job training and employment; and 56 to help people understand finances." n237 **It seems unlikely that additional federal hydraulic fracturing regulation, if enacted, would not suffer from similar financial inefficiencies.** Of course, state regulatory agencies could be just as wasteful. Nevertheless, **citizens are arguably more equipped to hold local and state government officers politically accountable for their waste**. n238 **This is so not only because citizens generally have greater access to local and state leaders, but also because they can compare government spending in their state with that of neighboring states.** n239 In contrast, **selecting appropriate foreign governments for comparisons of federal spending seems a much more daunting task. Regardless of the cost to taxpayers, additional federal regulation would put a significant financial burden on developers. A 2009 report** prepared for the American Petroleum Institute estimates that **national fracking legislation could increase the costs of shale plays by $ 47,333 per well and non-shale plays by $ 109,833 per well**. n240 Perhaps even more troubling is that **such "added costs raise the economic threshold ... at which a play can be developed," decreasing the total number of wells operators who are willing to drill**. n241 As the report explains: Experience suggests **that a 20% reduction in the number of wells completed each year due to increased regulation is a valid** [\*1780] **assumption due to the additional time needed to file permits, push-back of drilling schedules due to higher costs, increased chance of litigation, injunction or other delay tactics used by opposing groups and availability of fracturing monitoring services**. n242 **Such costs would undoubtedly be passed along to consumers, compounding government waste with higher prices at the pump.**

V. Conclusion

**The tremendous economic impact of hydraulic fracturing should not be understated**. **As the need to replace conventional sources of energy becomes more pressing, the United States' dependence on foreign oil and the risks of offshore drilling may combine to make the debate about fracking and other unconventional forms of drilling one of the most important energy-related issues** of the twenty-first century. **Special interest groups insist that fracking's impact** on the environment **is disastrous, but decades of study have revealed only minor concerns**. **In light of federal regulatory failures such as those that led to the BP disaster in the Gulf, leaving control of hydraulic fracturing with the states seems to be a far more prudent course**. Local and regional industry realities should guide energy regulation in the United States, and **state officials are far more equipped than federal employees to successfully account for the geological and human variables that shape onshore development**. State regulation of such development has intensified as unconventional methods of drilling have increased. In the process, courts have properly addressed the legal aspects of hydraulic fracturing while giving appropriate deference to agency regulations based on state common law theories, legislative directives, environmental needs, and local practices. **Hydraulic fracturing has played an important role in the oil and gas industry for more than sixty years. Regulatory intrusions by the federal government at this point will only create unnecessary financial burdens and hinder developers' ability to efficiently extract hydrocarbons.** [\*1781] As the Groundwater Protection Council warned more than a decade ago: "**If additional federal regulations were to be imposed they would not be based on scientific observation of associated contamination, and there would be little if any increase in protection of public health and the environment**." n243 W**ith so little to gain, the costs of additional federal controls are simply unjustifiable.**

***States regulations will fill in and solve.***

**Willie ‘12**

Matt Willie, J.D. candidate, April 2012, J. Reuben Clark Law School, Brigham Young University, Brigham Young University Law Review, 2011 B.Y.U.L. Rev. 1743, Hydraulic Fracturing and "Spotty" Regulation: Why the Federal Government Should Let States Control Unconventional Onshore Drilling, Lexis, jj

**What is conspicuously missing from many of these groups' arguments, however, is an explanation of how and why federal regulation will actually diminish fracking's environmental risks**. In fact, a closer look at much of the rhetoric against a state-centric regulatory system reveals not so much a push for federal regulation, but rather for federal prohibition of hydraulic fracturing. n122 Perhaps [\*1762] this is because, by and large, **state control of hydrofracking is already relatively expansive. As fracking has become more widespread, state regulation of the practice has intensified**, although specific rules vary widely. n123 Some see this variation as a reason for more federal control. n124 But as the following discussion illustrates, **every producing state has promulgated a considerable amount of fracking regulation, whether through general permitting processes or more directly**. n125 **Wyoming**, for example, **was the first state to require companies to fully disclose the chemicals used in their fracking fluids.** n126 **The state also requires drillers to give notice to surface owners of planned oil and gas operations on their lands and make good faith efforts to enter into "surface use agreements" that will protect surface resources, provide for reclamation of disturbed areas, and determine a payment for any** damages caused by the operations. n127 **Developers must show that they have complied with this requirement before the** [\*1763] **Wyoming Oil and Gas Commission will grant a permit to drill** n128 or a permit to construct a pit for retaining fluids. n129 Moreover, before any well can be used for injection activities, **an operator must demonstrate to the Commission that its casing is leak-proof and able to withstand pressures of at least 300 pounds per square inch**. n130 **New York has perhaps the nation's strictest fracking controls**. Shortly before leaving office in late 2010, former governor David Paterson "issued an executive order imposing a moratorium on permits for horizontal wells and instructed the [Department of Environmental Conservation] to revise its draft of standards governing the use of high-volume fracking." n131 In July of 2011, the Agency released a revised Draft Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement (SGEIS) which recommended that the moratorium be kept in place in certain areas and lifted in others, subject to strict regulation. n132 Even without the moratorium, the state's rules are far from lenient. An operator seeking to drill needs to submit an application for a permit, pay a permit fee, offer a description of the planned drilling project, provide three copies of a plat, and complete an Environmental Assessment Form. n133 This form "provides information about the physical setting of the proposed project, the general character of the land and land use, the projected size of the area that will be disturbed and the length of time the drilling rig will be on the [\*1764] site." n134 A Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and additional permits may also be necessary. n135 Even **Professor Wiseman calls the state's fracking rules "relatively comprehensive**." n136 **She says the same about Pennsylvania**, even though the state uses general oil and gas rules to regulate fracking. n137 Strong permitting requirements compel operators to account for any water sources or coal seams near drilling sites, n138 and the Department of Environmental Protection may deny permits that would violate any applicable environmental law. n139 The state also has separate rules for exploration activities in the Marcellus Shale. n140 Likewise, **Colorado has adopted comprehensive fracking regulations**. In 2009, the state overhauled its rules, providing more protections against methane contamination. n141 Even before the overhaul, the Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (COGCC) instituted a "mitigation program" to seal improperly abandoned wells. The program resulted in a reduction of methane concentrations in close to 30% of all sampled water wells. n142 More recently, the Commission has begun investigating the use of diesel fuel in fracking operations and regularly testing groundwater wells for contamination. n143 The COGCC also requires operators to maintain a "Chemical Inventory" of all chemicals used in drilling and completion, including fracturing, at each well site. n144 **The Alabama Oil and Gas Board claims that it "investigates every complaint it receives**." n145 A unique feature of its investigations is that each one includes research regarding "historical water quality [\*1765] data." n146 As the EPA explains, this "information is important because the coal-bearing Pottsville Formation often contains high concentrations of iron." n147 The symptoms of iron staining, which can occur suddenly and "in water with a history of good quality," are apparently similar to those of methane contamination. n148 Such observations show the importance of accounting for regional characteristics in fracking regulations. Perhaps more than any other state, **Texas has been criticized for its fracking regulations**, primarily because until recently no rule addressed the practice specifically. n149 **That changed** in June of 2011, **when** Texas governor **Rick Perry** **signed into law H.B. 3328, which requires operators to publicly disclose chemicals used in fracturing applications**. n150 Even without the legislation, much of the criticism of Texas is misplaced, since, as Professor Wiseman herself admits, **many of the state's general oil and gas regulations "apply to various components of the fracking process.**" n151 Like other states, **operators cannot drill without a permit**, n152 **and they must obtain a Water Board Letter from the state Commission on Environmental Quality setting out "the depth to which fresh water must be protected" for each well**. n153 **No operator in the state "may dispose of any oil and gas wastes [which would include fracking fluids] by any method without obtaining a permit**." n154 In addition, **the state has extensive casing and cementing regulations, including requirements that all casing be** [\*1766] **made of steel and "hydrostatically pressure tested," and that "all usable-quality water zones be isolated and sealed off to effectively prevent contamination or harm."** n155 Despite the peculiarities of each state's regulatory system, **almost all share several common features. Every producing state, for example, has "permitting requirements governing the locating, drilling, completion, and operations of wells."** **n156 Almost all have casing and cementing requirements designed to isolate ground water from production zones**. n157 **Every state but one requires regulatory authorization before operators can leave a well idle**. n158 **And all twenty-seven producing states have regulations regarding the proper plugging of wells**. n159 **Given the level of scrutiny most states are already applying to hydraulic fracturing, it is difficult to see how federal agencies could significantly curb any of the few environmental effects left unaddressed**. Congress's decision in 2005 to exempt most aspects of fracking from federal regulation has been criticized as a "loophole" for developers. n160 But as the Independent Petroleum Association of America states, "This characterization is entirely inaccurate; **Congress' action merely keeps in place a system that has worked for half a century**." n161

***It’s abundant and recoverable***

**Doran ‘12**

Kevin Doran, is an institute fellow and assistant research professor at the Renewable and Sustainable Energy Institute (RASEI), a joint institute of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory and the University of Colorado at Boulder. His research focuses on the legal, regulatory and public policy dimensions of energy development. Adam Reed is a research associate at RASEI. He researches and writes on the legal, policy, and regulatory issues surrounding the deployment of sustainable energy technologies.

Yale Environment 360, 13 Aug 2012, Natural Gas and Its Role In the U.S.’s Energy Endgame <http://e360.yale.edu/feature/natural_gas_role_in_us_energy_endgame/2561/>, jj

**The United States has won the lottery on natural gas**. According to the most recent estimates by the Energy Information Administration, **the U.S. has some 2,214 trillion cubic feet cubic feet of technically recoverable natural gas — enough to satisfy all of our natural gas demands for the next century at current consumption levels**. **The extraction of shale gas, enabled by technological advances such as hydrofracturing and horizontal drilling, has led the way in creating this largely unforeseen cornucopia. Domestic natural gas is now a cheaper fuel for electricity generation than coal** — long our go-to fuel for power around the clock — and emits roughly half the greenhouse gas emissions.

***Fracking DA’s are empirically denied***

**Weinstein ‘10**

Bernard L. Weinstein, Associate Director, Maguire Energy Institute at the Southern Methodist University's Cox School of Business, National Journal, 12-20-10, Is Natural Gas the Answer? Fears Over Fracking Overblown, http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2010/12/is-natural-gas-the-answer.php, jj

Irrational fears make up a considerable portion of the American Psychiatric Association’s Manual of Mental Disorders. It includes catoptrophobia (fear of mirrors), geliophobia (fear of laughter), and levophobia (bizarrely enough, a fear of things to the left side of the body). **Unfounded fears are bad enough when they impair an individual’s ability to function in the real world and even worse when they obstruct entire sectors of our economy. Today, America faces a growing threat to its economic recovery as propaganda-generated afflictions like “frackophobia**” (fear of hydraulic fracturing in natural gas production) **spread through the media and seeped into regulation and legislation**. For example, “**fear of fracking” has resulted in** a de facto moratorium on gas drilling in New York State. Public officials ranging from city council members across Texas, Pennsylvania, and Wyoming to federal regulators in the Obama administration are currently considering **new fracking regulations that threaten to bring the industry to a *standstill*.** As with other perceived risks, **we should be careful to keep those associated with energy development in perspective.** Though **the U.S. natural gas industry has safely managed the hydraulic fracturing process for more than 50 years**, environmental activists and alternative fuel lobbies have begun hyping its risks in recent months. Yet, **there is not one verifiable instance of properly performed hydraulic fracturing causing direct harm to communities or individuals.** Opponents claim that fracking fluids frequently migrate into local water supplies. But **of the nearly 100,000 natural gas wells drilled annually, water contamination occurs in only a handful of cases.** **In those rare instances, responsible companies have provided clean water and compensation to affected families**. **While the risks associated with hydraulic fracturing are minor, those associated with stymieing natural gas production are major. Natural gas production currently supports nearly 4 million jobs in the U.S. and adds $385 billion to our economy each year. Its growth potential is enormous, with large shale formations existing in virtually all regions of the country**. A Penn State study estimates **the Marcellus Shale gas reservoir could add $8 billion in economic value and 100,000 new jobs in Pennsylvania next year**. Over the past two years, **the 13,600 residents in Bradford County have enjoyed $300 million in lease bonuses and royalties—just one example suggesting the rewards from gas drilling far outweigh the risks**. A recent study by this author for Broome County, New York found that **shale gas drilling and production would pump $19 billion into the local economy over a ten year period while supporting 5600 much-needed jobs.** Production of every energy source involves some risks. **In view of historically high unemployment and empty state coffers, regulators and legislators need to carefully weigh the economic benefits from natural gas development against the environmental risks that are typically exaggerated by drilling opponents. Removing “frackophobia**” from the lexicon of the energy policy debate **is an imperative for assuring a robust future for the natural gas industry.** **This abundant domestic resource**, **if fully developed, can shrink our dependence on energy imports while simultaneously reducing greenhouse gas emissions because of its minimal carbon footprint. And America will be happier and more prosperous** if we pay more attention to geliophobia and less to frackophobia.

#### Only plan solves warming and economy

D’Angelo, 12/10/12 (Wayne D’Angelo, special counsel in the Washington office of Kelley Drye & Warren, counsels clients on environmental and energy matters, He has experience in all aspects of environmental and energy law and focuses on issues surrounding hydraulic fracturing, conventional and nonconventional fuels, resource extraction, greenhouse gas regulation, and stationary and mobile-source issues under the Clean Air Act. This commentary previously appeared in Kelley Drye’s Fracking Insider blog.) Thompson Reuters News & Insight, WESTLAW JOURNAL ENVIRONMENTAL, Hydraulic fracturing regulation in President Obama’s second term, <http://newsandinsight.thomsonreuters.com/Legal/Insight/2012/12_-_December/Hydraulic_fracturing_regulation_in_President_Obama%E2%80%99s_second_term/>, jj

Before we even finished counting the votes in the 2012 presidential election, political pundits, environmental and energy practitioners and, in some ways, even Wall Street traders, offered their insights on how President Obama would regulate the energy industry in the next four years. Such an exercise is perilously speculative, particularly when applied emerging segments of the industry, such as hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling. Nonetheless, the general consensus is that the administration will take a heavy hand, that long-shelved initiatives will take on new life and that the hydrocarbon extraction industry should brace for punitive measures.

While we absolutely agree that the pace of regulatory activity on hydraulic fracturing will hasten in Obama’s second term, we do not share the sentiment that this administration is out to destroy America’s domestic unconventional oil and gas industry. We hold the view that this administration will try to use existing statutory authority to further regulate hydraulic fracturing on a federal level, but will not purposefully punish the industry with regulations aimed at killing the hydraulic fracturing industry. That being said, this administration and the energy industry has, at times, had trouble working together, and there may be some residual bad blood over a contentious election where energy issues were front and center. If this administration attempted to proceed with federal regulation of hydraulic fracturing without meaningful input from the energy industry, there is a very real chance of a regulatory overreach that could deal a detrimental blow to a critical domestic industry.

Here is the context that informs Fracking Insider’s view of federal hydraulic fracturing regulation in Obama’s second term:

IT IS ENTIRELY UP TO THE WHITE HOUSE

Democrats held the Senate, and Republicans continue to control the House of Representatives. There will be some musical chairs among key committees with jurisdiction over hydraulic fracturing, but there is no indication that partisan gridlock will thaw in the coming years, particularly on a hot button issue like energy. While there will be hydraulic fracturing legislation introduced in both chambers, the White House is not banking on a meaningful hydraulic fracturing bill reaching the president’s desk.

Absent new statutory authority, this administration is going to inventory the regulatory authority it has within existing environmental statutes and figure how to promulgate rules under those statutes. The Obama Environmental Protection Agency did the same thing with climate change in the first term. Once the administration satisfied itself that the divided legislature would not pass a climate change bill, it promulgated greenhouse gas, or GHG, regulations under the Clean Air Act. Even the administration acknowledged that the CAA was a poor tool to regulate GHGs and that the CAA would need to be modified administratively to accommodate these ubiquitous gases, but they shoehorned GHGs into the CAA anyhow and, so far, courts have allowed it. We suspect that experience is fresh in this administration’s mind and that the regulatory shoehorn is primed for action.

THE PETITIONS FOR RULEMAKING AND ONGOING STUDIES SAY MORE ABOUT THIS ADMINISTRATION’S PLANS FOR HYDRAULIC FRACTURING REGULATION THAN THE “DELAYED RULES.”

Much has been made about a backlog of environmental regulations that the administration shelved in the months leading up to the election and that now will be unleashed upon industry. While true that this administration postponed a number of environmental regulations that could be seen as hurting jobs, energy prices and the fledgling economic recovery, none of those are precisely directed at hydraulic fracturing. Certainly, industry should and will engage in issues such as ozone and particulate matter standards, the Boiler MACT, sulfur standards for gasoline, and New Source Performance Standards for power plants and refineries, but it should not forget about the environmental groups’ petitions for hydraulic fracturing rulemaking that have similarly (but less conspicuously) been delayed.

Those petitions include:

• Petition to regulate hydraulic fracturing fluids under the Toxic Substances Control Act (partially granted already).

• Petition to apply the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act to drilling fluids and produced waters.

• Petition to require Toxic Release Inventory reporting for hydraulic fracturing operations under the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act.

• Request for regulatory determination over whether biocides in hydraulic fracturing fluid should be regulated under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act.

For an administration that has resigned itself to congressional inaction, these petitions provide avenues (albeit flawed) for shoehorning new regulatory authority into old statutes.

If petition-driven regulation is promulgated, it may also accompany Clean Water Act regulation. The EPA has been studying the impact of hydraulic fracturing on water since 2010. Draft findings are due in early 2013 with a final report due in 2014. Regardless of the draft or final findings, many administration officials predisposed to increased regulation of hydraulic fracturing under the CWA will point to this study as a justification for further regulation. On top of the administration’s 2012 initiatives to increase regulation under the CAA, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and on federal land, it is easy to see how this “all-points/all-media” approach to hydraulic fracturing regulation has convinced many that the Obama administration is out to dismantle the industry.

PRESIDENT OBAMA NEEDS HYDRAULIC FRACTURING

Despite this administration’s regulatory propensities and the apparent attempt to federally regulate hydraulic fracturing through a multimedia, multi-statute approach, we believe that this administration needs a thriving domestic natural industry and the hydraulic fracturing that makes such an industry possible.

From an economic perspective, America is still in trouble, and the energy industry provides a rare bright spot on an otherwise gloomy economy. Obama’s second term was made possible by millions of union workers who rely on a thriving domestic energy industry for paychecks, and by voters in Ohio and Pennsylvania where hydraulic fracturing breathed life into state treasuries and local economies. While term limits permit the president to decouple himself from these constituencies, history will judge this president on how he managed our nation’s economic recovery — and recovery is impossible without a thriving domestic energy industry.

Obama is undoubtedly looking at his legacy from an environmental perspective as well. His election night reference to the “destructive power of a warming planet” reveals that he sees his response to climate change as a key component of his environmental legacy. This administration has aggressively pursued GHG regulation and fuel efficiency standards, but such efforts would be meaningless unless he can show a reduction in GHG emissions. Such reductions are not possible without meaningfully embracing natural gas. The Obama administration may not love hydraulic fracturing, but it likes natural gas a whole lot more than coal because natural gas combustion produces half the carbon dioxide emissions of coal. This administration’s heavy-handed regulation of the coal and coal-fired power industries reflects that fact.

We believe that Obama understands that the fate of his economic and environmental legacy is intertwined with the energy industry and hydraulic fracturing. Whether that understanding will be sufficient to reign in anti-hydrocarbon elements of his administration and take a more restrained approach to regulation remains unclear. What is clear, however, is that this administration stands no chance of finding an appropriate level of regulation without working closely with industry. Unless Obama reaches out it the energy industry in a meaningful way, he will run the risk of allowing his regulators to run right past the breaking point of a healthy domestic energy and hydraulic fracturing industry.

## A2: fracking bad – generic

#### Coal production and use cause pollution

NRDC 2008 (Natural Resources Defense Council, 2008, “There Is No Such Thing as ‘Clean Coal’,” http://www.nrdc.org/globalwarming/files/coalmining.pdf)

Coal Mining Can Harm People’s¶ Health and the Environment¶ The way coal is currently produced and used contributes to damage to the land, water, and air, and can severely harm human health and the environment. Environmental insults begin with coal mining and transportation, continue with combustion, and leave behind a trail of waste.¶ Dangerous Working Conditions Can Put Miners’ Health and Safety at Risk: Coal mining is one of the most dangerous professions in the United States. The industry is about five times¶ as hazardous as the average private workplace; in 2006 and 2007, a total of 80 miners were killed on the job. Coal miners also suffer many nonfatal injuries and are vulnerable to serious diseases, most notably black lung disease (pneumoconiosis) which is caused by inhaling coal dust.¶ Mining Can Make Our Water Undrinkable:¶ Strip mining, particularly in the semi-arid West, can damage the underground aquifers that¶ supply household drinking water and water for agricultural purposes. Both underground and surface mining can pollute nearby waters with sediments and chemicals. The most serious kind of chemical pollution is acid mine drainage, or AMD. AMD causes heavy metals and toxins to¶ be carried into streams and groundwater, and¶ can make the water undrinkable and unfit for recreational use. The most dramatic physical effect on water occurs from valley fills, the depositing of mining waste often associated with mountaintop removal (MTR) mining in the headwaters of streams. The government has estimated that that valley fills alone buried more than 700 miles¶ of streams from 1985 to 2001. More broadly, between 1992 and 2002, surface coal mining¶ in Appalachia has damaged or destroyed more than 1,200 miles of streams and deforested some 380,000 acres, with valley fills covering more¶ than 83,000 acres and affecting the drainage of some 438,000 acres of watershed.1 If current policies do not change, these numbers will increase dramatically over the coming decade.¶ Mining Adds Harmful Pollution to Our Air:¶ There are two main sources of air pollution during the coal production process: methane emissions from the mines, which contribute to global warming pollution, and particulate matter (PM) emissions, which can cause significant respiratory damage as well as premature death.

***We control uniqueness --- pollution down now because of fracking***

**Lu et al. ‘12**

Xi Lu , School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, United States Jackson Salovaara , School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, United States Michael B. McElroy\* School of Engineering and Applied Sciences and Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, United States

Implications of the Recent Reductions in Natural Gas Prices for Emissions of CO2 from the US Power Sector

Environmental Science & Technology201246 (5), 3014-3021, jj

**US emissions of greenhouse gases decreased by 2.94% in 2008 relative to 2007 and by a further 6.59% in 2009**.(1) **Emissions from the power sector, which accounts for approximately 40% of total US greenhouse gas emissions,(1) declined by an even larger factor, by 8.76% in 2009 relative to 2008.** **The overall decrease in emissions may be attributed to** the recession in the economy that set in during late 2008. A contributing factor for the power sector, however, relates to **an important shift from coal to natural gas that took place over this period in generation of electricity in the US**. Total production of electricity declined by 4.1% in 2009 relative to 2008. Over the same interval, **production from coal decreased by 11.63% while the contribution from natural gas combined cycle** (NGCC) **plants rose by 7.18%.**(2) **The shift from coal to gas was triggered to a large extent by a significant decrease in the cost of natural gas relative to coal**. **Prices for natural gas consumed in the power sector fell from a high of $12.06**/MMBTU (1 MMBTU = 106 BTU) **in June 2008 to a low of $3.97/MMBTU in September 2009**. Prices have fluctuated since around an average of about $5/MMBTU.(3, 4) **The recent persistent decrease in gas prices is attributed primarily to an increase in the production of gas from shale facilitated by developments in horizontal drilling and by technological advances involving injection of high pressure water and chemicals into gas-rich shales, the process referred to as fracking**. The price of coal has been relatively stable, increasing modestly, over this period. A diversity of sources contributed to the generation of electricity in the US in 2010: coal accounted for approximately 56.1% of the total followed by nuclear (17.3%), natural gas (15.5%), hydro (9.5%), and wind (2.3%).(5) **Utilities have an incentive to produce electricity at the lowest possible cost to meet demand subject to constraints imposed by transmission limitations and by requirements for ancillary services including the regulation of reactive power, voltage, and frequency**.(6, 7) Decisions as to which plants are deployed by a utility at any given time depend on consideration of a combination of operational and maintenance costs (O&M), fuel prices, and the efficiency with which plants can convert specific sources of energy to electricity.(6, 8) In practice, wind, hydro, nuclear, and solar facilities, for which immediate power generation costs are typically low, rate highest on what is referred to as the economic merit order: these sources are deployed first to meet demand(8) and will generate as much electricity as they can, subject to existing capacities. Their deployment is relatively insensitive in the short term to variations in prices for coal and natural gas.(2) **When prices for gas are high relative to coal, coal resources are deployed typically to meet baseload demand with gas plants operated primarily to accommodate occasions where demand for electricity is particularly high. If prices for gas are low relative to coal, the most efficient gas plants may be engaged to displace the least efficient coal plants in the economic merit order**.(9) The price induced transition from coal to gas in the power sector offers an important opportunity to diagnose the response of the US power sector to a changing differential price for coal relative to gas. The primary objective of the present study is to quantify the role low gas prices played in the recent reduction in emissions of CO2 from the US power sector. A secondary objective is to identify additional reductions that could be achieved through the introduction of a carbon tax, a levy specifically targeting emissions from the power sector. A number of previous studies have investigated the short-term impact of a hypothetical tax on CO2 emissions as applied to the production of electricity delivered to specific transmission grids in the US.(6, 10, 11) Newcomer et al.(6) studied the short run impact of a price on CO2 on production of electricity in the PJM (a regional transmission organization that coordinates the movement of wholesale electricity in all or parts of Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia), MISO (Midwest Independent System Operator, which covers all or most of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan and parts of Montana, Missouri, Kentucky, and Ohio), and ERCOT (the Electric Reliability Council of Texas) transmission systems and concluded that a tax of $35 per metric ton of CO2 would lead to a 10% reduction in CO2 emissions in PJM and MISO, with a 30% decrease in ERCOT. Most of the reductions identified by Newcomer et al., however, resulted from a lower demand for electricity, rather than from a change in the order of dispatch between gas and coal. A more recent investigation(10) examined the potential impact of a carbon tax on the future ERCOT system focusing specifically on prospects for 2013. Accounting for expected changes in the hourly dispatch of electricity, it was argued, assuming a prevailing price for gas of $7 per MMBTU, that a significant reduction in CO2 emissions would require a carbon price of between $40 and $60 per metric ton of CO2. Cullen,(12) using a dynamic econometric model, concluded that a tax of $20 per metric ton CO2 would result in only a minimal change in emissions from ERCOT. All these studies were based, however, on specific assumptions with respect to the cost of gas, assuming prices ($7–$10 per MMBTU) much higher than values that were applied over the period emphasized in the present study. One would not expect under these circumstances significant displacement of coal for gas fired systems: operational expenses for coal systems would remain lower than those for gas, ensuring a higher relative position for the former on the economic merit order. **Our analysis will be based on an econometric model tuned to data reported for power generation, which covers the time interval of 2005–2010 and will be used specifically to quantify the shift of fuel from coal to gas in response to the changing differential prices for coal and gas**. The model will be applied to argue that ***economically driven coal to gas substitution was primarily responsible for the recent decrease in the use of coal in the power sector and for the corresponding reduction in emissions of CO2.***

### Methane

***NG still better despite methane***

L. M. **Cathles**, June 6, 20**12**

After receiving his PhD from Princeton, Professor Larry Cathles joined Kennecott Copper Corporation where he investigated the genesis of porphyry copper deposits and industrial leaching processes. In 1978 he joined the faculty at Pennsylvania State University where his research focus was on the formation of massive sulfide deposits at mid-ocean ridges and in failed rifts in Japan. In 1982 he joined the Chevron Oil Field Research Laboratory where he developed genetic and exploration models for gold and sulfide deposits and investigated the C02 generation that often attends steam injection for enhanced oil recovery. In 1987 Cathles came to Cornell as an earth scientist who addresses the Earth processes with the perspective of a physicist. His fundamental approach is to construct physical process models that predict chemical change; to develop models that simulate the chemical alteration caused by the movements of water in the subsurface for example. Cathles has published over 110 peer-reviewed publications and a book: "The Viscosity of the Earth`s Mantle". Presently he is a co-leader of the oil and gas thrust of the Cornell KAUST program and Director of the Cornell Institute for the Study of the Continents.

Assessing the greenhouse impact of natural gas

<http://www.geo.cornell.edu/eas/PeoplePlaces/Faculty/cathles/Natural%20Gas/Assessing%20the%20greenhouse%20impact%20of%20natural%20gas%20FINAL%20UNFORMTTED.pdf>

The global warming impact of substituting natural gas for coal and oil is currently in debate. We address this question here by comparing the reduction of greenhouse warming that would result from substituting gas for coal and some oil to the reduction which could be achieved by instead substituting zero carbon energy sources. We show that **substitution** **of natural gas reduces global warming by 40%** of that which could be attained by the substitution of zero carbon energy sources. At **methane leakage rates that are ~1% of production**, which is similar to today’s probable leakage rate of ~1.5% of production, the 40% benefit is realized as gas substitution occurs. For short transitions the leakage rate must be more than 10 to 15% of production for gas substitution not to reduce warming, and for longer transitions the leakage must be much greater. But **even if the leakage was so high** that the substitution was not of immediate benefit, **the 40%**‐of‐zero‐carbon **benefit would be realized shortly after methane emissions ceased because methane is removed quickly from the atmosphere whereas CO2 is not**. The benefits of substitution are unaffected by heat exchange to the ocean. **CO2 emissions are the key to anthropogenic climate change, and substituting gas reduces them by 40%** of that possible by conversion to zero carbon energy sources. Gas substitution also reduces the rate at which zero carbon energy sources must be eventually introduced.

## A2: regs not so bad

#### Yes they are

ARI 12 – Advanced Resources International Inc. report for the American Petroleum Institute, "Estimate of Impacts of EPA Proposals to Reduce Air Emissions from Hydraulic Fracturing Operations,"www.api.org/~/media/Files/Policy/Hydraulic\_Fracturing/NSPS-OG-ARI-Impacts-of-EPA-Air-Rules-Final-Report.ashx

Depending on the REC-Set Use Rate scenario assumed, the following impacts from base case levels are projected in the first 4 years after the requirements go into effect (through 2015):¶ • Overall **well drilling** for unconventional resources producing natural gas over 2012 - 2015 would be **reduced by** 31% to 52%, amounting to reductions in drilling ranging from 12,700 to 21,400 wells.¶ • 5.8 to 7.0 quadrillion Btu (Quads) of otherwise economic unconventional natural gas would not be developed and produced by 2015, a 9% to **11% reduction**.¶ • 1.0 to 1.8 billion barrels of otherwise economic unconventional liquids would not be developed and produced by 2015, a 21% to 37% reduction.¶ • Federal royalties of $7.0 to $8.5 billion that would otherwise be collected would not be paid in the first 4 years after the requirements go into effect.¶ • State revenues from severance taxes amounting to $1.9 to $2.3 billion would be delayed beyond the first 4 years after the requirements go into effect.¶ Under either scenario of REC equipment availability, a significant slowdown in unconventional resource development **would occur, resulting in less reserve additions, less production, lower royalties to the Federal government and** private landowners, **and l**ower severance tax payments **to state governments**. The **delays in drilling results in delays in production, which result in the delays in** the **economic benefits** associated with that production. This analysis did not attempt to estimate lost jobs associated with reduced drilling, oil and gas supply services, and indirect employment.

# T

**2ac – A2: T – Can’t Be Moratorium**

**1) We meet – Moratoriums reduce restrictions**

**Pence ‘11**

Mike, Congressman from Indiana, Reducing Regulation, <http://www.mikepence.com/issues-reducing-regulation/>, jj

**Reducing Regulation** The State That Works: **Reduce Regulatory Burdens** to Create a Better Small Business Climate Policy Goal: Give Indiana the best small business climate in America by **taking a regulatory time-out** until existing regulations are reviewed and by addressing the regulatory barriers to employment. Vision Plan Goals Served: Goal #1: Increasing private sector employment Goal #2: Attracting new investment in Indiana, with emphasis on manufacturing, agriculture, life sciences and logistics Goal #5: Improving the quality of the Hoosier workforce **Policy Steps:** •**Issue an executive order** on day one **placing a moratorium on new regulations**, and initiate a process to review all existing regulations, with some exceptions.[1]

**2) Counter interp – reduce means to limit**

**Free Dictionary**

<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/reduce>, jj

**reduce** - narrow or **limit; "reduce the influx of foreigners**"

tighten

confine, limit, throttle, trammel, restrain, restrict, bound - **place limits on** (extent or access); "restrict the use of this parking lot"; "limit the time you can spend with your friends"

**We meet: a moratorium limits regulations**

**Business Journal**, Jan 11th 20**12**, http://www.bizjournals.com/milwaukee/morning\_roundup/2012/01/johnson-backs-bills-to-limit-federal.html

U.S. Sen. Ron **Johnson** **has written bills to limit government** spending **by placing a moratorium on** all **federal regulations** until employment improves and reducing the federal government work force. The two bills are part of Johnson's broader effort to improve the economy.

**2ac – T Direct Restrictions**

**1) We meet:**

**The plan removes restrictions on natural production**

**Washington Times 12** 4-23, EDITORIAL: More fracking red tape <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/apr/23/more-fracking-red-tape/>, jj

The Environmental Protection Agency (**EPA**) on Wednesday **finalized** 588 pages of **new restrictions on the production of natural gas** and oil **that take** primary **aim at** hydraulic fracturing, or “**fracking**,” a drilling technique that releases trapped natural gas from underground shale. **Gas producers will be required to install equipment** on about 13,000 new natural gas wells and around 1,200 old ones **to prevent released gas from escaping into the atmosphere**, where the agency says it contributes to “greenhouse” gases. Humans and animals release the same vilified gases merely by being alive. House Republicans say **the added restrictions belie** Mr. **Obama’s** purported **all-of-the-above energy policy**. “American energy production on state and private lands remains a bright spot in our economy, but **EPA’s** layers of **red tape threaten to stifle** job creation and **industry growth**, especially for small businesses,” said Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman Fred Upton. **Fracking has led to an exponential growth in gas production**, driving prices below $2 per million British thermal units, the lowest level in 10 years. That’s good news for American consumers but bad news for Mr. Obama’s unrealistic “green” energy initiatives. Already reliant on generous federal subsidies to survive, intermittent energy sources such as windmills and solar panels have been unable to compete on an equal footing with inexpensive alternatives such as natural gas. Regulatory compliance costs will be added into gas prices - a welcome development for struggling “eco-friendly” competitors but not for consumers, who will be forced to shell out extra dollars. The president has been all-in for renewables, backing solar manufacturers such as Solyndra, which collapsed loudly last summer after burning through $535 million in taxpayer-provided subsidies. Since then, prospects for sun power have remained dim. Last week, First Solar, which pocketed a $1.46 billion loan from the Energy Department, announced it would lay off 2,000 employees. Additional regulatory burdens may further raise the pressure on natural gas costs. The EPA is investigating a charge that fracking contaminated a water well in Wyoming, prompting anti-progress activists in Pennsylvania and New York to protest the practice on the grounds that it could endanger local water tables. In Ohio, geologists claim fracking is causing small earthquakes. Each scare story becomes the basis for new rules and higher costs. The message from the marketplace is that the trendy, feel-good “green” power sources don’t sell. **The White House response is to generate restrictions ensuring natural gas** and other affordable fossil fuels don’t, either. Though Newton’s law can’t be changed, Americans fed up with Obama’s law will have a chance to repeal it in November.

**2) Counter-interpretation:**

**“Restrictions” includes “regulations” – this evidence is energy specific**

**Davies 30** (Major George, “CLAUSE 1.—(Scheme regulating production, supply and sale of coal.),” February, vol 235 cc2453-558, http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1930/feb/27/clause-1-scheme-regulating-production)

Major GEORGE DAVIES The hon. Member says he has heard no reason advanced for this Amendment. I am willing to give him one, and I will tell him that the reason why the benches are not full, as they were a short time ago, is that man cannot live by bread alone and, as there is a rule against the introduction of newspapers and foodstuffs, it is necessary for some of us to refresh ourselves after a late Division. I am not going to transgress the ruling of the Chair, as we have been given very great latitude, but I want to confine myself to the point at issue, which is the regulation of sale. I have had experience in the past of efforts to regulate the sale of sugar. **Like the coal industry** to-day, **there has been** in the past an **over-production** of many of the fundamental articles of the life of a nation. I will not dwell on the case of rubber, but the sugar situation was entirely on all fours with this situation, **as it was a question of the regulation of sale**. Facing a situation very similar in kind and not dissimilar in degree to the problem now before us, those connected with that particular industry in certain countries thought it an advantage to control and regulate the sale. **As soon as you use the word "regulation" in this connection it is idle to suggest that it does not mean restriction**. Obviously, **that is the point**—**to restrict**—and, while 2541 it is true the word "restrict" is not in this particular Clause, and cannot be argued in connection with this Amendment, yet **behind the word "regulate" is the word "restrict**," **in other words, controlling what has been uncontrolled, production thrown on markets not able to receive it**.

**“On” means directly targeted**

**World English Dictionary** 20**09** (http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/on?s=t)

— prep

1.

**in contact** or connection **with** the surface of; at the upper surface of: an apple on the ground ; a mark on the table cloth

2.

**attached** to: a puppet on a string

3.

carried with: I've no money on me

4.

in the immediate vicinity of; close to or along the side of: a house on the sea ; this verges on the ridiculous!

5.

within the time limits of a day or date: he arrived on Thursday

6.

being performed upon or relayed through the medium of: what's on the television?

**Production means drilling**

**GDF SUEZ**, no date global gas and lng division (GDS SUEZ, Global Gas %26 LNG Division, "Exploration and production of natural gas," [http://www.gdfsuez.com/en/businesses/gas/natural-gas-prospection-production/-http://www.gdfsuez.com/en/businesses/gas/natural-gas-prospection-production/](http://www.gdfsuez.com/en/businesses/gas/natural-gas-prospection-production/-http%3A//www.gdfsuez.com/en/businesses/gas/natural-gas-prospection-production/))

**Exploration is the first stage of the gas chain**. At the core of this essential activity, GDF SUEZ **specialists** (geologists, geophysicists, engineers, etc.) **analyze the structure of the soil to detect areas liable to contain hydrocarbons**. They carry out specific tests, such as seismic analyses, to confirm their initial studies. **When there is a high probability of discovering gas (or oil), wells are drilled**. **If those wells prove successful, production (extraction and processing of the natural gas or oil) can start**. **Exploration**-production **activities also include the acquisition of licenses (the right to explore then exploit a field) from the authorities of the countries in which those fields are located.**

**3) Standards:**

**A) Education --- they limit out fracking affs --- the main controversy isn’t leasing or incentives, its EPA restrictions on the technique itself --- it’s a core energy issue**

**The Topic Paper 12**

Resolved: The College Debate Community Should Debate Energy Topic Proposal Paper for the 2012-2013 CEDA Topic Controversy Ballot Submitted by: Ana Nikolic Policy Resolution Group at Bracewell & Giuliani Dylan Quigley Dartmouth University With special thanks to two true experts in the subject matter: Scott Segal Founding Partner Policy Resolution Group at Bracewell & Giuliani Josh Zive Senior Counsel Policy Resolution Group at Bracewell & Giuliani

Online

**Natural gas development has brought about one of the most significant breakthroughs in the history of the American energy sector**. **Previously inaccessible shale rock resources have been made accessible through** the development of **hydraulic fracturing** and horizontal drilling techniques. **The controversy around the relatively new process of “fracking” pits many competing interest holders against each other**. **The processes has been touted by the administration as the best path forward for clean and affordable energy given the abundant reserves our nation has**. At the same time, the administration has been trying to balance increased calls for regulation of the industry from environmental advocates.

# DA’s

## A2: coal exports

**Conceded that plan lets us export --- that solves Chinese coal consumption**

**Ebinger ‘12**

Charles Ebinger is a senior fellow and director of the Energy Security Initiative at Brookings. He has more than 35 years of experience specializing in international and domestic energy markets (oil, gas, coal, and nuclear) and the geopolitics of energy, and has served as an energy policy advisor to over 50 governments. He has served as an adjunct professor in energy economics at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies and Georgetown University’s Walsh School of Foreign Service.

Kevin Massy is Assistant Director of the Energy Security Initiative at Brookings where he manages research into international energy relations and domestic energy policy. A former writer for the Economist magazine on energy and technology, he has an MSFS in International Business and Commerce from Georgetown University, an MA in International Journalism from City University, London, and a BA from the University of Newcastle.

Govinda Avasarala is a Senior Research Assistant in the Energy Security Initiative at Brookings. His research focuses on the geopolitics of energy in emerging markets, domestic and international oil and natural gas markets, and multilateral energy frameworks. He has a BSc in Economics from the University of Mary Washington.

Energy Security Initiative @ Brookings, Liquid Markets: Assessing the Case for U.S. Exports of Liquefied Natural Gas, May, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/1/natural%20gas%20ebinger/natural_gas_ebinger.pdf>, jj

By contrast, some advocates of **U.S. exports of LNG** maintain that they **have the potential to bring global environmental benefits if they are used to displace more carbon-intensive fuels**. According to the IEA, **natural gas in general has the potential to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 740 million tonnes in 2035, nearly half of which could be achieved by the displacement of coal in China’s power-generation portfolio**. **Natural gas—in the form of LNG—also has the potential to displace more carbon-intensive fuels in other major energy users, including across the EU and in Japan, which is being forced to burn more coal and oil-based fuels** to make up for the nuclear generation capacity lost in the wake of the Fukushima disaster. **In addition to its relatively lower carbon-dioxide footprint, natural gas produces lower emissions of pollutants such as sulfur dioxide nitrogen oxide and other particulates than coal and oil.**

**China consumption better – they have better tech**

**Bloomberg,** March 27th 20**12**, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-03-27/china-shows-u-s-how-to-push-for-carbon-capture.html

**It’s a tantalizing promise that one day “carbon capture” will remove greenhouse gases from the smoke made by coal**-fired power plants. After all, **these plants**, which provide 45 percent of electricity **in the U.S., account for more than a third of the country’s carbon dioxide emissions**. Small-scale experiments have been successful enough that, at this point, **engineers have little doubt the technology can work. Yet efforts in the U.S. to advance it are stalled**. **What was to have been the nation’s first commercial-scale project** -- at Mountaineer, a coal-burning electricity plant in New Haven, West Virginia -- **has been put on hold.** **Meanwhile, in China, carbon capture marches steadfastly ahead**, as an article in the May issue of Bloomberg Markets magazine reports. **A pilot project** by China Huaneng Group Corp. **has been able to remove carbon from coal-plant exhaust for about $39 per ton of captured CO2, which is a little more than a third of what it costs in the U.S.** The work has been so impressive, as John Lippert and Chua Baizhen report, that **Duke Energy Corp., the largest U.S. energy company, has signed a research agreement** with Huaneng **to study its technology**. Duke wants to learn how much it would cost to retrofit its largest power plant, in Gibson County, Indiana, to capture carbon. **The Chinese plant filters the smoke through an aqueous amine solution rather than through chilled ammonia, as is commonly done in U.S. carbon-capture experiments**. Duke would like to find out how much of Huaneng’s cost savings flow from its proprietary technology, and how much is attributable to lower labor and capital costs. **How can it be that China has taken the leadership role on clean coal? The answer has to do partly with China’s greater need, given its overwhelming reliance on coal for power. Unlike the U.S., China lacks huge stores of natural gas to tap as an alternative. It also has to do with China’s controlled economy, which makes it possible for its power plants to take on greater costs and risks than American electricity providers can**. **The Chinese government plans to finance a demonstration project that, by 2015, captures a million tons of carbon per year. And energy companies are competing with one another for the prize.**

***Chinese coal imports key to prevent water scarcity***

Kevin Jianjun **Tu** is a senior associate in the Carnegie Energy and Climate Program, where he leads Carnegie’s work on China’s energy and climate policies, “Understanding China's Rising Coal Imports”, Feb 20**12**, http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/02/16/understanding-china-s-rising-coal-imports#

**The environment could also play a part in China’s coal-importing decisions**. Importing coal from overseas markets might enable the Chinese central government to close down many small and inefficient mines and prevent similar mines from being opened up, thereby protecting local environments. Still, no matter where coal is mined, the process often has detrimental environmental effects on the host country. Evaluating this local impact against global environmental challenges and preventing a mere shifting of local environmental burdens from China to other coal-producing countries requires closer collaboration between China and its major coal trading partners. Local environmental impacts There is a vast amount of literature on local environmental degradation associated with coal mining activities. Local ecosystems and the health of residents adjacent to coal mines are particularly at risk. Acidic mine drainage and toxic coal sludge can contaminate local streams and groundwater. Mountaintop removal causes forest destruction, loss of wildlife habitats, and subsequent erosion, while underground mining can lead to land subsidence. Local air pollutants—nitrogen oxide and sulfur dioxide, and toxic heavy metals, such as lead, mercury, and arsenic—cause damage to human health. And coal dust, which is stirred up through coal mining, preparation, transport, storage, and end use, can cause severe respiratory problems. Moreover, **both coal mining and processing are water intensive. Because many of China’s coal resources are located in arid regions, Chinese coal mining operations often compete with residents and agriculture for access to scarce water resources.** **As mining activities often draw heavily from groundwater sources, they have depleted groundwater levels in many coal districts.** **This has detrimental effects on local flora and fauna, especially during increasingly more frequent periods of drought.** To the extent that coal imports relieve the push to keep small and inefficient mines operating or to site new large-scale mines, they could suppress widespread mining activities and the associated environmental damage to China’s coal-rich regions, such as Shanxi, Shaanxi, and Inner Mongolia. **From a Chinese perspective, coal imports could serve local environmental goals, especially regarding small coal mines that have been difficult for the central government to regulate in an environmentally responsible fashion.**

***Collapses the CCP***

Nathan **Nankivell**, Senior Researcher at the Office of the Special Advisor Policy at Maritime Forces Pacific Headquarters, “The National Security Implications of China’s Emerging Water Crisis”, China Brief Volume: 5 Issue: 17. August 2, 20**05**, http://www.jamestown.org/single/?no\_cache=1&tx\_ttnews%5Btt\_news%5D=30735

As **water shortages** impact and restrict continued economic growth and the quality of life of Chinese citizens, they **may mutate into a potential catalyst for domestic dissent**. Throughout 2005, increasing reports of public protests, riots, and demonstrations against the CCP circulated through the national and international press. But unlike issues of employment, local cadre corruption, and land use, which have sparked much of this year’s unrest, **water shortages** and other environmental issues **present far more pressing concerns** for the Party. Environmental grievances and especially water shortage concerns already receive regular media attention from the state media organs like Xinhau, China Daily and the People’s Daily. This fact has ensured that water issues are already known and have been the subject of debate and low-level criticism for many years. As shortages become more prevalent and far reaching, **they present a unifying focal point for dissent** that crosses geographic, cultural, socio-economic, and political lines. As decisions are made from the center over the future of water resources, there will no doubt be winners and losers. The problem for the Party will be how to prevent and control the ensuing unrest that will result as some citizens’ water needs are sacrificed for the good of the nation. Will rural peasants outside Beijing who have for years suffered disproportionately from unfair agricultural taxing, corruption, and poor social services willingly give up their access to clean potable water to ensure that urbanites and Olympic spectators have water? Or will they instead fight tooth and nail like unemployed factory workers in other northern cities to keep and defend their economic livelihood. Already the answer appears to be emerging as several disputes over water issues in 2004 resulted in violent protests that left several injured and hospitalized. [7] A Potential Threat to Party Control **Water issues** in China **are** evolving into **a political challenge for the CCP**. Whether the Party will direct greater funding and resources towards solving the nation’s water crisis, and more importantly whether any investments can truly reverse the damage already done will be key factors to watch. Equally important is how Beijing will address and react to the political environment created by the problem. Without question the Party’s options will be limited. Planners will be hard-pressed to justify picking winners and losers as they allocate resources that will no doubt alienate elements within the Party and throughout Chinese society. Whether these decisions create factions within the CCP or evolve into a key platform for independent political candidates as land issues did in municipal elections in Shanghai is a very real possibility. In a worst-case scenario water **shortages could be the catalyst for** united **demonstrations** throughout the country **that reveal the Party’s soft underbelly**. Any move by the Party to quell or put down dissent will result in huge amounts of domestic pressure potentially equal to levels seen during Tiananmen, but without the convenient central location that allowed the Party to crush pro-democracy forces and justify it to the rest of the nation. Internationally, crackdowns will also force key trading nations like Japan, the US, Australia, and South Korea to reduce trade and investment and revaluate relations if significant domestic pressure is brought to bear. Moreover, such pressure in European Union nations could forestall Chinese efforts to have the arms embargo removed, a key to furthering international legitimacy. Thus as many China watchers continue to monitor the traditional security threats to the nation they may be wise to look at the impact that water issues foreshadow for the Communist Party. Whether the issue is strong enough to truly impact the Party’s control remains uncertain, but it may be as threatening to domestic stability as any traditional security threat. Moreover, if other nations are able or willing to exploit the issue, **the** Communist **Party could witness its first true political challenge in more than 15 years.**

***Global nuclear war***

**Yee and Storey, ’02** (Herbert Yee, Professor of Politics and International Relations at the Hong Kong Baptist University, and Ian Storey, Lecturer in Defence Studies at Deakin University, The China Threat: Perceptions, Myths and Reality, RoutledgeCurzon, pg 5)

The fourth factor contributing to the perception of a China threat is the fear of political and economic collapse in the PRC, resulting in territorial fragmentation, civil war and waves of refugees pouring into neighbouring countries. Naturally, any or all of these scenarios would have a profoundly negative impact on regional stability. Today the Chinese leadership faces a raft of internal problems, including the increasing political demands of its citizens, a growing population, a shortage of natural resources and a deterioration in the natural environment caused by rapid industrialisation and pollution. These problems are putting a strain on the central government's ability to govern effectively. Political disintegration or a Chinese civil war might result in millions of Chinese refugees seeking asylum in neighbouring countries. Such an unprecedented exodus of refugees from a collapsed PRC would no doubt put a severe strain on the limited resources of China's neighbours. A fragmented China could also result in another nightmare scenario - nuclear weapons falling into the hands of irresponsible local provincial leaders or warlords.'2 From this perspective, a disintegrating China would also pose a threat to its neighbours and the world.

## A2: debt ceiling

**2ac – link turn**

***Obama has no PC***

Reeve, 12/31/12 (Elspeth, TNR reporter and researcher, The Atlantic: ¶ “Just How Bad Was Obama's Fiscal Game?,” http://www.theatlanticwire.com/politics/2012/12/just-how-bad-was-obamas-fiscal-game/60459/)

[New York's Jonathan Chait](http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2012/12/why-is-obama-caving-on-taxes.html). **Obama is revealing horrifyingly bad negotiating skills**, Chait says, **by agreeing to letting the Bush tax cuts expire on income over $450,000, instead of $250,000,** which he campaigned on.¶ **"[T]the tax cuts are the one area where [Obama] enjoys overwhelming leverage over the Republicans**. Their only threat is to block extension of tax cuts on income under $250,000, a wildly unpopular stance countless Republicans have acknowledged they could not sustain for long without courting an enormous public backlash. **This is the hand where Obama needed to collect all the chips. Instead he is allowing Republicans to whittle down the sum by essentially threatening to shoot themselves in the head**."¶ **Obama only encouraged Republicans to play chicken with the debt limit in a few months: "Obama may think his conciliatory approach has helped avoid economic chaos. Instead, he is courting it."** In a followup post, Chait says new details of the reported compromise make it seem "[less bad](http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2012/12/obamas-deal-possibly-not-terrible-deal.html)." He says, "What we have now is a spectrum of outcomes that will play itself out over the next few months, ranging from 'okay' to 'terrible.'"¶ ¶ [The New York Times' Paul Krugman](http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/12/31/conceder-in-chief-2/?smid=tw-NytimesKrugman&seid=auto). **Krugman calls Obama the "Conceder in Chief?"** He sees "a bad and upsetting deal but not as terrible as initial rumors had it." There were no cuts to Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid. But **Obama traded $150 billion or so in taxes on the wealthy for unemployment benefits being extended for a year and other spending provisions. The worst part, Krugman says, is that Obama revealed he will cave on what he wants most. "[W]henever the president says that there’s an issue on which he absolutely, positively won’t give ground, you can count on him, you know, giving way — and soon, too."¶** ¶ Iowa Democrat [Tom Harkin](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/us/politics/debt-reckoning.html#sha=50197f60b). Harkin said on the Senate Floor Monday, "As I see this thing developing, as I have said, no deal is better than a bad deal... and this is a very bad deal, the way things are shaping up." ¶ ¶ [The New Republic's Noam Scheiber](http://www.tnr.com/blog/plank/111521/the-cliff-compromise-bad-the-strategic-consequences-are-disastrous). Schieber says he actually hates the reported compromise**. "I think the president made a huge mistake by negotiating over what he’d previously said was non-negotiable,"** Schieber says, referring to the Bush tax cuts. "**If Obama will cave even when he’s got all the leverage, when won’t he cave? Never, the Republicans will assume."¶**

***Obama’s pushing gun control --- causes massive fights and drains PC***

**Beckwith 12/31** Ryan Teague Beckwith, Digital First Media, 12/31/12, YDR, What will Congress fight about in 2013?, <http://www.ydr.com/nation-world/ci_22287047/what-will-congress-fight-about-2013>, jj

What will happen**: Gun control measures will get farther than they have in years and may even pass the Senate. But it will be a much tougher fight in the House, where a key Republican has already said he would not support new gun control proposals. Past mass shootings have not immediately led to new laws, so next year is likely the beginning of a drawn-out fight.**

**A deal is inevitable --- the GOP isn’t serious about fighting on the debt ceiling**

**Chaddock 1-2** Gail Russell Chaddock, Staff writer / January 2, 2013, Christian Science Monitor, 'Fiscal cliff' deal: After rush of relief, debt ceiling clash already looms, [http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2013/0102/Fiscal-cliff-deal-After-rush-of-relief-debt-ceiling-clash-already-looms/(page)/2](http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2013/0102/Fiscal-cliff-deal-After-rush-of-relief-debt-ceiling-clash-already-looms/%28page%29/2), jj

**Republicans are divided over how aggressively to push the debt-ceiling negotiations in a new round with the White House**. Last month, Mr. **Boehner, who is up for relection** as speaker on Jan. 4, **offered to defer a fight over raising the debt limit for a year, as part of negotiations with Obama over a “grand bargain**.” But he has taken a battering from some conservative activist groups and members of his own caucus for those failed negotiations.

Conservative groups see the debt ceiling as a point of maximum leverage on spending and are urging Boehner to again insist on "the Boehner rule" and use it as a point of maximum leverage.

“The mass majority of Americans know the danger we’re putting ourselves in and want less debt,” says Chris Chocola, president of the Club for Growth, best known for funding primary campaigns against GOP incumbents viewed as not conservative enough.

“It’s up to Republicans to tell this story, and they have more leverage [in debt-ceiling negotiations] than they did in the fiscal cliff debate,” he adds. “If they’re not willing to go there, they have nothing.”

But **after tough 2012 elections**, some **House Republicans are wary of confronting the White House on an issue so potentially damaging to the economy.**

"A lot of people talk about the debt ceiling, but **I don’t want to be messing around with the obligations of the federal government,” say**s Rep. Jim **Renacci (R) of Ohio, a veteran of the 2010 tea party class. “We can use that for some leverage, but we should be using every opportunity to cut debt.”**

“**After two tough races, I did not come here to continue the status quo**,” he adds.

**Obama won’t spend PC**

Zeke **Miller**, BuzzFeed Staff, **1-1**-13, Obama: I Won't Negotiate Over The Debt Ceiling, <http://www.buzzfeed.com/zekejmiller/obama-i-wont-negotiate-over-the-debt-ceiling>, jj

WASHINGTON — President Barack Obama reiterated his pledge not to negotiate over the nation's borrowing limit Tuesday night, as he marked the passage of a bill to avert the fiscal cliff.

Speaking from the White House briefing room 20 minutes after the House of Representatives passed the bill — and minutes before his own return to a vacation in his native Hawaii — Obama offered Republicans brief, tough talk.

"While I will negotiate over many things, I will not have another debate with this Congress over whether they should pay the bills for what they've racked up," Obama said. "We can't not pay bills that we've already incurred."

**( ) No link uniqueness --- Obama’s already come out in support of fracking**

**Loris ‘12**

Nicolas, 1-32, Heritage, The Fracking Truth on Government’s Role in Natural Gas Production <http://blog.heritage.org/2012/01/31/the-fracking-truth-on-governments-role-in-natural-gas-production/>, jj

President **Obama has been on a kick to promote natural gas production**. **He said in his State of the Union address, “And by the way, it was public research dollars, over the course of 30 years, that helped develop the technologies to extract all this natural gas out of shale rock—reminding us that government support is critical** in helping businesses get new energy ideas off the ground.”

**( ) Fracking lobby shields Obama’s capital**

**Thill ‘11**

Scott Thill runs the online mag Morphizm.com. His writing has appeared on Salon, XLR8R, All Music Guide, Wired and others. 12-16-11, Alter Net, The Fracking Industry Has Bought Off Congress: Here Are the Worst Offenders <http://www.alternet.org/story/153467/the_fracking_industry_has_bought_off_congress%3A_here_are_the_worst_offenders?paging=off>, jj

Environmentalists and other well-adjusted citizens of Earth, I've got some good news and some bad news. The good news is that, thanks to illuminating documentaries like Josh Fox's Gasland and determined pressure from activists in and out of the mainstream, the toxic ravages of hydraulic fracturing , known as fracking, are no longer the shale gas sector's dirty secret. The bad news is that, **thanks to** the United States' morally bankrupt political system and its Supreme Court's reality-defying ruling on **Citizens United** v. Federal Election Commission , **the fracking lobby's power of the purse is greater than it has ever been.** That power was depressingly dissected in Common Cause's recent report, Deep Drilling, Deep Pockets, which explained that **earnings junkies like Exxon, Koch and more have paid House and Senate politicians on select energy and commerce committees nearly $750 million** over the last decade to smother regulatory oversight of the expanding fracking practice, whose complete chemical components still remain a relative mystery. **It was** evidently **money well spent**. During that lobbying stretch, the Environmental Protection Agency scientifically linked fracking with water poisoning in Wyoming, and probably isn't far from siding with the increasing ranks of those who blame fracking for earthquakes from Oklahoma to Ohio to England. And yet beyond manageable fines and stock devaluations, no one from the industry has yet to seriously face the music for groundwater contamination and worse. For that, you can thank the industry's "Halliburton loophole," so named for former Vice-President Dick Cheney's insistence that his former company's fracking be stripped of EPA regulation. Years and billions later, **money still talks** and safety still walks in our peak oil century tapping, like veins, what fossil fuel deposits we have left, from natural gas to tar sands. **And they do so in a decidedly nonpartisan fashion.** "**The natural gas industry has spent billions on lobbying and advertising to convince Americans that natural gas is a cleaner, cheaper alternative to oil,"** Common Cause regional director James Browning, co-author with Alex Kaplan of Deep Drilling, Deep Pockets, told AlterNet. "**They've also tried to rebut environmental concerns by pitching natural gas as a 'transition fuel'** that will help America move from fossil fuels to primarily clean forms of energy by the next century. "But while fracking's exemption from the Safe Drinking Water Act is rightly called the 'Halliburton loophole' and the vast majority of our top 100 recipients of fracking money are Republicans, **it's important to note the extent of the industry's influence among Democrats,"** he added. "In Pennsylvania, the only state without a severance tax on natural gas extraction, previous Democratic governor Ed Rendell only made an issue of imposing a tax during his last year in office, too late to make it a reality. President **Obama is very pro-fracking and it's important to note that the FRAC Act languished in the Democratic 111th Congress."** Currently, the FRAC Act, which would repeal fracking's exemption from the Safe Water Drinking Act, also languishes in the 112th Congress, where it is still taking its first legislative steps while sponsored by Colorado's Democratic congresswoman Diana DeGette. DeGette and Delaware Republican Michael N. Castle coauthored the 2005 Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, an opportunity that provided former president George W. Bush with his first veto. Yet it is respective Bush Republicans like Joe Barton ($514,945) and John Cornyn ($417,556) who crown Common Cause's top 100 congressional hoarders of campaign cash from the fracking industry. As Browning explained, they're followed in fourth by Louisiana Democrat Mary Landrieu ($328,300), who's accompanied by House Democrats Dan Boren ($328,300), Jim Matheson ($223,79), and even Gene Green ($186,300). More importantly, and **across party lines, the fracking industry has lavished millions on crucial members of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce and Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works**. Yet it was only DeGette who continued to beat the lonely regulation drum after the EPA's report on Wyoming.

**( ) Plan’s popular with the GOP and spun as job creation**

**Bluey ‘12**

Rob Bluey is a journalist and blogger who leads The Heritage Foundation's investigative reporting unit.

6-21-12, Heritage, North Dakota’s Oil Boom in Pictures <http://blog.heritage.org/2012/06/21/north-dakotas-oil-boom-in-pictures/>, jj

**The combination of energy production and job creation is potent force**. **It’s one reason a bipartisan majority in the U.S. House** today **approved the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act**, **legislation that would increase access to America’s resources and spur job creation**. **With the national unemployment rate still stuck above 8 percent, congressional Republicans hit the road** in May **to highlight how energy initiatives could cure America’s economic** **woes**. One of the stops was in North Dakota — a state that Heritage and the Institute for Energy Research recently visited.

**House GOP key to agenda**

**INT 11-9** (Inland News Today, <http://www.inlandnewstoday.com/story.php?s=26450>, jj)

Mr **Obama's prospects for his second term will hinge on his relationship with** Mr **Boehner and congressional Republicans**. Vice-President Joe Biden told reporters aboard Air Force Two that there was much work to be done. "We're really anxious to get moving on, first of all, dealing with the first things first, this **fiscal cliff**. I think we can do it," Mr Biden said. But he added that **negotiations would depend on co-operation from their Republican colleagues.**

***( ) Current political climate makes plan a win***

Laurance **Geri &** David **McNabb** 20**11**, Laurance (Larry) Geri is a member of the faculty of The Evergreen State College, where he teaches in the Masters Program in Public Administration; David E. McNabb is business administration professor emeritus at Pacific Lutheran University and currently a member of the adjunct faculty of Olympic College; Energy Policy in the U.S.: Politics, Challenges, and Prospects for Change, electronic copy of book, KEL)

A new approach to energy politics was evident in President **Obama’s 2011 State of the Union**¶ **address**, in which he **set a national goal of producing 80 percent of U.S. electricity from “clean**”¶ **sources by 2035** (Obama 2011). “**Clean” was defined as** renewables, nuclear, clean coal and **natural**¶ **gas**. Although **this** stretches the **definition** of “clean” beyond recognition, it **might be broad**¶ **enough to attract bipartisan support** for a bill supporting R&D and incentives for such production¶ that will also generate green jobs. Biofuels and support for electric vehicles could be included in¶ this policy proposal, as **actions to lower U.S. reliance on imported oil and generate jobs may be a**¶ **winning formula at a time of slow growth and high geopolitical tension.**

 **( ) Winners win**

**Singer, ’09** (Jonathan, My Direct Democracy editor, “By Expending Capital, Obama Grows His Capital”, 3-3-9, http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428, accessed 7-8-9, AFB)

"What is amazing here is how much political capital Obama has spent in the first six weeks," said Democratic pollster Peter D. Hart, who conducted this survey with Republican pollster Bill McInturff. "And against that, he stands at the end of this six weeks with as much or more capital in the bank." Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital. Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result.

**( ) Issues are compartmentalized – no reason the plan will change peoples’ votes on a separate bill. And, PC irrelevant to the agenda**

**Silver, 1/26/11** – political statistician and all-around baller (Nate. “Obama’s paradox of choice.” http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/01/26/obamas-paradox-of-choice/)

Now, however, the stakes are probably much lower for him. With Democrats no longer in control of the House of Representatives, Mr. Obama will not be able to pass any major Democratic policy initiatives now, no matter how much political capital he might be willing to stake on them. Meanwhile, the Republicans control only the House, not the Senate. In contrast to Bill Clinton — who faced opposition control of both houses of Congress after his first midterm election — Mr. Obama may never have to use his veto pen. This is not to suggest, exactly, that Mr. Obama’s job has become easy (the president’s job never is). But surely it has become easier in one regard: he has far fewer choices to make.

**Plan is popular and spun as deficit reduction**

**Wolfgang 11/22**/12 Ben Wolfgang is a national reporter for The Washington Times. Before coming to the Times, he spent four years as a political reporter in Pennsylvania. His focus is on education and science policy. 11-22-12, The Washington Times, Fracking industry keeps eye on Obama, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/nov/22/fracking-industry-keeps-eye-on-obama/?page=2&utm_medium=RSS&utm_source=RSS_Feed>, jj

But **economics may outweigh environmental arguments**. **Energy leaders** now, more than ever, **are portraying** oil and **gas production as a key way of generating tax revenue, spurring job creation and saving the nation from going off the looming “fiscal cliff.”**

“**It’s going to take tax reform**, **but we can’t tax our way out of this**. It’s going to take entitlement reform, but we can’t save our way out of this. And we’re not going to be able to grow out of this. **We need another [way] to make this achievable, and we believe that’s energy**,” said Karen A. Harbert, president and CEO of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's Institute for 21st Century Energy. “**Every dollar that we generate from energy is a dollar that we don’t have to take out of the Defense Department, the entitlement area, or increase taxes**.”

**No impact & a deal is inevitable**

**Cramer 1-2** Jim Cramer, Cramer is host of CNBC's "Mad Money," and co-anchor of the 9 a.m. ET hour of CNBC's "Squawk on the Street." 2 Jan 2013, CNBC, 2 Jan 2013, Cramer: Don’t Fret Over Debt Ceiling, <http://www.cnbc.com/id/100349915>, jj

"I feel like I'm surrounded by people who are already fretting about the next big bad thing, this time it's the expected fight over how to address the debt ceiling," said Cramer.

The Mad Money host, however, refuses to get bogged down in Washington's petty squabbling.

Here's why:

1. **Typically sharp sell-offs are generated by unexpected catalysts**.

"I know there are plenty of other people who can and will worry about the debt ceiling, so I don't have to do it," he said. In other words, Cramer thinks it's far more prudent to worry about the things that very few people are worried about – that's what typically sends the market into a tailspin. **"When everyone is fretting over a problem in advance, that problem has a tendency to be resolved."**

**2. The worst is probably behind us.**

"I was far more concerned about where individual tax rates would end up than I am about the coming battle over spending," he said. "And I suspect **the President might invoke the 14th amendment to ignore the debt ceiling limit and argue that the Federal government's bills must be paid. There's a strong constitutional argument in favor of this stance, even as I want to see spending reined in very badly."**

**3. Politicians won't gamble with their careers.**

**Perhaps this takeaway is most important. Ultimately the fiscal cliff issue was resolved, albeit at the 11th hour, but it was resolved.**

***Demise of the dollar overstated-weak European economies, Chinese wouldn’t let it happen, and Japan will stabilize***

**Hugh 10 -**Macroeconomist who specializes in growth and productivity theory (“Interview with Edward Hugh: The Dollar’s Demise is Vastly Overstated,” Blog Invest, 4/30/10, http://trick-bloggerinvest.blogspot.com/2010/04/interview-with-edward-hugh-dollars.html)

Forex Blog: You wrote a recent post outlining the US Dollar carry trade, and how you believe that the Dollar’s decline is cyclical/temporary rather than structural/permanent. Can you elaborate on this idea? Do you think it’s possible that the fervor with which investors have sold off the Dollar suggests that it could be a little of both? Well, first of all, there is more than one thing happening here, so I would definitely agree from the outset, there are both cyclical and structural elements in play. Structurally, the architecture of Bretton Woods II is creaking round the edges, and in the longer run we are looking at a relative decline in the dollar, but as Keynes reminded us, in the long run we are all dead, while as I noted in the Afoe post, news of the early demise of the dollar is surely vastly overstated. Put another way, while Bretton Woods II has surely seen its best days, till we have some idea what can replace it it is hard to see a major structural adjustment in the dollar. Europe’s economies are not strong enough for the Euro to simply step into the hole left by the dollar, the Chinese, as we know, are reluctant to see the dollar slide too far due to the losses they would take on dollar denominated instruments, while the Russians seem to constantly talk the USD down, while at the same time borrowing in that very same currency – so read this as you will. Personally, I cannot envisage a long term and durable alternative to the current set-up that doesn’t involve the Rupee and the Real, but these currencies are surely not ready for this kind of role at this point. So we will stagger on. On the cyclical side, what I am arguing is that for the time being the US has stepped in where Japan used to be, as one side of your carry pair of choice, since base money has been pumped up massively while there is little demand from consumers for further indebtedness, so the broader monetary aggregates haven’t risen in tandem, leaving large pools of liquidity which can simply leak out of the back door. That is, it may well be one of the perverse consequences of the Fed monetary easing policy that it finances consumption elsewhere – in Norway, or Australia, or South Africa, or Brazil, or India – but not directly inside the US. This is something we saw happening during the last Japanese experiment in quantitative easing (from 2002  - 2006) and that it has the consequence, as it did for the Yen from 2005 to 2007, that the USD will have a trading parity which it would be hard to understand if this were not the case. I am also suggesting that this situation will unwind as and when the Federal Reserve start to seriously talk about withdrawing  the emergency measures (both in terms of interest rates and the various forms of quantitative easing), but that this unwinding is unlikely to be extraordinarily violent, since the Japanese Yen can simply step in to plug the gap, as I am sure the Bank of Japan will not be able to raise interest rates anytime soon given the depth of the deflation problem they have. Indeed, investors will once more be able to borrow in Yen to invest in  USD instruments, to the benefit of Japanese exports and the detriment of the US current account deficit, which is why I think we are in a finely balanced situation, with clear limits to movements in one direction or another.

# CP’s

## A2: gov pay to do reg’s

#### c. “Off the books” key to certainty and regulatory fairness --- CP’s not sufficient

Mack 9-7 (Mary Bono Mack – Congresswoman, California’s 45th District, 9-7-12, A Minute With Mary - September 7, 2012 <http://bono.house.gov/news/documentsingle.aspx?DocumentID=307728>, jj)

WHAT SHOULD AMERICA DO? If we’re truly serious about creating the kind of positive legislative and regulatory environment needed to create new jobs – as well as to bring jobs back to the United States from abroad – there are some common-sense steps that we should take right now, along with dramatically cutting non-essential federal spending and reducing our nation’s staggering debt.

With unemployment stuck at a stubborn 8.1 percent, it’s time to finally free American innovation and ingenuity – long held hostage by a regulatory regime which is as great a threat to our prosperity as any foreign regime. Today, U.S. businesses are holding tight onto nearly $2 trillion in cash reserves. Let’s give them a reason to invest that money in America’s future. As Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade, I believe there are six things we should do immediately:

First, let’s ensure regulatory fairness. Rules and regulations imposed by Washington cost Americans more than $1.75 trillion each year or about $15,500 per household. After finishing our top-to-bottom review of all regulations – scrubbing every outdated and senseless regulatory requirement off the books – we should place a moratorium on any job-killing regulations and establish a more fair and transparent review process. Moving forward, we should also require Congressional approval for all major rules and regulations imposing significant new costs on the economy. The House has passed legislation to do this, but the Senate is MIA again.

Second, let’s encourage innovation and job growth by completely overhauling our often-times punitive, complex and byzantine Tax Code. Among other things, we should lower the tax rate on U.S. businesses to no more than 25 percent. According to a recent report by the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, the United States ranked sixth among 40 nations in “innovation-based competitiveness.” But we were dead last in progress made over the past decade. Dead last.

Third, we need to make intellectual property protection a top priority. By most estimates, the theft of U.S. intellectual property costs our economy hundreds of billions of dollars a year, but the real damage – both in terms of lost jobs and stalled progress – is impossible to calculate. Most sinister, this is deflating to our nation’s entrepreneurial spirit and psyche. From Hollywood to the Silicon Valley, California has been especially hard hit by this problem. Simply put, our nation’s economy cannot thrive in a world of “no cost” competitors.

Fourth, we need to open more foreign markets to U.S. products by enacting fair trade policies and by developing a comprehensive manufacturing strategy for America. Throughout our nation’s long history, a growing and robust manufacturing sector has helped to make America great. It’s been a driving force in our economy since the Industrial Revolution. But as our nation has moved from the Atomic Age to the Space Age to the Information Age, manufacturing has not kept up, losing nearly 6 million American jobs since the beginning of the 21st century. Aging, rusting and abandoned factories litter the U.S. landscape. Statistics show the manufacturing sector was the hardest hit in terms of job losses during the recession. While manufacturing accounts for just a tenth of our nation’s jobs, manufacturing suffered a third of our nation’s job losses.

We have a chance now to reverse this trend, and I have worked very hard this year to help develop a common sense, bipartisan plan for improving manufacturing in the United States. The American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2012, H.R. 5865, calls for two Presidential reports to Congress, outlining a strategy for promoting growth, sustainability and competitiveness in the manufacturing sector. Next week, I will manage this bill on the House floor, and I expect it to be approved overwhelmingly.

Fifth, we need to dramatically increase energy production here at home. It’s time for an “all-of-the-above” approach to energy that includes more American-produced oil, natural gas, coal and nuclear, along with alternative energy sources such as wind, solar, hydropower and geothermal. This will drive down prices, create new American jobs, reduce our dangerous dependence on foreign oil and strengthen our national security.

#### 4. Doesn’t solve certainty

Fabrizio 12 (Kira R. Fabrizio\* 2012 Fuqua School of Business, The Effect of Regulatory Uncertainty on Investment: Evidence from Renewable Energy Generation, online)

The relationship between firms and political/regulatory actors can be viewed as an implied contract. Like any complex contract, it is necessarily incomplete and does not provide recourse for every possible future contingency. Terms can be altered over time through legislative initiatives and regulatory rulings. The legislature and/or the regulatory body often have unilateral power to change the regulatory contract. These changes may modify what is required of firms or it may change the terms by which firms are compensated. The regulatory contract therefore leaves firms vulnerable to opportunistic behavior by policy makers and/or regulators.

#### CP links to politics and can’t capture the turns—seen as EPA bureaucracy

Stirewalt 12 (Chris, staff writer, 4/26/12, “Obama's EPA Could Be Toxic to His Re-Election Hopes” Fox News) http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/04/26/obama-epa-could-be-toxic-to-his-re-election-hopes/

Sen. James Inhofe, R-Okla., the agency's leading critic in the Senate, got ahold of the video and on Wednesday launched a blistering speech on the Senate floor, quoting from it extensively. Media outlets quickly picked up on the video, which seemed to confirm conservative critics who claim that Obama's environmental enforcement has been capricious, heavy-handed and unfair.

Armendariz acknowledged in a statement having made the speech and apologized to those offended and said he regretted his "poor choice of words" but claimed he has always practiced "fair and vigorous enforcement." An agency spokeswoman also indicated that the EPA was standing behind Armendariz. But congressional hearings and greater press scrutiny on his record can't be far off. If Armendariz thinks he regrets the statement now, just wait a week.

Remember, all energy producers are in some ways out of compliance with EPA regulations. The regulatory process is just that - a process. The agency finds violations of phonebook-thick rules on drilling, mining, pumping, burning, storing and transporting of energy. The energy companies then offer remedies that the agency either accepts or rejects. Disputes often end up in federal administrative law courts.

Sometimes there's a cut and dried case of an energy producer knowingly violating the rules and trying to cover it up, but most of the environmental offenses fall under a back-and-forth between the regulators and the regulated.

Republicans say that the agency under Obama has gone from an agency that seeks to keep companies in compliance with environmental rules to one that is looking to bust companies and take scalps.

# K’s
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***Ignoring large scale violence is just as dumb --- we should focus on both***

Johan **Galtung**, Peace Researcher and Originator of “Positive and Negative Peace,” **1985**, Journal of Peace Research, v. 22, n. 2

**That peace has something to do with ‘absence of violence’ is so widespread as an idea that any concept of peace research would have to accommodate this notion. However, from the very beginning this was seen as too negative.** In a sense the inspiration was taken from medical science where health can be seen as the absence of disease (meaning absence of symptoms of disease), but also as something more positive: as the building of a healthy body capable of resisting diseases, relying on its own health forces or health sources. **Correspondingly a concept of ‘positive peace’ emerged**, build around such ideas as ‘harmony’, ‘cooperation’ and ‘integration5 **The role of peace research was to consider both the negative and positive aspects of peace, both the conditions for absence of violence in general and war in particular, and the conditions for peace building** — perhaps referring to the action needed for negative peace as peace-keeping; peace-making could then be used to cover both (Galtung 1967). Again, **exactly what is put into the twin ideas of negative and positive peace is not so important as the broad agreement that peace studies should cover both, thereby expanding the field of study from prevention and control of war to the study of peaceful relations in general.** In a sense constructive (as opposed to critical) development studies take care of the latter.

***There’s no root cause of war and case turns structural violence***

**Goldstein, ’01** (Joshua S., Professor of International Relations at American University, War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa, pp.411-412)

I began this book hoping to contribute in some way to a deeper understanding of war – an understanding that would improve the chances of someday achieving real peace, by deleting war from our human repertoire. In following the thread of gender running through war, I found the deeper understanding I had hoped for – a multidisciplinary and multilevel engagement with the subject. Yet I became somewhat more pessimistic about how quickly or easily war may end. The war system emerges, from the evidence in this book, as relatively ubiquitous and robust. Efforts to change this system must overcome several dilemmas mentioned in this book. First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, “if you want peace, work for justice.” Then, if one believes that sexism contributes to war, one can work for gender justice specifically (perhaps among others) in order to pursue peace. This approach brings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices cause war. The evidence in this book suggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War is not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although all of these influence wars’ outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueled and sustained these and other injustices. So, “if you want peace, work for peace.” Indeed, if you want justice (gender and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis, from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war. It runs downward too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes towards war and the military may be the most important way to “reverse women’s oppression.” The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice brings to the peace movement energy, allies, and moral grounding, yet, in light of this book’s evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate.

***Nuclear war comes before ‘structural’ violence– the alternative is meaningless***

**Quester 89** International-Security Criticisms of Peace ResearchAuthor(s): George H. QuesterReviewed work(s):Source: Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 504, PeaceStudies: Past and Future (Jul., 1989), pp. 98-105Published George H. Quester is the J.B. and Maurice C. Shapiro Visiting Professor of International Affairs at The George Washington University's Elliott School of International Affairs. He is one of the most distinguished scholars in the field of international security studies, having published a dozen single-authored books and ten edited books and textbooks over the course of his career. He is especially noted for his work on nuclear weapons and arms control. Professor Quester has held appointments at Harvard University, Cornell University, the National War College, the United States Naval Academy, and the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University. Most recently, he was Professor of Government and Politics at the University of Maryland in College Park. Professor Quester's publications include: Deterrence Before Hiroshima (1966, reissued 1986), The Politics of Nuclear Proliferation (1973), The Future of Nuclear Deterrence (1986), Nuclear Monopoly (2000), Offense and Defense in the International System (2003, 3rd ed.), Nuclear First Strike: Consequences of a Broken Taboo (2005), and Preemption, Prevention and Proliferation: the Threat and Use of Weapons In History (2009). He is currently working on a book project, The Last Time We Were at Global-Zero, funded by the Smith Richardson Foundation for 2010-11

**MISSPECIFICATIONS OF PEACE** A third major problem to be raised about some forms of peace research and **peace studies**, again related to what we have already discussed, arises in the tendency to **define peace as** much more than an absence of the organized violence of warfare, to define it indeed as **the elimination** also **of poverty and injustice** and of prejudice and tyranny, and so on-namely, to define peace **simply as a synonym for** what is **good,** for what an economist would call utility. Sometimes **we are thus told that an opposition to violence must include an opposition to "structural violence**,"7 with the latter phrase presumably meaning any organizational or power relationships that violate the moral standards of the beholder, or we are also told that we must be in favor **of "positive peace,"** which will include all of these good things, accomplished somehow simultaneously, **rather than** being content with a **"negative peace**," limited merely to an absence of warfare. Surely there is a great deal that is lost from all of these definitional innovations, but what is there to be gained? If someone assumed, as noted previously, that consciousnesses somehow have to be raised, then it may well seem important. as an educational and motivational vehicle, to insist that peace includes an end to poverty or racism. If one assumes that there can never be an avoidance of war unless one simultaneously has an avoidance of poverty. Such an approach can apparently be traced to Johan Galtung. See his Peace and Social Structure (Copenhagen: Christian Eljiers, 1978). erty or racism or other social evils, then this causal link will also suggest a definitional link. But, if there is indeed no such one-to-one link in causal relationships and if motivation is not the entirety of the problem of war and peace, then **we** surely **will have thrown away** a great deal of **clarity** if we insist on **calling everything bad "war" or "violence" and** if we insist on referring to **everything we favor** as **"peace**." This would be a little **like telling the American Cancer Society that every disease now has to be referred to as "cancer,"** including heart disease and cholera and meningitis. **Can medicine make any progress at all if it is not allowed to use different words for different ailments?** Is it really true that to use different words for war and dictatorship and poverty is to weaken our motivation or to accept the inevitability of some evils or actually to favor the existence of such evils? If one goes far enough in accepting the definitional innovations produced by some peace studies curricula, **it becomes possible then to define violent attacks as peaceful**, as long as they are intended to eliminate racism or injustice, because these attacks are **to oppose "structural violence."** At the worst, – is kind of redefinition is deliberately misleading, as war and violence are defined as being inappropriate for any cause except one's own () **th.** At a less duplicitous level, we simply have some needless confusion brought into the process, by some relatively honest and well-meaning people. THE SEARCH FOR ULTIMATE SOLUTIONS **Advocates** of peace research sometimes **justify** their approach by asserting that they alone are addressing the ultimate or **root causes** of conflict. Unless one eliminates injustice or racism or prejudice or tyranny, they contend, there can never be a real peace or positive peace. This argument runs the risk, however, of becoming a play on words. Real peace can mean that we approve of every step of the causal chain, going back as far as it can be traced, which might indeed be ideal; **but this might hardly be** so **essential for someone caught in the crossfire** of Beirut, someone who is merely pleading and praying that the shooting might stop. **To imply** that a **termination of conventional war and an avoidance of nuclear war** and an abatement of terrorism **are not** somehow **real would be** to **blur our understanding** of a great deal of what most men and women indeed care about. Similarly, **to refer to such an absence of warfare as "negative peace"-**as compared with something more positive in "positive peace"-is to use these words of our English language in a manner that substantially **underrates** the human priority of **eliminating warfare, whatever its causes** and whatever the remedy. Critics of peace studies would thus come back to argue that these **ultimate and genuine reforms** of human arrangements for which peace researchers claim such priority are all well and good, but that these **may not be** capable of being **attained in** anything less than **several centuries.** Rather than eliminating all ideological suspicions between Marxists and non-Marxists or eliminating all ethnic dislikes between Greeks and Turks, would it not be a major accomplishment **in the meantime** to eliminate those kinds of weapons that tend to **make wars between such contending factions more likely,** and to stress instead the defensive types that discourage military forces from launching attacks? Peace researchers then often reply that any such resignation to intermediate and proximate improvements implies a welcoming of permanent conflict or even a relishing of it or at least an assumption that conflict and hostility are in the natural order of things. But **the real issue is** surely much more one of whether **certain kinds of improvements can be made over certain ranges of time**.

## A2: Kato

#### Link of omission --- we still recognize that there was nuclear violence against the periphery – that’s not a reason to drop us

 ***( ) Imagining potential nuclear wars serves as a collective warning against its possibility and opens up space for interrogating national values***

**Seed, Professor of English literature at the University of Liverpool, 2000**

(David, “Imagining the Worst: Science Fiction and Nuclear War,” Journal of American Studies of Turkey,

Vol. 11, pp. 39-49, http://www.bilkent.edu.tr/~jast/Number11/Seed.htm)

A number of recurring features emerge from these narratives. In virtually every case the USA plays a reactive role, never attacking first. Secondly, **the nation’s capacity to cope with such an attack becomes a test of its morale and for that reason the nuclear aftermath**, in the short and long term, **occasions an interrogation of cherished national values.** Thirdly, because nuclear attack can only be mounted with the latest technology, these novels explore anxieties about problems of control. Finally this fiction expresses a collective horror of ultimate endings. Some human presence persists however tenuous or displaced. Cherished human values like reason might be transposed on to extraterrestrial beings; or reader might play out the role of a survivor through the very act of reading a narrative whose deliverer has died. Ultimately there is an unusual circularity to such narratives. **By deploying a whole range of strategies to imagine a dreaded future, they function as warnings against such imminent developments. The more the future fails to develop along these imagined lines, the more necessary is the reconfirmation of these narratives as mere imaginary extrapolations.**

***( ) Imagining future nuclear scenarios enables criticism of nuclear weapons ability to destroy all humankind***

**Foard, Associate Professor of Religion, Arizona State, 1997**

(James, “Imagining Nuclear Weapons: Hiroshima, Armageddon, and the Annihilation of the Students of Ichijo School,” Journal of the American Academy of Religion, http://jaar.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/LXV/1/1.pdf)

This ambivalence about Hiroshima has been partially ameliorated by displacing it with Armageddon in our imagination of nuclear weapons In Amenca the images of the atomic bomb, particularly after the Soviet Union's successful test in 1949 (Boyer.341), were pressed into the service of apocalyptic speculations, both scientific and otherwise, a process which has until recently assigned the horror that Hiroshima represented to a superpower war in an imagined future (cf. Pease'562). Specifically, **images of a nuclear Armageddon have helped us perform two sorts of cultural tasks** fundamental for imagining nuclear weapons: those involving difference and those involving representation. By "difference" I mean **both the articulation of what makes nuclear weapons different from other weapons and the consequent reflection on the different human situation engendered by them.** By "representation" I mean the **expressions which seek to describe the use of nuclear weapons** and incorporate that description into structures of meaning Armageddon **permits us to define the difference of nuclear weapons by their capacity to destroy the human species in a war that no one will win**.

## A2: Baudrillard - death

#### Impossible to embrace their definition of death

**Pyszczynski ‘4** (Tom, Prof. Psych. – U. Colorado, Social Research, “What are we so afraid of? A terror management theory perspective on the politics of fear”, Winter, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m2267/is\_4\_71/ai\_n13807478/)

One thing that has become very clear from our studies of the effects of thinking about death is that the problem of death affects us in very different ways, depending on whether we are consciously thinking of it or whether it is on the fringes of consciousness--what cognitive psychologists would refer to as highly accessible but outside of current focal attention (Pyszczynski, Greenberg, and Solomon, 1999). The clinging to the worldview and pursuit of self-esteem that the studies described earlier document occur when thoughts of death are on the fringes of consciousness--shortly after being reminded of the problem of death and after a distraction; or when death-related words or symbols are presented subliminally, so that people are not aware of them. What is interesting and important to realize about the pursuit of self-esteem and faith in our worldviews is that these defenses bear no logical or semantic relation to the problem of death--what does being a good American have to do with the fact that I am going to die someday? In a logical sense, absolutely nothing, but **we are socialized early in life to use meaning and self-esteem as ways of protecting ourselves from our fears and anxieties**. On the other hand, when people are consciously thinking about death, they cope in very different ways that do have a logical connection to death. These defenses seem to make sense. We either distract ourselves from the problem of death, by switching the topic or turning up the radio as we drive by an accident scene, or try to convince ourselves that death is a problem for the distant future. We remind ourselves that our grandmother lived to be 99, that we do not smoke, or we promise to get more exercise, start taking that medicine our doctor has been pushing, or get on the latest fad diet. The point here is that because it is highly accessible but unconscious thoughts of death that promote clinging to our worldviews or self-esteem, it is difficult if not impossible to observe this in ourselves. But **the empirical evidence is really very clear now**. So let us turn to a consideration of how this core human fear of death affects us in ways that politicians and other leaders can manipulate. DEATH AND NATIONALISM One of our earliest and most widely replicated findings is that reminders of death increase nationalism and other forms of group identification, making people more accepting of those who are similar to themselves and more hostile toward those who are different. For example, in a very early study we found that reminding people of death led them to react more positively toward a person who praised America and more negatively toward a person who criticized America (Greenberg et al., 1990). Similar patterns have been found all over the world. When subtly reminded of death, Germans sit closer to fellow Germans and farther away from Turks (Ochsman and Mathay, 1994) and, more recently, show an increased preference for the deutsche mark over the euro (Jonas and Greenberg, in press); Dutch citizens exaggerate how badly the Dutch national soccer team will beat the rival German team (Dechesne et al., 2000); Israelis are more accepting of fellow Israelis and rejecting of Russian Jews who have immigrated to Israel (Florian and Mikulincer, 1998); Italians view Italian identity as more "real," reflecting bigger differences between Italians and people from other countries (Castano et al., 2002); and Scots are more discriminating in judging pictures as either Scottish or English, viewing fewer faces of Englishmen as Scottish (Castano, Yzerbet, and Palladino, 2004). These findings all come from highly controlled laboratory experiments.

## Heidegger 2ac

***And, no prior questions --- elevating ontological and philosophical concerns fails and trades off with pragmatic policy solutions***

**Jenkins ‘11**

Willis Jenkins, Margaret A. Farley Assistant Professor of Social Ethics, Professor Jenkins teaches environmental ethics, global ethics, and Christian social thought. He is author of Ecologies of Grace: Environmental Ethics and Christian Theology, which won a 2009 Templeton Award for Theological Promise, and Sustainability, Social Justice, and Christian Ethics (Georgetown, in press). He is editor of The Spirit of Sustainability (2009) and coeditor of Bonhoeffer and King: Their Legacies and Import for Christian Social Thought (2010). He has written recent journal articles on ethics in the environmental sciences, on homelessness and urban theory, and on the field of religion and ecology.

Ethics & the Environment, ENVIRONMENTAL PRAGMATISM, ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT, AND CULTURAL REFORM, Volume 16, Number 1, Spring 2011, pp.

51-74 (Article) PROJECT MUSE, jj

Pragmatism: Making Ethics Practical

**Pragmatists** often **introduce their strategy of practical reason with an opening complaint that cosmological strategies of environmental ethics have not proven their practical worth**. **That complaint about effectiveness introduces a pragmatic proposal for less metaphysical debate and more attention to creating broad agreement on policy responses to practical problems**. The editors of the anthology Environmental Pragmatism thus set the scene: On the one hand, the discipline…has produced a wide variety of positions and theories in an attempt to derive morally justifiable and adequate environmental policies. On the other hand, **it is difficult to see what practical effect the field of environmental ethics has had on the formation of environmental policy**. (Light and Katz 1995, 1) Ben Minteer and Robert Manning blame the field’s ineffectiveness on its cosmological innovations: “**urgent calls for new environmental worldviews and radically revised ontological schemes, rather than leading to improved environmental solutions and conditions, only lead ethicists’ attention away from the resources already present within our shared moral and political traditions**.” In consequence, **the field exhibits a “conspicuous silence regarding concrete solutions to real world environmental dilemmas**” (2003, 319). Minteer and Manning follow the problem-solving approach opened by Bryan Norton, who contrasts his authentically “practical philosophy” with “**axiological” value theories** that, in his view, **have narrowed topics of discussion, reduced possibilities for interdisciplinary collaboration, and led to a communicative breakdown between science and society** (2003, 47–63). For Norton, **sustainability depends on an integrative, adaptive ethos developed from science-based responses to specific problems** (2005). **Pragmatists thus present their ethic of contextual problem-solving by pressing the dilemma between radical cosmological change and practical political engagement.** **Pragmatists expect environmental ethics to be practical in two ways: (1) by working with available moral resources, (2) for the sake of resolving specific policy problems.** **With both elements working together, they say, ethics can help achieve effective social response to environmental problems**. Andrew **Light thus asks ethicists to attend to cultural contexts by trying to “work within traditional moral psychologies and ethical theories that people already have” in order to create links between existing moral priorities in specific communities and the ends of environmental concern** (2003, 235). **Practical ethics requires, he says, a “practical anthropology,” attentive to the environmental interests and commitments that people hold, with a view toward “generating creative ways to persuade a variety of people” to adopt environmental solutions** (2003, 241).

***2. Perm – do both - Action and reflection on consequences of that action are compatible.***

**Padrutt, 92** – Psychiatrist and President of the Daseinsanalyse Gesellschaft – 1992 (Hanspeter Padrutt, *Heidegger and the Earth*, “Heidegger and Ecology,” ed. LaDelle McWhorter, P.31)

Once in a while the conceptual interplay of theory and praxis is put against this attempt. From the philosophical point of view the so-called practical or political dimension of the attempt is rejected, whereas from the ecological point of view the so-called theoretical, philosophical dimension is rejected. But deeper reflection and decisive action do not need to contradict each other. Those who shield themselves from the political consequences might one day be confronted by the fact that no decision is still a decision that can have consequences. And those who believe that they need not bother about thinking fail to recognize that no philosophy is also a philosophy – e.g., a cybernetic worldview – that also has consequences.

***3. Prefer the aff’s incrementalism to the alt’s inaction --- refusal to embrace bridge fuels like the aff guarantees environmental collapse***

Charles K. **Ebinger**, Director, Energy Security Initiative Govinda Avasarala, Research Assistant, Foreign Policy, Energy Security Initiative The Brookings Institution 4-22-**10**, Environmental Pragmatism <http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/0422_environmental_pragmatism_ebinger.aspx>, jj

Finally, **people need to embrace pragmatism**. **Though it is not ideal and rarely a sexy declaration, pragmatism and incrementalism are** the **obligatory** taxes of multilateral agreements (mind you, they are less obtrusive with fewer parties). **There are many tools at our disposal that can put the stalled climate change efforts into first gear**. First, **we must embrace bridge technologies, such as natural gas, nuclear energy, and state of the art cleaner coal**. **With total global renewable energy capacity falling catastrophically short of global energy demand, ‘bridge’ technologies can ease the environmental strain while we wait for renewable capacity to reach requisite levels**. In addition, investments in upgrading many nations’ electricity grids will make a remarkable difference in the environmental impact of power generation. **The need for action to reduce climate change is very real, particularly as many emerging economies and failed and near-failed states are most at risk and can potentially spur widespread global unrest**. **Clinging to an inefficient, incapable system will only exacerbate the crisis of inaction at a time where the world can ill-afford it. By focusing on smaller negotiations** with actual large emitters, garnering a better understanding of the real economics behind climate change, **and embracing smaller steps in ‘bridge’ technologies, we can do a far more effective job of getting the ball rolling.**

***4. Extinction turns the alternative***

**Reilly 8**—26 year career in politics during which he founded the nation’s largest political consulting firm of its time. Reilly managed winning campaigns for a wide variety of high-profile candidates, including current Pelosi(Clint, “From Heidegger to the Environment: Californians Are in the World,” 19 August 2008, http://www.californiaprogressreport.com/2008/08/from\_heidegger.html,)

Even in today’s age of cutting-edge science and technology, it is important to remember that history can still be shaped by big ideas. In the 18th century, a philosophy of knowledge emboldened the Founding Fathers to build our democracy – a system of government based on the meritocracy of ideas, rights of the individual and a free press. Capitalism itself is rooted in an innate belief in the power of individual initiative rather than the supremacy of group action – which inspired Marxism and Communism. Philosophy can be mind numbingly boring. But it can help us more clearly see the path to a better world. The mid-20th century German philosopher Martin Heidegger had a favorite term, “Dasein,” which cannot be translated precisely into a single English word. The rough meaning is “being-in-the-world,” Heidegger’s description of human existence. Heidegger’s most important point was that it is impossible to separate a person from the earth. Without the “world,” a human being could not know, grow or even live. A person is like a tree planted in the earth; without the earth, the tree could not exist. But there is a second implication to Heidegger’s “being-in-the-world” bumper sticker. To be in the world is also to be “in common with other beings.” Whether we like it or not, we live in a natural state of dependence upon one another. Put another way, it is impossible to accurately define existence without affirming our dependence not only upon the earth, but also upon our fellow human beings. Was the German philosopher, who lived through World War II without standing up to Nazism’s atrocities, a closet environmentalist and a globalist before his time? Why is this somewhat obvious definition of human existence important to our world today? Many theories of human progress are rooted in a moral imperative. The Christian practice of charity is premised on the religious conviction that we are all God’s children and equal members of the human family. Therefore we are obligated to donate, assist and help others in need. Christians are also challenged to respect nature as God’s creation. This implies that charity and environmentalism are a sacrifice rather than a reflection of our collective self-interest. The truth is exactly the opposite. Protecting the earth and uniting the planet is the only logical political agenda of Dasein. In Jeffrey Sachs’ 2008 book “Common Wealth,” he argues that “the defining challenge of the 21st century will be to face the reality that humanity shares a common fate on a crowded planet.” Sachs, director of Columbia University’s Earth Institute, cites four imperatives for world leaders to address: 1) Pressure on the earth’s ecosystems will produce climate change and species extinction. 2) Population growth will tax the earth. 3) The unequal distribution of wealth across the world is untenable. 4) Failed institutions impair vital global cooperation and problem solving. Last week, Russia invaded Georgia, sparking fears of a reconstituted cold war. The assault belied the presumption that the world was moving beyond nationalism. Fundamental conflicts between Islamic and Western cultures still dominate global politics. Despite a growing consensus on the need for international efforts to curb emissions and develop clean energy, the earth still reels from pollution. Poverty and sickness in sub-Saharan Africa contradict the image of a world that has conquered disease and hunger. And thousands of nuclear bombs still have the unthinkable power to destroy the earth and the entire human race. Those who thought that war and hunger would be easily conquered by science are slowly realizing that our toughest challenges are ahead. Perhaps we need to be reminded of Heidegger’s truth: **No “world,” no “being,”** no “we,” no “I.”

*6. Can’t solve calc thought --- too entrenched*

**Riis 11**—Carlsberg Research Fellow and Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Science Studies at Roskilde University, Ph.D. from Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg (Søren, 8 February 2011, “Towards the origin of modern technology: reconfiguring Martin Heidegger’s thinking,”)

Moreover, Heidegger maintains: ‘‘Readiness-to-hand is the way in which entities as they are ‘in themselves’ are defined ontologico-categorially.’’47 According to Heidegger’s fundamental phenomenology, which he unfolds in detail in Being and Time and reaffirms a decisive part of in ‘‘The Question Concerning Technology,’’ nature is ‘‘primally’’ revealed in its ‘‘usability’’ and ‘‘serviceability-for-;’’ that is to say, ‘‘nature’’ is a resource long before the actual rise of modern and ancient technology, namely ***simultaneously with the very origin of human beings***. That something is primordially revealed in its ‘‘usability’’ and ‘‘serviceability-for-’’ does not imply that it is actually used or serves accordingly, but that it is revealed as standing ready to be utilized in the corresponding context. As such, it is revealed as ‘‘standing-reserve.’’ This, for example, also corresponds to the empirical fact that prehistoric humans settled close to woods and rivers. In these areas they always had stockpiles of timber, power for transportation, and easy access to drinking water. Based on ‘‘The Question Concerning Technology’’ and completed through references to Being and Time, we now have an interpretation of the origin of the essence of modern technology, which traces back the characteristic revealing of das Gestell to the beginning of humankind.48 This does not imply that prehistoric technology is identical with contemporary technology; rather the third genealogy of the rule of das Gestell suggests that when ‘‘we still more primally’’ try to consider the origin of the challenging revealing characterizing the rule of das Gestell, we in fact rediscover that it is ***connected to being human***. The rule of das Gestell has challenged humans as long as they have existed. In this sense, humans first and foremost exist under the rule of das Gestell.49 This also entails a revision and precision of Heidegger’s renowned formula characterizing the world-connectedness of human existence: being-in-the-world. Based on the comparison of ‘‘The Question Concerning Technology’’ and Being and Time, human existence is better described as being-under-the-spell-of-das-Gestell.

***7. Abandoning management causes extinction***

**Soulé 95** – Natural Resources Professor, California (Michael and Gary Lease, Reinventing Nature?, p 159-60, AG)

The decision has already been made in most places. Some of the ecological myths discussed here contain, either explicitly or implicitly, the idea that nature is self-regulating and capable of caring for itself. This notion leads to the theory of management known as benign neglect—nature will do fine, thank you, if human beings just leave it alone. Indeed, a century ago, a hands-off policy was the best policy. Now it is not. Given nature's current fragmented and stressed condition, neglect will result in an accelerating spiral of deterioration. Once people create large gaps in forests, isolate and disturb habitats, pollute, overexploit, and introduce species from other continents, the viability of many ecosystems and native species is compromised, resiliency dissipates, and diversity can collapse. When artificial disturbance reaches a certain threshold, even small changes can produce large effects, and these will be compounded by climate change.' For example, a storm that would be considered normal and beneficial may, following widespread clearcutting, cause disastrous blow-downs, landslides, and erosion. If global warming occurs, tropical storms are predicted to have greater force than now. Homeostasis, balance, and Gaia are dangerous models when applied at the wrong spatial and temporal scales. Even fifty years ago, neglect might have been the best medicine, but that was a world with a lot more big, unhumanized, connected spaces, a world with one-third the number of people, and a world largely unaffected by chain saws, bulldozers, pesticides, and exotic, weedy species. The alternative to neglect is active caring—in today's parlance, an affirmative approach to wildlands: to maintain and restore them, to become stewards, accepting all the domineering baggage that word carries. Until humans are able to control their numbers and their technologies, **management is the only viable alternative** to massive attrition of living nature.

***8. Turn - Waiting for a new ontology is a strategy that dooms us to nuclear omnicide and makes all the aff and neg impacts inevitable.***

**Santoni ‘85** (Ronald E., Philosophy Professor @ Denison, Nuclear War, ed. Fox and Groarke, p. 156-7)

To be sure, Fox sees the need for our undergoing “certain fundamental changes” in our “thinking, beliefs, attitudes, values” and Zimmerman calls for a “paradigm shift” in our thinking about ourselves, other, and the Earth. But it is not clear that what either offers as suggestions for what we can, must, or should do in the face of a runaway arms race are sufficient to “wind down” the arms race before it leads to omnicide. In spite of the importance of Fox’s analysis and reminders it is not clear that “admitting our (nuclear) fear and anxiety” to ourselves and “identifying the mechanisms that dull or mask our emotional and other responses” represent much more than examples of basic, often-stated principles of psychotherapy. Being aware of the psychological maneuvers that keep us numb to nuclear reality may well be the road to transcending them but it must only be a “first step” (as Fox acknowledges), during which we Simultaneously act to eliminate nuclear threats, break our complicity with the arms race, get rid of arsenals of genocidal weaponry, and create conditions for international goodwill, mutual trust, and creative interdependence. Similarly, in respect to Zimmerman: in spite of the challenging Heideggerian insights he brings out regarding what motivates the arms race, many questions may be raised about his prescribed “solutions.” Given our need for a paradigm shift in our (distorted) understanding of ourselves and the rest of being, are we merely left “to prepare for a possible shift in our self-understanding? (italics mine)? Is this all we can do? Is it necessarily the case that such a shift “cannot come as a result of our own will?” – and work – but only from “a destiny outside our control?” Does this mean we leave to God the matter of bringing about a paradigm shift? Granted our fears and the importance of not being controlled by fears, as well as our “anthropocentric leanings,” should we be as cautious as Zimmerman suggests about out disposition “to want to do something” or “to act decisively in the face of the current threat?” In spite of the importance of our taking on the anxiety of our finitude and our present limitation, does it follow that “we should be willing for the worst (i.e. an all-out nuclear war) to occur”? Zimmerman wrongly, I contend, equates “resistance” with “denial” when he says that “as long as we resist and deny the possibility of nuclear war, that possibility will persist and grow stronger.” He also wrongly perceives “resistance” as presupposing a clinging to the “order of things that now prevails.” Resistance connotes opposing, and striving to defeat a prevailing state of affairs that would allow or encourage the “worst to occur.” I submit, against Zimmerman, that we should not, in any sense, be willing for nuclear war or omnicide to occur. (This is not to suggest that we should be numb to the possibility of its occurrence.) Despite Zimmerman’s elaborations and refinements his Heideggerian notion of “letting beings be” continues to be too permissive in this regard. In my judgment, an individual’s decision not to act against and resist his or her government’s preparations for nuclear holocaust is, as I have argued elsewhere, to be an early accomplice to the most horrendous crime against life imaginable – its annihilation. The Nuremburg tradition calls not only for a new way of thinking, a “new internationalism” in which we all become co-nurturers of the whole planet, but for resolute actions that will sever our complicity with nuclear criminality and the genocidal arms race, and work to achieve a future which we can no longer assume. We must not only “come face to face with the unthinkable in image and thought” (Fox) but must act now - with a “new consciousness” and conscience - to prevent the unthinkable, by cleansing the earth of nuclear weaponry. Only when that is achieved will ultimate violence be removed as the final arbiter of our planet’s fate.

#### There is no root cause to environmental destruction – assuming so prevents effective solutions to specific issues

**Garrard 4** (Greg, PhD in Humanities and Cultural Industries @ Liverpool U, “Ecocriticism”, pp.

176-178, Questia) JPG

Much **ecocriticism has taken for granted that its task is to overcome anthropocentrism**, just as feminism seeks to overcome androcentrism. The metaphysical argument for biocentrism is meant to sustain moral claims about the intrinsic value of the natural world, which will in turn affect our attitudes and behaviour towards nature. **Wilderness experiences, or apocalyptic threats, or Native American ways of life, are supposed to provide the impetus** or the example by which individuals come **to an authentic selfhood orientated toward right environmental action. Whilst the importance of changing** the **minds** and lives of individuals **is undeniable, this book has aimed to show the political dimension that this moralistic emphasis may occlude.** However, the politicisation of ecocriticism does pose its own problems. Dwelling on the troubling example of Heidegger (Chapter 6), who espoused both Nazism and a kind of deep ecology, Jonathan Bate asserts in The Song of the Earth that 'The dilemma of Green reading is that it must, yet it cannot, separate ecopoetics from ecopolitics' (2000:266). Environmentalism is compatible with most political positions, and while we have seen possible dangers inherent in this, it might also give us a clear argument for better, not less, political attunement in ecocriticism. Bate rightly points out that poets are not the engineers of the world, and that literature cannot provide specific solutions, which means that ecocriticism must continue to adopt and adapt theories from feminist and Marxist traditions, enabling positive engagement in cultural politics. I would argue that the promise of ecofeminist literary and cultural theory has yet to be realised. With important exceptions such as Haraway, Armbruster, Westling and Murphy, such criticism has been held back by the overstated anti-rationalism and gynocentric dualism of radical ecofeminism. The work of Australian philosopher Val Plumwood offers ecofeminism a sound basis for a much-needed critique of the dynamics of domination as they operate in a range of cultural contexts. **A monolithically conceived root cause of environmental destruction**, be it labelled anthropocentrism or androcentrism **is bound to misrepresent the complexity of causation in the real world**. **Ecofeminism**, modified by dialogue with social ecological positions**, can provide insight into the cultural operations of environmental injustice**. In this way, the fusion of environmental and social development agendas that has occurred so strikingly within and between global NGOs might come to ecocriticism; Beyond Nature Writing (2001), edited by Karla Armbruster and Kathleen Wallace, includes several essays in this emergent field of enquiry. Ecocritics therefore continue to experiment with hybridised reading practices, drawing on various philosophical and literary theoretical sources. Bennett and Teague's The Nature of Cities (1999) reveals a new emphasis on bringing cultural theorists such as Cronon, Ross, Luke and Haraway into dialogue with literary ecocritics, thereby consolidating the field around a critical encounter between genres, perspectives and politics. The work of Richard Kerridge is exemplary in this respect: he writes with as much insight about postmodern risk as he does about Thomas Hardy. Harrison's eclectic Forests (1993), which ranges from Grimm fairy tales to the architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright, fosters the making of connections between disparate cultural phenomena without eliminating their peculiarities. Bate and Buell first published books that identified a single 'environmental tradition' in Britain and the USA, stemming from Wordsworth and Thoreau respectively. In later works, however, they favour an explicitly dialectical approach. In The Song of the Earth, Wordsworth's piety is leavened with Byron's wit, and Heidegger's portentousness gets a learned sneer from Theodor Adorno. For Buell, Writing for an Endangered World involves juxtaposing urbanites like Theodor Dreiser and Gwendolyn Brooks with the more obvious candidates for ecocritical treatment, Jeffers and Berry. Drawing upon such diverse resources of hope enables ecocriticism to connect with the urban and suburban places in which most of us will continue to live, and will add depth to the ecological critique of modernity; **material and economic progress is no more the root of all evils than it is an unalloyed benefit to people or the natural world**. By such means **the risk of fostering reactionary politics might be minimized.**

***9. Their K is complicit in Heidegger’s Nazism---impact is extinction***

**Faye 09** (Emmanuel, associate professor at the University Paris – Ouest-Nanterre La Defense and an authority on Descartes, Translated by Michael B. Smith, professor emeritus of French and philosophy at Berry College, “HEIDEGGER: The Introduction of Nazism into Philosophy”, pg xxiii-xxv, jj)

**We have not yet grasped the full significance of the propagation of Nazism and Hitlerism in the domain of thought and ideas**---that mounting tidal wave that sweeps up minds, dominates them, possesses them, and eventually overcomes all resistance. **Against it, the military victory was but the winning of a first battle**---a vital one, to be sure, and a costly one for humanity, since it took a world war. **Today a different battle, more protracted and sinister, is unfolding: a contest in which the future of the human race is at stake**. It calls for a heightened awareness in all areas of thought, from philosophy to law and history. Whether we are considering the case of Heidegger, Schmitt, Junger (in many respects), or Nolte, these main propagators of Nazism in the life of letters have taken the time to refine their strategy of reconquest after the defeat of the armies of Hitler’s Reich**. By an interplay of the obfuscation of real causes, the dilution of responsibilities in a globalization of approaches, the disqualification of humanistic thought and universal values, the mythologizing of self in the figure of the “shepard of being**,” the “Christian Epimetheus,” the “anarch,” the theoretician of the “historical right,” **these authors have scripted the roles of philosophy, law, letters, and history, enlisting them in the service of** the “revision” and ultimately of the rehabilitation of foundations of **Nazism**. **Some have progressively conquered a planetary audience with a public that most often does not realize what is at stake, in the long run, in this conquest of minds**. It is true that the front lines of the invasion are not found on any map. There is no geopolitics of the mind, although **the increasing number of apologetic or too complacent works in an indication of the magnitude of its propagation**. Nevertheless, centers of criticism and resistance have sprung up progressively in many countries. For **Heidegger**, the subject of this work, very incisive criticisms have been raised, both in Europe and on the American continent, since Karl Lowith perceived and reported as early as 1947 that he **was “more radical than Mr. Kriech and Mr. Rosenberg,” two pillars of the Nazi regime, but who, being less adroit and more trivial, did not see their reputations survive the defeat of the Third Reich.** Furthermore, **new documents and deeper research allow us today to see to what extent Heidegger devoted himself to putting philosophy at the service of legitimizing and diffusing the very bases of Nazism and Hitlerism**. That is why I want to make available to the public some of the most significant moments of the seminars taught between 1933 and 1935, taken from the archives of Heidegger’s unpublished manuscripts. A few of **these texts**, known to only a handful of researchers, **are** in fact **political education courses at the service of Hitler’s state and go so far as to** identify the ontological difference between being and individual entities with the political relationship between the state and the people, while other texts **explicitly explore the means of perpetuating the “spirit” of Nazism**. In making these excerpts public, my intention has been simply to exercise the right to historical and philosophical truth. **I have** also **based my work on the speeches, lectures, and courses over these same years that have recently appeared in Germany and can be consulted only by readers of German. These texts,** published in volumes 16, 36/37, and 38 of the so-called complete works, **are every bit as racist and virulently National Socialist as those of the official “philosophers” of Nazism,** such as Alfred Baeumler or Hans Heyse. **They surpass the others by the virulence of their Hitlerism, which no other “philosopher” of the regime has equaled. Despite that, these Hitlerian and Nazi Texts of Heidegger are to be found on the philosophy shelves of public libraries. The seriousness of that situation calls for a new and heightened awareness.** Without ever dissociating philosophical reflection from indispensable historical investigation, I have tried to bring together the establishment and analysis of historical and textual sources, as the historians Hugo Ott and Bernd Martin (as well as Guido Schneeberger and Victor Farias), with the philosophical critique, which has been developed by a series of authors as varied as Ernst Cassirer, Benedetto Croce, Karl Lowith, Theodor Adorno, Gunther Anders, Hans Blumenberg, Jurgen Habermas, Ernst Tugendhat, Eric Weil, Rainer Marten, Nicolas Tertulian, Jeffrey Barash, Domenico Losurdo, Arno Munster, Richard Wolin, Tom Rockmore, Thomas Sheehan, Herman Philipse, Hassan Givsan, Reinhard Linde, and Julio Quesada, to mention but a few of the most important names. But this book proposes a new understanding of what Heidegger brought about. With the help of texts little known outside the German-speaking world, some not even published, and taking into account those individuals with whom he chose to surround himself---the “philosopher” Erich Rothacker, the historian Rudolf Stadelmann, and the legal scholar Erik Wolf---I intend to prove that **the question of the relationship between Heidegger and National Socialism is not that of the personal commitment of a man temporarily gone astray and a philosophical work that remains almost unaffected, but rather that of the deliberate introduction of the foundations of Nazism and Hitlerism into philosophy** and its teaching. In showing this, it is not my desire to add to Heidegger’s renown by making it even more diabolical. I do not subscribe to the theory of a Heidegger “thinker” of Nazism, because rather than enlightening us, he has done nothing but blend the characteristic opacity of his teaching with the darkness of the phenomenon. **Far from furthering the progress of thought, Heidegger has helped to conceal the deeply destructive nature of the Hitlerian undertaking** by exalting its “grandeur.” **Far from enriching philosophy, he has worked to destroy it, by making it subservient to a movement that, by the murderous discrimination underlying it and the project of collective annihilation to which it leads, constitutes the radical negation of all humanity and all thought.** After the paroxysm of the Nazi and Hitlerian period, long elaborated in Heidegger’s writings even before 1933, and after the toxic spite often characterizing his courses taught in 1933-1934, **the diffusion of Heidegger’s works after the war slowly descends like ashes after an explosion---a gray cloud slowly suffocating and extinguishing minds**. Soon **the** 102 **volumes** of the so-called complete work (sixty-six volumes have appeared to date), in which the same assertions are repeated over and over through thousands of pages, will encumber by their sheer bulk the shelves reserved for twentieth century philosophy and **continue to spread the fundamental tenets of Nazism on a world-wide scale**.

***Ontology not first --- must stop in the face of mass death***

**Davidson ’89**(Arnold I. coeditor of Critical Inquiry, Assoc Prof of Philosophy, U of Chicago, Critical Inquiry, Winter . p.426)

I understand Levinas’ work to suggest another path to the recovery of the human, one that leads through or toward other human beings: “The dimension of the divine opens forth from the human face… Hence metaphysics is enacted where the social relation is enacted- in our relations with men… The Other is not the incarnation of God, but precisely by his face, in which he is disincarnate, is the manifestation of the height in which God is revealed. It is our relations with men… that give to theological concepts the sole signification they admit of.” Levinas places ethics before ontology by beginning with our experience of the human face: and, in a clear reference to Heidegger’s idolatry of the village life of peasants, he associated himself with Socrates, who preferred the city where he encountered men to the country with its trees. In his discussion of skepticism and the problem of others, Cavell also aligns himself with this path of thought, with the recovery of the finite human self through the acknowledgement of others: “As long as God exists, I am not alone. And couldn’t the other suffer the fate of God?… I wish to understand how the other now bears the weight of God, shows me that I am not alone in the universe. This requires understanding the philosophical problem of the other as the trace or scar of the departure of God [CR, p.470].” The suppression of the other, the human, in Heidegger’s thought accounts, I believe, for the absence, in his writing after the war, of the experience of horror. Horror is always directed toward the human; every object of horror bears the imprint of the human will. So Levinas can see in Heidegger’s silence about the gas chambers and death camps “a kind of consent to the horror.” And Cavell can characterize Nazis as “those who have lost the capacity for being horrified by what they do.” Where was Heidegger’s horror? How could he have failed to know what he had consented to? Hannah Arendt associates Heidegger with Paul Valery’s aphorism, “Les evenements ne sont que l’ecume des choses’ (‘Events are but the foam of things’).” I think one understands the source of her intuition. The mass extermination of human beings, however, does not produce foam, but dust and ashes; and it is here that questioning must stop.

***Earth is so over-run with human control that relinquishing management now wouldn’t solve – it would be impossible for nature to take its course – only pragmatism solves***

**Katz ’99** (Eric, Science, Technology, and Society Program, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Winter, Environmental Ethics, Vol 21, “A Pragmatic Reconsideration of Anthropocentrism,” jj)

What about the nonanthropocentric argument regarding beach replenishment? A nonanthropocentric argument, by definition, will not consider as primary the benefits that humans will obtain from a particular policy—so many of the reasons just listed cannot be considered. **From a perspective of nonanthropocentric ecological holism, we should let natural processes take their course for the good of the overall ecological community**. **If the beach erodes, the erosion is part of the normal natural dynamics of the shoreline ecosystem. Indeed, most of the sand is not lost to the system; it simply shifts its location**, for undeveloped and unprotected barrier islands have a tendency to move landward over the course of time. Sand moves from the ocean side of the island to the bay side. The movement and displacement of sand would result in the loss of houses, especially along the immediate ocean waterfront, but this loss would not be a negative impact for the natural ecosystem. In addition, letting the natural erosion process continue without interference might lead to the possible reemergence or resurgence of those species that have been harmed by human housing development along the shore—such as the piping plover and the least and roseate terns. Thus, **a nonanthropocentric perspective would lead to a policy in which the shoreline would continue to erode as sands naturally shift.** The beach would be “restored” in a sense to a more natural state. On first examination, thus, there is a clear pragmatic difference between anthropocentrism and nonanthropocentrism. One position favors a policy of beach replenishment and the other does not. However, **there is a major complication to this analysis** that I want to consider. **The idea that we can let nature take its course in this case is problematic.** On my view, **the beaches** of Fire Island **are now an artifactual system, considerably modified by human development**—particularly bulkheading and jetties. Except for the wilderness areas, almost the entire north side of Fire Island is bulkheaded, with docks and artificially dredged harbors and boat slips. Thus, **the natural movement of sand by water currents has been disrupted** for about a hundred years, and indeed part of the erosion problem is caused by the fact that the sand, when it migrates to the bay side of the island, has no place to land—the bulkheading acts like a seawall and prevents the accumulation of sand dropped by the smaller estuarine waves of the Great South Bay. Sand migrating over the island by wind, waves, and tidal surges is also prevented from a natural buildup by the humanmade physical structures and human activity. (One of the common early spring chores is to sweep the winter’s accumulation of sand off the main sidewalks. But the sand’s movement to the north is relentless—the sidewalks have to be swept weekly during the summer months.) **Given the current state of development on the island it would be impossible to let nature take its course**; the island no longer has a natural configuration. (Of course, there would be one radical way to solve this problem: the park service could condemn all the private homes on the island, destroy them, and rip out all human-made physical structures. The economic cost of this plan would be astronomical, both in outof- pocket expenses and in the lost revenue from tourism and real-estate taxes.) Thus, if the beach is an artifactual system, the question to be asked changes: What is the pragmatic difference between anthropocentrism and nonanthropocentrism regarding the policy of beach replenishment for a nonnatural artifactual beach system? **The anthropocentric argument appears essentially to be the same as before. We still want to promote human interests by saving and preserving the beach— only now we recognize that it is not a natural beach, but an artifactual one**. We are still going to preserve the island for human benefits and human interests. We still want to protect the private homes and provide a recreational beach. We can even argue that the artifactual beach system is necessary to protect the relatively undisturbed wilderness area that lies on the landward side of the dunes. The anthropocentric argument thus does not change. However, **the nonanthropocentric ecological holistic argument is now largely irrelevant, for we are only dealing with an artifactual system**, or at best a hybrid of natural and artifactual. **Such a system is essentially human-based, so that human interests and concerns dominate any evaluation**. I have previously analyzed the difference between artifacts and natural entities—and I will not repeat arguments I have made in some detail in other places.23 I have argued that it is the presence of human intentionality in a natural system that irrevocably modifies nature and establishes an artifactual system. The introduction of human purpose is the key to understanding the difference between artifactual and natural systems. The reason why we create artifacts, why we interfere in natural processes, is to further human goals and interests. We tend to evaluate the worth of our artifacts and human-made systems by their success in achieving our human-centered aims. Thus, we will value the Fire Island system to the extent that it meets our aims and goals. **We cannot return** Fire Island **to a “natural” state**. **Thus, we cannot use what is beneficial to the overall ecological community as the sole guide to environmental decision-making. We must consider the satisfaction of human interests in the evaluation of** environmental **policies** on Fire Island. As an artifactual system—or as a hybrid of the natural and the artifactual—Fire Island must be evaluated from a perspective that includes anthropocentrism. Thus, Fire Island will have to be managed— perhaps preserved in terms of long-range sustainability—so that it best achieves the human goals that have been incorporated into its development. In this case, pragmatism as a methodology—as a means of testing theoretical ideas for their “cash-value” in terms of practical consequences—teaches us that a **simplistic reliance on theoretical concepts such as anthropocentrism and nonanthropocentrism will fail to address adequately the complexities of the policy situation.** Pragmatism endorses a vision beyond the facile dualisms of nonanthropocentrism and anthropocentrism, natural and artifactual. Without resorting to the substantive content of pragmatism as a moral philosophy, **we can see the need for flexibility, compromise, and a pluralism of values in the analysis of concrete environmental policy decisions. When dealing with a hybrid system of humanity and nature, we need to use all of the relevant theoretical concepts, crossing and recrossing the boundaries that separate anthropocentrism and nonanthropocentrism**. Pragmatism cannot, in the end, tell us how to effect the compromise; it cannot tell us what specific policies we should adopt in all situations. **Pragmatism** simply **reminds us to be open to a wide range of possibly relevant and meaningful values in the formation and justification of policy.**

#### No impact to standing reserve – the state won’t eliminate impure populations

**Dickinson 4** (UC Berkeley – History, Edward Ross, “Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy: Some Reflections on Our Discourse About “Modernity,” Central European History, vol. 37, no. 1, 1–48)

In short, the continuities between early twentieth-century biopolitical discourse and the practices of the welfare state in our own time are unmistakable. Both are instances of the “disciplinary society” and of biopolitical, regulatory, social-engineering modernity, and they share that genealogy with more authoritarian states, including the National Socialist state, but also fascist Italy, for example. And it is certainly fruitful to view them from this very broad perspective. But **that analysis can easily become superficial and misleading**, because **it obfuscates the profoundly different** strategic and local **dynamics of power in the** two kinds of **regimes. Clearly the democratic welfare state is not only formally but also substantively quite different from totalitarianism**. Above all, again, **it has nowhere developed the fateful, radicalizing dynamic that characterized National Socialism** (or for that matter Stalinism), **the psychotic logic that leads from economistic population management to mass murder**. Again, there is always the potential for such a discursive regime to generate coercive policies. In those cases in which the regime of rights does not successfully produce “health,” such a system can —and historically does— create compulsory programs to enforce it. But again, there are political and policy potentials and constraints in such a structuring of biopolitics that are very different from those of National Socialist Germany. **Democratic biopolitical regimes require, enable, and incite a degree of self-direction and participation that is functionally incompatible with authoritarian** or totalitarian **structures.** And **this pursuit of biopolitical ends through** a regime of **democratic citizenship does appear**, historically, **to have imposed** increasingly **narrow limits on coercive policies, and to** have **generate**d **a “logic”** or imperative **of increasing liberalization**. Despite limitations imposed by political context and the slow pace of discursive change, I think this is the unmistakable message of the really very impressive waves of legislative and welfare reforms in the 1920s or the 1970s in Germany.90 Of course it is not yet clear whether this is an irreversible dynamic of such systems. Nevertheless, such regimes are characterized by sufficient degrees of autonomy (and of the potential for its expansion) for sufficient numbers of people that I think it becomes useful to conceive of them as productive of a strategic configuration of power relations that might fruitfully be analyzed as a condition of “liberty,” just as much as they are productive of constraint, oppression, or manipulation. At the very least, totalitarianism cannot be the sole orientation point for our understanding of biopolitics, the only end point of the logic of social engineering.

***The judge must evaluate the consequences of the plan – ignoring the implications allows infinite violence***

**Williams 2005** (Michael, Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales—Aberystwyth, The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations, p. 174-176)

A commitment to an ethic of consequences reflects a deeper ethic of criticism, of ‘self-clarification’, and thus of reflection upon the values adopted by an individual or a collectivity. It is part of an attempt to make critical evaluation an intrinsic element of responsibility. Responsibility to this more fundamental ethic gives the ethic of consequences meaning. Consequentialism and responsibility are here drawn into what Schluchter, in terms that will be familiar to anyone conversant with constructivism in International Relations, has called a ‘reflexive principle’. In the wilful Realist vision, scepticism and consequentialism are linked in an attempt to construct not just a more substantial vision of political responsibility, but also the kinds of actors who might adopt it, and the kinds of social structures that might support it. A consequentialist ethic is not simply a choice adopted by actors: it is a means of trying to foster particular kinds of self-critical individuals and societies, and in so doing to encourage a means by which one can justify and foster a politics of responsibility. The ethic of responsibility in wilful Realism thus involves a commitment to both autonomy and limitation, to freedom and restraint, to an acceptance of limits and the criticism of limits. Responsibility clearly involves prudence and an accounting for current structures and their historical evolution; but it is not limited to this, for it seeks ultimately the creation of responsible subjects within a philosophy of limits. Seen in this light, the Realist commitment to objectivity appears quite differently. Objectivity in terms of consequentialist analysis does not simply take the actor or action as given, it is a political practice — an attempt to foster a responsible self, undertaken by an analyst with a commitment to objectivity which is itself based in a desire to foster a politics of responsibility. Objectivity in the sense of coming to terms with the ‘reality’ of contextual conditions and likely outcomes of action is not only necessary for success, it is vital for self-reflection, for sustained engagement with the practical and ethical adequacy of one’s views. The blithe, self-serving, and **uncritical stances of abstract moralism** or rationalist objectivism avoid self-criticism by refusing to engage with the intractability of the world ‘as it is’. Reducing the world to an expression of their theoretical models, political platforms, or ideological programmes, they fail to engage with this reality, and thus avoid the process of self-reflection at the heart of responsibility. By contrast, Realist objectivity takes an engagement with this intractable ‘object’ that is not reducible to one’s wishes or will as a necessary condition of ethical engagement, self-reflection, and self-creation.7 Objectivity is not a naïve naturalism in the sense of scientific laws or rationalist calculation; it is a necessary engagement with a world that eludes one’s will. A recognition of the limits imposed by ‘reality’ is a condition for a recognition of one’s own limits — that the world is not simply an extension of one’s own will**.** But it is also a challenge to use that intractability as a source of possibility, as providing a set of openings within which a suitably chastened and yet paradoxically energised will to action can responsibly be pursued. In the wilful Realist tradition, the essential opacity of both the self and the world are taken as limiting principles. Limits upon understanding provide chastening parameters for claims about the world and actions within it. But they also provide challenging and creative openings within which diverse forms of life can be developed: the limited unity of the self and the political order is the **precondition for freedom**. The ultimate opacity of the world is not to be despaired of: it is a condition of possibility for the wilful, creative construction of selves and social orders which embrace the diverse human potentialities which this lack of essential or intrinsic order makes possible.8 But it is also to be aware of the less salutary possibilities this involves. Indeterminacy is not synonymous with absolute freedom — it is both a condition of, and imperative toward, responsibility.

***Extinction first***

Robin **Attfield**, Professor of Philosophy at Cardiff University, “The Ethics of the Global Environment”, Perdue University Press, 19**99**, pg 68

Nevertheless, as John Leslie has remarked, many **philosophers write as if there were no reason for preserving the human species** beyond obligations either to the dead or to the living, and some as if there would be nothing wrong with allowing the species to extinguish itself, or even with actively extinguishing it ourselves, well before this would happen in the ordinary course of events. Now **the argument** concerning the value of ongoing current activities already shows that the verdicts that there would be nothing wrong with **allowing** (let alone causing) **premature extinction are unsupportable**; for the prospect of premature human extinction deprives many (but not all) widespread current activities of their meaning and value. But, as has just been argued, there must be something else to explain the strength of the imperative not to allow or to make premature extinction come about, and to explain what it is that makes most people who contemplate the possibility of premature human extinction regard it as appalling. Cicero makes a parallel point: 'As we feel it wicked and inhuman for men to declare that they care not if when they themselves are dead the universal conflagration ensues, it is undoubtedly true that we are bound to study the interest of posterity also for its own sake.'23  Likewise the consequentialist ethic introduced and defended in Chapter 2 maintains that future people have moral standing (and future living creatures of other species too). **Future generations have this standing even though their existence is contingent on current generations and the identity of future individuals is unknown at present; the good or ill of individuals who could be brought into existence count as reasons for or against actions or policies which would bring them into being**. This in turn implies that where the existence beyond a certain date of individuals likely to lead happy, worthwhile or flourishing lives can be facilitated or prevented, there is an obligation not to prevent it, other things being equal. **This does not mean that everyone should be continually having children**; other things are seldom equal, and problems of human numbers mean that acting on this basis could easily produce overextended families, countries or regions, or an overpopulated planet, where extra people would spell misery for themselves and for the others (see Chapter 7). But it does mean that each life likely to be of positive quality comprises a reason for its own existence, and that countervailing reasons of matching strength (concerning the disvalue of adding this life) are required to neutralise such a reason.  There are many other implications, including the importance of planning for the needs of future generations (considered in later chapters). **A further implication, more relevant here, is that humanity should not be allowed to become extinct, insofar as this is within human control, even if,** foreseeably, a small minority of any **given generation will lead lives of negative quality** (lives which are either not positively worth living or actually worth not living), **as long as**, **overall, the lives of that generation are of positive quality**, and the positive intrinsic value of worthwhile lives outweighs the intrinsic disvalue of the lives of misery. Since each generation is highly likely to include some lives which are not worth living, however hard its members and their predecessors may try to raise the quality of these lives, this implication makes all the difference to the issue of whether causing or even allowing the extinction of humanity is a moral crime.  **People who think that preventing misery is always of the greatest importance have to take the view that human extinction should be tolerated or even advocated; but the consequentialist ethic defended here says otherwise**. So, of course, say the widespread intuitions reviewed earlier. A modified version of one of John Leslie's thought-experiments could be used to test much the same issue. On each of numerous inhabitable planets, capable of supporting a large human population, whose members would predictably lead lives of positive quality, there will also be a person whose life will predictably and inevitably be of negative quality. For the purposes of the thought-experiment, these large human populations can be brought into existence by waving a magic wand. Should this be done? For consequentialists who believe in optimising the balance of intrinsic value over intrinsic disvalue, and in counting every actual and possible life as having moral standing, the answer is affirmative, even though the resulting population of each planet includes a life of negative quality.  But **theorists who prioritise the prevention of misery would have to hold that** the answer depends entirely on whether the **life of negative quality** on each planet **can be prevented**; **if it cannot, then none of these lives should be engendered**. (Others too, including consequentialists, might also take this view if the addition of human lives were liable to harm the living creatures of these same planets; to make this thought-experiment a test case, we need to adopt the further assumption that no such harm would be done.)   This thought-experiment also has a bearing on human extinction. For the future of the Earth beyond a certain date (just after the death of the youngest person now alive) is in some ways similar to the situation of the planets just mentioned. The current generation could produce a population living then, most of them people with lives worth living, but only at the risk of producing a minority whose lives will foreseeably be miserable. If the happiness or the worthwhile lives of the majority do not count as reasons for generating those same lives, and hence nothing counts but the misery of the minority, or if the prevention of misery  should be prioritised over all else, then allowing extinction is clearly mandatory, and so may be even genocide. **However**, as Leslie claims, **the coexistence of hundreds of thousands of lives of positive quality with one life of misery is not morally disastrous, if the misery of the miserable life really cannot be alleviated**. 25 (If of course this misery could be alleviated, whether by contemporaries or by the previous generation, then this might well be a morally disastrous situation, and alleviation would almost certainly be obligatory.) Consequentialism, then, does not mandate extinction, unlike several of the theories which stand opposed to it.

**A2: Apocalyptic Rhetoric**

***2. Perm – do both - The plan over comes apocalyptic fear -- coupling our rhetoric with a solution solves***

**Feinberg and Willer 11** - Psychology Dept and Sociology Dept, UC Berkeley (Matthew and Robb, "Apocalypse Soon? Dire Messages Reduce Belief in Global Warming by Contradicting Just-World Beliefs", Psychological Science January 2011 vol. 22 no. 1 34-38)//KL

These results demonstrate how dire messages **warning of the severity of global warming and its presumed dangers can backfire, paradoxically increasing skepticism about global warming by contradicting individuals’ deeply held beliefs that the world is fundamentally just**. In addition, we found evidence that this **dire messaging led to reduced intentions among participants to reduce their carbon footprint – an effect driven by their increased global warming skepticism**. Our results imply that **because dire messaging regarding global warming is at odds with the strongly established cognition that the world is fair and stable, people may dismiss the factual content of messages that emphasize global warming’s dire consequences**. But **if the same messages are delivered coupled with a potential solution, it allows the information to be communicated without creating substantial threat to these individuals’ deeply held beliefs**. Our findings extend past research showing that fear-based appeals, especially when not coupled with a clear solution, can backfire and undermine the intended effects of messages (Witte, 1992; 1994). In addition, our results complement recent research showing that framing environmentalism as patriotic can successfully increase proenvironmental behavioral intentions in those most attached to the status quo (Feygina, Jost, & Goldsmith, 2010). Taken together, these findings stress the importance of framing global warming messages so they do not contradict individuals’ deeply held beliefs. Additionally, our results suggest that reducing individuals’ just world beliefs could result in decreased global warming skepticism. Although we were able to manipulate such beliefs in Study 2, it remains to be seen how just world beliefs could be

changed longer-term in field settings.

***4 Our specific reps – even if doomsday – are good. Spur needed movements***

**Joppke '91**

(Christian - professor of political and social sciences at the European University Institute — The British Journal of Sociology - March - via J-Store)

**Since the ecology and anti-nuclear movements lack a well-defined group basis, they all the more depend on the public attention to the issues they address**. The new risks must be drawn as imminent and global, otherwise Olson's mobilization barrier could not be overcome. **No looming threat of disaster or prospect of immediate 'collective bads', no collective action**. **12 As a result, doomsday visions, Angst, and a sense of utmost urgency prosper in these movements'**. ' **After all, they emerge in reaction to policies on the brink of implementation, large-scale technologies in the process of realization or air and water already polluted. Considering their temporal position, there is no time to lose because too much time has already been lost.**

***5 Dystopic images are an antidote to fear – they counteract fatalism and catalyze debates to alter the future***

Fuyuki **Kurasawa,** Professor of Sociology, York University of Toronto, Constellations Volume 11 No 4 20**04**

Returning to the point I made at the beginning of this paper, **the significance of foresight is a direct outcome of the transition toward a dystopian imaginary** (or what Sontag has called “the imagination of disaster”).11 **Huxley’s Brave New World and Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four, two groundbreaking dystopian novels** of the first half of the twentieth century, **remain as influential as ever in framing public discourse and understanding current techno-scientific dangers**, while recent paradigmatic cultural artifacts – **films like The Matrix** and novels like Atwood’s Oryx and Crake – **reflect and give shape to this catastrophic sensibility**.12 **And yet dystopianism need not imply despondency, paralysis, or fear**. **Quite the opposite, in fact, since the pervasiveness of a dystopian imaginary can help notions of historical contingency and fallibilism gain traction against their determinist and absolutist counterparts**.13 **Once we recognize that the future is uncertain and that any course of action produces both unintended and unexpected consequences, the responsibility to face up to potential disasters and intervene before they strike becomes compelling.** From another angle, **dystopianism lies at the core of politics in a global civil society where groups mobilize their own nightmare scenarios** (‘Frankenfoods’ and a lifeless planet for environmentalists, totalitarian patriarchy of the sort depicted in Atwood’s Handmaid’s Tale for Western feminism, McWorld and a global neoliberal oligarchy for the alternative globalization movement, etc.). **Such scenarios can act as catalysts for public debate and socio-political action, spurring citizens’ involvement in the work of preventive foresight.**

***6 Anxiety and fear K’s wrong and cause anti-politics***

**Buss ‘97**

(Psychological Inquiry, 8, David, Department of Psychology at University of Texas)

A central premise in TMT is that the evolution of human intellectual capacities brought about with it the unfortunate consequences of awareness of our own mortality. This awareness is presumed to cause “paralyzing terror,” which renders goal-directed activities impossible unless it is subverted through psychological means. An unexamined premise in this theory is the origin of terror or anxiety itself. Precisely why awareness of death should provoke anxiety is unclear. Why wouldn’t such awareness provoke a host of other phenomena, such as careful planning of one’s life or a surge of hedonic sexual promiscuity? Presumably, we need an explanation for why such awareness would produce anxiety and not some other psychological state, but I could not discern in their article a rationale for this premise. Self-esteem is proposed as an evolved mechanism designed to protect us from anxiety, but a prior question is why we have anxiety-producing mechanisms to begin with. If the distribution of fears and phobias is any indication, the human anxiety appears to be highly domain specific and tailored to particular adaptive problems. We tend to develop fears of snakes, spiders, darkness, heights, and strangers, all of which were presumably hazardous to our survival in human ancestral environments (Marks, 1587). Moreover, anxiety about social exclusion may have specific survival functions, such as ensuring the protection and resources of the group and reproductive functions such as ensuring access to potential mates (Buss, 1990). Thus anxiety, rather than being a byproduct of our greater cognitive capabilities leading to awareness of death seems tailored, at least in part, to the solution of specific problems of survival and reproduction.

***7 Apocalyptic rhetoric motivates environmentalism.***

**Salvador and Norton 11** ([Michael Salvador](http://www.tandfonline.com/action/doSearch?action=runSearch&type=advanced&result=true&prevSearch=%2Bauthorsfield%3A(Salvador%2C+Michael)) - Michael Salvador is an Associate Professor in the Edward R. Murrow College of Communication at Washington State University and [Todd Norton](http://www.tandfonline.com/action/doSearch?action=runSearch&type=advanced&result=true&prevSearch=%2Bauthorsfield%3A(Norton%2C+Todd)) - Todd Norton is an Assistant Professor in the Edward R. Murrow College of Communication at Washington State University, “The Flood Myth in the Age of Global Climate Change,” 2/18/11, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2010.544749>) Gangeezy

For Killingsworth and Palmer (1996), use of apocalyptic rhetoric has shifted in response to the changing relationship between the prevailing paradigm of human domination over nature\*limitless American progress through technology and economic development\*and the oppositional environmental paradigm of humans as subject to nature and in need of ecologically sustainable practices. When this prevailing paradigm was at its zenith, stronger apocalyptic visions were advanced, as in Rachel Carson’s (1962) Silent Spring. As environmental activism took hold in the public consciousness, less threatening visions of the Earth’s future were offered, as in Barry Commoner’s (1971) The Closing Circle. Thus, apocalyptic rhetoric served as a malleable framework for discussing environmental problems, allowing those concerned to transform growing awareness of environmental problems ‘‘into acceptance of action toward a solution by prefacing the solution with a future scenario of what could happen if action is not taken, if the problem goes untreated’’ (Killingsworth & Palmer, 1996, p. 22).

***Turn - Rhetoric of fear is necessary to mobilize preventative action against catastrophe – AIDS proves.***

**Giddens ‘2K**

(Anthony; served as Director of the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) from 1997 to 2003. Previously a Fellow and Professor of Sociology at King's College, Cambridge. “Runaway world : how globalization is reshaping our lives” 2000; pg 47-49)

In these circumstances, there is a new moral climate of politics, marked by a push and pull between accusations of scaremongering the one hand, and of cover-ups on the other. If anyone -government official, scientific expert or researcher -takes a given risk seriously, he or she must proclaim it. It must be widely publicised because people must be persuaded that the risk is real-a fuss must be made about it. Yet if a fuss is indeed created and the risk turns out to be minimal, those involved will be accused of scaremongering. Suppose, however, that the authorities initially decide that the risk is not very great, as the British government did in the case of contaminated beef. In this instance, the government first of all said: we've got the backing of scientists here; there isn't a significant risk, and anyone who wants to can continue eating beef without any worries. In such situations, if events turn out otherwise -as in fact they did -the authorities will be accused of a cover-up-as indeed they were. Things are even more complex than these examples suggest. Paradoxically, **scaremongering may be necessary to reduce risks we face** -yet if it is successful, it appears as just that, scaremongering. The case of AIDS is an example. Governments and experts made great public play with the risks associated with unsafe sex, to get people to change their sexual behaviour. Partly as a consequence, in the developed countries, AIDS did not spread as much as was originally predicted. Then the response was: why were you scaring everyone like that? Yet as we know from its continuing global spread, they were -and are -entirely right to do so. This sort of paradox becomes routine in contemporary society, but there is no easily available way of dealing with it. For as I mentioned earlier, in most situations of manufactured risk, even whether there are risks at all is likely to be disputed. We cannot know beforehand when we are actually scaremongering and when we are not.

## A2: Coloniality/modernity bad

***1. Our framework is plan focus – we get to weigh the 1AC – it’s key to clash and fairness and productive debate***

***And, no prior questions --- elevating ontological and philosophical concerns fails and trades off with pragmatic policy solutions***

**Jenkins ‘11**

Willis Jenkins, Margaret A. Farley Assistant Professor of Social Ethics, Professor Jenkins teaches environmental ethics, global ethics, and Christian social thought. He is author of Ecologies of Grace: Environmental Ethics and Christian Theology, which won a 2009 Templeton Award for Theological Promise, and Sustainability, Social Justice, and Christian Ethics (Georgetown, in press). He is editor of The Spirit of Sustainability (2009) and coeditor of Bonhoeffer and King: Their Legacies and Import for Christian Social Thought (2010). He has written recent journal articles on ethics in the environmental sciences, on homelessness and urban theory, and on the field of religion and ecology.

Ethics & the Environment, ENVIRONMENTAL PRAGMATISM, ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT, AND CULTURAL REFORM, Volume 16, Number 1, Spring 2011, pp.

51-74 (Article) PROJECT MUSE, jj

Pragmatism: Making Ethics Practical

**Pragmatists** often **introduce their strategy of practical reason with an opening complaint that cosmological strategies of environmental ethics have not proven their practical worth**. **That complaint about effectiveness introduces a pragmatic proposal for less metaphysical debate and more attention to creating broad agreement on policy responses to practical problems**. The editors of the anthology Environmental Pragmatism thus set the scene: On the one hand, the discipline…has produced a wide variety of positions and theories in an attempt to derive morally justifiable and adequate environmental policies. On the other hand, **it is difficult to see what practical effect the field of environmental ethics has had on the formation of environmental policy**. (Light and Katz 1995, 1) Ben Minteer and Robert Manning blame the field’s ineffectiveness on its cosmological innovations: “**urgent calls for new environmental worldviews and radically revised ontological schemes, rather than leading to improved environmental solutions and conditions, only lead ethicists’ attention away from the resources already present within our shared moral and political traditions**.” In consequence, **the field exhibits a “conspicuous silence regarding concrete solutions to real world environmental dilemmas**” (2003, 319). Minteer and Manning follow the problem-solving approach opened by Bryan Norton, who contrasts his authentically “practical philosophy” with “**axiological” value theories** that, in his view, **have narrowed topics of discussion, reduced possibilities for interdisciplinary collaboration, and led to a communicative breakdown between science and society** (2003, 47–63). For Norton, **sustainability depends on an integrative, adaptive ethos developed from science-based responses to specific problems** (2005). **Pragmatists thus present their ethic of contextual problem-solving by pressing the dilemma between radical cosmological change and practical political engagement.** **Pragmatists expect environmental ethics to be practical in two ways: (1) by working with available moral resources, (2) for the sake of resolving specific policy problems.** **With both elements working together, they say, ethics can help achieve effective social response to environmental problems**. Andrew **Light thus asks ethicists to attend to cultural contexts by trying to “work within traditional moral psychologies and ethical theories that people already have” in order to create links between existing moral priorities in specific communities and the ends of environmental concern** (2003, 235). **Practical ethics requires, he says, a “practical anthropology,” attentive to the environmental interests and commitments that people hold, with a view toward “generating creative ways to persuade a variety of people” to adopt environmental solutions** (2003, 241).

**2. PERM – do both - The state is inevitable – we have to act through the state in order to have a relationship to the Other. Permutation overcomes Eru-centrism**

**Simmons 99** William Paul, current Associate Professor of Political Science at ASU, formerly at Bethany College in the Department of History and Political Science, “The Third: Levinas' theoretical move from an-archical ethics to the realm of justice and politics,” Philosophy and Social Criticism November 1, 1999 vol. 25 no. 6

**Since ‘it is impossible to escape the State’**,70 **Levinas insists that the state be made as ethical as possible.** The world of institutions and justice must be held in check by the an-archical responsibility for the Other. Levinas calls for both an-archy and justice. Alongside the an-archical responsibility for the Other there is a place for the realm of the said, which includes ontology, justice and politics. Levinas’ thought is not apolitical as many have charged. His harsh critiques of the political realm refer to a politics unchecked by ethics. For example, in Totality and Infinity, Levinas sees politics as antithetical to an ethics based on the Other. ‘The art of foreseeing war and winning it by every means – politics – is henceforth enjoined as the very exercise of reason. Politics is opposed to morality, as philosophy to naïveté.’71 Politics unrestrained, by necessity, totalizes the Other by reducing him or her to abstract categories. **Levinas will call for a politics that is founded on ethics and not on ontology**. **The state must be answerable to the an-archical relationship with the Other**, it must strive to maintain the exteriority of the Other. **Levinasian heteronomic political thought oscillates between** the saying and the said, an-archy and justice, **ethics and politics**. **The liberal state is the concrete manifestation of this oscillation**. Levinas calls for a balance between the Greek and the Judaic traditions. **Neither tradition should dominate.** The fundamental contradiction of our situation (and perhaps of our condition) . . . that both the hierarchy taught by Athens and the abstract and slightly anarchical ethical individualism taught by Jerusalem are simultaneously necessary in order to suppress the violence. Each of these principles, left to itself, only hastens the contrary of what it wants to secure.72

***3. Prefer the aff’s incrementalism to the alt’s inaction --- refusal to embrace bridge fuels like the aff guarantees environmental collapse***

Charles K. **Ebinger**, Director, Energy Security Initiative Govinda Avasarala, Research Assistant, Foreign Policy, Energy Security Initiative The Brookings Institution 4-22-**10**, Environmental Pragmatism <http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/0422_environmental_pragmatism_ebinger.aspx>, jj

Finally, **people need to embrace pragmatism**. **Though it is not ideal and rarely a sexy declaration, pragmatism and incrementalism are** the **obligatory** taxes of multilateral agreements (mind you, they are less obtrusive with fewer parties). **There are many tools at our disposal that can put the stalled climate change efforts into first gear**. First, **we must embrace bridge technologies, such as natural gas, nuclear energy, and state of the art cleaner coal**. **With total global renewable energy capacity falling catastrophically short of global energy demand, ‘bridge’ technologies can ease the environmental strain while we wait for renewable capacity to reach requisite levels**. In addition, investments in upgrading many nations’ electricity grids will make a remarkable difference in the environmental impact of power generation. **The need for action to reduce climate change is very real, particularly as many emerging economies and failed and near-failed states are most at risk and can potentially spur widespread global unrest**. **Clinging to an inefficient, incapable system will only exacerbate the crisis of inaction at a time where the world can ill-afford it. By focusing on smaller negotiations** with actual large emitters, garnering a better understanding of the real economics behind climate change, **and embracing smaller steps in ‘bridge’ technologies, we can do a far more effective job of getting the ball rolling.**

***Coal is inevitable in the world of the alt --- turns the K***

**Wendland ‘11**

Joel Wendland is editor of Political Affairs magazine. He is a union member and a US Army veteran.

7-20-11, People’s World, Coal pollution killing poor, people of color, NAACP charges <http://www.peoplesworld.org/coal-pollution-killing-poor-people-of-color-naacp-charges/>, jj

**America is addicted to coal, and that addiction is killing poor people and people of color**, according to a new report published by the NAACP and other environmental justice organizations. According to the report, **emissions from 431 coal plants across the country cause 30,000 premature deaths and tens of thousands incidents of chronic respiratory health problems like asthma, bronchitis and lung cancer each year**. According to the study, titled "Coal Blooded: Putting Profits Before People," Sulfur dioxide (SO2) and Nitrogen Oxide (NOx), **coal plants produce nearly all of the SO2 and fine particle pollution in the U.S.** Coal-powered plants produce about 44 percent of the electricity used in the U.S. Ten states use about half of the total amount of coal-fired electricity produced in the whole country. **More than 8 million people live within three miles of a coal power plant, and those people are disproportionately poor or people of color**. The average per capita income of those people total less than $19,000, substantially lower than the national average. About 3 million are people of color, the report found. The report also revealed the locations of the worst coal plants in the countries. These "**failing plants" produce the most pollution and impact the largest number of poor and people of color.** To be precise, **90 "failing plants" across the country produced a quarter of SO2 and one-fifth of NOx emissions in the entire country. More than half of the 4.7 million people who live near these plants are people of color.** Of the 90 "failing plants," the report scrutinizes the 12 worst offenders. Three are owned by Edison International and are located in Illinois. PSEG owns two of the worst offenders in Connecticut and New Jersey. Duke Energy, DTE Energy, and Dominion are among the companies whose plants create the greatest harm. **Detroit, Michigan is host to one of the worst pollution-producing plants in the country**. The River Rouge Power Plant (DTE Energy), located on the southwest edge of the city produces more than 13,000 tons of SO2 and 4,658 tons of NOx each year. **The plant is just five miles from downtown Detroit and just across the Rouge River from the only major Latino district in the city, known as "Mexican Town." Of the residents who live within three miles of the River Rouge plant, more than 65 percent are African Americans and Latinos. Average income for people living in the area is just over $13,000 each year. The study attributed 44 premature deaths and hundreds of asthma attacks each year to the pollution from just this one plant.** Another deadly culprit is the Hammond, Indiana plant owned by Dominion. Located on outskirts of Chicago, this plant emits almost 17,000 tons of SO2 and NOx pollution. Of the people living within three miles of the plant, almost 80 percent are African Americans and Latinos. In that same corridor along the southern edge of Lake Michigan between Chicago and the Michigan border are six other coal-fired power plants that contribute to the poor health and premature deaths of mostly poor communities of color. The authors of the report called for immediately closing the 90 "failing plants." **While they total about 20 percent of the coal-fired plants in the country, they produce less than 10 percent of its electricity.** In addition, **closing those plants would reduce the number of people living within three miles of a coal-fired plant by 58 percent and reduce the number of emergency room visits, deaths and chronic illnesses by thousands each year.**

***Policy analysis should trump discourse – more effectively challenges power than revisiting structures of thought***

**Taft-Kaufman 95** (Jill, Speech prof @ CMU, Southern Comm. Journal, Spring, v. 60, Iss. 3, “Other Ways”)

**The postmodern passwords of "polyvocality," "Otherness," and "difference," unsupported by substantial analysis of the concrete contexts of subjects, creates a solipsistic quagmire**. The political sympathies of the new cultural critics, with their ostensible concern for the lack of power experienced by marginalized people, aligns them with the political left. Yet, **despite their adversarial posture and talk of opposition, their discourses on intertextuality and inter-referentiality isolate them from and ignore the conditions that have produced leftist politics--conflict, racism, poverty, and injustice**. In short, as Clarke (1991) asserts, postmodern emphasis on new subjects conceals the old subjects, those who have limited access to good jobs, food, housing, health care, and transportation, as well as to the media that depict them. Merod (1987) decries **this** situation as one which **leaves no vision, will, or commitment to activism**. He notes that academic lip service to the oppositional is underscored by the absence of focused collective or politically active intellectual communities. Provoked by the academic manifestations of this problem Di Leonardo (1990) echoes Merod and laments: Has there ever been a historical era characterized by as little radical analysis or activism and as much radical-chic writing as ours? **Maundering on about Otherness:** phallocentrism or Eurocentric tropes **has become a lazy academic substitute for actual engagement with the detailed histories and contemporary realities** of Western racial minorities, white women, or any Third World population. (p. 530) Clarke's assessment of the **postmodern elevation of language to the "sine qua non"** of critical discussion **is an even stronger indictment against the trend.** Clarke examines Lyotard's (1984) The Postmodern Condition in which Lyotard maintains that virtually all social relations are linguistic, and, therefore, it is through the coercion that threatens speech that we enter the "realm of terror" and society falls apart. To this assertion, Clarke replies**:**  I can think of few more striking indicators of the political and intellectual impoverishment of a view of society that can only recognize the discursive. **If the worst terror we can envisage is the threat not to be allowed to speak, we are appallingly ignorant of terror in its elaborate contemporary forms. It may be the intellectual's conception of terror** (what else do we do but speak?), **but its projection onto the rest of the world would be calamitous....(**pp. 2-27) **The** realm of the **discursive is derived from the requisites for human life,** which are in the physical world**, rather than in a world of ideas or symbols**.(4) Nutrition, shelter, and protection are basic human needs that require collective activity for their fulfillment. **Postmodern emphasis on the discursive without an accompanying analysis of how the discursive emerges from material circumstances hides the complex task of envisioning and working towards concrete social goals** (Merod, 1987). Although the material conditions that create the situation of marginality escape the purview of the postmodernist, the situation and its consequences are not overlooked by scholars from marginalized groups. Robinson (1990) for example, argues that "**the justice that working people deserve is economic, not just textual"** (p. 571). Lopez (1992) states that "**the starting point for organizing the program content of education or political action must be the** present existential, **concrete situation"** (p. 299). West (1988) asserts that borrowing French post-structuralist discourses about "Otherness" blinds us to realities of American difference going on in front of us (p. 170). Unlike postmodern "textual radicals" who Rabinow (1986) acknowledges are "fuzzy about power and the realities of socioeconomic constraints" (p. 255), most writers from marginalized groups are clear about how discourse interweaves with the concrete circumstances that create lived experience. **People whose lives form the material for postmodern counter-hegemonic discourse do not share the optimism over the new recognition of their discursive subjectivities, because such an acknowledgment does not address sufficiently their collective historical and current struggles against racism, sexism, homophobia, and economic injustice.** They do not appreciate being told they are living in a world in which there are no more real subjects. **Ideas have consequences. Emphasizing the discursive self when a person is hungry and homeless represents both a cultural and humane failure. The need to look beyond texts to the perception and attainment of concrete social goals keeps writers from marginalized groups ever-mindful of the specifics of how power works through political agendas,** institutions, agencies, and the budgets that fuel them.

***Modernism and Enlightenment are better than any alternative –key to solve global violence --- be skeptical of their K of eurocentrism***

Steven **Pinker** is professor of psychology at Harvard University. His research focuses on language and cognition. His bestselling books include, The Language Instinct and How the Mind Works. 10-15-**11**, New Scientist, Violent? Not us, not now Lexis, jj

**What do you want readers to take away from your new book? To be grateful for some of the institutions we take for granted, such as government** and the court system. That, **as much as we are irritated by** lawyers, cops and **government, the alterative is worse**. **The forces of reason, enlightenment, cosmopolitanism, women's empowerment –; we should be grateful for all this and not nostalgic for a time in which everyone's world was far more constricted**. This goes for trade and commerce too. **Capitalism is a dirty word for many intellectuals but there are a number of studies showing that open economies and free trade are negatively correlated with genocide and war. I would lump all of these things together under 'modernity'. So modernity tends to result in less violence? Yes. There is an enormous current of romantic nostalgia among many sectors of intellectual life** –; the religious right, the green left. What I hope to remind people is that **modernity, for all its problems, has brought us many gifts. Foremost is** one that few people appreciate, namely **a reduction in overall violence**.

**No impact - All forms of structural violence are decreasing. The K of modernity is empirically denied.**

Steven **Pinker** 20**11** is in the Department of Psychology at Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA. This article is adapted from his new book The Better Angels of Our Nature: The Decline of Violence in History and its Causes (Allen Lane, 2011). Nature 478,309–311(20 October 2011)doi:10.1038/478309a PROQUEST, jj

Moreover, a century has 100 years, not just 50, and **the second half of the twentieth century has astonished military historians with its unprecedented avoidance of wars between developed states and between great powers**. Civil wars did proliferate in the years after the two world wars, but **civil wars** tend to be less destructive than interstate wars, and they, too, **have declined in number and in death tolls.** There were far fewer deaths in war in the first decade of the twenty-first century than any of the five decades preceding it. **The obsolescence of major war is just one of many historical declines of violence.** **European homicide rates have dropped at least 30-fold** since the Middle Ages, from about 40 per 100,000 people per year in the fourteenth century to 1.3 at the end of the twentieth. **Barbaric customs that were unexceptional for millennia, such as human sacrifice, the persecution of witches and heretics, chattel slavery, blood sports, punitive torture and mutilation, sadistic executions** (burning, breaking, crucifixion, disembowelling, impalement) **and execution for victimless crimes have been abolished in most of the world**. **The past 50 years have seen a cascade of rights revolutions — civil, women's, children's, gay, animal — which have demonstrably driven down rates of lynching, pogroms, rape, spousal abuse, child abuse, spanking, gay-bashing, hunting and callousness to laboratory animals.**

***No impact – sovereign power is limited***

**Rabinow & Rose 3** (Paul, Anthropology at Berkeley, Nikolas, Sociology @ London School of Economics, December 10, http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/sociology/ pdf/RabinowandRose-BiopowerToday03.pdf, accessed July 07, pg. 8-9)

**The interpretation of contemporary biopolitics as the politics of a state modeled on the figure of the sovereign suits the twentieth century absolutisms of the Nazis** and Stalin. **But we need a more nuanced account of sovereign power to analyze contemporary** rationalities or technologies of **politics**. Since these authors take their concept and point of reference from Foucault, it is worth contrasting their postulate of a origin and beneficiary of biopower to Foucaultís remarks on sovereignty as a form of power whose diagram, but not principle, is the figure of the sovereign ruler. Its characteristic is indeed ultimately a mode of power which relies on the right to take life. However, with the exception of certain ‘paroxysmal’ moments, this is a mode of power whose activation can only be sporadic and non-continuous. T**he totalization of sovereign power as a mode of ordering daily life would be too costly, and indeed the very excesses of the exercise of this power seek to compensate for its sporadic nature.** **Sovereignty**, in this sense, **is precisely a diagram of a form of power not a description of its implementation**. Certainly some forms of colonial power sought to operationalize it, but in the face of its economic and governmental costs, colonial statecraft was largely to take a different form. The two megalomaniac State forms of the twentieth century also sought to actualize it, as have some others in their wake: Albania under Hoxha, North Korea. But **no historian of** pre-modern forms of **control could fail to notice the dependence of sovereign rule** in its non-paroxysmal form **on** a fine web of customary **conventions, reciprocal obligations, and** the like, in a word, **a moral economy** whose complexity and scope far exceeds the extravagance displays of the sovereign. **Sovereign power is at one and the same time an element in this moral economy and an attempt to master it.**

***Turn – appeal to the concept of humanity only way to prevent ideology of racial superiority***

**Hannah Arendt, 1945** (The Portable Hannah Arendt “Organized Guilt and Universal Responsibility,” Collection printed in 2K ed. Peter Baehr, p. 154-155

 For many years now we have met Germans who declare that they are ashamed of being German. I have often felt tempted to answer that I am ashamed of being human. This elemental shame, which many people of the most various nationalities share with one another today, is what finally is left of our sense of international solidarity; and it has not yet found an adequate political expression. Our fathers’ enchantment with humanity was of a sort which not only light-mindedly ignored the national question; what is far worse, it did not even conceive of the terror of the idea of humanity and of the Judeo-Christian faith in the unitary origin of the human race. It was not very pleasant even when we had to bury our false illusion about “the noble savage,” having discovered that men were capable of being cannibals. Since then peoples have learned to know one another better and learned more and more about the evil potentialities in men. The result has been that they have recoiled more and more from the idea of humanity and become more susceptible to the doctrine of race, which denies the very possibilities of a common humanity. The instinctively felt that the idea of humanity, where it appears in a religious or humanistic form, implies the obligation of a general responsibility which they do not wish to assume. For the idea of humanity, when purged of all sentimentality, has the very serious consequence that in one form of another men must assume responsibility for all crimes committed by men and that all nations share the onus of evil committed by all others. Shame at being a human is the purely individual and still non-political expression of this insight.

 In political terms, the idea of humanity, excluding no people and assigning a monopoly of guilt to no one, is the only guarantee that one “superior race” after another may not feel obligated to follow the “natural law” of the right of the powerful, and exterminate “inferior races unworthy of survival”; so that at the end of the an “imperialistic age” we should find ourselves in a stage which would make the Nazis look like crude precursors of future political methods. To follow a non-imperialistic policy and maintain a non-racist faith becomes daily more difficult because it becomes daily clearer how great a burden mankind is for man.

 Perhaps those Jews, to whose forefathers we owe the first conception of the idea of humanity, knew something about that burden when each year they used to say “Our Father and King, we have sinned before you,” taking not only the sins of their own community but all human offenses upon themselves. Those who today are ready to follow this road in a modern version do not content themselves with the hypocritical confession “God be thanked, I am not like that,” in horror at the undreamed-of potentialities of the German national character. Rather, in fear and trembling, have they finally realized of what man is capable—and this is indeed the precondition of any modern political thinking. Such person will not sever very well as functionaries of vengeance. This, however, is certain: Upon them and only upon them, who are filled with a genuine fear of the inescapable guilt of the human race, can there be any reliance when it comes to fighting fearlessly, uncompromisingly, everywhere against the incalculable evil that men are capable of bringing about.

***Even if continuing bias exists, the basis for reform is in Enlightenment ideals – we can’t abandon them***

**Bronner 4** Stephen Eric, Professor of Political Science and Comparative Literature at Rutgers University, “Reclaiming the Enlightenment” Columbia University Press p. 64-67

**Fighting against a world dominated by** monsters and saints, witches and gods, **myths and prejudices, misery and privilege, custom and laziness, demanded a mixture of courage and clarity.** The assault on metaphysics intro- duced by the authors of The Spectator, Joseph Addison and Richard Steele, prepared the way for the new egalitarian emphasis upon “common sense” offered by Thomas Paine. Utilitarianism, so boring in its shopkeeper mentality, nonetheless gave the individual a measure of respect by making clear that each was capable of discerning his or her interest and that social welfare was the primary aim of government. Lessing, Montesquieu, and Goethe challenged the church injunction against suicide. Most partisans **of the Enlightenment were repulsed by slavery and the subordination of women plays a role in many of their works. Their privileging of persuasion over coercion, their vision of the fully formed personality, their interest in matters outside their immediate expertise and experience, their emphasis upon tolerance, all project an eradication of what is brutal and unjust in the name of a better society with a new set of human relations. Resistance undertaken in the name of progressive, liberal, and ultimately socialist ideals served to separate critical from affirmative intellectuals and place some thinkers often associated with the Enlightenment**, such as Samuel Johnson and Edmund Burke**, outside the tradition that they might otherwise seem to espouse.** The result was what might be termed a great divide that separated intellectuals of the Enlightenment from those of the Counter-Enlightenment. Enlightenment **intellectuals were not pillars of political correctness.** Organizations condemning slavery were formed. Salons may have accorded women a new public presence,9 and the grosser expressions of anti-Semitism and even anti-Muslim attitudes were generally looked down upon. But the Enlightenment was still primarily a male, white, straight, and Christian world. In the United States, moreover, slavery was embedded in the national legislative process: Jefferson supported the idea that a slave is three-fifths of a person for purposes of representation, which won him the election of 1800, and Washington placed the national capital in slave territory. Admittedly, for such individuals, support for measures of this sort probably had less to do with their personal approval of slavery than with its political use to protect the economic base of the South: it remained the case into the twentieth century that no serious political career was open to Southerners opposed to slavery or supportive of civil rights.10 **But that doesn’t change the reality: it was what it was. Still, it would be misleading to lump the philosophes together with their adversaries. The principles underpinning the critique of slavery, sexism, and exclusion of the other derived from the Enlightenment.** Then, too, **the political stance of its advocates on such issues was generally qualitatively different from those of the Counter-Enlightenment.** It is instructive, for example, to consider the views on women and divorce expressed by archreactionaries like Justus Moeser or Bonald; the views on prejudice offered by Burke; the irrationalism of Hamann; the unyielding Christianity of De Maistre; the brutal anti-Semitism of the Abbé Bruelle; and the alternatives offered to cosmopolitanism, constitutionalism, and social equality by the rest of the reaction. It is also easy to forget the witch trials that cost thousands upon thousands of women their lives;11 the slaughters attendant upon the Crusades;12 the Inquisition, and the constant pogroms. Michel **Foucault may be correct in his assertions that the Enlightenment in its time had little sympathy for the “unreasonable”: the beggars, the petty criminals, and the insane.13 In practical terms, however, the more progressive programs for improving the conditions of these groups were again inspired by Enlightenment principles and intellectuals of the Counter-Enlightenment would historically show even less interest in these groups and the reforms capable of bettering their lot.** Above all, however, it wrong to suggest that the prejudices of the philosophes somehow invalidate the ideals associated with their republic of letters. **The logic of the Enlightenment suggested that citizenship should be open to everyone with a pen and an argument to make in the name of freedom. Sex, race, religion, property, and class, should—in principle—play no role in determining the ability of individuals to participate in the public realm and they should be able to pursue their private interests as they see fit.** Kant’s notion concerning the formal equality of all subjects, in fact, made possible a criticism of any such barriers to the public exercise of reason while the principles underpinning the liberal rule of law enabled suffragettes and civil libertarians as well as advocates of the excluded and insane to contest the existence of positive laws tainted by discrimination and regressive attitudes. It is only fair to note that: The Enlightenment public sphere assigned new importance to women as producers and consumers of culture, but often on the basis of values that served to justify their subordination. Its norms of openness and inclusion created new kinds of association, but also new forms of exclusion. For all this ambiguity, however, **we continue to invoke the norms of openness and transparency preached by the Enlightenment public sphere even as we criticize its failure to live up to them. For that reason its legacy is more enduring than it seems**, whatever its vicissitudes from the Enlightenment to our own day.14 “Enlightenment” was initially seen as depending upon the “courage” of the individual to exercise his or her intellect, question rather than obey and, according to the famous formulation, “leave behind his self-imposed immaturity.” Contrary to popular opinion, however, Kant did not leave the individual subject hovering in the metaphysical stratosphere. It was clear to him no less than to the rest of the philosophes that **summoning** such **courage becomes easier with the existence of liberal institutions and a “public” animated by civic interests.**15 **That is why liberating the “public” not merely from dogma, but from the institutions and conditions that promote it, became the primary goal of Enlightenment intellectuals. The philosophes understood that the right to criticism is the precondition for the exercise of autonomy and**, if not the pursuit of absolute truth, then **the rectification of error**. Thus, in contrast to thinkers of the Counter-Enlightenment like Burke and De Maistre, Kant and Paine would insist that no age can commit the future to a condition in which it would be impossible to extend knowledge or correct errors. 16

***Liberalism isn’t exclusive – exclusion only exists because of a failure to fully carry out its******principles***

**Bronner 4** (Stephen Eric, Professor of Political Science and Comparative Literature at Rutgers University, “Reclaiming the Enlightenment” Columbia University Press p. 49-50)

**Women, people of color, Catholics, atheists, and those without property**16— for very different reasons—**had no place in the original liberal vision**. But **this was the product less of some inherent defect of liberalism than the unwillingness of liberals to confront existing prejudices with the logic of their principles**. Institutionalizing **the universal** may not have immediately resulted in recognizing the legitimacy of the outsider, or the “other,” but it **served as the precondition** for doing so. If patriarchy is now seen as having been ignored in the universal social contract,17 for example, the oversight was actually recognized at the time.18 Women would, in any case, not have attempted to further their interests by using the arguments of “antiphilosophes” like Justus Moser, who authored “On the Diminished Disgrace of Whores and Their Children in Our Day” (1772), or Louis Bonald, who thundered against divorce. Olympe **de Gouges** in The Rights of Woman (1791), **and** Mary **Wollstonecraft** in her Vindication of the Rights of Women (1792) instead **referred to** the original **liberal values** of the **Enlightenment in criticizing the French Revolution for not realizing its universal commitments** with respect to women: in the process**, both radicalized the purely formal implications of equality** under the law. Their undertaking is both related to yet different from that of the young Marx in On the Jewish Question and The Holy Family. These writings highlighted the contradiction between the political commitment of the bourgeois state to liberty, equality, and fraternity on the level of the state—that is freedom from the exercise of arbitrary power, equality before the law, and a concern with the common good—when coupled with the existence of coercion, inequality, and egoism in the economic realm of civil society. In extending democracy from the formal to the substantive, to be sure, he sought the “sublation” (Aufhebung) of both the state and civil society from the perspective of realizing “human” emancipation. **This romantic and utopian vision, however, had far less practical impact than his clarification of the limits of classical liberalism with respect to “social” equality. What marks the criticisms of classical liberalism** launched by feminists like Olympe de Gouges and Wollstonecraft no less than Marx, in any event, **is their attempt to extend its implications**. This differentiates them from conservative critics like Edmund Burke who, while he may have supported a cause like the American Revolution, also championed by most philosophes, did so more in terms of a newly constituted organic tradition than from the perspective of the Declaration of Independence. In the guise of attacking the French Revolution, Burke actually attacked the very idea of universal rights and the possibility of altering the English class structure. His emphasis on community and tradition, indeed, becomes little more than a façade for opposing the exercise of liberty, the pursuit of equality, and the “sordid darkness of this enlightened age.”

***Focusing on epistemology selfishly ignores real world problems***

**Jarvis, 2K** – Prof Philosophy @ U South Carolina (Darryl, Studies in International Relations, “International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism”, pg. 2)

While Hoffmann might well be correct**, these days one can neither begin nor conclude empirical research without first discussing epistemological orientations and ontological assumptions.** Like a vortex**, metatheory has engulfed us all and the question of "theory" which was once used as a guide to research is now the object of research.** Indeed, for a discipline whose purview is ostensibly outward looldng and international in scope, and **at a time of ever encroaching globalization and transnationalism, International Relations has become increasingly** provincial and **inward looking.** Rather than grapple with the numerous issues that confront peoples around the world, since the early 1980s the discipline has tended more and more toward obsessive self-examination.3 These days **the politics of famine, environmental degradation, underdevelopment, or ethnic cleansing, let alone the cartographic machinations in Eastern Europe and the reconfiguration of the geo-global political-economy, seem scarcely to concern theorists of international politics who define the urgent task of our time to be one of metaphysical reflection and epistemological investigation.** Arguably, **theory is no longer concerned with the study of international relations so much as the "manner in which international relations as a discipline, and international relations as a subject matter, have been constructed."**4 To be concerned with the latter is to be "on the cutting edge," where novelty has itself become "an appropriate form of scholarship."5

***The impact is huge --- ceding the political makes collective action impossible --- moving away from anti-politics is vital to check extinction***

**Small ‘6**

(Jonathan, former Americorps VISTA for the Human Services Coalition,“Moving Forward,” *The Journal for Civic Commitment*, Spring, http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/other/engagement/Journal/Issue7/Small.jsp)

What will be the challenges of the new millennium? And how should we equip young people to face these challenges? While we cannot be sure of the exact nature of the challenges, we can say unequivocally that humankind will face them together. If the end of the twentieth century marked the triumph of the capitalists, individualism, and personal responsibility, **the new century will present challenges that require collective action**, unity, and enlightened self-interest. **Confronting global warming, depleted natural resources, global super viruses, global crime syndicates**, and multinational corporations with no conscience and no accountability **will require** cooperation, openness, honesty, compromise, and most of all **solidarity** – ideals not exactly cultivated in the twentieth century. We can no longer suffer to see life through the tiny lens of our own existence. Never in the history of the world has our collective fate been so intricately interwoven. **Our very existence depends upon our ability to adapt to this new paradigm, to envision a more cohesive society.**  With humankind’s next great challenge comes also great opportunity. Ironically, modern individualism backed us into a corner. **We have two choices, work together in solidarity or perish together in alienation.** Unlike any other crisis before**, the** noose is truly around the neck of the whole world at once. Global super viruses will ravage rich and poor alike, developed and developing nations, white and black, woman, man, and child. Global warming and damage to the environment will affect climate change and destroy ecosystems across the globe. Air pollution will force gas masks on our faces, our depleted atmosphere will make a predator of the sun, and chemicals will invade and corrupt our water supplies. Every single day we are presented the opportunity to change our current course, to survive modernity in a manner befitting our better nature. **Through zealous cooperation and radical solidarity we can alter the course of human events.** Regarding the practical matter of equipping young people to face the challenges of a global, interconnected world, **we need to teach cooperation**, community, solidarity, balance and tolerance in schools. We need to take a holistic approach to education. Standardized test scores alone will not begin to prepare young people for the world they will inherit. The three staples of traditional education (reading, writing, and arithmetic) need to be supplemented by three cornerstones of a modern education, exposure, exposure, and more exposure. How can we teach solidarity? How can we teach community in the age of rugged individualism? How can we counterbalance crass commercialism and materialism? How can we impart the true meaning of power? These are the educational challenges we face in the new century. **It will require a** radical **transformation of our conception of education**. We’ll need to trust a bit more, control a bit less, and put our faith in the potential of youth to make sense of their world. In addition to a declaration of the gauntlet set before educators in the twenty-first century, this paper is a proposal and a case study of sorts toward a new paradigm of social justice and civic engagement education. Unfortunately, the current pedagogical climate of public K-12 education does not lend itself well to an exploratory study and trial of holistic education. Consequently, this proposal and case study targets a higher education model. Specifically, we will look at some possibilities for a large community college in an urban setting with a diverse student body. Our guides through this process are specifically identified by the journal Equity and Excellence in Education. The dynamic interplay between ideas of social justice, **civic engagement**, and service learning in education **will be the lantern in the dark cave of uncertainty**. As such, a simple and straightforward explanation of the three terms is helpful to direct this inquiry. Before we look at a proposal and case study and the possible consequences contained therein, this paper will draw out a clear understanding of how we should characterize these ubiquitous terms and how their relationship to each other affects our study. Social Justice, Civic Engagement, Service Learning and Other Commie Crap Social justice is often ascribed long, complicated, and convoluted definitions. In fact, one could fill a good-sized library with treatises on this subject alone. Here we do not wish to belabor the issue or argue over fine points. For our purposes, it will suffice to have a general characterization of the term, focusing instead on the dynamics of its interaction with civic engagement and service learning. Social justice refers quite simply to a community vision and a community conscience that values inclusion, fairness, tolerance, and equality. The idea of social justice in America has been around since the Revolution and is intimately linked to the idea of a social contract. The Declaration of Independence is the best example of the prominence of social contract theory in the US. It states quite emphatically that the government has a contract with its citizens, from which we get the famous lines about life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Social contract theory and specifically the Declaration of Independence are concrete expressions of the spirit of social justice. Similar clamor has been made over the appropriate definitions of civic engagement and service learning, respectively. Once again, let’s not get bogged down on subtleties. Civic engagement is a measure or degree of the interest and/or involvement an individual and a community demonstrate around community issues. There is a longstanding dispute over how to properly quantify civic engagement. Some will say that today’s youth are less involved politically and hence demonstrate a lower degree of civic engagement. Others cite high volunteer rates among the youth and claim it demonstrates a high exhibition of civic engagement. And there are about a hundred other theories put forward on the subject of civic engagement and today’s youth. But one thing is for sure; **today’s youth no longer see government and politics as an effective or valuable tool for affecting positive change in the world.** Instead of criticizing this judgment, perhaps we should come to sympathize and even admire it. Author Kurt Vonnegut said, “There is a tragic flaw in our precious Constitution, and I don’t know what can be done to fix it. This is it: only nut cases want to be president.” Maybe the youth’s rejection of American politics isn’t a shortcoming but rather a rational and appropriate response to their experience. Consequently, the term civic engagement takes on new meaning for us today. In order to foster fundamental change on the systemic level, which we have already said is necessary for our survival in the twenty-first century, we need to fundamentally change our systems. Therefore, **part of our challenge becomes convincing the youth that these systems, and by systems we mean government** and commerce, **have the potential for positive change.** Civic engagement consequently takes on a more specific and political meaning in this context. Service learning is a methodology and a tool for teaching social justice, encouraging civic engagement, and deepening practical understanding of a subject. Since it is a relatively new field, at least in the structured sense, service learning is only beginning to define itself. Through service learning students learn by experiencing things firsthand and by exposing themselves to new points of view. Instead of merely reading about government, for instance, a student might experience it by working in a legislative office. Rather than just studying global warming out of a textbook, a student might volunteer time at an environmental group. If service learning develops and evolves into a discipline with the honest goal of making better citizens, teaching social justice, encouraging civic engagement, and most importantly, exposing students to different and alternative experiences, it could be a major feature of a modern education. Service learning is the natural counterbalance to our current overemphasis on standardized testing. Social justice, civic engagement, and service learning are caught in a symbiotic cycle. The more we have of one of them; the more we have of all of them. However, until we get momentum behind them, we are stalled. Service learning may be our best chance to jumpstart our democracy. In the rest of this paper, we will look at the beginning stages of a project that seeks to do just that.

***Overemphasis on method destroys effectiveness of the discipline***

**Wendt,** Handbook of IR, **2k2** p. 68

It should be stressed that in advocating a pragmatic view we are not endorsing method-driven social science. Too much research in international relations chooses problems or things to be explained with a view to whether the analysis will provide support for one or another methodological ‘ism’. But the point of IR scholarship should be to answer questions about international politics that are of great **normative concern, not to validate methods. Methods are means, not ends in themselves.** As a matter of personal scholarly choice it may be reasonable to stick with one method and see how far it takes us. But since we do not know how far that is, if the goal of the discipline is insight into world politics then it makes little sense to **rule out one or the other approach on a priori grounds**. In that case a method indeed becomes a **tacit ontology,** which may lead to **neglect of whatever problems it is poorly suited to address**. Being conscious about these choices is why it is important to distinguish between the ontological, empirical and pragmatic levels of the rationalist-constructivist debate. We favor the pragmatic approach on heuristic grounds, but we certainly believe a conversation should continue on all three levels.

 ***( ) There’s always value to life –Prefer our ev because of Frankl’s subject position.***

Phyllis D. **Coontz,** PhD Graduate School of Public and International Affairs University of Pittsburgh, et al, JOURNAL OF COMMUNITY HEALTH NURSING, **2001**, 18(4), 235-246 – J-Stor

In the 1950s, **psychiatrist and theorist** Viktor **Frankl (**1963) **described an existential theory of** purpose and **meaning in life. Frankl, a long-time prisoner in a concentration camp, re- lated several instances of transcendent states that he experienced in the midst of that terri- ble suffering** using his own experiences and observations. He believed that **these experi- ences allowed him and others to maintain their sense of dignity and self-worth.** Frankl (1969) claimed that **transcendence occurs by giving to others, being open to others** and the environment, and coming to accept the reality that some situations are un- changeable. **He hypothesized that life always has meaning for the individual; a person can always decide how to face adversity**. Therefore, **self-transcendence provides mean- ing and enables the discovery of meaning for a person** (Frankl, 1963). Expanding Frankl's work, Reed (1991b) linked self-transcendence with mental health. Through a developmental process **individuals gain an increasing understanding of who they are and are able to move out beyond themselves despite the fact that they are ex- periencing** physical and mental **pain. This** expansion beyond the self **occurs through in- trospection**, concern about others and their well-being, and integration of the past and fu- ture **to strengthen one's present life** (Reed, 1991b).