## Solvency

**Intermittency does not disturb the base load or wind being able to solve for the environment**

**MTC, 04**

In collaboration with the Massachusetts Technology Collaborative’s Renewable Energy Trust Fund, the Renewable Energy Research Laboratory “Wind Power: Capacity Factor, Intermittency, and what happens when the wind doesn’t blow?” <http://www.umass.edu/windenergy/publications/published/communityWindFactSheets/RERL_Fact_Sheet_2a_Capacity_Factor.pdf>, accessed 10/3/12,WYO/JF

**The wind does not always blow**; sometimes a wind power plant stands idle. Furthermore, **wind power is really not “dispatchable” –** you can’t necessarily start it up when you most need it. **As wind power is first added to a region’s grid, it does not replace an equivalent amount of existing generating capacity – i.e. the thermal generators that already existed will not immediately be dismantled**. **Does intermittency imply that wind power cannot have beneficial impact on the environment?** **No. We need to distinguish here between capacity and production.** The first is the amount of installed power in a region, and is measured in MW. P**roduction is how much energy is produced by that capacity, and is measured in MWh. While wind power does not replace an equal amount of fossil-fuel capacity, it does replace production – for every MWh that is produced by a wind turbine, one MWh is not produced by another generator. The damage done by our existing electricity generation is primarily a function of production, not capacity**. **Burning less coal has a positive environmental impact, even if the coal plant is not shut down permanently.** In Massachusetts, the avoided production would mostly be from fossil-fuel plants. So for every MWh that is produced by a wind turbine here, that causes about two thirds of a ton of CO2 not to be produced (see page 4 for a discussion of marginal emissions in New England.) **The impact of intermittence on the grid Intermittency does have an impact on the grid, though it is not the impact that wind power critics usually assume**. When the concentration of wind power in a region is low, the impact is negligible. Keep in mind that loads fluctuate constantly, **so a small amount of fluctuating generation can be said to act as a “negative load” and have almost no measurable impact on the grid.** Many modern wind turbines can supply some grid support as well (referred to as “ancillary services,” e.g. voltage support), just as most power plants do. As the concentration of wind power increases in a region, though, intermittence and the difficulty of forecasting wind power production do have a real cost associated with them. Recent studies of wind power installed on United States grids have attempted to determine the actual cost of intermittency, They indicate it is currently in the area of a 2-5 tenths of a cent per kWh, depending on penetration. The higher costs were for 20% penetration. A few tenths of a cent per kWh is not insignificant, but it is still a small percentage of the total cost of generating power (which for wind power might be in the range of 2-6 ¢/kWh). Intermittency does impose a cost but that cost is typically not prohibitive, as some people imagine.

#### Other countries prove that intermittency does not cause wind to be back up by fossil fuel

[Chris Varrone](http://www.riverviewconsultinginc.com/our-team),11

Founder & President of [Riverview Consulting](http://www.riverviewconsultinginc.com/) and former Chief Strategist, Technology R&D at Vestas Wind Systems. “Why Wind Intermittency is NOT a Big Deal” <http://cleantechnica.com/2011/05/10/why-wind-intermittency-is-not-a-big-deal/>, accessed 10/3/12,WYO/JF

What if Wind Provided 20% of Our Energy? By now, even the Manhattan Institute’s best and brightest would have sweat on their brow. In my imagination, they would grasp at the final straw, arguing: “Well, that’s all well and good, but you’re forgetting that wind is a marginal player today. It’s easy to integrate a LITTLE wind. But once you get to 10% or 20%, the system breaks down. For every MW of wind you put on the system, you need to add a full MW of fossil fuel to back it up. It’s completely uneconomic from a capital cost perspective.” Of course this is all specious, too. Such scholars love to remind us how wind is just 2% of the US Energy pie today, neglecting to mention that [35% of the new-build for the past three years has been wind power](http://www.awea.org/newsroom/pressreleases/1QNumbers4282011.cfm). The fact is that there are already states and countries that have 20% or more wind power over the course of a full year — Iowa for one; [Denmark](http://cleantechnica.com/2011/03/05/how-denmark-will-integrate-50-wind-power-by-2025/) and Northern Germany for another. And, in some of these places, wind accounts for 50% or even 100% of electricity demand for certain periods. Are there rolling blackouts in Europe due to their reliance on wind energy? No, far from it. The reliability of European grids is far better than [US grids](http://cleantechnica.com/2011/02/03/secessionist-grid-hurts-texas-as-day-after-tomorrow-freeze-causes-blackouts/). In fact, [according to Jay Apt](http://www.issues.org/22.4/apt.html), Executive Director of the Electricity Industry Center at Carnegie Mellon: “The United States ranks toward the bottom among developed nations in terms of the reliability of its electricity service… The average U.S. customer loses power for 214 minutes per year. That compares to 70 in the UK, 53 in France, 29 in the Netherlands, 6 in Japan, and 2 minutes per year in Singapore.” So, European grid operators have learned how to integrate wind in large quantities. Have they built large numbers of natural gas peaker plants to “back up” wind? No, not at all. European power system experts tell me that they are not aware of even a single gas peaker plant added to balance wind energy — not even in Northern Germany or Denmark. There is enough capacity in the system to handle everything without adding any extra capacity. In this context, and given that in 2007, under George W. Bush, the US Department of Energy came out with a plan called “20% Wind Energy by 2030,” it would seem that we are okay for at least the next 20 years. What happens beyond 20% or 30% wind penetration, it is hard to know for sure. I asked Mr. Peter Jørgensen, Vice President of International Relations at Energinet, Denmark’s grid operator, who told me: “We are able to balance the present system with strong interconnectors, market-based trade with the neighboring countries, and good wind forecasts.” No one is saying that a country can run solely on wind all year long, but [Denmark does plan to reach 50% wind penetration by 2025](http://cleantechnica.com/2011/03/05/how-denmark-will-integrate-50-wind-power-by-2025/). Jørgensen says: “It is a big challenge to integrate even more wind power in the system, but we think that we can manage this task, and we base our activities on the development of a strong international transmission grid, a flexible and coherent energy system and SmartGrid solutions.” So the key is not “backup” for wind – that’s the wrong concept entirely – but flexibility for the entire system across all generation types. Flexibility comes in four flavors: 1) forecasting and scheduling, 2) transmission, 3) demand-side management, and 4) energy storage. You can explore this more in an article of mine that appeared in [International Sustainable Energy Review](http://www.riverviewconsultinginc.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/OurWindEnergyFuture-ISERDec2010.pdf) in Dec 2010.

## Warming

**Even if the plan is not perfect, it still sends a credible signal of climate leadership that can boost American credibility**

**CFR 12**

[Council on Foreign Relations, staff, “The Global Climate Change Regime”, updated July 5, p. <http://www.cfr.org/climate-change/global-climate-change-regime/p21831> //wyo-tjc]

**The failure to pass comprehensive U.S. climate legislation**, **with a sweeping carbon cap-and-trade** at its base, **is a significant setback to U.S. mitigation efforts**. **Cutting U.S. emissions remains an essential step toward a climate-change solution at home and abroad**, providing not only an environmentally sound solution to the problem, but **giving the United States leverage in international bargaining as well**. The increasingly intractable position of the United States became more apparent during the COP-17 meeting in Durban. There, **the United States faced nearly universal criticism for not showing the leadership necessary for addressing climate change**.**While a cap-and-trade system remains ideal**, **deep cuts in U.S. emissions can be pursued a variety of ways, including** energy-efficiency regulations, **subsidies for renewable energy, and tax incentives for low-carbon technologies**. **Effort to reach consensus on these solutions should be pursued in the short term**, keeping in mind that a broad-based and economy-wide price on carbon is essential to driving the very deep emissions cuts that will be needed through 2050 and beyond at a reasonable economic cost.

## Economy

**[\_\_\_] Extend Royal – economic decline causes war – 3 reasons**

**--Redistribution of power causes miscalculation as global economic trends shift. Their defense doesn’t assume shifting global power or miscalculation means we should win full risk of impact**

**--Hampers trade expectations and encourages protectionism that most recent studies show increases the likelihood to trigger conflict because it undermines cooperative economic interdependency**

**--Diversionary theory indicates that governments have incentive to create military conflict during hard economic times to increase popularity and create a ‘rally around the flag’ effect.**

**[\_\_\_] Outweighs**

**[Magnitude]**

**Economic collapse causes escalating nuclear exchange that destroys civilization and the biosphere.**

**Bearden**, **2k** (T.E., Director of the Association of Distinguished American Scientists, “The Unnecessary Energy Crisis: How To Solve It Quickly”, Space Energy Access Systems, http://www.seaspower.com/EnergyCrisis-Bearden.htm)

History bears out that desperate nations take desperate actions. **Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress on nations will have increased** the intensity and number of their conflicts, **to the point where** the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (**WMD**) now possessed by some 25 nations, **are** almost **certain to be released**. As an example, suppose a starving North Korea { } launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response. Or suppose a desperate China - whose long range nuclear missiles can reach the United States - attacks Taiwan. In addition to immediate responses, the **mutual treaties** involved in such scenarios **will** quickly **draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly**. Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, **once a few nukes are launched, adversaries** and potential adversaries **are** then **compelled to launch on perception of preparations** by one's adversary. The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed. Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all, is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible. As the studies showed, rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs, with a great percent of the WMD arsenals being unleashed . **The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere**, at least for many decades.

.

**[Probability] There is a strong historical correlation between economic decline and war.**

**Mead 9** — Henry Kissinger Senior Fellow at the CFR, Professor at Yale (Walter Russel, "What Doesn't Kill You Makes You Stronger," The New Republic)

So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. **Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists** who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, **the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies.** As a result, **developing countries** and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots **tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes**--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, **financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth.** This may be happening yet again. **None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession.** History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. **If financial crises have been a normal part of life** during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, **so has war**. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: **The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars.** Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but **the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring** Adolf **Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might** start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to **be born**? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, **if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.**

#### Economic collapse makes your impact inevitable- Russia, China, and Iran would try to fill the economic gap, causing imperialist wars

Sander 2

(“Why was there (so far) No Third World War,” *Internationalist Perspective*, March 12, http://users.skynet.be/ippi/3t15%20iptex.htm)

But let us now examine the consequences of a deep global economic crisis on the imperialist impulses of other countries. The worsening economic conditions would be felt most acutely in the periphery of the global order, where already now many capitals feel the knife of devalorization on their throats and many states are losing their authority over parts of their territories and their monopoly over the use of armies. Thus, the economic collapse will inevitably ignite more interimperialist fires, wars of states against states as well as so-called civil wars. Increasingly, the US and its main allies will face the dilemma whether to put them out or not. The line of what the sheriff of the global order permits will be constantly shifting. Given their own economic problems, the cost of intervening militarily will weigh increasingly heavily. The dispute over who should carry the burden will come on top of the other conflicts created by the economic crisis and further undermine the perception of commonality of interests between them. Furthermore the willingness of society and of the working class in particular to accept growing military intervention may throw up an impassable roadblock. What is and what is not in the vital national interest of the US and Europe will be constantly redefined. It seems very likely then, that an increasing number of conflicts will have to be allowed to go on without intervention of the major powers. Countries such as Russia, China, Iran and others would jump into the vacuum to advance their own imperialist interests. Alliances and connections between different conflicts would emerge. The deeper the economic crisis becomes and the more wars are permitted, the more the imperialist impulse would snowball. Even if the major powers would succeed in imposing a retrenched but hard line of defense of the global order, which is a very big ‘if’, and prevent war between the nuclear armed India and Pakistan, between China and Taiwan or Japan, an invasion of South-Korea by the North or wars that would endanger oil-production in the Middle East, the fire would burn wide and deep. To summarize: for many capitals, the cost-benefit analysis of imperialist undertakings would drastically change because the severity of their economic problems would increase the incentive to seek compensation through conquest and pillage, while the disincentive to do so would diminish because the global economy in crisis would offer them less benefits, especially if the developed capitals react to this crisis in a defensive, protectionist way. The military disincentive would progressively diminish by a growing reluctance and incapacity of the US and other powers to intervene and last but not least the social incentive would increase because through nationalist, racist and xenophobic war and ethnic/religious cleansing campaigns, capitalism would seek to channel the increasing unrest, anger and violence in society to protect its own rule and domestic order.

## K

**First, Our Interpretation: The resolution asks the question of desirability of USFG action. The Role of ballot is to say yes or no to the action and outcomes of the plan.**

**Second, is reasons to prefer:**

**(\_\_\_) A. Aff Choice, any other framework or role of the ballot moots 9 minutes of the 1ac**

**(\_\_\_) B. It is predictable, the resolution demands USFG action**

**(\_\_\_) C. It is fair, Weigh Aff Impacts and the method of the Affirmative versus the Kritik, it’s the only way to test competition and determine the desirability of one strategy over another**

**Finally, It is a voter for competitive equity—prefer our interpretation, it allows both teams to compete, other roles of the ballot are arbitrary and self serving**

**Perm solves: Capitalism is key to economic, social and political change, we can use the system to reform it.**

**Gartzke, 05**

Eric Gartzke, Future Depends on Capitalizing on Capitalist Peace, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=5133>, accessed 1-20-2011, WYO/JF

**A more powerful explanation is emerging from newer**, and older, **empirical research - the "capitalist peace**." As predicted by Montesquieu, Adam Smith, Norman Angell and others, **nations with high levels of economic freedom not only fight each other less, they go to war less often, period. Economic freedom is a measure of the depth of free market institutions or, put another way, of capitalism. The "democratic peace" is a mirage created by the overlap between economic and political freedom. Democracy and economic freedom typically co-exis** t. Thus, if economic freedom causes peace, then statistically democracy will also appear to cause peace. When democracy and economic freedom are both included in a statistical model, the results reveal that economic freedom is considerably more potent in encouraging peace than democracy, 50 times more potent, in fact, according to my own research. Economic freedom is highly statistically significant (at the one-per-cent level). Democracy does not have a measurable impact, while nations with very low levels of economic freedom are 14 times more prone to conflict than those with very high levels. But, why would free markets cause peace? **Capitalism is not only an immense generator of prosperity; it is also a revolutionary source of economic, social and political change. Wealth no longer arises primarily through land or control of natural resources.**

**Capitalism is key to space exploration and development**

**Blundell, 04**

John Blundell, director general of the Institute for Economic Affairs, 2004 (“Mission to Mars must go private to succeed,” February 2, http://www.iea.org.uk/record.jsp?type=news&ID=166)

**What we need is capitalists in space. Capitalism needs property rights, enforcement of contracts and the rule of law.** The ideological tussle does not cease once we are beyond the ionosphere. With the exception of Arthur C Clarke, **none of us imagined the** **entertainment potential from satellites**. Geostationary lumps of electronic gadgetry beam us our BSkyB television pictures. I remain in awe that Rupert Murdoch can place a device in the skies above Brazil that sends a signal to every home in each hemisphere. Who could have foreseen that mobile phones could keep us chattering without any wiring, or that global position techniques could plot where we all are to within a metre? **These are business applications. Business is already in space. Markets detect and apply opportunities that are not envisaged by even the most accomplished technicians**. I’m not saying Murdoch has special competences. I imagine he is as baffled by digital miracles as I am. The point is that **companies define and refine what public bodies cannot achieve. Lift the veil of course and all those satellite firms are an intricate web of experts supplying ideas and services. We have an infant space market**. What use will the Moon be? Is there value on Mars other than the TV rights? The answer is nobody can know. We can only make some guesses. The Spanish ships that set off for the US thought they would get to India. The Portuguese knew they’d reach China. The English followed them westwards seeking gold. In fact, they got tobacco. Events always confound expectations. The arguments for putting men on Mars are expressly vague from President Bush. Perhaps he was really bidding for votes. From my reading **the best results may be medical. Zero, or low, gravity techniques may allow therapies of which we are ignorant. It seems facetious to suggest tourism may be a big part of space opportunity** but as both the North and South poles are over-populated and there is a queue at the top of Mount Everest, a trip to the Sea of Tranquility may prove a magnet for the wealthy. Instead of NASA’s grotesque bureaucracy it may be Thomas Cook will be a greater force for exploration. NASA could be a procurement body. It need not design and run all space ventures. It could sub-contract far more extensively. Without specialised engineering expertise it is not easy to criticise projects such as the shuttle. It seems to be excessively costly and far too fragile. **There are private space entrepreneurs already**. They are tiddlers up against the mighty NASA. Yet Dan Goldin, the NASA leader, says he favours the privatisation of space: "**We can’t afford to do solar system exploration until we turn these activities over to the cutting edge private sector**..."Some may say that commercialising portions of NASA’s functions is heresy. Others may think we are taking a path that will ruin the wonders of space. I believe that when NASA can creatively partner, all of humankind will reap the benefits of access to open space". Is it possible the Moon has a more noble future than merely a branch office of NASA? Is it tolerable that Mars could be a subsidiary of the USA? Could it be nominally a further state of the union? These are not silly questions. In time space will be defined by lawyers and accountants as property rights will need to be deliberated. One possibility may be that both environments are so hostile that Mars and the Moon will never be more than token pockets for humanity. On the evidence so far it is the orbiting satellites that have made us see the Earth through new eyes. We can survey and explore the planet better from 200 miles up than stomping on the surface. The emerging commercial body of space law is derived from telecommunications law. It is perplexing and contrary to our immediate senses. How can you own or exchange something as intangible as digital messages bouncing off satellites? Yet we all pay our mobile phone bills. Many of the business results of space exploration are unintended consequences of NASA’s early adventures. Computer development would probably have been slower but for the need for instrumentation for Apollo. Are there prospects for Scottish firms in space? The prizes will not go to only the mega corporations. Perhaps Dobbies, the Edinburgh garden centre group, can create new roses by placing pots beyond gravity. Edinburgh University laboratories, or rather their commercial spin offs, could patent new medicines. Is it possible the genetic magicians at the Bush could hitch a ride into space and extend their discoveries? NASA is a monopolist. All monopolies are bad for business. They only stunt opportunities. They blunt alternatives. By opening space to entrepreneurship we will be starting on what FA Hayek memorably describes as "a discovery procedure". **Science is** an **open** system. **So is capitalism**.

**Space solves multiple existential threats –key to survival**

**Pelton 03**

(Joseph, Director of the Space and Advanced Communications Research institute at George Washington University and Executive Director of the Arthur C. Clarke Foundation, “COMMENTARY: Why Space? The Top 10 Reasons”, September 23, http://www.space.com/news/commentary\_top10\_030912.html)

Actually the **lack of a space program could get us all killed**. I dont mean you or me or my wife or children. I mean that Homo sapiens as a species are actually endangered. Surprising to some, a **well conceived space program may well be our only hope for long-term survival**. The right or wrong decisions about space research and exploration may be key to the futures of our grandchildren or great-grandchildren or those that follow. Arthur C. Clarke, the author and screenplay writer for 2001: A Space Odyssey, put the issue rather starkly some years back when he said: **The dinosaurs are not around today because they did not have a space program**. He was, of course, **referring to the** fact that we now know a **quite largish meteor crashed into the earth, released poisonous** Iridium **chemicals into our atmosphere and created a killer cloud** above the Earth **that blocked out the sun for a prolonged period of time. This could have been foreseen and averted with a** sufficiently advanced **space program**. But this is only one example of how space programs, such as NASAs Spaceguard program, help protect our fragile planet. **Without a space program we would not know about the large ozone hole in our atmosphere**, the **hazards of solar radiation**, **the path of** killer **hurricanes or** many other **environmental dangers**. But this is only a fraction of the ways that space programs are crucial to our future. He Continues… Protection against catastrophic planetary accidents: It is easy to assume that an erratic meteor or comet will not bring destruction to the Earth because the probabilities are low. The truth is we are bombarded from space daily. **The dangers are greatest not from a cataclysmic collision, but from not knowing enough about solar storms, cosmic radiation and the ozone layer. An enhanced Spaceguard Program is actually a prudent course that could save our species in time.**

**In a nuclear world we have to weigh consequences**

Sissela **Bok**, Professor of Philosophy, Brandeis, **1988**, Applied Ethics and Ethical Theory, Ed. David Rosenthal and Fudlou Shehadi

The same argument can be made for Kant’s other formulations of the Categorical Imperative: “So act as to use humanity, both in your own person and in the person of every other, always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means”; and “So act as if you were always through actions a law-making member in a universal Kingdom of Ends.” **No one with a concern for humanity could** consistently will to **risk eliminating humanity** in the person of himself and every other or to risk the death of all members in a universal Kingdom of Ends **for the sake of justice**. To risk their collective death for the sake of following one’s conscience would be, as Rawls said, “irrational, crazy.” And **to say that one did not intend such a catastrophe, but that one merely failed to stop other persons** from bringing it about **would be beside the point when the end of the world was at stake.**For although it is true that we cannot be held responsible for most of the wrongs that others commit, the Latin maxim presents a case where **we would have to take such a responsibility seriously—perhaps to the point of** deceiving, bribing, even **killing an innocent person, in order that the world not perish.**

## Natural Gas

#### Can’t export until at least 2016 – EIA study proves

**Saunders, Executive Director at the Center for National Interest, 7-9-12**

(Paul, “The Shale Gas Revolution,” 7-9-12, <http://www.tokyofoundation.org/en/topics/washington-update/shale-gas-revolution>, accessed 8-15-12) PM

A narrower but still significant question is whether the United States may become a natural gas exporter. The [US Energy Information Administration](http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/aeo/) currently projects that the United States will have the capability to export LNG as early as 2016 and to become a net exporter of natural gas soon after 2020, with a surplus reaching 1.36 trillion cubic feet (tcf), or about 38 billion cubic meters (bcm), by 2035. (The surplus could be as high as 7 tcf, or nearly 200 bcm, in the most optimistic scenario.) To provide a sense of perspective, the EIA estimates Japan’s gas consumption at approximately 4 tcf in 2035. Notwithstanding its projections, the EIA’s respected Annual Energy Outlook states in its 2012 edition that LNG exports “depend on a number of factors that are difficult to anticipate and thus are highly uncertain.”

#### Natural gas has little economic impact.

Meyer 12

(Gregory, Writer @ the Financial Times, *Shale gas unlikely to reignite US economy*, April 13th, <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/50c5460a-856d-11e1-a75a-00144feab49a.html#axzz23U3hDs1P>), accessed 10/2/12,WYO/JF

One million British thermal units is a lot of energy. It can warm the average American home for almost three winter days or get a car from New York to Baltimore. This week, the price of a million Btus of natural gas tumbled below $2 for the first time in a decade. This astonishingly cheap energy price has important implications. But don’t expect gas to become rocket fuel for the US economy. Gas has fallen thanks to the shale rock drilling boom that has spread from Louisiana to Pennsylvania. Last year the US produced record volumes. Academics, Wall Street analysts and the popular press are celebrating America’s newfound natural gas riches. Citigroup has been circulating research saying North America could become the new Middle East, while the cover of Fortune magazine shows the oxidised hand of the Statue of Liberty holding a blue-flamed torch of freedom, highlighting a feature on how shale gas is reviving the US economy. The benefits are clear: lower heating bills, potentially cheaper electricity and fewer US gas imports. But they should also be put in perspective. For reference, look at a December 2011 study commissioned by America’s Natural Gas Alliance, US a coalition of 30 drillers. The report found that by 2015 shale gas would contribute $118bn to gross domestic product (in 2010 dollars) and “809,000 more Americans will be employed because of low gas prices”. Before getting too excited, though, consider these facts. America’s GDP was $15tn last year. Assuming it keeps growing, shale’s contribution would be less than 1 per cent in 2015. The US has a labour force of 155m people, of whom 12.7m were unemployed last month. If gas put 809,000 more Americans to work tomorrow, it would shave the unemployment rate from its current 8.2 per cent to a slightly less dismal 7.7 per cent. “It’s certainly a good thing for the economy,” says John Parsons, economist at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a member of the university’s natural gas study group. “But it’s not any magical elixir. It’s not that large a segment.” Mr Parsons points out that the US economy has become much less energy-intensive than in past decades, meaning energy cost savings have less impact than they once did. The ANGA study has even brighter forecasts for the year 2035. But anyone who has spent time on the energy patch knows forecasts can go awry. Indeed, 20 years ago the Financial Times was writing about a US “gas bubble” that had depressed prices. They later rose as high as $15. This week the US Department of Energy’s analysis wing, the Energy Information Administration, said domestic gas production rose by a record 4.8bn cubic feet per day in 2011. This is more than three times its annual growth forecast made a year ago.

**No conflict escalation- China will respond peacefully to international pressure on Mineral exports**

Aaron **Souppouris, 8-22**

(“China raises export quota for rare earth metals”, the verge)

**In the face of mounting international pressure, China has raised its export quota for rare earth metals**. Chinas controls around 95 percent of the world's production of the metals, which are used when manufacturing a wide range of military, commercial, and personal electronics. **Back in October last year**, Bautou Steel, **a Chinese company that just happens to be the world's largest producer of rare earths, openly announced that it would cease production for a month in order to drive up prices.**¶ **Now, five months after the US, EU, and Japan filed a trade complaint against it, China has increased its export quota by 2.7 percent.** The Wall Street Journal reports that the quota rise largely symbolic, however, as demand has fallen by around 37 percent so far this year, despite Ben Popper's attempts to embed the world's rare earth deposits in his body.

#### Trade does not solve war—there’s no correlation between trade and peace

Martin, Mayer, and Thoenig 8

(Phillipe, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, and Centre for Economic Policy Research; Thierry MAYER, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, CEPII, and Centre for Economic Policy Research, Mathias THOENIG, University of Geneva and Paris School of Economics, The Review of Economic Studies 75)

**Does globalization pacify international relations**? The “liberal” view in political science argues that increasing trade flows and the spread of free markets and democracy should limit the incentive to use military force in interstate relations. This vision, which can partly be traced back to Kant’s Essay on Perpetual Peace (1795), has been very influential: The main objective of the European trade integration process was to prevent the killing and destruction of the two World Wars from ever happening again.1 Figure 1 suggests2 **however**, that **during the 1870–2001 period, the correlation between trade openness and military conflicts is not** a **clear** cut one. **The first era of globalization**, at the end of the 19th century, **was a period of rising trade openness and multiple military conflicts, culminating with World War I**. Then, **the interwar period was characterized by a simultaneous collapse of world trade and conflicts. After World War II, world trade increased rapidly**, while the number of conflicts decreased (**although the risk of a global conflict was obviously high). There is no clear evidence that the 1990s, during which trade flows increased dramatically, was a period of lower** prevalence of **military conflicts**, even taking into account the increase in the number of sovereign states.

**US-China war won’t happen – economic interdependence**

**Weede**, Former Professor of Sociology at the University of Bonn, 2010

(Erich, retired in 2004, current member of the Mont Pelerin Society, “The Capitalist Peace and the Rise of China: Establishing Global Harmony by Economic Interdependence”, International Interactions 36:2, 206-213, 5/18/10, accessed 6/20/11) JDB

**Economic cooperation and interdependence provide much more hope for the immediate future than democratization. The more countries trade with each other, the less likely military disputes between them become. Given the size of both economies and the distance between America and China, they already trade a lot with each other. As China is the first Asian giant to become capable of challenging the U.S., these pacifying ties happen to be in place where they are most needed.** From a capitalist peace perspective there is another piece of good news. Although trade between India and China had been negligible for a long time, since 1999 it has grown. **By 2009, China had become India’s biggest trading partner. Economic interdependence or trade may exert some pacifying impact on the relationship between Asia’s neighboring giants. Comparing the war-proneness of the Middle East with the avoidance of major military conflicts in the Far East over the past three decades, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the East Asian focus on economic openness and interdependence, on commerce, exports and growth did contribute to the pacification of East Asia.**

## CP

**Third,** 50 State Fiat is bad **unless it contains a solvency advocate that assumes every level of fiat including uniformity.**

**No literature base kills education- No one advocates all 50 states making one action at the same time- means not real world**

**Steals all aff offense by fiat-ing all the plan- makes it impossible to be aff on domestic topics- kills fairness**

**Voter for fairness and education**

**Fourth, C/P links to net benefits- will be perceived as federal action**

**State incentives empirically have failed to support renewable projects without federal support because of budget constraints and weak global economy- means any state policy alone would fail and fed incentives are key.**

**Rowley et al 12**

(Kath, Uday Varadarajan, Brendan Pierpont, and Andrew Hobbs, Climate Policy initiative, “Supporting Renewables while Saving Taxpayers Money,” September 2012, http://climatepolicyinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/Supporting-Renewables-while-Saving-Taxpayers-Money.pdf//wyo-mm)

**Over the last decade, a number of states have implemented renewable energy policies such as binding targets for renewable energy generation or state tax concessions**. These policies often include mechanisms to cover the gap between the cost of renewable electricity generation and market prices for electricity. These may involve explicit funding or subsidies such as tax concessions, rebates, or separate state funds for renewable energy. Others may involve implicit support—for example, regulators may be empowered to authorize increases in retail electricity prices to cover a utility’s incremental costs for compliance with renewable energy targets. **In theory, states with such policies in place could have covered the cost gap in the absence of federal support through the increased use of such mechanisms. However: • State budget constraints from the recession made increasing support from states unlikely. The global economic downturn**, which began with the financial crisis **of 2008, was particularly difficult on state budgets. Significant tax revenue losses associated with economic contraction along with increased mandatory spending to provide services to those impacted by the downturn** (such as through Medicaid insurance) **created significant fiscal pressures in nearly every state**. 16 While the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act provided $145 billion to state and local governments to help them cope with the downturn, this covered only about 40% of state deficits and states were nevertheless forced to make severe cuts to essential services. The **cuts were particularly severe in states with balanced budget requirements. These constraints made it unlikely that states would have increased spending if federal renewable energy incentives had been removed**. • **The recession’s impact on electricity demand made additional ratepayer support unlikely**. The impact of the recession on ratepayers was similarly stark. Unemployment reached nearly 10%. According to FERC, electricity demand in the U.S. fell by 4.2% in 2009 due to decreased economic activity (the steepest drop in 60 years). As a result, utilities and the relevant regulators would have faced an exceptionally difficult business and political environment for making a case to increase retail rates to cover additional costs of new renewable electricity generation. • European states facing fiscal constraints pulled back renewable energy policies but U.S. states did not. Nevertheless, renewable energy deployment in the U.S. continued to grow during the recession, and most state renewable energy targets prior to the recession were either maintained or strengthened. This is in marked contrast, for example, to the impact of the downturn on renewable energy deployment in Europe. E.U. Member States facing significant fiscal constraints—such as Spain and Italy— abruptly curtailed their renewable energy policy ambitions in the absence of E.U.-wide fiscal support analogous to the support provided by federal incentives to U.S. states. Thus, we believe that **additional state** or ratepayer **support was not likely and that federal policies were critical to the recent growth in renewable energy deployment. Due to the continued weakness of the global economy, it does not appear that the budget and demand constraints noted above are likely to ease in the near term**. Further, as we noted in the introduction, **current state policies alone do not appear to be strong enough to sustain the level of growth in renewable energy deployment seen over the last four years**. The PTC was allowed to expire at the end of 2001 and 2003 when wind faced similar market conditions, leading to booms just prior to expiration followed by substantially lower employment in the year after. As a result, it is likely that the expiration of federal incentives, in particular, the PTC for wind, could lead to significantly reduced levels of annual renewable energy deployment in the near future, another boom and bust cycle for renewables.

**State governments fail at renewable energy policy—patchwork policies and budget constraints**

**Mann, 2011**

[Roberta, Professor and Dean’s Distinguished Faculty Fellow, University of Oregon School of Law, “FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAX POLICIES FOR CLIMATE CHANGE: COORDINATION OR CROSS-PURPOSE?” 4-25-11, Lewis and Clark Law Review, Online, http://www.lclark.edu/live/files/8326-lcb152art4mann] /Wyo-MB

**Coordination of federal, state, and local tax policies** for climate ¶ change **raises concerns** similar to those raised by scholars contemplating ¶ the effect of comprehensive federal climate change legislation on ¶ existing regional, state, and local efforts to mitigate climate change. **What ¶ level of government should bear the primary responsibility for setting ¶ climate change policy**? **From a business perspective, setting climate** ¶ **change policy at the national level is efficient because it avoids the need ¶ to comply with a patchwork of state and local regulations**. **From a fiscal ¶ perspective, letting the federal government fund climate change efforts ¶ makes sense as well. The federal government can run a deficit; most State ¶ governments are constitutionally prohibited from doing so**¶ 12¶ **and are ¶ further limited by their inability to print money**. Recent federal economic stimulus legislation increased tax incentives ¶ for investments in renewable energy for individuals and businesses.¶ 13¶ At ¶ the same time, **budgetary concerns caused some states to consider ¶ cutting back energy tax incentives**.¶ 14¶ **Local governments facing budget ¶ shortfalls may consider reducing climate-friendly** public transportation ¶ **services** and increasing property taxes. On the other hand, state and local governments, while lacking revenue, may be well positioned to identify ¶ and encourage the use of locally abundant renewable energy sources.

**Extend 1AC Mormann and Reicher- investment is the only way to spur the industry and MLP investment has better benefits than any status quo state incentives**

## Fiscal Cliff

#### Fiscal cliff won’t pass now-the parties are far apart

NYT 10-2

(“Senators try to deal with 'fiscal cliff'” 10-2-12 http://www.sfgate.com/nation/article/Senators-try-to-deal-with-fiscal-cliff-3910971.php//wyoccd)

Senate leaders are closing in on a path for dealing with the "fiscal cliff" facing the country in January, opting to try to use a postelection session of Congress to reach agreement on a comprehensive deficit reduction deal rather than a short-term solution. Senate Democrats and Republicans remain far apart on the details, and House Republicans continue to resist any discussion of tax increases. But lawmakers and aides say a bipartisan group of senators is coalescing around an ambitious three-step process to avert a series of automatic tax increases and deep spending cuts.

#### Wind lo Bill is largely bipartisan now 2. Parity doesn’t limit fossil fuels 3. Will result in economic growth.

Brown 12

(Sam, SCS Renewables, “New legislation creates energy investment opportunity,” July 5, 2012, <http://www.scsrenewables.com/2012/07/05/new-legislation-creates-energy-investment-opportunity/#more-961//wyo-mm>)

With the recent introduction of the MLP Parity Act, a bipartisan bill that would amend the tax code to allow Master Limited Partnerships (MLPs) to participate in renewable energy projects, we continue to see momentum towards the implementation of new investment vehicles needed to broaden the investor pool and lower the cost of capital for solar. In today’s partisan climate, targeting simple changes such as this is wise and difficult to argue against given the changes don’t seek to limit the growth of competing fossil fuel resources. In a time when economic growth is a primary concern for all parties, the promotion of structures that are solely intended to create market efficiencies and allow the greater public to invest represents the low-hanging fruit of legislation.

**Wind lobby will get house GOP on board**

Timothy P. **Carney**, the Examiner's senior political columnist, “Wind lobby strives to adapt to Tea Party era”, May 6, **2012**

**Tapping the Republican revolving door has been a big part of AWEA's campaign**. The annual report noted that **the group hired lobbyist** and former Louisiana Rep. Jim **McCrery, who was the top Republican on the Ways and Means Committee until** the **2008** election. AWEA **also hired** Maggie **Lemmerman, a former Republican congressional aide, to lobby House Republicans**, according to the annual report. The rollout of the PTC-renewal legislation must be carefully plotted, the AWEA report stated. Reauthorization should first come up in the GOP-controlled House, with at least one-third of its original co-sponsors being Republican, the AWEA report explains. **House Majority Whip** Kevin **McCarthy**, who **has sponsored PTC renewals** in the past, **was portrayed as AWEA's prime target. McCarthy has conservative credibility, and** if it got him on board, AWEA felt **it would have better luck getting t**he **support of Senate Finance** Committee **Chairman** Chuck **Grassley**, R-Iowa. AWEA explained its strategy **as "providing political cover to** Senator **Grassley by recruiting House leadership** to sponsor version of PTC extension in that chamber." As of May 4, however, McCarthy is not a co-sponsor of the House bill, HR 3307, reauthorizing the PTC. AWEA won't convince everyone, and that's where opposition research comes in. The public affairs department in 2011 "identified sources of opposition in [the] anti-wind libertarian, free-market fundamentalist echo chamber," the annual report explains. I asked AWEA just who was on the "anti-wind libertarian, free-market fundamentalist" list. They didn't tell me. **AWEA plans "continued deployment of opposition research through third parties to cause critics to have to respond," the battle plan states**. In other words: **When people attack AWEA's subsidies, AWEA might feed an unflattering story on that person to some ideological or partisan media outlet or activist group. AWEA's tactics aren't out of the ordinary for Washington.** And given that the tax credit is worth an estimated $1 billion a year in tax savings, you can't blame them for trying so hard to save it.

#### Even if he has PC he won’t use it: Dream Act proves

Saunders 9/24

(Debra J., San Francisco Chronicle, “'Obama's promise' a political football,” September 24, 2012, http://www.sfgate.com/opinion/saunders/article/Obama-s-promise-a-political-football-3891069.php//wyo-mm)

Under Obama, Congress didn't vote on the Dream Act until after the 2010 midterm elections, which would bring in a Republican majority to the House. The lame-duck House passed the bill 216-198. But then, as Obama pointed out, a Senate bill failed to meet the 60-vote threshold to overcome a GOP filibuster. Obama neglected to mention that the Senate bill would have hit the magic number if five Democrats had voted for it instead of against it. McCain has not forgiven Obama for supporting a poison-pill provision that toppled the fragile coalition behind the ill-fated 2007 immigration bill. McCain was willing to risk his far-from-modest ambitions to pass a compromise measure that was 11 years in the making. For his part, Obama opted for purity - and kept alive a bill whose promise has kept the Latino community snuggly inside the Democrats' pockets. "For Obama, it's a political issue to be managed," observed Mark Krikorian of the antiamnesty Center for Immigration Studies. Obama risked no political capital on immigration reform early on. Instead, he waited until 2012 and issued an executive order allowing Dream Act wannabes to apply for "deferred action" that stops deportations and delivers work papers. Obama overrode the will of Congress, so is it legal? Maybe voters will find out after the election.

#### Political capital doesn’t spillover – presidential lobbying wont affect votes.

Dickinson, 2009 (Matthew Dickinson, professor of political science at Middlebury College and taught at Harvard University, where he also received his Ph.D., “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power” May, google)

What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee.

#### Winners win—unlocks the agenda

Green 10

 (David, professor of political science at Hofstra University, June 11, “The Do-Nothing 44th President”,  <http://www.opednews.com/articles/The-Do-Nothing-44th-Presid-by-David-Michael-Gree-100611-648.html>, accessed 10-31-2011,WYO/JF

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

**Eliminating ‘fiscal restraint’ not possible**

Benjamin **Page**, CBO Macoeconomic Analysis Division, “Economic Effects of Reducing the Fiscal Restraint That Is Scheduled to Occur in 2013”, Congressional Budget Office, May **2012.**

**However, eliminating or reducing the fiscal restraint scheduled to occur** next year **without imposing comparable restraint in future years would reduce output and income in the longer run relative to what would occur if the scheduled fiscal restraint remained in place. If all current policies were extended for a prolonged period, federal debt** held by the public—currently about 70 percent of GDP, its highest mark since 1950—**would** continue to **rise much faster than GDP. Such a path for federal debt could not be sustained** indefinitely, **and policy changes would be required** at some point.

#### Superpowers won’t go to war over the Middle East.

Gelb ’10

Leslie, President Emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations. He was a senior official in the U.S. Defense Department from 1967 to 1969 and in the State Department from 1977 to 1979, November/December Foreign Affairs, Proquest

Also reducing the likelihood of conflict today is that there is no arena in which the vital interests of great powers seriously clash. Indeed, the most worrisome security threats today-rogue states with nuclear weapons and terrorists with weapons of mass destruction-actually tend to unite the great powers more than divide them. In the past, and specifically during the first era of globalization, major powers would war over practically nothing. Back then, they fought over the Balkans, a region devoid of resources and geographic importance, a strategic zero. Today, they are unlikely to shoulder their arms over almost anything, even the highly strategic Middle East. All have much more to lose than to gain from turmoil in that region. To be sure, great powers such as China and Russia will tussle with one another for advantages, but they will stop well short of direct confrontation. To an unprecedented degree, the major powers now need one another to grow their economies, and they are loath to jeopardize this interdependence by allowing traditional military and strategic competitions to escalate into wars. In the past, U.S. enemies-such as the Soviet Union-would have rejoiced at the United States' losing a war in Afghanistan. Today, the United States and its enemies share an interest in blocking the spread of both Taliban extremism and the Afghan-based drug trade. China also looks to U.S. arms to protect its investments in Afghanistan, such as large natural-resource mines. More broadly, no great nation is challenging the balance of power in either Europe or Asia. Although nations may not help one another, they rarely oppose one another in explosive situations.

**MLP legislation strengthens US as a leader in clean energy**

**D'Alessandro 12**

(Laura, Energy Reporter at SNL Financial and working on a Masters in Interactive Journalism at American University, SNL Energy Power Week Canada, “Senators introduce bill to change definition of MLPs to include renewables,” June 11, 2012, accessed via ProQuest//wyo-mm)

**Since the legislation is seeking a more cost-effective way to finance clean energy, it will cross party lines, said Felix Mormann, a fellow at Stanford University's Steyer-Taylor Center for Energy Policy and Finance**. "It's no coincidence that **the act has bipartisan co-sponsorship** from Sens. Coons and Moran," he said in a June 7 email. "**The act has** the **potential to give taxpayers more bang for their buck when it comes to renewables**. I think it's got legs." In addition to **the support of a handful of senators**, the bill is backed **by AWEA**, the Solar Energy Industries Association, **the Biomass Power Association, the Biotechnology Industry Organization, the Ocean Renewable Power Energy Coalition, the American Council on Renewable Energy and other** trade and environmental **groups**. Mormann said that besides bringing renewable energy to parity with conventional generation, which is the main thrust of the bill, **it stands to provide incentives to promote growth across the entire energy sector and strengthen the nation's position as a global clean energy leader**.

**That’s key to primacy, preventing extinction from warming and great power wars**

**Klarevas, 9**

NYU Center for Global Affairs professor 12-15-2009

[Louis, Ph.D. in International Relations from the School of International Service at American University, NYU coordinator of graduate Transnational Security studies, former Defense Analysis Research Fellow at the London School of Economics, former research associate at the United States Institute of Peace, "Securing American Primacy While Tackling Climate Change: Toward a National Strategy of Greengemony," [www.huffingtonpost.com/louis-klarevas/securing-american-primacy\_b\_393223.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/louis-klarevas/securing-american-primacy_b_393223.html), accessed 4-13-11, mss]

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

## Elections

**Romney will win- Intrade betting proves**

**Bingham Oct. 4th**

[Amy Bingham, ABC News October 4th, 2012, <http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2012/10/mitt-romney-dominates-in-post-debate-betting/>, uwyo//amp]

It will be days before public opinion polls will have tallied how President Obama and Mitt Romney performed at the first presidential debate. But**, while the odds are still with the president, betting men have been casting their lots for Romney. On both Intrade**, an Ireland-based online betting market**, and BetFair, i**ts English counterpart, **the odds that Romney will win the election spiked in the aftermath of his strong debate performance as bettors poured thousands of pounds and dollars into predicting who will win the White House** in November. **Bettors on Intrade**, primarily Americans **wagering millions, boost Romney’s chances 7 percentage points** from his closing value on Tuesday to his closing value Thursday, the largest spike Romney has seen on the 2012 market. **Obama’s odds, on the other, dropped 14 points** from a 79-percent high the day before the debate to a 65-percent low the day after.

**Romney is actually winning- media bias is manipulating polls**

**Gate Sept. 26th**

[Gate, September 26th, 2012, If The Election Were Held Today, Romney Would Win Big Over Obama, <http://www.norcalblogs.com/gate/2012/09/if-the-election-were-held-today-romney-would-win-big-over-obama.php>, uwyo//amp]

**When you get beyond the medias attempt to manipulate the poll, you will learn** that, not counting those who are still undecided, **if the election were held today, Romney would win 51.8% to 44.1**% over Obama. Truth is, **Obama can take every undecided vote between now and November 6th, and Romney would still win.** However **the undecided voters will split, so let's consider** the split that resulted in the most recent election, **the 2010 midterms. That would mean 58% of undecided voters will pull the lever for the Republican while, with the remaining 42% going to the Democrat. That would put the final tally at 59.74% to 41.26%, which would be a** historic **landslide for** Mitt **Romney.**

**Romney wins: peaking in voter enthusiasm necessary in battleground states.**

**Ferrechio 9/11**

(Susan, Chief Congressional Correspondent, Washington Examiner, “Polls show Romney soars with independent voters,” September 11, 2012, <http://washingtonexaminer.com/polls-show-romney-soars-with-independent-voters/article/2507679#.UFJD8o1lQvk//wyo-mm>)

**Romney** also **appears to have an advantage over Obama when it comes to voter enthusiasm**. The **CNN/ORC International poll showed Republicans leading Democrats among the most enthusiastic voters, 62 percent to 56 percent**. The **enthusiasm level helps determine which party will show up in greater numbers to vote. "This Republican enthusiasm advantage has manifested itself in an** unprecedented and historic grassroots **effort that will have a significant impact on turnout in battleground states on Election Day,"** Romney campaign pollster Neil Newhouse said in a Monday memo aimed at downplaying reports of an Obama bounce.

#### Plan would be massively popular with voters

**CSI 12**

[Civil Society Institue, “SURVEY: CONGRESS, WHITE HOUSE FOCUS ON FOSSIL FUELS, NUCLEAR POWER IS OUT OF TOUCH WITH VIEWS OF MAINSTREAM AMERICA” November 3 -- <http://www.civilsocietyinstitute.org/media/110311release.cfm>]

If Congress thinks it has found a winning issue in trashing wind and solar power ... and if the Obama Administration believes that voters will reward it for boosting coal, gas and nuclear power ... then both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue are making serious miscalculations about the sentiments of mainstream Americans - including Republicans and Tea Party supporters -- one year before the 2012 elections, according to the findings of a major survey of 1,049 Americans conducted October 21-24, 2011 by ORC International for the nonprofit and nonpartisan Civil Society Institute (CSI).¶ Documenting a major gulf between the views of Americans and the Congress/White House on energy policy, the CSI survey includes the following key findings:¶ **• If Washington had to choose between fossil fuel/nuclear subsidies and wind/solar subsidies, "clean energy" aid would get support from three times more Americans than fossil fuel/nuclear energy subsidies**. Only a bit more than one in 10 American adults (13 percent) - including just 20 percent of Republicans, 9 percent of Independents, 10 percent of Democrats, and only 24 percent of Tea Party supporters - are in favor of concentrating federal energy subsidies on the coal, nuclear power and natural gas industries. When it comes to focusing federal subsidies on wind and solar, 38 percent of all Americans are supportive -- about three times the support level for fossil fuel/nuclear subsidies. Only about one in 10 Americans (13 percent) - including just 26 percent of Tea Party supporters -- believes that "no energy source should receive federal subsidies."¶ • Fossil fuel subsidies are opposed by Americans on a bipartisan basis. Six in 10 Americans - including a strikingly uniform 59 percent of Republicans, 65 percent of Independents, 59 percent of Democrats, and 59 percent of Tea Party members -- oppose "federal subsidies for oil and gas, coal, natural gas and other fossil fuel companies."¶ • Nuclear reactor loan guarantees are opposed by Americans on a bipartisan basis. More than two out of three Americans (67 percent) - including 65 percent of Republicans, 66 percent of Independents, 68 percent of Democrats and 62 percent of Tea Party backers - disagree that "taxpayers and ratepayers should provide taxpayer-backed loan guarantees for the construction of new nuclear power reactors in the United States through proposed tens of billions in federal loan guarantees for new reactors."¶ • Most Americans want the U.S. to shift federal loan guarantee support from nuclear power to wind and solar energy. About seven in 10 Americans (71 percent) - including 55 percent of Republicans, 72 percent of Independents, 84 percent of Democrats, and almost half (47 percent) of Tea Party backers -- strongly or somewhat support "a shift of federal loan-guarantee support for energy away from nuclear reactors and towards clean renewable energy such as wind and solar."¶ • A strong majority of Americans want the U.S. to make the investments needed to be a clean energy leader on a global basis. More than three in four Americans (77 percent) - including 65 percent of Republicans, 75 percent of Independents, 88 percent of Democrats, and 56 percent of Tea Party members -- agree with the following statement: "The U.S. needs to be a clean energy technology leader and it should invest in the research and domestic manufacturing of wind, solar and energy efficiency technologies."¶ Pam Solo, founder and president, Civil Society Institute, said: "Americans of all political stripes have moved ahead of Washington and want our nation to make smarter choices about cleaner and safer sources of power. Common sense is the driving force in American opinion, which focuses not on whether Washington should help usher in a renewable, clean energy future, but how it should proceed in doing so. Americans believe that the energy industries have an undue influence over decisions made by Washington. They want leadership and problem solving from Washington for a clean energy future. Americans understand that we can no longer have our economy and environment tethered to 'old' energy solutions that are unsafe, unhealthy and simply unable to meet our long-term needs."¶ Graham Hueber, senior researcher, ORC International, said: "One clear message of this survey sit that **there is no clear 'Old Fuel Constituency' in the sense of a large number of unified Americans who favor** **fossil fuels** and nuclear power over wind and solar power. In fact, Republicans and Tea Party supporters who might seem like the most logical place for such a constituency are somewhat more likely than others to support federal subsidies for fossil fuels and nuclear power, but they also would prefer development of cleaner sources of energy. These are actually quite striking findings in the context of the 2012 election campaign."¶

**Obama not winning Col now- they’re in a dead heat**

**Richardson Sept. 14th**

[Obama, Romney still dead even in Colorado - Washington Times http://www.washingtontimes.com/blog/inside-politics/2012/sep/14/obama-romney-still-dead-even-colorado/#ixzz26Uy8tVMm , uwyo//amp]

DENVER — President **Obama and** Mitt **Romney have** practically **made Colorado their second home, but all those campaign stops and television ads haven't broken the deadlock. A survey of Coloradans** released Friday by The Denver Post **showed the candidates still stuck in a one-point dead heat, with Mr. Obama leading by 47 to 46 percentage points. The margin of error for the poll is +/- 4 percentage** points, meaning **the candidates are** essentially **tied.** **What about when Libertarian candidate Gary Johnson is included? In that case, it's still a one-point race, with the Democrat Obama ahead of the Republican Romney by 45 to 44 percentage point**s. Mr. Johnson takes 3 percent of the vote. Denver political analyst Floyd Ciruli said **the results "really raise the importance of the October debate here**." The first presidential debate is scheduled for Oct. 3 at the University of Denver. "**This race could come down to a few thousand votes in Colorado**, which means we'll be seeing a lot more them," said Mr. Ciruli.

**Colorado will be the only way to compensate for bigger swing state losses- it is key to Obama’s reelection**

**Sale 2012**

[Anna Sale, politics journalist, July 08, 2012, Anna in the Swing States: Colorado's Swinging Suburbs and Untapped Latino Voters, <http://www.wnyc.org/articles/its-free-country/2012/jul/08/colorados-swinging-suburbs-and-untapped-latino-voters/>, uwyo//amp]

At the start of this summer, Mitt **Romney was cutting into** President Barack **Obama's lead in the key swing state of Colorado,** even as the president's advantage with Latino voters here was expanding. With the unemployment rate stuck above eight percent and immigration reform newly prominent on the president's priority list, we're asking Colorado's swing suburban voters if they're souring on the president they helped elect, and whether Latino voters here have been convinced enough by Obama's recent moves to make up that difference. Colorado’s swelling suburbs and the growing numbers of Latino voters are most often cited as the drivers behind recent Democratic gains in the western state. Latino voters made up just 13 percent of the electorate in 2008, but they proved decisive by overwhelming favoring Obama while white voters almost evenly split. Suburban voters were pivotal for another reason: their massive share of the vote in Colorado. They cast more than half of all votes here four years ago, and after supporting George W. Bush in 2004, they swung ten points to give Obama a slight edge over John McCain. Obama won Colorado by nine points in 2008, the first time a Democrat had a presidential race won here since 1992. **This year, Colorado is in many ways the lynchpin in the Obama campaign’s strategy to remake the electoral map. As Obama campaign manager Jim Messina laid out last year, if the president repeats that win in Colorado, and captures Iowa, Nevada, New Mexico and the states John Kerry won in 2004, Obama wins another term. This western strategy diminishes the importance of Ohio and Florida, even though those perennial battlegrounds are much bigger electoral prizes compared to Colorado’s relatively modest nine electoral votes**. The Colorado electorate is largely broken up in thirds among Democrats, Republicans, and independents. Since 2008, the ranks of the unaffiliated, independent voters have grown in Colorado, and Democrats and Republicans now make up a slightly smaller percentage of registered voters in Colorado than they did four years ago. Much of the registration gains for Democrats and independents has happened in congressional districts with urban areas, contributing to the Democrats' recent success there.

**Colorado will only reach voter enthusiasm if Obama takes further steps toward clean energy**

**Casey 2011**

[Mike Casey, founder and president of Tigercomm. He uses his 27 years of communications experience to counsel cleantech company executives, pro-sustainability nonprofit leaders and elected officials on building and running their communications programs, Can Obama Go Back to Political base(ics)?, November 28, 2011, <http://www.greatenergychallengeblog.com/2011/11/28/can-obama-go-back-to-political-baseics/>, uwyo//amp]

President **Obama made a smart move** this month **by putting** the **Keystone XL** pipeline **project into the deep freeze. It had been poor politics** for him — and it would have been even worse policy for the country, especially when you consider the aggressive retooling of our world energy sources demanded by the International Energy Agency findings in its latest World Energy Outlook. But for the president’s staff, the question that lingers is whether it will relearn what it had mastered so well in 2008 — that **while you have to campaign in the center, your base voters’ enthusiasm matters a lot. Based on articles** like this one in Bloomberg Businessweek, **about how environmentalists “matter less to Obama 2012,” it certainly doesn’t seem that way**. For instance, the Businessweek article quotes Obama campaign spokesman Ben LaBolt commenting that “[w]hen voters compare Obama’s record with [the Republican candidates for president], ‘there will be no question about who will continue our progress.’” The problem is, for ego-conscious millennials (the key, according to a new analysis by Center for American Progress political analysts Ruy Teixeira and John Halpin, to the 2012 election) like former Microsoft executive Jabe Blumenthal, who care deeply about environmental issues and who want to feel that their concerns are being heard at the highest levels, simply asserting that “I’m not Rick Perry” or “I’m not Mitt Romney” won’t work. To the contrary, Blumenthal says in the Businessweek piece, it’s “simply not true” that the specter of Romney, Perry or Gingrich will be sufficient cause for him to open his checkbook to the Obama campaign, as he did in 2008. Throughout the Keystone XL process, the message from Washington pundits and experts was that environmentalists “will not be happy, but **they have nowhere else to go**.” It’s hard to imagine such an arrogant statement being directed at African-American, gay or Latino voters, but the “nowhere else to go” sentiment directed at environmentalists seemed to have taught them it was time to chuck the tradition of patty-cake politics and “principled loserism” they’ve operated with for so long. The clincher in the Keystone fight was when committed Obama 2008 volunteers, donors and staffers started correcting the “nowhere else to go” idea. These Obama supporters recognized that they did indeed have somewhere else they could go: home, And not just on election day, but on all the days between now and then. **In key states such as Colorado, where the green base is a lot of the base, these base voters realized that they could make themselves matter**. In addition, environmental leaders such as 350.org’s Bill McKibben, Sierra Club’s Mike Brune, Friends of the Earth’s Erich Pica, and Greenpeace’s Phil Radford have shown they aren’t interested in the “nowhere to go” approach. **I’m still not sure why the White House let things get to the point where supporters had to threaten to withhold their time, money and effort — all over a boondoggle that wouldn’t have dropped gas prices at all**. To me, the politics around the Keystone XL pipeline were clear from the start. First there were the wildly inflated claims of jobs from an industry with a history of inflating them. And, of the jobs that would have been created, most would have been in states that were politically out of reach for Obama, and many of those would likely have been created after the election. Worse, the project had become a cafeteria line for TransCanada lobbyists, creating a paper trail of revolving door influence-peddling and inside dealing that the media would have acquired and used long into an Obama second term. On top of all that, the president’s approval of this project would have further depressed his base while benefiting an industry that is resolutely opposed to him — including his arch political enemies, the Koch brothers. It all leaves me scratching my head. But, hey, as a clean energy advocate, I’ll take the result. Going forward, **there’s an opportunity for the Obama staff to stop confusing** the critical task of **courting the political center with the ill-advised practice of coddling lobbyists from a hostile oil industry.** For the environmental community, **there’s an opportunity to not resume the folded-hands, broken-hearted mode so much of its leadership has operated from over the last three decades. It will be interesting to see what the younger environmental.**

#### Energy won’t overwhelm a host of other voter priorities-health care, education, the deficit and the economy

Farnam 2012

[T.W. Farnam, Washington Post Journalist, June 29, 2012, Energy issue gets jolt of ads, Washington Post, Lexis Nexis, uwyo//amp]

Energy issues don't spark much excitement among voters, ranking below health care, education and the federal budget deficit - not to mention jobs and the economy. And yet those same voters are being flooded this year with campaign ads about energy policy. Particularly in presidential swing states, the airwaves are laden with messages boosting oil drilling and natural gas and hammering President Obama for his support of green energy. The Cleveland area alone has seen $2.7 million worth of energy-related ads. The disconnect between what voters say they care about and what they're seeing on TV lies in the money behind the ads, much of it coming from oil and gas interests. Those funders get the double benefit of attacking Obama at the same time they are promoting their industry. Democrats also have spent millions on the subject, defending the president's record and linking Republican candidate Mitt Romney to Big Oil. Overall, more than $41 million, about one in four of the dollars spent on broadcast advertising in the presidential campaign, has gone to ads mentioning energy, more than a host of other subjects and just as much as health care, according to ad-tracking firm Kantar Media/Cmag. Much to gain or lose In a campaign focused heavily on jobs and the economy, all of this focus on energy seems a bit off topic. But the stakes are high for energy producers and environmentalists, who are squared off over how much the government should regulate the industry. And attention has been heightened by a recent boom in production using new technologies such as fracking and horizontal drilling, as well as a spike in gas prices this spring just as the general-election campaign got underway. When asked whether energy is important, more than half of voters say yes, according to recent polls. But asked to rank their top issues, fewer than 1 percent mention energy. Still, so much spending focused on a topic low on the public agenda should not be a surprise, given the interest of the ad sponsors, said Bob Biersack, a senior fellow at the nonpartisan Center for Responsive Politics. "It's always been true that people's financial involvement in politics tends to reinforce their self-interest," he said.

#### Obama’s already seen as pushing wind, it’s just a question of how effective the policies are

Belsie 10/4

(Laurent, Christian Science Monitor, “Romney zinger: Obama backs 'green' energy losers. Is he right? (+video),” October 4, 2012, <http://www.csmonitor.com/Environment/Energy-Voices/2012/1004/Romney-zinger-Obama-backs-green-energy-losers.-Is-he-right-video//wyo-mm>)

One of the clearest dividing lines in the 2012 presidential campaign is 'green' energy subsidies. President Obama has pushed them in his four years in office. Challenger Mitt Romney wants to eliminate them, under the theory that government should avoid tinkering with the private sector. At Wednesday night's presidential debate, GOP candidate Romney summarized the difference with this zinger: "You put $90 billion — like 50 years worth of tax breaks — into solar and wind, to Solyndra and Fisker and Tesla and Ener1," he told the president. "I had a friend who said: 'You don't just pick the winners and losers; you pick the losers.' " He has a point. In pushing green energy, Mr. Obama has pursued a high-risk strategy of handing out loan guarantees and other federal subsidies to green energy companies, a strategy most of his predecessors have avoided. The results have not always been pretty.

#### No risk of trade war: threats Overblown- just campaign rhetoric

White 9/15

(Ben, Wall Street correspondent and served as national political researcher, POLITICO, “Doubts grow on Mitt Romney’s China threats,” September 15, 2012, <http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=D093A6D2-BB08-4466-8E06-1909BF75C357//wyo-mm>)

Mitt Romney is hoping his tough talk on China policy will win him votes — but few of his big business donors or fellow Republicans support what he’s saying or believe he’d follow through if elected. And if he did, many analysts say, he’d likely spark a disastrous and counter-productive trade war that would hurt both American consumers and the workers he says he’s trying to protect. But Romney advisers say voters shouldn’t expect him to back off the tough talk if he gets elected, and other experts say fears of a “trade war” are overblown since the Chinese need the American market just as much consumers like cheap Chinese imports.

#### No risk of war- even supporters believe it’s just rhetoric.

White 9/15

(Ben, Wall Street correspondent and served as national political researcher, POLITICO, “Doubts grow on Mitt Romney’s China threats,” September 15, 2012, <http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=D093A6D2-BB08-4466-8E06-1909BF75C357//wyo-mm>)

An actual Romney policy, many corporate executives believe, would have the same kind of focus on bringing cases before the World Trade Organization and negotiating behind closed doors — the same approach of Obama and George W. Bush. “On his first day on the job, Romney is not going to put himself on the immediate defensive with the world’s second largest economy,” said one top financial industry executive who strongly supports Romney. The executive, like many others interviewed for this story, asked not to be identified by name so as not to jeopardize relations with a possible future president.

#### China-bashing not bad- they’ll modify their stance to avoid war

White 9/15

(Ben, Wall Street correspondent and served as national political researcher, POLITICO, “Doubts grow on Mitt Romney’s China threats,” September 15, 2012, <http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=D093A6D2-BB08-4466-8E06-1909BF75C357//wyo-mm>)

So far, the Romney camp has shown no signs of backing off its hard stance, either publicly or in private meetings with donors. And not everyone in the business community thinks Romney’s approach is reckless. “A trade war is the unicorn of international economics,” said Scott N. Paul, executive director of the Alliance for American Manufacturing. “China’s a rational actor. China will modify its behavior if it believes market access to the United States could be at risk.” In an interview with POLITICO, a top Romney adviser said people who think Romney will soften his position are dead wrong. “People should wait and see what he does after the inauguration,” said the adviser, who was not authorized by the campaign to speak on the record. “You have to look at how much we buy from China and how much they buy from us. Those numbers are a very serious deterrent to the Chinese pursuing retribution against us. And from a strategic standpoint, if we are always unwilling to act because we think the Chinese might be willing to act, then we are always going to be stuck at this same point.”