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**First, we meet- A) plan in a vacuum is topical.**

**Second, counter-interpretation- a restriction is a regulatory constraint**

**Farlex, ’12** (Farlex collection, Princeton University, 2012, WordNet 3.0, Print)//CC

restriction - an act of limiting or restricting (as by regulation)

**Third, aff interp outweighs because a) predibility and education- NEPA is THE central production restriction.**

**USDI, USDA, DOE 2008**

[“Inventory of Onshore Federal Oil and Natural Gas Resources and Restrictions to Their Development”, <http://www.blm.gov/pgdata/etc/medialib/blm/wo/MINERALS__REALTY__AND_RESOURCE_PROTECTION_/energy/0.Par.68195.File.dat/EPCA2008lo_1.pdf> //wyo-tjc]

**Additional statutory and discretionary requirements beyond lease stipulations** impact Federal land access for oil and gas development. Many of these impacts were not quantified because GIS data do not exist, or they are issues that are not amenable to quantitative analysis. Many of **these requirements can be considered restrictions on drilling because they have effects similar to stipulations on oil and gas development activities**. **These issues can directly or indirectly impact Federal land accessibility for oil and gas development**. Tables 4-1 through 4-16 present office-specific issues that were recorded from discussions with BLM and FS staff during field visits. Average APD processing time was calculated for each office using input from the offices supplemented by an analysis of BLM’s Automated Fluid Minerals Support System (AFMSS).47 4.1 **Issues Directly Impacting Access The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969**. The NEPA is the nation’s central environmental statute. It requires Federal agencies to consider environmental impacts before an action is taken. The NEPA process is intended to help public officials make better decisions based on an understanding of their environmental consequences. **The NEPA is embedded into the fabric of Federal land management decision-making and has become the most important procedural public land management statute because it requires agencies to comply with its processes in all situations where major actions are contemplated.** When an activity or action is proposed on Federal lands, an interdisciplinary review of the environmental effects of the proposal is conducted and made available to citizens and public officials. The review can take one of four forms: • a categorical exclusion (CX) • documentation of NEPA adequacy (DNA) • an environmental assessment (EA) • an environmental impact statement (EIS) The NEPA process can impact oil and gas development in terms of cost and time delays. Typically an EIS or EA is drafted in consultation with the cooperating agencies, presented for public comment, and reviewed by multiple agencies. A simple EIS can take 24 to 36 months to complete, while those with more complex issues may require three to six years to complete. The land use planning process as a whole takes in excess of 36 months, particularly if there is oil and gas involved. The NEPA documents analyze alternatives to the proposed action and must include a “no action” alternative. Impacts are classified as direct, indirect, and cumulative, and include the evaluation of economic impacts to counties and states to be considered, as well as impacts on resources. When considering oil and gas leasing, the BLM has identified the need to obtain additional data on such issues as air quality and clean water as a part of the cumulative impact analysis required by the NEPA and land use planning processes. This has been cited as an overarching issue that affects oil and gas lease parcel nominations. This lack of data can result in leasing delays when existing documents are deemed inadequate. The net result is that potential applicants are often aware of the problem and make decisions not to develop in areas that will be or could be held up by the NEPA process. With respect to the NEPA process itself, concern was expressed by some government officials that individual documents provide “piecemeal” information and that better environmental decisions could be made based on larger scale studies that look at the “bigger picture.” For example, wildlife habitat fragmentation is better characterized when it is examined in the context of larger rather than smaller areas. Delays can increase costs for oil and gas operations because, rather than waiting for the Federal agency to complete the work, operators frequently pay a third-party contractor to perform the necessary work. Section 366 of Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPAct 2005) sets a deadline for the consideration of applications for permits. The permit must be issued within 30 days (if NEPA and other legal requirements have been met), or defer the decision and provide a notice to the applicant.

**B) topic specific- DOI outweighs their legal interp because of energy context, expertise and government predictability.**

**C)No neg offense bc Limits explosion inevitable – restrictions are broader**

**Hoekman 2**

Bernard Hoekman and Petros C. Mavroidis (World Bank Development Research Group) October 2002 **“**Economic Development, Competition Policy, and the World Trade Organization” http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2002/11/22/000094946\_02111404425138/Rendered/PDF/multi0page.pdf

Under the "effects" doctrine (or subjective territoriality), countries may take action¶ against foreign practices that have negative effects in their markets. Cartels are an¶ example. The WTO may be relevant in this connection through GATT Art. XI, which¶ states: "no prohibition or restriction ... shall be instituted or maintained ... on the exportation or sale for export". Export cartels are a restriction on exportation. As with national treatment, the threshold issue is whether the export cartel can be attributed to government behavior. On this, a GATT panel (Japan - Semiconductors) argued that a "but for" test should be used, i.e., to what extent the observed behavior would have taken place absent government involvement. Unfortunately the precise degree of government involvement was not specified and thus it is doubtful whether mere 'tolerance' of a cartel suffices. Arguably, however, even passive behavior could be caught by Art. XI, given that the term "restriction" invites a wider reading than the terms "law", "regulation" or "requirement" figuring in Art. I1.4. A legislative (rule making) initiative could usefully clarify this gray area.

**Fourth, prefer the affirmative-**

**a)competing interps stacks the deck for the negative and the race to overlimit destroys the value of debate by eliminating unique energy education in favor of the SMRs topic which is unsustainable**

**b) IF there is no REAL difference between the interps you vote aff because Debate is still possible EVEN IF the aff makes it slightly more difficult. The most perfect interp is impossible to find and hard debate is good.**

# Case

**Commercial shipbuilding’s key to naval power**

**NLUS 12**

Navy League of the United States, “America’s Maritime Industry The foundation of American seapower”, 2012, <http://www.navyleague.org/files/americas-maritime-industry.pdf>, Date Verification – http://gsship.org/industry-links/

**Defense Industrial Base: Shipbuilding The American Maritime Industry also contributes to our national defense by sustaining the shipbuilding and repair sector of our national defense industrial base upon which our standing as a seapower** is based**. History has proven that** **without a strong maritime infrastructure—shipyards, suppliers, and seafarers—no country can hope to build and support a Navy of sufficient size and capability to protect its interests on a global basis. Both our commercial and naval fleets** **rely on U.S. shipyards** **and their numerous industrial vendors for building** **and repairs**. The U.S. commercial shipbuilding and repair industry also impacts our national economy by adding billions of dollars to U.S. economic output annually. In 2004, there were 89 shipyards in the major shipbuilding and repair base of the United States, defined by the Maritime Administration as including those shipyards capable of building, repairing, or providing topside repairs for ships 122 meters (400 feet) in length and over. This includes six large shipyards that build large ships for the U.S. Navy. Based on U.S. Coast Guard vessel registration data for 2008, in that year U.S. shipyards delivered 13 large deep-draft vessels including naval ships, merchant ships, and drilling rigs; 58 offshore service vessels; 142 tugs and towboats, 51 passenger vessels greater than 50 feet in length; 9 commercial fishing vessels; 240 other self- propelled vessels; 23 mega-yachts; 10 oceangoing barges; and 224 tank barges under 5,000 GT. 11 Since the mid 1990’s, the industry has been experiencing a period of modernization and renewal that is largely market-driven, backed by long-term customer commitments. Over the six-year period from 2000-05, a total of $2.336 billion was invested in the industry, while in 2006, capital investments in the U.S. shipbuilding and repair industry amounted to $270 million.12 **The state of the industrial base that services this nation’s Sea Services is of great concern** **to the U.S. Navy.** **Even a modest increase** **in oceangoing commercial shipbuilding would give a substantial boost to our shipyards and marine vendors**. Shipyard facilities at the larger shipyards in the United States are capable of constructing merchant ships as well as warships, but often cannot match the output of shipyards in Europe and Asia. On the other hand, **U.S. yards** construct and equip the best warships, aircraft carriers and submarines in the world. They are unmatched in capability, but **must maintain that lead**. 13

# CP

**Alt causes to bird death- wind kills 20 birds a year**

[**R. Saidur**](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669)**, 11**

Centre of Research UMPEDAC, Level 4, Engineering Tower, “Environmental impact of wind energy” <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669>, accessed 10/10/12,WYO/JF

It is found that birds are one of the largest victim groups in mortality collision of wind turbines around the world [[29]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669#bib0145). Regional and overall birds’ fatality rates in United States are shown in [Table 4](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669#tbl0020). On the other hand, **Sovacool and Benjamin stated that wind energy killed about twenty times fewer birds than fossil fuels.** **The number of birds killed by wind turbines can be negligible compared to other human activities** [[30]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669#bib0150). It was found that **out of the total number of birds killed in a year**, **only 20 deaths were due to wind turbines** (for an installed capacity of 1000 MW), **while 1500 deaths were caused by hunters and 2000 caused by the collisions with vehicles and** electricity **transmission lines** (they are almost “invisible” for birds [[31]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669#bib0155)). Summing up, **it is important to understand that whatever impacts wind turbines have**, on the one hand they are very obvious, and on the other hand, it is possible to minimize them through proper design and planning. In contrast, **the impacts of thermal or nuclear energy production are slow to appear,** are long term and no matter how much effort and money are spent**, it is impossible to minimize them**. In conclusion, we must decide that if we have to produce electricity, it is certainly preferable to produce it in a way which has the smallest possible impact on the environment. From a technical and economic standpoint, **the most mature form of renewable and “clean” energy is wind energy**. It can effectively contribute to combating climate change while at the same time providing various environmental, social and economic benefits [[31]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669#bib0155). [Table 5](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669#tbl0025) shows the leading human-related causes of bird kills in United States [[32]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669#bib0160). **AWEA calculates that if wind energy were used to generate 100% of U.S. electricity needs, wind energy would only cause one bird death for every 250 human-related bird deaths with reference to the current rate of bird kills as described in**[**Table 5**](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669#tbl0025)[**[24]**](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669#bib0120)**.**

**Wind power technology allows for turbines to turn themselves off before killing massive amounts of birds**

[**R. Saidur**](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669)**, 11**

Centre of Research UMPEDAC, Level 4, Engineering Tower, “Environmental impact of wind energy” <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669>, accessed 10/10/12,WYO/JF

3.1.3.2. **Guidelines and consultancy** **for industry In United States**, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service **developed voluntary guidelines for** the sitting of **wind energy facilities**. These guidelines make recommendations regarding sitting of the wind plants. However, the wind industries are resisting such guidelines. A wildlife consultant may identify any issues of possible concern. The consultant examines the proposed site and prepares a detailed report on impacts for review for the developer. **These surveys reduce the threat to avian to minimal levels** [[38]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669#bib0190). 3.1.3.3. **Radar technologies Avian radar was developed for NASA and United States to detect birds as far as four miles away. The system will determine whether the birds are in danger or in safe. If the system detects that a bird is in danger, it will shut down the wind turbines automatically. Once a bird crossed the turbine safely, the system will automatically restart the turbine** [[39]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669#bib0195).

**Offshore wind does not affect birds**

**DOI, 11**

“Commercial Wind Lease Issuance and Site Characterization Activities on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Offshore New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia”, <http://www.boem.gov/uploadedFiles/BOEM/Renewable_Energy_Program/Smart_from_the_Start/MidAtlanticWEAs_DraftEA.pdf>, accessed 10/26/12,WYO/JF

While **birds may be affected by vessel discharges**, the presence of meteorological towers and buoys, and accidental fuel releases, **no significant impacts are anticipated**. **The risk of collision would be minor due to the small number of meteorological towers proposed, their size, and their distance from shore and each other.** The impact of meteorological buoys on ESA listed and non ESA listed migratory birds is expected to be negligible, because they are much smaller and close to the water surface and similarly dispersed. **The impact of meteorological towers on ESA listed and non ESA listed migratory birds is also expected to be minor at most for the same reasons**.

**Solar Power produces more GHG emissions than conventional fossil fuel energy systems**

**Abbasi ’12**

[Tasneem, 9/12/12, “Is the Use of Renewable Energy Sources an Answer to the Problems of Global Warming and Pollution?” Critical Reviews in Enviornmental Science and Technology http://www.tandfonline.com.libproxy.uwyo.edu/doi/pdf/10.1080/10643389.2010.498754//Wyo-PS]

**Harte and Jassby** (1978) c**onducted an analysis of pollution emissions associated with the material requirements for central direct solar receiver systems by comparing these emissions with those of an oil- or coal-burning plant** producing the same average power, and operating over the lifetime of

the solar plant. The comparison shows that, for those pollutants considered environmentally harmful, the emissions associated with the central receiver system are lower by about an order of magnitude as compared with an oilor coal-fired plant. **The findings of later studies are less favorable toward central solar systems** (Abbasi, 2001a; Abbasi et al., 2002; Bezdek, 1993). In **these studies the impact of GHG emissions, environmental degradation, and human health and safety of solar energy systems have been compared with the nuclear and fossil fuel energy options.** **After accounting for all direct and indirect aspects of the different energy production and delivery systems, the studies indicated the following** Given present technologies, on a standardized energy unit basis, **solar energy systems** may initially **cause more GHG emissions and environmental degradation than do conventional nuclear and fossil fuel energy systems**. 2. An ambitious program to utilize **solar energy systems** in place of nuclear and fossil-fuel systems could, for the next four or five decades, **actually increase environmental degradation.** In addition, **the production of materials for these technologies involves hazardous substances that must be handled cautiously to avoid environmental damage**. 3. **In comparing solar energy systems with the conventional alternatives**, it is important to recognize the substantial costs, hazardous wastes, and land-use issues associated with solar technologies. 4. Based on risk perceptions and present technologies, the health and safety risks of large-scale centralized solar energy systems may be substantially larger than those associated with some fossil and nuclear energy resource options. Of the different types of materials that can be used to make PV cells cadmium telluride is the least expensive (Zweibel et al., 2007) and is likely to be favored for this reason, especially in less economically advanced countries. But it is highly hazardous.

# Disad

**DA non-unique - Coal demand decreasing now- natural gas, and Obama regulations**

**James Shea,9/12**

Bristol Herald Courier, Va. McClatchy-Tribune Information Services

“Alpha CEO says Obama administration regulations a burden on coal industry [Bristol Herald Courier, Va.]” <http://www.equities.com/news/headline-story?dt=2012-09-12&val=472238&cat=energy>, accessed 9-12-12,WYO/JF

Alpha Natural Resources CEO Kevin Crutchfield made a "moral and economic case" Tuesday for coal usage in the U.S. **The head of the Bristol-based coal company said the industry is going through a turbulent period due to both market conditions and proposed regulations**. **The price of natural gas has declined significantly in recent years and many utility companies have switched power plant production from coal to natural gas.** **This has decreased demand for coal and led to layoffs in the industry. "**Unfortunately, I don't think we have seen the last of those," Crutchfield told members of the Rotary Club of Bristol, VA/TN. **At the same time, the Obama administration is implementing regulations that are burdensome on the industry,** Crutchfield said. "We are seeing out there a governmental interventionist technique creating an unfair playing field," he said. **Ten years ago, coal represented more than 50 percent of electricity production in the U.S. That number has slipped to 32 percent, and Crutchfield said he is concerned it could drop further to 25 percent.**

**No china link- China wants to transfer to wind- turns the DA.**

**Park, 9-28**

[Andrea, (Beijing Review) “Greener Pastures: China looks to Xinjiang for new energy”, September 28, 2012. <http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90778/7963812.html>//wyokb]

The name Xinjiang literally translates into "new frontier," and the name of the autonomous region rings especially true as **China looks to expand its new energy market**. **Companies are flocking to Xinjiang to build alternative energy plants, windfarms and new energy parts production factories**. **The region** has become a powerhouse for the energy industry and **is paving the way for China's recent efforts to foster sustainable energy.** Hami Prefecture has become one of Xinjiang's hot spots for energy. It provides 12.5percent of China's coal and is the 14th largest coal producer in China. But Zhang Wenquan, Deputy Secretary of Hami Prefectural Party Committee, said that now the city's priority is to shift toward more sustainable options. "**We want to transfer to wind and solar energy instead of coal and gas**," he said. **Xinjiang** is already the largest base of wind power in China. It **has nine wind farms,** three of which are in Hami. At Naomahu Wind Farm in Yiwu County of Hami, 99 soaring wind turbines stretch across the horizon—the area is so vast that it's impossible to see anything outside of the plant. The first phase of the plant consists of 66 smaller turbines, with a capacity of 750 kw each. The second phase has 33 larger turbines with a capacity of 1,500 kw each. Each phase has a 50,000-kw capacity, and the plant has generated 320 million killo watt hours (on average, 10 million kwh per week) since its completion last year; in China, only seven wind-powered plants have generated over10 million kwh. The power capacity of Naomahu Wind Farm is more than enough for allof Yiwu.

**China no longer needs large amounts of coal imports, shale gas is replacing**

**Wall Street Daily, 9/7**

“The King is Dead: Coal Stocks Have No Place in Your Portfolio Read more:” <http://community.nasdaq.com/News/2012-09/the-king-is-dead-coal-stocks-have-no-place-in-your-portfolio.aspx?storyid=171165#ixzz26KVuLgDG>, accessed 9-12-12,WYO/JF

**Still, many optimists believe that demand in emerging markets - especially China** - **will offset this decline and eventually lead to a resurgence in coal prices**. **But that's unlikely**. To begin with, **China's economy isn't growing nearly as fast as it once was**. (That's dampened the demand for electricity and steel, further exacerbating the decline in coal prices.) **And while China currently gets 80% of its power from coal, the country is fast tracking its natural gas program to duplicate the United States' success**. **China is home to the world's largest deposits of shale gas**. And **if it develops those assets, it has the chance to reduce pollution, create jobs and become more energy independent**… That's why it set a goal of producing more than 60 billion cubic meters of natural gas - about 10 times the current amount - by 2020. Recall, that's why so many Chinese energy companies have been looking for overseas takeover targets. **Indeed, coal's days in China are numbered, just like they are in the United States**.

**Failure to move forward on OSW guts American credibility on climate leadership**

**Kimmell and Stalenhoef 11**

[Kenneth, general counsel to the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, was responsible for overseeing the state permitting of the Cape Wind project, and now serves as the Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, and Dawn, environmental law attorney and Counsel for the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities, Golden Gate University Environmental Law Journal, “The Cape Wind Offshore Wind Energy Project: A Case Study of the Difficult Transition to Renewable Energy”, p**.** asp//wyo-tjc]

If completed, the Cape Wind offshore wind energy project would be one of the largest offshore wind farms in the world. **The project is** also **one of the most significant** greenhouse gas (**GHG) reduction measures in our nation. It would reduce GHG emissions** by an estimated 730,000 tons per year, which is **the equivalent of taking 175,000 cars off the road each year**.2 **Due to its size, novelty, and** colorful **permitting history, the project has become a symbol of the United States’ resolve to take action to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions** and its dependence on fossil fuels. **However, if the project is not constructed**, either because of the aesthetic concerns of tenacious beachfront property owners who oppose the project or because of its large up-front costs, **the world may well begin to question the United States’ commitment to doing its part to avert climate change**.

# k

#### First, F/W: Our interpretation is the ballot is a yes/no referendum on the aff’s plan-

#### RTP:

#### Fairness- should be able to weigh the aff’s impact against the k.

#### a:Predictibility- prevents negs from linking generically

#### b. skews the debate into an abstract direction that prevents focus on the implications of plan action

#### Governmental policy focus key to education-

**Crist 4** (Eileen, Professor at Virginia Tech in the Department of Science and Technology, “Against the social construction of nature and wilderness”, Environmental Ethics 26;1, p 13-6, http://www.sts.vt.edu/faculty/crist/againstsocialconstruction.pdf)

Yet, constructivist analyses of "nature" favor remaining in the comfort zone of zestless agnosticism and noncommittal meta-discourse. As David Kidner suggests, this intellectual stance may function as a mechanism against facing the devastation of the biosphere—an undertaking long underway but gathering momentum with the imminent bottlenecking of a triumphant global consumerism and unprecedented population levels. Human-driven extinction—in the ballpark of Wilson's estimated 27,000 species per year—is so unthinkable a fact that choosing to ignore it may well be the psychologically risk-free option.

Nevertheless, this is the **opportune** historical **moment** for **intellectuals in the humanities and social sciences** to join forces with conservation scientists in order to help create the consciousness shift and **policy changes** to stop this irreversible destruction. Given this outlook, how **students** in the human sciences are **trained** to regard scientific knowledge, and what kind of **messages percolate to the public from the academy** about the nature of scientific findings, **matter immensely**. The "agnostic stance" of constructivism toward "scientific claims" about the environment—a stance supposedly mandatory for discerning how scientific knowledge is "socially assembled"[32]—is, to borrow a legendary one-liner, striving to interpret the world at an hour that is pressingly calling us to change it.

#### The role of the ballot is to compare the impacts of wind to the alternative of not acting which is the tacit acceptance of fossil-fuel based generation

Weber 7

[Lucas, no qualifications available, published on WindPower.net- the North American Offshore Wind Power Information Project, “Offshore Wind Energy Permitting”, May 10, p. online//wyo-tjc]

Along the same line as the current regulatory delay, the NEPA environmental review process is being misused as a method of obstructing future offshore wind energy development. Under the NEPA review process, the EIS should consider both the direct and indirect environmental effects of the proposed action.124 The environmental consequences, both positive and negative, of alternatives to the proposed action, including the alternative of no action, must also be objectively compared as part of EIS.125 During the scoping process, which is required to take place before the draft EIS is published126, the agency should consider the significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action, as well as any connected actions and reasonable alternatives, including the alternative of no action.127 In the context of permitting offshore wind energy development, the MMS would be required to consider the significant environmental consequences associated with granting access rights for the construction and operation of the facility, any reasonable alternatives, and the alternative of no action. Essentially, this would translate into two potential options: permit offshore wind energy development or allow the current reliance on fossil fuel-generated electricity to continue. This environmental review framework should create a decision-making process based on a comparison of the proposed offshore wind energy project’s impacts against the impacts associated with other forms of electricity generation, chiefly fossil fuel generation. Given the known consequences of both the options, this decision-making process would make the offshore wind energy project the appropriate decision virtually every time.128 Consideration of the potential impacts on fish populations from offshore wind energy development illustrates this decision-making process. Despite claims that the Cape Wind Project would have significant impacts on fish populations, the project’s Draft EIS found that the impacts would be minimal and temporary.129 Conversely, the potential impacts on fish populations from fossil fuel and nuclear power plants would be significant and permanent. Fossil fuel and nuclear power plants typically use tremendous amounts of water for cooling. They pull water from the nearby lake, river, or ocean into the plant’s cooling system, where it absorbs waste heat. This heated water is then dumped back into the waterbody. This process kills thousands of fish and the warmer water destroys habitats. However, an offshore wind energy project, such as the Cape Wind Project, would reduce power plant fish kills to the extent that it displaces existing generation. Therefore, the concern for potential impacts on fish populations, which is frequently used by opponents of offshore wind energy projects, would actually favor those projects under the proper environmental review process.

Cap k

**Cap**

**Cap sustainable: rising now and can recapture growth**

**Corcoran, 11**

Terence Corcoran, Financial Post · Saturday, Jan. 8, 2011, Capitalism's comeback,
[http://www.financialpost.com/opinion/columnists/Capitalism+comeback/4078699/story.html#ixzz1CYct9eqf](http://www.financialpost.com/opinion/columnists/Capitalism%2Bcomeback/4078699/story.html#ixzz1CYct9eqf) , accessed 1-30-2011, WYO/JF

**The markets are ready to take up the challenge. Corporations and investors are sitting on unprecedented volumes of cash. This is the capital that will drive capitalism's recapture of the economy and a return to growth. That's already happening,** as Richard Salsman of InterMarket Forecasting noted recently (see commentary nearby). **That these trends toward more growth and production will continue through the year seems all but inevitable**. What is not certain is the ability of governments to get out of the way fast enough to make growth solid and sustainable. Getting out of the way means two things: reducing government spending and reining in monetary policy. All governments now talk about reducing deficits. But if Washington, Ottawa and the provinces are to avoid fiscal calamities -- and even Eurostyle debt meltdowns -- they must begin by reducing spending. So far, politicians are talking about the need for fiscal reform but nobody is doing anything. The second big uncertainty is monetary policy. Unprecedented printing of money by the Federal Reserve has flooded the world economy with U.S. dollars. As a result, the U.S. dollar is going down and commodity prices are rising, including oil. Low interest rates and monetary expansion are creating an environment that could fuel pockets of inflation--bubbles--that risk a repeat of the mortgage bubble that was at the heart of the financial crisis. **But there's no denying a major shift in the political and economic landscape -- a shift back to markets, growth and competition. Capitalism is on the rise**, but the state has yet to get as far out of the way as it should.

**[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.**

**Collapse causes Resource hording – turns mindset shift**

**Monbiot, 09**

[George Monbiot, columnist for The Guardian, has held visiting fellowships or professorships at the universities of Oxford (environmental policy), Bristol (philosophy), Keele (politics), Oxford Brookes (planning), and East London environmental science, August 17, 2009, “Is there any point in fighting to stave off industrial apocalypse?,” online: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cif-green/2009/aug/17/environment-climate-change>, \\wyo-bb]

**From the second and third observations**, this follows: **instead of gathering as free collectives of happy householders, survivors of** this **collapse** will be **subject** **to** the **will of people seeking to monopolise** **remaining resources**. This will is likely to be **imposed through violence**. **Political accountability** will be a **distant memory**. The **chances of conserving any resource** in these circumstances **are** approximately **zero**. The **human and ecological consequences** of the first global **collapse are likely to persist for** **many** **generations**, perhaps **for our species' remaining time on earth.** **To imagine** that **good could come of** the involuntary **failure of industrial civilisation is** also **to succumb to denial**. The answer to your question – what will we learn from this collapse? – is nothing.

**Elites will backlash at the revolution, resulting in extinction**

**Dasmann, 89**

Raymond F. Dasmann, PhD in Zoology, professor emeritus of ecology at UC-Santa Cruz, 1989, The Ends of the Earth, edited by Donald Worster and Alfred W. Crosby, p. 288

There is really little doubt that there is a growing awareness of the necessity for modifying human ways to ensure the survival of the natural world on which the future of the human race depends. There is a rapidly growing biosphere consciousness, which is reaching the higher levels of many governments and has often found its expression at the level of the United Nations. One regrets that it is less evident in the United States government than it has been in the past, but it is certainly expressed among many members of the Congress, and one can expect future changes in the national leadership which will reflect the growing public awareness. The real question is whether or not the human race can modify its ways of behavior rapidly enough, because the majority continues to pursue pathways that lead toward the ecological impoverishment of the planet. The increase in awareness does not keep pace with the rate of destruction of tropical forests, the spread of deserts, the erosion of agricultural soils, the depletion of wildlife, or the growing pollution of the atmosphere and hydrosphere. **Those who exercise the greatest political and military power still threaten a war that can bring the whole edifice built by civilization crashing down into the wreckage of the biosphere, while in the meanwhile dozens of little wars forestall efforts to achieve sustainable ways of life. There is also a reasonable fear that if the power and influence of those who work for conservation of nature, sustainable development** based on social justice and equity, and a more reasonable approach to human use of the biosphere, **begins to reach a critical mass there will be attempts at massive repression by those who feel threatened by such changes. In other terms, if we begin to approach the hundredth monkey level, the “international power structure” will declare an open season on monkeys. If that happens then the real question will be whether anyone will be left to write the environmental history of our times.**

**Economic growth solves proliferation**

**Burrows and Windram 94**

(William & Robert, Critical Mass, p. 491-492)

**Economics is** in many respects **proliferation’s catalyst.** As we have noted, **economic desperation drives** Russia and some of the former Warsaw Pact **nations to peddle weapons and technology**. The possibility of considerable profits or at least balanced international payments also prompts Third World countries like China, Brazil, and Israel to do the same. Economics, as well as such related issues as overpopulation, drive proliferation just as surely as do purely political motives. Unfortunately, that subject is beyond the scope of this book. Suffice it to say that, all things being equal, well-of, **relatively secure societies like today’s Japan are less likely to buy or sell superweapon technology than those that are insecure, needy, or desperate. Ultimately, solving economic problems**, especially as they are driven by population pressure, **is the surest way to defuse proliferation and enhance true national security.**

**And, prolif causes extinction from arms races and miscalculations**

**Utgoff 2**

(Deputy Director of the Strategy Forces, and Resources Division of the Institute for Defense Analyses, Victor, “Proliferation, Missile Defence, and American Ambitions,” Survival, Volume 44, Number 2, Summer)

In sum, widespread **proliferation** is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such **shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible** with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, **we are headed toward a world** that will mirror the American Wild West of the, late 1800s. **With most,** if not all, **nations wearing nuclear 'six-shooters' on their hips**, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but **every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.**

**ECONOMIC COLLAPSE CAUSES QUICK WARMING**

**Lovelock 06**

 (Inventor: Gaia theory, fellow Royal Society, fellow Green College: Oxford) 2006

[James, The Revenge of Gaia p. 56-57, loghry]

 Recently the BBC broadcast in their Horizon series of science programmes an account of 'global dimming'; in it climate scientists, among them V. Ramanathan and Peter Cox, voiced their concern that we have already, in a sense, passed the point of no return in global heating. The science behind this programme appeared in a Nature article in 2005 which included as an author the distinguished German scientist, M. O. Andreae. **Industrial civilization has released into the atmosphere, in addition to greenhouse gases, a huge quantity of aerosol particles, and these tiny floating motes reflect incoming sunlight back to space and cause global cooling**. On large areas of the Earth's surface **the aerosol haze reflects sunlight back to space sufficiently to offset global warming. By themselves they cause a global cooling of 2 to 3°C**. Back in the 1960s, when we knew much less about the Earth and its atmosphere, a few scientists even speculated that continued economic growth would increase the density of the aerosol and lead to global cooling and even precipitate the next glaciation. The present extent of aerosol cooling is real and seriously worrying. It may have allowed us to continue our business as usual, not noticing how much we had changed the Earth nor realizing that we would have to pay back the borrowed time. **Aerosol particles stay only a brief time in the atmosphere: within weeks they settle to the ground. This means that any large economic downturn**, or a planned reduction in fossil-fuel usage, or unwise legislation to stop sulphur emissions, as the Europeans are now enacting to stop acid rain, **will allow the immediate expression of greenhouse warming**. It has been suggested that part of the excessive heat of the 2003 summer in Europe was caused by the European Union's efforts to remove the aerosol which is the source of acid rain. Peter Cox reminded us that because the aerosol was not fully included, climate modellers may have underestimated the sensitivity of their models to greenhouse gas abundance and failed to notice that we may already be beyond the point of no return.

**Free market growth key to space exploration—profit incentive boosts innovation and creativity**

**Garmong, 2005**

[Robert, Ph.D. in philosophy, was a writer for the Ayn Rand Institute from 2003 to 2004, “Privatize Space Exploration.” 7-22-2005, Online, <http://capitalismmagazine.com/2005/07/privatize-space-exploration>] /Wyo-MB

Nor would it be difficult to spur **the private exploration of space–it’s been happening, quietly, for years. The free market works to produce whatever there is demand for**, just as it now does with traditional aircraft**. Commercial satellite launches are now routine**, and could easily be fully privatized. The X Prize, which SpaceShipOne won, offered incentives for private groups to break out of the Earth’s atmosphere. But all this private exploration is hobbled by the crucial absence of a system of property rights in space. **Imagine the incentive to a profit-minded business if,** for instance, **it were granted the right to any stellar body it reached and exploited.** We often hear that the most ambitious projects can only be undertaken by government, but in fact the opposite is true**. The more ambitious a project is, the more it demands to be broken into achievable, profit-making steps–and freed from the unavoidable politicizing of government-controlled science. If space development is to be transformed** from an expensive national bauble whose central purpose is to assert national pride to a practical industry**, it will only be by unleashing the creative force of free and rational minds.** The creative minds that allowed SpaceShipOne to soar to triumph have made the first private steps toward the stars. Before them are enormous technical difficulties, the solution of which will require even more heroic determination than that which tamed the seas and the continents. **To solve them, America must unleash its best minds, as only the free market can do.**

**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.**