## T

**First, we meet: plan in a vacuum is for wind power production- their definition only operationalizes words in the plan**

**Second, counter-interpretation: ‘for’ refers to ‘those things designed or meant for a specific purpose**

**Collins English Dictionary, no date** [http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/for#wordorgtop]

for (fɔː, ( unstressed ) fə)

— prep

1. **intended to reach; directed or belonging to:** there's a phone call for you

2. to the advantage of: I only did it for you

3. in the direction of: heading for the border

4. over a span of (time or distance): working for six days ; the river ran for six miles

5. in favour of; in support of: those for the proposal ; vote for me

6. in order to get or achieve: I do it for money ; he does it for pleasure ; what did you do that for?

7. **appropriate to; designed to meet the needs of; meant to be used in**: these kennels are for puppies

**Third, we meet: MLPs are ‘for energy production’- production MLPs have it as their primary purpose**

**Nelson 12**

[Gabriel Nelson, E&E reporter, Greenwire, “Senate Bill Offers New Tax Option for Wind, Solar”, 6.7.12, p. ln //wyo-tjc]

**Congress first authorized companies to use the master limited partnership** model **in the 1980s** as part of a plan **to spur domestic energy production** with gasoline and electricity prices still soaring from the energy crisis of the previous decade. **It was limited to resources that can be depleted**, such as fossil fuels and timber operations. Since then, it has proved particularly popular with the "midstream" companies that run pipelines, natural gas processing plants and storage facilities. The number of publicly traded companies that are structured this way has grown from a dozen in 1996 to about 75 today, and most of them are involved in the distribution of fossil fuels. **When another wave of high energy prices arrived in 2008, lawmakers opened the door to ethanol, biodiesel and other biofuels. They** also **decided to let companies use the partnership model if they are producing,** transporting or storing carbon dioxide gas for an industrial use, such as coaxing oil out of soon-to-be-depleted wells. Some policymakers want to get rid of these special business structures, arguing that they skew the tax code. Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) and Rep. Keith Ellison (D-Minn.), two fervent supporters of renewables, have proposed that master limited partnerships be scrapped altogether in the energy industry with the reasoning being that under current law they give an unfair advantage to fossil fuels. Still, in the past few months, **support has grown among clean energy advocates for the master limited partnership model**. Among them are the clean energy research group at the moderate Democratic group Third Way and the Maguire Energy Institute at Southern Methodist University, which put out a report this week in favor of the idea.

**Fourth, prefer our interpretation:**

1. **Contextually true for wind production**

**D’Alessandro 8.20**

[Laura, staff writer, SNL Electric Utility Report, “MLP structure for renewables could mobilize capital, lead to consolidation”, p. ln//wyo-tjc]

According to the Maguire Energy Institute at Southern Methodist University, **master limited partnerships could bring nearly $6 billion of capital to the industry between 2012 and 2021 if federal law is amended to expand the tax structure to include renewable energy production**. In May, the Maguire Energy Institute released a report highlighting the potential benefits of extending the MLP status to renewable energy investments.

1. **Education- they exclude cases that link tools across fuel sources, decreasing education about interlinkages between energy types**

**C-Arbitrary limit- The ‘direct’ interpretation is arbitrary and overlimiting because of the way the government organizes the tax code- they would exclude basic extraction cases**

**Sherlock 11**

[Molly, CRS Analyst in Economics, “Energy Tax Incentives: Measuring Value Across Different Types of Energy Resources”, CRS Reports, Aug 10, p. <http://www.nationalaglawcenter.org/assets/crs/R41953.pdf> //wyo-tjc]

**A number of tax provisions that support energy are not energy specific The U.S. energy sector benefits from a number of tax provisions that are not targeted at energy**. For example, **the production activities deduction** (§ 199) **benefits all domestic manufacturers**. **For the purposes of the** § 199 **deduction, oil and gas extraction is considered a domestic manufacturing activity**. Certain **energy-related activities may** also **benefit from other tax incentives that are available to non-energy industries, such as** the ability to issue tax-exempt debt, **the ability to structure as a master limited partnership**, or tax incentives designed to promote other activities, such as research and development.

## 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.**

#### Sustaining US Job Growth is Key to the US Economy – Collapse Would Go Global

AP, 7-24

(“Another global recession on the horizon?”) <http://www.thonline.com/news/business/article_fb02ea23-ccba-5ab3-b49f-09d509b58ca5.html>, accessed 9/30/12,WYO/JF

Reinvigorating the US economy prevents global economic meltdown¶ One growing concern about the global economy is there's little margin for error: Unemployment is already at recession levels in Europe and the United States.¶ The United States, by far the world's biggest economy, has long pulled the global economy out of slumps. Now it needs help. Three years after the Great Recession officially ended, the American economy can't maintain momentum. For the third straight year, growth has stalled at mid-year after getting off to a promising start.¶ Unemployment stood at 8.2 percent in June -- the 41st straight month it's been above 8 percent.¶ Americans spent less at retail businesses for a third straight month in June, the longest losing streak since the recession. Economists are downgrading their estimates of economic growth in the April-June quarter. When the government releases its first estimate on Friday, many think it won't even match the first quarter's sluggish 1.9 percent annual pace.¶ The global slowdown is squeezing U.S. exports, which have accounted for an unusually large 43 percent share of U.S. growth since the recession officially ended in June 2009.¶ Consumer confidence has fallen four straight months in the face of scant hiring and weak economic growth. U.S. companies are nervous about the threat of tax increases and spending cuts that are scheduled to kick in at year's end unless Congress breaks a deadlock. The IMF has warned of a spillover to the rest of the world if the U.S. economy falls off the so-called fiscal cliff.

#### 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).

## Warming

#### Wind energy will be able to produce massive amounts of power, and not harm the environment

Ros Donald, 9/11

“New models suggest wind power won’t cause global warming” <http://www.carbonbrief.org/blog/2012/09/new-proof-that-wind-turbines-dont-cause-global-warming>, accessed 9/28/12,WYO/JF

The first [piece of research](http://www.nature.com/nclimate/journal/vaop/ncurrent/full/nclimate1683.html), released in the journal Nature Climate Change on Sunday, finds that wind power on the scale needed to meet global power demand would only have a tiny effect on the climate. According to a team led by Ken Caldeira from the Carnegie Institution for Science, harvesting wind power could have substantial climate effects - but only if it's deployed on a truly massive scale that far exceeds current global energy demand. But even at the (relatively large) level of meeting current global energy demand, the paper says these effects would be small, as long as turbines are spread out evenly. Meeting global demand with wind power might affect surface temperatures by around 0.1 degree Celsius, the research estimates, and affect precipitation by around one per cent, although it's not clear to us whether this means up or down. The paper as a whole looked at the potential for wind to produce large volumes of power. It concludes that winds at high altitudes could provide more than 1,800 terawatts of power, while surface winds have the potential to produce more than 400 terawatts. If this seems like a lot - the world currently uses about 18 terawatts of power - it's important to be clear that this is an examination of the geophysical limitations to wind power extraction, and doesn't consider technical or economic factors. As Caldeira points out: "Looking at the big picture, it is more likely that economic, technological or political factors will determine the growth of wind power around the world, rather than geophysical limitations."

**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.

**Emissions are reversible but the window is closing.**

Harvey, 11

Fiona Harvey 11 is an environmental correspondent for Guardian, “World headed for irreversible climate change in five years, IEA warns,” 11/9, http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/nov/09/fossil-fuel-infrastructure-climate-change

**The world is likely to build** so **many fossil-fuelled power stations**, energy-guzzling factories and inefficient buildings in the next five years that it will become impossible to hold global warming to safe levels, and the last chance of combating dangerous climate change will be "lost for ever", according to the most thorough analysis yet of world energy infrastructure. Anything built from now on that produces carbon will do so for decades, and this "lock-in" effect will be the single factor most likely to produce irreversible climate change, the world's foremost authority on energy economics has found**. If this is not rapidly changed within the next five years, the results are likely to be disastrous. "The door is closing**," Fatih Birol, chief economist at the International Energy Agency, said. "I am very worried **– if we don't change direction now on how we use energy, we will end up beyond** what scientists tell us is **the minimum [for safety]. The door will be closed forever.**" If the world is to stay below 2C of warming, which scientists regard as the limit of safety, then emissions must be held to no more than 450 parts per million (ppm) of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere; the level is currently around 390ppm. But the world's existing infrastructure is already producing 80% of that "carbon budget", according to the IEA's analysis, published on Wednesday. **This gives an ever-narrowing gap in which to reform the global economy on to a low-carbon footing**. **If current trends continue**, and we go on building high-carbon energy generation, then **by 2015 at least 90% of the available "carbon budget" will be swallowed up by our energy and industrial infrastructure**. **By 2017, there will be no room for manoeuvre at all** – t**he whole of the carbon budget will be spoken for, according to the IEA's calculations.** Birol's warning comes at a crucial moment in international negotiations on climate change, as governments gear up for the next fortnight of talks in Durban, South Africa, from late November. "If we do not have an international agreement, whose effect is put in place by 2017, then the door to [holding temperatures to 2C of warming] will be closed forever," said Birol.

**Electricity sector is key polluter**

Mormann 11

(Felix, German JD and JSD from University of Passau School of law, as well as an LMM from UC BerkeleySchool of Law and is a research Fellow at Stanford’s Steyer Center for Energy Policy and Finance, writing for Economic Law Quarterly, “Requirements for a Renewables Revolution.” 05/02/11. http://www.boalt.org/elq/documents/elq38\_4\_03\_2012\_0808.pdf**)**

Renewable sources of energy are relevant not only to electricity generation but also to other sectors of the energy market, such as heat and transport. The latter especially features prominently in the public debate over ever stricter fuel-economy standards mandated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).29 Notwithstanding the importance of renewable energy sources for heat and transport, this Article focuses on reducing greenhouse gas emissions as necessary to mitigate climate change through the timely transition to renewables in the electricity sector. From 1990 to 2008, **electricity generation accounted for 32 percent of all U.S. greenhouse gas emissions, placing the electricity sector at the top of the emitters’ list, ahead of the transport sector**, which is responsible for 27 percent of all U.S. greenhouse gas emissions.30 **Globally, the energy sector accounts for 73 percent of greenhouse gas emissions, with the agricultural sector assuming a distant second place responsible for 16 percent.31 With U.S. and global electricity generation expected to increase by 22 percent and 74 percent respectively until 2030,32 any effort to significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions must include major reforms in the electricity sector. A timely shift to renewable sources is the only long-term sustainable solution** presently available.33 Moreover, the projected growth in electricity generation will easily be surpassed if the current trend towards electric vehicles (e.g., plug-in hybrids) continues.34 The resulting large-scale electrification of the transport sector would further increase the need for a timely decarbonization of the electricity sector. Otherwise greenhouse gas emissions may merely move from one sector (transport) to another, only slightly less carbon-intensive sector (electricity). While improvements in energy efficiency will also be important,35 the timely shift to renewables is essential if current efforts in climate change mitigation are to be successful.36 Fortunately, the case for rapid large-scale deployment of renewables in the electricity sector is not one of necessity only but of potential, too. In comparison to the fragmented structure of the heat-relevant building sector, for instance, the electricity sector is relatively centralized and, hence, easier to regulate and reform.37 Indeed, a recent study found that meeting the world’s entire demand with electricity generated from water, wind, and sunlight is technologically feasible as early as twenty years from today.38 Accordingly, this Article focuses on the use of renewables for the generation of electricity.

**CO2 good arguments ignore atmospheric science because it’s about a balance of CO2, not just high CO2 levels in general being good**

**Prothero 12**

(Donald R. Prothero is a Professor of Geology at Occidental College and Lecturer in Geobiology at the California Institute of Technology. “How we know global warming is real and human caused” Winter 2012. Academic OneFile//wyoccd)

\* **"Carbon dioxide is good for plants, so the world will be better off." Who do they think they're kidding? The Competitive Enterprise Institute (funded by oil and coal companies and conservative foundations** (17)) **has run a series of shockingly stupid ads concluding with the tag line "Carbon dioxide: they call it pollution, we call it life." Anyone who knows the basic science of earth's atmosphere can spot the gross inaccuracies in this ad.** (18) **True, plants take in carbon dioxide that animals exhale**, as they have for millions of years. **But the whole point of the global warming evidence** (as shown from ice cores**) is that the delicate natural balance of carbon dioxide has been thrown off balance by our production of too much of it, way in excess of what plants or the oceans can handle.** As a consequence, the oceans are warming (19,20) and absorbing excess carbon dioxide making them more acidic. **Already we are seeing a shocking decline in coral reefs** ("bleaching") **and extinctions in many marine ecosystems** that can't handle too much of a good thing. **Meanwhile, humans are busy cutting down huge areas of temperate and tropical forests, which not only means there are fewer plants to absorb the gas,** but the slash and burn practices are releasing more carbon dioxide than plants can keep up with. There is much debate as to whether increased carbon dioxide might help agriculture in some parts of the world, but that has to be measured against the fact that other traditional "breadbasket" regions (such as the American Great Plains) are expected to get too hot to be as productive as they are today. **The latest research** (21) **actually shows that increased carbon dioxide inhibits the absorption of nitrogen into plants,** so plants (at least those that we depend upon today) are not going to flourish in a greenhouse world. It is difficult to know if those who tell the public otherwise are ignorant of basic atmospheric science and global geochemistry, or if they are being cynically disingenuous.

**CO2 fert ineffective—while crops may respond positively, the effects of global warming will reduce yields—leads to undernourishment**

**Gregory et al 9**

[Gregory, Peter J., Scott N. Johnson, Adrian C. Newton, and John S. I. Ingram. "Integrating pests and pathogens into the climate change/food security debate." *Journal of Experimental Botany*. 60.10 (2009): n. page. Web. 10 Jul. 2012. <http://jxb.oxfordjournals.org/content/60/10/2827.full>. //Wyo-BF]

**Current research suggests that while many crops may respond positively to increased atmospheric CO2 concentrations in the absence of climate changes** (Long et al., 2004), **the associated effects of higher temperatures and altered patterns of precipitation will probably combine to reduce yields** (Easterling et al., 2007). **Estimates of the CO2 fertilization effect vary depending on which experimental approach is used** (Long et al., 2006; Tubiello et al., 2007a; Ziska and Bunce, 2007; Ainsworth et al., 2008), **but current estimates for increases in crop yield are 10–20% for C3 crops and 0–10% for C4 crops** (Ainsworth and Long, 2005). **However, it is widely recognized that these figures are likely to represent an overestimate in actual field and farm level responses because they are derived from experiments and crop models that do not necessarily take limiting factors such as pests and** **pathogens, competition, nutrient competition, and soil water fully into account** (Gregory et al., 1999; Tubiello et al., 2007b).

## CP

**Conditionality is bad:**

**Time Skew: allows them to neutralize large chunks of 2ac time, hurting 1AR strat. The 2AC matters most because it puts out all the arguments that the aff can go.**

**Decrease Education: multiple worlds cause muddled debates that preclude consistency of education.**

**Voting issue: for ground, fairness, and education.**

#### Manufacturing is Key to the US Economy

Oak Ridge National Laboratory 2011

“Innovations in New Technology” <http://www.ornl.gov/adm/partnerships/industrial/ManufactBrochureSml.pdf>, accessed 9/30/12,WYO/JF

The US manufacturing industry is a cornerstone of the American ¶ economy and embodies the innovation and productivity that have ¶ allowed the United States to be the dominant leader in advanced ¶ manufacturing technologies since the early 20th century. A strong ¶ manufacturing base is vital for a balanced economy and critical to our nation’s energy security and defense. Advances in manufacturing technology are imperative to avoid further erosion of our manufacturing base and maintain a competitive edge in the global market.¶ Innovation drives economic growth. New, cutting edge technologies with real-world applications can both revitalize existing manufacturing industries and support the development of new products in emerging ones. ¶ The development and commercial deployment of advanced manufacturing technologies remain essential to America’s long-term economic competitiveness. Manufacturing and materials ¶ research at Oak Ridge National Laboratory is focused on reducing ¶ the energy intensity of US industry, supporting development of new ¶ products, and strengthening our nation’s vitality. ORNL, through its ¶ on going collaborative relationships with more than 1,000 companies ¶ and distinction as the leading Department of Energy Laboratory ¶ for R&D 100 Awards, has demonstrated the ability to work with US ¶ manufacturers to transition technologies that will drive manufacturing ¶ innovations in the coming decades.

#### MLPs comparatively better than giving tax breaks: produce better investment returns.

Spencer and Shaffer 12

(Jim and David, Star Tribune, “New strategy targets tax breaks for green energy,” June 16, 2012, <http://m.startribune.com/business/?id=159234595//wyo-mm>)

Tax breaks alone won't increase renewable energy market shares very much, noted lawyer Todd Taylor. Master limited partnerships should produce better investment returns, he said. Selling shares to the public while avoiding corporate taxes should definitely attract new capital. But nothing substitutes for willing buyers.

## Add On

**Water crisis is inevitable- scaling up wind power capacity is crucial to achieve massive water savings across the economy**

**Snyder 8**

[Brian, LSU Center for Energy Studies, “Ecological and economic cost-benefit analysis of offshore wind energy”, Renewable Energy, p. asp//wyo-tjc]

In many parts of the **U.S. water resources are stressed**. The six world **climate models** used in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) generally **predict that the U.S. will become drier by 2050.** One of the models predicts that **precipitation over virtually the entire U.S. will decline by over 30%** while the other five models show more modest declines [57]. **Forty-eight percent of total water withdraws** and nine percent of total water consumption (68 billion liters per day) **is used by thermoelectric power plants** (powered by coal, natural gas, nuclear, oil and biomass; [9]). **Ethanol production also uses large quantities of water**, from 3.5 to 6 l of water for every liter of ethanol produced [58]. **Wind power directly uses no water**. Per kW h, the amount of water used in fossil-fueled plants ranges from about 0.2 to 0.6 gallons depending on the technology employed [59]. **Assuming a 40% capacity factor, 1 MW of** offshore **wind power can offset the use of between 0.7 and 2.1 million gallons of freshwater per year**.

**Stretched water systems coming now leads to extinction and accesses every major impact**

**Walton 12** (Brett, worked on a NASA-affiliated research project on water data and as a member of a State Department project on climate change and water management in Central Asia, “National Security Assessment: Water Scarcity Disrupting U.S. and Three Continents” 4/3/12 http://www.circleofblue.org/waternews/2012/world/national-security-assessment-water-scarcity-disrupting-u-s-and-three-continents/)

**The world** â€™s **demand for fresh water is growing so fast that, by 2030, agriculture, industry, and expanding cities on three continents will face such scarce supplies that the confrontation could disrupt economic development and cause ruinous political instability**, according to the first U.S. cabinet-level report on the global water crisis.¶ The report, â€œ Global Water Security, â€ prepared for the State Department by the National Intelligence Council, found that, unless there are serious changes in conservation and water use practices, global water demand will reach 6,900 billion cubic meters (1,800 trillion gallons) annually by 2030, a figure that is about 2,400 billion cubic meters (634 trillion gallons) higher than today. **The authors of the report concluded that level of consumption is** â€œ**40 percent above current sustainable water supplies**, â€ and will â€œ hinder the ability of key countries to produce food and generate energy, posing a risk to global food markets and hobbling economic growth. â€¶ In other words, this would be the equivalent of adding four Chinas over the next 18 years, since China currently uses around 600 billion cubic meters (158 trillion gallons) of water annually.¶ **These** and other **findings** about global water supply **were made public** on World Water Day, March 22, **by** U.S. Secretary of State Hillary **Clinton**, who called the study â€ œa landmark document that puts water security in its rightful place as part of national security. â€¶ â€œIt â€™s not only about water,â€ she added. â€œIt is about security, peace, and prosperity. â€¶ But those goals are imperiled, according to the report, by the collision of two powerful global trends. The first is what the report called â€œ **key drivers of rising freshwater demand** â€ â€” **population growth, expanding cities, rising energy demand and production.** The second is declining supply caused by deforestation; pollution; leaks and waste; and climate change that is melting glaciers, speeding evaporation, deepening droughts, and increasing the number of extreme weather events.¶ In remarks at the World Water Day event in Washington, D.C., Clinton introduced a new government initiative to improve global water management and conservation, steps that the reportâ€™s authors repeatedly called for in the study. The U.S. Water Partnership, she said, brings together 28 organizations â€” including government agencies, philanthropic foundations, environmental groups, corporations, and universities â€” and their body of water knowledge, which will be spread globally through training sessions, web-based data libraries, and collaborations with any organization looking for solutions.¶ â€œ You can â€™t work on water as a health concern independently from water as an agricultural concern, â€ Clinton said. â€œ And **water** that is **needed** for agriculture **may** also **be water that is needed for energy production.** So we need to be looking for interventions that work on multiple levels simultaneously and help us focus on systemic responses. â€¶ What The Report Says¶ The Global Water Security report confirms much of the data about the severity of the world water crisis, as well as many of the conclusions about how to solve it that have been developed by research groups, by other lower level U.S. government offices, and by news organizations â€” among them Circle of Blue, whose photographs of the crisis from around the world were featured at the State Department event.¶ But, in conducting the first cabinet-level assessment and in personally announcing the results, Secretary Clinton continued the work she has undertaken since joining the Obama administration to elevate the threats to the water supply to an urgent national and diplomatic priority.¶ **The United States itself is certain to be buffeted by the water crisis**, according to the report, **which cites extensive research on** food and **energy production**, groundwater abuse, and trade economics, as well as studies on international conflict and water management practices. For instance, **achieving U.S. foreign policy goals could be more difficult, since nations may be too** â€ œ **distracted** â€ **by domestic problems to work with other nations.** Additionally, **there are risks of instability, increased regional tensions, and perhaps even state failure in nations that are important to U.S. national security interests. Water shortages could inflame pre-existing social and political tensions; they could cause disease outbreaks; and they could threaten food security, energy production, and the stability of local economies.**¶ â€œ Water shortages, poor water quality, and floods by themselves are unlikely to result in state failure, â€ the report says. â€œ However, water problems â€” when combined with poverty, social tensions, environmental degradation, ineffectual leadership, and weak political institutions â€” contribute to social disruptions that can result in state failure. â€¶ Strategically Important Basins¶ In a companion classified report for the State Department, the National Intelligence Council assessed the national security implications from these river basins: Nile, Tigris-Euphrates, Mekong, Jordan, Indus, Brahmaputra, and Amu Darya.¶ The report names Southern Africa, northeastern Brazil, eastern Australia, the Mediterranean Basin, and the Western U.S. as places where climate change will decrease the amount of freshwater. North Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia face the most difficult water challenges due to demographic and economic development pressures.¶ Such conditions will likely not be the direct cause of violent conflicts during the next 10 years, the authors argue, because, â€œ historically, water tensions have led to more water-sharing agreements than violent conflicts. â€ Still, the authors of the report state that, **beyond the next 10 years, they expect water to be used increasingly as leverage between countries that share a river basin, or even used as a weapon.** Further, the report notes that **water delivery systems** â€” dams, desalination plants, pipelines, and canals â€” **are a potential target for terrorists.**¶ Ever since the disintegration of the Soviet Union more than two decades ago, these concerns about government instability, or even collapse, have formed a significant chunk of the academic research on environmental security. The new National Intelligence Council report â€” and related government programs begun in the last few years â€” shows that leaders in the nation â€™s capital have grown more comfortable with the need to address non-traditional, more oblique security threats.¶ The report gives good news, as well, stating that there are preventative actions that can be taken, with many of the technologies available now.¶ â€œ From now through 2040, improved water management (e.g. pricing, allocations, and â€œ virtual water â€ trade) and investments in water-related sectors (e.g. agriculture, power, and water treatment) will afford the best solutions for water problems, â€ the report says. â€œ Because agriculture uses approximately 70 percent of the global freshwater supply, the greatest potential for relief from water scarcity will be through technology that reduces the amount of water needed for agriculture. â€¶ A Short History of Water in U.S. Government Reports ¶ One of the first U.S. government reports to address water in relation to national security was in 2000, with the National Intelligence Council â€™s â€œ Global Trends 2015 Survey, € which sought to identify the strategic undercurrents that would shape U.S. policy.¶ A more rigorous assessment came five years later, with a 134-page report on water from the Center for Strategic and International Studies and Sandia National Laboratories. The â€œ Global Water Futures report â€ argued that **water** was **a blanket force**: â€œ **Virtually every major U.S. foreign policy objective** â€” **promoting stability and security, reducing extremist violence, democracy building, post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction, poverty reduction, meeting the U.N. Millennium Development Goals, combating HIV/AIDS, promoting bilateral and multilateral relationships â€” will be contingent to some extent on how well the challenge of global water can be addressed**. â€

#### Water wars go nuclear

**Weiner 90**

Prof. Princeton,The Next 100 Years p.270

If we do not destroy ourselves with the A-bomb and the H-bomb, then we may destroy ourselves with the C-bomb, the Change Bomb. And in a world as interlinked as ours, one explosion may lead to the other. Already in the Middle East, tram North Africa to the Persian Gulf and from the Nile to the Euphrates, tensions over dwindling water supplies and rising populations are reaching what many experts describe as a flashpoint A climate shift in that single battle-scarred nexus might trigger international tensions that will unleash some at the 60.000 nuclear warheads the world has stockpiled since Trinity.

## Elections

#### Don’t buy statistical noise- Obama will win even post-debate slide

Silver Oct. 8th

[Nate Silver, political analyst, Amid Volatile Polling, Keep an Eye on Election Fundamentals, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/08/after-conventions-follow-the-bouncing-poll-numbers/>, uwyo//amp]

By the weekend, however — after the release of a favorable jobs report last Friday — Mr. Romney’s bounce seemed to be receding some. Tracking polls released on Monday by Gallup and Rasmussen Reports actually showed a shift back toward Mr. Obama, although another poll by Pew Research showed Mr. Romney with a four-point lead among likely voters. Polling data is often very noisy, and not all polls use equally rigorous methodology. But the polls, as a whole, remain consistent with the idea that they may end up settling where they were before the conventions, with Mr. Obama ahead by about two points. Such an outcome would be in line with what history and the fundamentals of the economy would lead you to expect.

#### Obama wins-consistent swing state polling

Silver Oct. 9th

[Nate Silver, political analyst, October 9th, 2012, Oct. 9: Romney Erases Obama’s Convention Bounce in Forecast, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/09/oct-9-romney-erases-obamas-convention-bounce-in-forecast/>, uwyo//amp]

However, the “now-cast” put Mr. Obama ahead by about five percentage points in advance of the debate, meaning that Mr. Romney’s gains are not quite enough to have erased Mr. Obama’s advantage entirely. The strongest evidence that the race is a true dead heat right now is from national polls. The 10 national polls that we added to our database on Tuesday showed an exact tie between the candidates, on average. Mr. Romney’s numbers are just slightly weaker in the majority of swing state polls, however. In the day just after the debate, Mr. Romney led in five of six polls between the top nine “tipping-point states,” but Mr. Obama has led in 10 of 14 such polls since then.

#### Obama wins- leading now, winning electoral college

Cohn Oct. 10th

[Nate Cohn, political analyst, October 10th, 2012, Daily Breakdown: Romney's Bounce Appears To Hold Through Wednesday,http://www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/108433/daily-breakdown-romneys-bounce-appears-hold-through-wednesday#, uwyo//amp]

There is one poll offering better news for the president: the YouGov/Economist survey showing Obama leading by 3 points, 49-46. Of course, YouGov/Economist is different in another respect; it’s an internet pollster with a track record. More on this later. If there was any other silver lining for the president, it was the continuing hints of a split between battleground and national surveys. Despite a wave of national polls showing Romney with the lead, there hasn’t been a battleground state poll showing Romney leading in a battleground state since ARG showed Romney ahead in Ohio and Colorado. Since then, multiple polls have shown Obama leading in Nevada and Ohio—two states sufficient to get Obama over the top when combined with Wisconsin, another state where two post-debate polls show Obama in the lead. Support thought-provoking, quality journalism. Join The New Republic for $3.99/month. To a certain extent, Obama’s persistent advantage in the battleground states isn’t surprising. In pre-debate polls, Obama led by at least 5 points in states worth 281 electoral votes, including Iowa, Wisconsin, New Hampshire, Ohio, and Nevada. If Romney has gained about 4 points, then Obama would retain a slight lead in these states. But the conclusion that Romney has only gained 4 points is largely based on these state polls, since the national surveys suggest that Romney has gained at least 5 points, which should have been enough to yield a few more polls showing Romney ahead in states like Ohio, Iowa, and Nevada.

**Plan happens after the election**

Ramsey **Cox** (writer for The Hill) **September 24**, 2012 “Congress to hold pro forma sessions until November” http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/senate/251313-congress-to-hold-pro-forma-sessions-until-november

Rather than being in recess for more than five weeks, both the Senate and the House decided to hold pro forma sessions until after the November elections. Both chambers will gavel in Tuesday morning for a brief session; typically, **legislative business doesn't take place in pro forma sessions**. At most members ask to be recognized for a speech, but rarely do. It is unclear if the legislative branch was afraid of recess appointments by the White House, yet both sides took a formal recess in August. The Senate will hold a pro forma session every Tuesday and Friday until Nov. 13 at 2 p.m. when they’ll continue work on S. 3525, the Sportsmen Act, which would increase access to federal land for hunters and fishers while also supporting conservation measures.

#### Blue collar, working class whites will decide the election due to their swing state locations- Obama will alienate them and send them to Romney should he reject traditional FF expansion

Mead 2012

[Walter Russell Mead, James Clarke Chace Professor of Foreign Affairs and Humanities at Bard College and Editor-at-Large of The American Interest magazine, and is recognized as one of the country's leading students of American foreign policy. June 6, 2012, <http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2012/06/06/green-politics-hurting-obama-in-swing-states/>, Uwyo//amp]

Since the beginning of the recession, America’s “brown jobs” revolution has been one of the few bright spots in an otherwise shaky recovery. States like North Dakota and Texas have led the country in growth due to their strong energy sectors, and the discovery of vast quantities of shale gas in states like Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Colorado are now providing new jobs. These states have more than shale gas in common: all of them are also on the short list of swing states that decide this year’s presidential election. Republicans are seizing the opportunity to make energy politics a centerpiece of their campaign. As the FT reports: “Blue-collar voters were never that sold on environmental issues, and if some Democrats come across as not keen on economic development, it could lose them support here in Ohio,” he said. Republicans, from Mitt Romney, the party’s presidential candidate, to the congressional leadership, have made Barack Obama’s alleged stifling of the energy industry a centrepiece of their campaigns this year. . . . Mr Romney has said he will approve the Keystone XL pipeline as soon as he wins office and curb the powers of the Environmental Protection Agency. Only time will tell whether this is a winning strategy, but there is reason to think it could work. As we’ve mentioned before, energy politics is an area where Obama is particularly vulnerable. His decision to nix the popular Keystone pipeline earlier this year signaled antipathy toward one of America’s strongest industries while doing nothing to help the environment; it was lambasted as a pointless blunder by observers on both sides of the aisle. Meanwhile, his pet projects in alternative energy have fallen flat, as debacles like Solyndra have received far more attention than the program’s few successes. This should be seriously worrying to the Obama campaign. Brown jobs may be unpopular in Obama’s white-collar, urban, coastal base, but it is blue collar voters in swing states that are likely to decide the election, and many of these voters stand to reap significant benefits from an expansion of America’s energy sector. From a political perspective, Obama has placed himself on the wrong side of this issue. It may come back to bite him come November.

#### 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.

#### Proliferation impacts are empirically denied – your authors are alarmists

Krepon 9

[Michael Krepon, Co-Founder of the Henry L. Stimson Center, a Diplomat Scholar at the University of Virginia, and the author of Better Safe Than Sorry: The Ironies of Living With the Bomb. "The mushroom cloud that wasn't: why inflating threats won't reduce them." Foreign Affairs 88.3 May-June 2009, Proquest, \\wyo-bb]

Today, as was the case during the Cold War, there is no shortage of nonproliferation specialists predicting impending nuclear disasters. Eighty-five experts polled by Senator Lugar in 2005 estimated that the risk of a wmd attack occurring before 2010 was 50 percent and before 2015, 70 percent. The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists has set its iconic Doomsday Clock at five minutes to midnights - two minutes closer to Armageddon than it was during the Cuban missile crisis. A bipartisan congressional commission concluded in 2008 that "America's margin of safety is shrinking, not growing" and that "unless the world community acts decisively and with great urgency, it is more likely than not that a weapon of mass destruction will be used in a terrorist attack somewhere in the world by the end of 2013." Graham Allison, one of the commission's members, had warned in 2004 that "the detonation of a nuclear device in an American city is inevitable if the U.S. continues on its present course." And soon after leaving office, former Vice President Dick Cheney warned that there is a "high probability" that terrorists will attempt a catastrophic nuclear or biological attack on the United States in the coming years. These sorts of scary predictions have a basis in reality. After all, Iran has mastered the ability to enrich uranium, is laying the foundation for a nuclear weapons program, and has close ties to terrorist groups; Pakistan is ramping up its capacity to produce plutonium as the central government's influence is waning; and North Korea has a bomb-making capacity, weapons-grade material, and a need for hard currency. Al Qaeda's leaders have sought to acquire and use these weapons, and other extremist groups have an interest in doing so, too. Experts cite such worrisome developments and then use threat inflation to seize the public's attention and to secure sufficient appropriations for their preferred remedies. They, along with government officials, members of Congress, and the intelligence community are all safer warning of great danger than downplaying threats - except when their inflated anxieties facilitate a preventive war based on false premises. The Iraq war notwithstanding, when worst cases do not materialize, those who issued dire warnings can take credit. And if attacks do occur, the alarmists can always say, "I told you so." As real as these threats are, hyping them carries its own risks. Crying wolf too often can lead to complacency when action is needed most. Repeated warnings can also prompt taxpayers and lawmakers to question what was gained from prior investments in reducing threats and so limit appropriations for new ones. This is a major problem, since remedial efforts over short periods of time are insufficient; reducing the nuclear threat requires success over the long haul.

#### The risk of their offense is really slim

Sechser 8

[Todd Sechser, Assist. prof, pol sci, UVA. PhD, pol sci, Stanford, “The Stabilizing Effects of Nuclear Proliferation”,http://faculty.virginia.edu/tsechser/Sechser-Haas-2009.pdf, \\wyo-bb]

A final objection to this critique holds that the nuclear age has not yet provided enough data to test theories of proliferation. In other words, it is simply too early to evaluate the theories’ predictions (see Sagan 1993, 12). This argument is unpersuasive. The nuclear age is now more than sixty years old, and more than a dozen nations have possessed nuclear weapons at one time or another. If we imagine that every operational nuclear warhead in existence provides, say, one “disaster opportunity” per year, then since 1945 there have been nearly two million opportunities for an accidental explosion, preemptive nuclear strike, nuclear terrorist attack, or preventive war against an emerging proliferator. At the very least, the fact that none of these scenarios has yet occurred should suggest that the risk is low enough to warrant a plausible cost benefit case against universal nonproliferation. Of course, the absence of a nuclear catastrophe to date does not “prove” that proliferation pessimism is wrong. But it is important that we recognize the sharp limits to the inferential leverage that near-misses provide. Each year that passes without a preemptive nuclear attack, preventive war against an aspiring nuclear power, nuclear accident, or act of nuclear terrorism must cast additional doubt on the theory. Ultimately, proliferation pessimism remains burdened by the contrast between the ubiquity of organizational pathologies and the absence of the disastrous nuclear outcomes it expects them to cause. This gap should make us skeptical of its claims.