**1AC – Inherency**

**Renewables currently barred from forming MLPs—stifling renewable energy projects**

**Blodgett and Gawell 12**

(Leslie and Karl, Geothermal Energy Weekly, “New MLP Parity Act Could Give a Boost to Geothermal/Renewable Energy Investors,” 2012, <http://geo-energy.org/Newsletter/2012/Geothermal%20Energy%20Weekly%20July%2019%202012.pdf//wyo-mm>)

An MLP is a business structure that is taxed as a partnership, but whose ownership interests are traded like corporate stock on a market. By statute, **MLPs have only been available to investors in energy portfolios for oil, natural gas, coal extraction, and pipeline projects**. These projects get access to capital at a lower cost and are more liquid than traditional financing approaches to energy projects, making them highly effective at attracting private investment. **Investors in renewable energy projects**, however, **have been explicitly prevented from forming MLPs, starving a growing portion of America’s domestic energy sector of the capital it needs to build and grow**. See also a white paper on the MLP Parity Act. Original cosponsors: Senators Jon Tester (D-Mont.), Al Franken (D-Minn.), Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.), Sheldon Whitehouse (D-R.I.), and Jeanne Shaheen (D-N.H.).

**1AC – Plan**

#### The United States federal government should allow the use of Master Limited Partnerships for the production of wind power.

 **1AC – Solvency**

**expanding MLP’s to renewable energy is key to spur investment and development of wind technology**

**Mormann and Reicher, 6-2-12**

[Felix and Dan, NYT editorial staff, “How to Make Renewable Energy Competitive.” The New York Times. (June 2, 2012): News: pNA(L), Accessed online via academic onefile] /Wyo-MB

Two financial mechanisms that have driven investment in traditional energy projects -- real estate investment trusts and master limited partnerships -- could, with some help from Washington, be extended to renewable energy projects **to lower their cost and make America's energy future cleaner, cheaper -- and more democratic**.¶ Federal support for renewable energy today consists primarily of two tax breaks: tax credits and accelerated depreciation rates. But both tools have a very limited reach. Only investors with hefty tax bills, typically big banks or corporations, can exploit them to reduce their tax burden. Most potential investors, including tax-exempt pension funds and, importantly, retail investors trading stocks, don't have big enough tax bills to exploit the break. As a result, the few remaining players whose considerable tax bills place them in the market for tax breaks are able to demand returns of up to 30 percent for investing in renewable energy projects -- an investment known as ''tax equity.''¶ There are **better options**. They may sound wonky, but they **could prove revolutionary**.¶ Real estate investment trusts, or REITs, which are traded publicly like stocks, could tap far broader pools of capital to vastly lower the cost of financing renewable energy. REITs have a market capitalization of over $440 billion while paying shareholders average dividends below 10 percent -- roughly a third of the cost of tax equity investments for renewable energy.¶ Master limited partnerships carry the fund-raising advantages of a corporation: **ownership interests are publicly traded and offer investors the liquidity, limited liability and dividends of classic corporations.** Their market capitalization exceeds $350 billion. With average dividends of just 6 percent, these investment vehicles could substantially reduce the cost of financing renewables.¶ But **current law makes using both of these investment vehicles for renewable energy difficult if not impossible. Washington could help** in two ways. First**,** the Internal Revenue Service needs to clarify the eligibility of renewable power generation for REIT financing. Second, Congress needs to fix a bizarre distinction in the tax code that bars master limited partnerships from investing in **''inexhaustible'' natural** resources like the sun and wind, **while allowing investments in exhaustible resources like coal and natural gas**. In 2008, as surging gasoline prices were infuriating American voters, Congress amended the tax code to enable master limited partnerships to invest in alternative transportation fuels like ethanol. We should treat power sources, like wind and solar farms, **similarly**.¶ There is hope. Senator Chris Coons, Democrat of Delaware, plans to introduce a bill to allow master limited partnership investment in renewable energy. This approach is preferable to a recent proposal by Senator Bernard Sanders, independent of Vermont, and Representative Keith Ellison, Democrat of Minnesota, to eliminate this investment option **for fossil-fuel projects**. Both moves **would level the playing field between conventional and renewable energy**, but the Coons bill does so by **promoting**, rather than limiting, **economic growth across the energy industry**.¶ **These approaches could help renewable energy projects** reduce their financing costs up to fivefold. **These cost improvements could significantly reduce the price of renewable electricity and, over time, erase the need for costlier subsidies**. Of course, **making renewable energy eligible for master limited partnership** and REIT financing **would amount to a new kind of subsidy**, **because both are exempt from income tax**. Indeed, some **members of Congress fear that expanding master limited partnerships will erode the federal tax base. We don't think so. Investors in master limited partnerships** and REITs **still pay taxes on dividends**. Moreover, **these investments would most likely bring many more renewable energy projects online, actually raising overall tax revenue**.

**And the federal government is key, changing MLP structure creates a stable regulatory environment**

**Freed and Stevens 11**

(Josh and Mae, Freed is the Vice President of the Third Way Clean Energy Program and served for more than a decade as a political strategist for national, federal and local campaigns and was a senior staffer on Capitol Hill, Stevens is a Policy Advisor for the Third Way Clean Energy Program, Third Way, “A Small Tax Change, Big Clean Energy Results,” December 2011, <http://content.thirdway.org/publications/475/Third_Way_Idea_Brief_-_A_Small_Tax_Change_Big_Clean_Energy_Results.pdf//wyo-mm>)

Moreover, the economic downturn that began in 2008 has made it difficult for companies to find tax equity. First, the tax equity market itself has been decimated. The banks and financial institutions that typically provided these funds are themselves in financial straits and no longer need or seek tax equity. **A report by the U.S. Partnership for Renewable Energy Finance estimated that, while the tax equity market is beginning to rebound, it is still barely half the size it was in 2007**. 12 Second, the **lack of consistent federal government policy is making it** almost **impossible for investors to anticipate what the tax and regulatory environment for tax equity funded projects will be**. Understandably, **they are reluctant to commit funds that will be illiquid for a long period.** **As a result, developers must look to commercial banks and other commercial lenders** for “commercial debt.” **Commercial lenders don’t require an equity stake in a project and generally seek lower returns** on their funds, but they are willing to take these lower returns because these projects are much less risky. Typically, debt providers want all the permitting, equity raises, construction plans, intellectual property resolutions, and other legal issues completed and pledged as collateral before they will make their loan. **This is, understandably, difficult for innovative energy companies to provide**.

#### Wind can solve intermittency, and emissions no need for back up power

MTC, 04

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

The need for back-up generation Wind power plants have been installed in the United States for long enough that detailed studies have been completed on the impacts and costs of its intermittency. A recent study concluded that, “...the results to date also lay to rest one of the major concerns often expressed about wind power: that a wind plant would need to be backed up with and equal amount of dispatchable generation. It is now clear that, even at moderate wind penetrations, the need for additional generation to compensate for wind variations is substantially less than one-for-one and is often closer to zero.” - Utility Wind Interest Group (UWIG) “Wind Power Impacts on Electric-Power-System Operating Costs, Summary and Perspective on Work Done to Date, November 2003”

**1AC – Warming Advantage**

**American clean energy markets are on the verge of collapse- a perfect storm of expiring financial incentives and declining export opportunities will gut renewables absent fast policy action**

**Jenkins et al 12**

[Jesse, Director of Energy and Climate Policy, Breakthrough Institute, Mark Muro, Senior Fellow, Metropolitan Policy Program, Brookings Institution, Ted Nordhaus and Michael Shellenberger, Cofounders, Breakthrough Institute, Letha Tawney, Senior Associate, World Resources Institute, Alex Trembath, Policy Associate, Breakthrough Institute, Beyond Boom and Bust: Putting Clean Tech on a Path to Subsidy Independence, April 2012, p. online//wyo-tjc]

**In the absence of significant and timely energy policy reform, the recent boom in US clean tech sectors could falter**. **Driven by** private innovation and entrepreneurship as well as **critical public sector support in the form of tax credits, grants, and loan guarantees, several clean energy technology (or “clean tech”) segments have grown robustly in recent years while making progress on cost and performance**. Renewable electricity generation doubled from 2006 to 2011, construction is under way on the nation's first new nuclear power plants in decades, and American manufacturers have regained market share in advanced batteries and vehicles. Prices for solar, wind, and other clean energy technologies fell, while employment in clean tech sectors expanded by almost 12 percent from 2007 to 2010, adding more than 70,000 jobs even during the height of the recession.1 **Despite this recent success**, however, **nearly all clean tech segments in the United States remain reliant on production and deployment subsidies** or other supportive policies to gain an expanding foothold in today’s energy markets. **Now, many of these subsidies and policies are poised to expire—with substantial implications for the clean tech industry**. This report aims to take stock of the coming changes to federal clean tech subsidies and programs (Part 1); examine their likely impact on key clean tech market segments (Part 2); and chart a course of policy reform that can advance the US clean tech industry beyond today’s policy-induced cycle of boom and bust (Part 3). Along the way, this report provides a comprehensive analysis of the spending trajectory of 92 distinct federal policies and programs supporting clean tech sectors over the 2009 to 2014 period. As this analysis illustrates, **an era of heightened clean energy spending supported by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009** (ARRA) **is now coming to an end, coinciding with the expiration of several additional time-delimited tax credits and programs. As a result, key portions of the clean tech industry can now anticipate substantially reduced federal support** (see Figure ES1). **At the same time, market subsidies are being cut in several European markets,2 reducing export oppor tunities for US clean tech manufacturers and leading to oversupply and declining margins**,3 even as pressure mounts from both low-cost natural gas at home4 and foreign clean tech manufacturers abroad.5 **US clean tech sectors therefore face a combination of new challenges, despite the growth and progress achieved in recent years**. The specific market impacts will vary by sector (see Part 2). But **without timely and targeted policy reform, several sectors are likely to experience more bankruptcies, consolidations, and market contraction ahead**.

**Warming is real; human caused and rapid: there are four key signals carbon dioxide increase, melting of polar ice caps, melting glaciers, and rapid sea level rise**

**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)

Converging Lines of **Evidence How do we know that global warming is real and primarily human caused? There are numerous lines of evidence that converge toward this conclusion.** **1. Carbon Dioxide Increase.** **Carbon dioxide in our atmosphere has increased at an un-precedented rate in the past 200 years. Not one data set collected over a long enough span of time shows otherwise**. Mann et al. (1999) compiled the past 900 years' worth of temperature data from tree rings, ice cores, corals, and direct measurements in the past few centuries, and the sudden increase of temperature of the past century stands out like a sore thumb. This famous graph is now known as the "hockey stick" because it is long and straight through most of its length, then bends sharply upward at the end like the blade of a hockey stick. Other graphs show that climate was very stable within a narrow range of variation through the past 1000, 2000, or even 10,000 years since the end of the last Ice Age. There were minor warming events during the Climatic Optimum about 7000 years ago, the Medieval Warm Period, and the slight cooling of the Little Ice Age in the 1700s and 1800s. But **the magnitude and rapidity of the warming represented by the last 200 years is simply unmatched in all of human history. More revealing, the timing of this warming coincides with the Industrial Revolution, when humans first began massive deforestation and released carbon dioxide into the atmosphere** by burning an unprecedented amount of coal, gas, and oil. **2. Melting Polar Ice Caps. The polar icecaps are thinning and breaking up at an alarming rate**. In 2000, my former graduate advisor Malcolm McKenna was one of the first humans to fly over the North Pole in summer time and see no ice, just open water. **The Arctic ice cap has been frozen solid for at least the past 3 million years** (and maybe longer), (4) **but now the entire ice sheet is breaking up so fast that by 2030 (and possibly sooner) less than half of the Arctic will be ice covered in the summer**. (5) As one can see from watching the news, t**his is an ecological disaster for everything that lives up there, from the polar bears to the seals and walruses to the animals they feed upon,** to the 4 million people whose world is melting beneath their feet. The Antarctic is thawing even faster. In February-March 2002, the Larsen B ice shelf--over 3000 square km (the size of Rhode Island) and 220 m (700 feet) thick--broke up in just a few months, a story typical of nearly all the ice shelves in Antarctica. **The Larsen B shelf had survived all the previous ice ages and interglacial warming episodes** over the past 3 million years, and even the warmest periods of the last l0,000 years--**yet it and nearly all the other thick ice sheets on the Arctic, Greenland, and Antarctic are vanishing at a rate never before seen in geologic history. 3. Melting Glaciers**. **Glaciers are all retreating at the highest rates ever documented. Many of those glaciers, along with snow melt, especially in the Himalayas, Andes, Alps, and Sierras,** provide most of the freshwater that the populations below the mountains depend upon--yet this fresh water supply is vanishing. Just think about the percentage of world's population in southern Asia (especially India) that depend on Himalayan snowmelt for their flesh water. The implications are staggering. The permafrost that once remained solidly frozen even in the summer has now thawed, damaging the Inuit villages on the Arctic coast and threatening all our pipelines to the North Slope of Alaska. **This is catastrophic not only for life on the permafrost, but as it thaws, the permafrost releases huge amounts of greenhouse gases which are one of the major contributors to global warming. Not only is the ice vanishing**, **but we have seen record heat waves** over and over again, killing thousands of people, as each year joins the list of the hottest years on record. (2010 just topped that list as the hottest year, surpassing the previous record in 2009, and we shall know about 2011 soon enough). Natural animal and plant populations are being devastated all over the globe as their environments change. (6) Many animals respond by moving their ranges to formerly cold climates, so now places that once did not have to worry about disease-bearing mosquitoes are infested as the climate warms and allows them to breed further north.. **4. Sea Level Rise. All that melted ice eventually ends up in the ocean, causing sea levels to rise, as it has many times in the geologic past** **At present, the sea level is rising about 3-4 mm per year, more than ten times the rate** of 0.1-0.2 mm/year **that has occurred over the past 3000 years. Geological data show that the sea level was virtually unchanged over the past 10,000 years since the present interglacial began.** A few mm here or there doesn't impress people, until you consider that the rate is accelerating and that most scientists predict sea levels will rise 80-130 cm in just the next century. A sea level rise of 1.3 m (almost 4 feet) would drown many of the world's low-elevation cities, such as Venice and New Orleans, and low-lying countries such as the Netherlands or Bangladesh. A number of tiny island nations such as Vanuatu and the Maldives, which barely poke out above the ocean now, are already vanishing beneath the waves. Eventually their entire population will have to move someplace else. (7) Even a small sea level rise might not drown all these areas, but they are much more vulnerable to the large waves of a storm surge (as happened with Hurricane Katrina), which could do much more damage than sea level rise alone. If sea level rose by 6 m (20 feet), most of the world's coastal plains and low-lying areas (such as the Louisiana bayous, Florida, and most of the world's river deltas) would be drowned.

#### Wind power solves warming, shifts away from fossil fuels

[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

Energy produced by wind turbines does not produce pollutants like other sources of energy (i.e. coal, gas, and petroleum based fuel). Wind energy may help to reduce the air pollutions by replacing the current sources of conventional energy. As a result, emissions especially carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxide and sulfur dioxide can be reduced. It has been found in the literatures that the emission of these gases is responsible for acid rain and global warming which causes greenhouse gas effect, rise in sea-level, and fluctuating weather conditions. Wind energy is an infinite type of energy that can be harvested either in the mainland or on the ocean. It was estimated that a 2.5 kW system can save 1–2 tonnes of CO2 and a 6 kW system can save 2.5–5 tonnes CO2[[18]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669%22%20%5Cl%20%22bib0090). In a suitable site, wind turbines represent a relatively low-cost method of micro-renewable electricity generation. They can bring increased security for electricity supply to non-grid connected locations and give some protection against electricity price rises. Renewable Obligations Certificates (ROCs) can be received by generating electricity. These can then be sold to electricity generators to allow them to meet their targets to derive a specified proportion of the electricity they supply to their customers from renewable energy sources [[19]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669#bib0095). A consumer can benefit from onsite generation of power by qualifying for exemption from the Climate Change Levy. One can also be paid for any surplus of electricity to supply to the grid. According to the fourth assessment report released by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the warming of the earth over the past half century has been caused by human activities. The main culprits are the greenhouse gases emitted by burning of fossil fuels, in particular carbon dioxide (CO2). Windpower can provide energy while reducing the emission of CO2. According to the World Energy Commission, use of one million kWh of windpower can save 600 tonnes of CO2 emission. Therefore, massive use of windpower will help mitigate climate change. The use of windpower can also avoid regional environmental problems brought about by burning coal [[20]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032111000669#bib0100).

**Studies prove emissions are a primary cause of global warming**

**IPCC, 2007**

[Compiled by a working group of scientists studying climate change, Lenny Bernstein, Peter Bosch, Osvaldo Canziani, Zhenlin Chen, Renate Christ, Ogunlade Davidson, William Hare, Saleemul¶ Huq, David Karoly, Vladimir Kattsov, Zbigniew Kundzewicz, Jian Liu, Ulrike Lohmann, Martin Manning, Taroh Matsuno,¶ Bettina Menne, Bert Metz, Monirul Mirza, Neville Nicholls, Leonard Nurse, Rajendra Pachauri, Jean Palutikof, Martin¶ Parry, Dahe Qin, Nijavalli Ravindranath, Andy Reisinger, Jiawen Ren, Keywan Riahi, Cynthia Rosenzweig, Matilde¶ Rusticucci, Stephen Schneider, Youba Sokona, Susan Solomon, Peter Stott, Ronald Stouffer, Taishi Sugiyama, Rob Swart,¶ Dennis Tirpak, Coleen Vogel, Gary Yohe, “Climate change 2007: Synthesis report.” Online, http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/syr/ar4\_syr\_spm.pdf] /Wyo-MB

Changes in atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse¶ gases (GHGs) and aerosols, land cover and solar radiation alter the energy balance of the climate system. {2.2}¶ **Global GHG emissions due to human activities have¶ grown** since pre-industrial times, with an increase of¶ 70% between 1970 and 2004 (Figure SPM.3).¶ 5¶ {2.1}¶ Carbon dioxide (**CO2**¶ ) **is the most important anthropogenic**¶ **GHG**. Its annual emissions grew by about 80% between 1970¶ and 2004. The long-term trend of declining CO2¶ emissions¶ per unit of energy supplied reversed after 2000. {2.1}¶ **Global atmospheric concentrations of CO2**¶ , **methane**¶ (CH4¶ ) **and nitrous oxide** (N2¶ O) **have increased markedly¶ as a result of human activities** **since 1750 and now far¶ exceed pre-industrial values determined from ice cores¶ spanning many thousands of year**s. {2.2}¶ Atmospheric concentrations of CO2¶ (379ppm) and CH4¶ (1774ppb) in 2005 exceed by far the natural range over the¶ last 650,000 years. **Global increases in CO2¶ concentrations¶ are due primarily to fossil fuel use**, with land-use change providing another significant but smaller contribution. It is very¶ likely that the observed **increase in CH4**¶ concentration **is predominantly** **due to** agriculture and **fossil fuel use**. CH4¶ growth¶ rates have declined since the early 1990s, consistent with total emissions (sum of anthropogenic and natural sources) being nearly constant during this period. The increase in N2¶ O¶ concentration is primarily due to agriculture. {2.2}¶ **There is very high confidence that the net effect of human¶ activities** since 1750 **has been one of warming**.¶ 6¶ {2.2}

no studies have attempted to empirically measure the environmental contribution of wind power resulting from these production offsets.

**Studies show warming is human caused and will cause extinction**

**Ahmed 2010**

(Nafeez Ahmed, Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Research and Development, professor of International Relations and globalization at Brunel University and the University of Sussex, Spring/Summer 2010, “Globalizing Insecurity: The Convergence of Interdependent Ecological, Energy, and Economic Crises,” Spotlight on Security, Volume 5, Issue 2, online)

Perhaps **the most notorious indicator is anthropogenic global warming**. **The landmark** 2007 Fourth **Assessment** Report of the UN Intergovernmental Panel **on Climate Change** (IPCC) – which **warned that at then-current rates of increase of fossil fuel emissions, the earth’s global average temperature would likely rise by 6°C by the end of the 21st century** **creating a** largely **uninhabitable planet** – was a wake-up call to the international community.[v] **Despite the pretensions of ‘climate sceptics,’ the peer-reviewed scientific literature has continued to produce evidence that the IPCC’s original scenarios were wrong – not because they were too alarmist**, but on the contrary, **because they were far too conservative**. According to a paper in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, **current CO2 emissions are worse than all six scenarios contemplated by the IPCC. This implies that the IPCC’s worst-case six-degree scenario severely underestimates the most probable climate trajectory** under current rates of emissions.[vi] It is often presumed that a 2°C rise in global average temperatures under an atmospheric concentration of greenhouse gasses at 400 parts per million (ppm) constitutes a safe upper limit – **beyond which further global warming could trigger rapid and abrupt climate changes that, in turn, could tip the whole earth climate system into a process of irreversible, runaway warming.[**vii] Unfortunately, we are already well past this limit, with the level of greenhouse gasses as of mid-2005 constituting 445 ppm.[viii] Worse still, cutting-edge scientific data suggests that the safe upper limit is in fact far lower**. James Hansen**, director of the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, **argues that the absolute upper limit for CO2 emissions is 350 ppm: “If the present overshoot of this target CO2 is not brief, there is a possibility of seeding irreversible catastrophic effects.**”[ix] A wealth of **scientific studies** has **attempted to explor**e the role of **positive-feedback mechanisms between different climate sub-systems**, the operation of which could intensify the warming process. **Emissions beyond 350 ppm over decades are likely to lead to the total** loss of Arctic sea-ice in the summer **triggering magnified absorption** of sun radiation, **accelerating warming**; the melting of Arctic permafrost triggering **massive methane injections** into the atmosphere, accelerating warming; the loss of half the Amazon rainforest triggering the momentous release of billions of tonnes of stored carbon, accelerating warming; and **increased microbial activity in the earth’s soi**l leading to further huge releases of stored carbon, accelerating warming; to name just a few. **Each of these feedback sub-systems alone is sufficient by itself to lead to** irreversible, catastrophic effects **that could tip the whole earth climate system over the edge**.[x] Recent studies now estimate that the **continuation of business-as-usual would lead to global warming of three to four degrees Celsius before 2060 with multiple irreversible, catastrophic impacts; and six, even as high as eight, degrees by the end of the century – a situation endangering the survival of all life on earth.[**xi]

**Try or die- the environment is at the tipping point- Collapse will be fast and catastrophic**

**AFP, 12**

(Agence France-Presse, citing UN study, “Environmental collapse now a serious threat: scientists,” Raw Story, http://www.rawstory.com/rs/2012/06/06/environmental-collapse-now-a-serious-threat-scientists/)

**The paper by 22 top researchers said a “tipping point” by which** the biosphere goes into swift and irreversible change, **with** potentially **cataclysmic impacts for humans, could occur as early as this century.**¶ The warning contrasts with a mainstream view among scientists that environmental collapse would be gradual and take centuries.¶ **The study appears ahead of the June 20-22 UN Conference on Sustainable Development,** the 20-year followup to the Earth Summit that set down priorities for protecting the environment.¶ The Nature paper, written by biologists, ecologists, geologists and palaeontologists from three continents, compared the biological impact of past episodes of global change with what is happening today.¶ **The factors in today’s equation include a world population that is set to rise from seven billion to around 9.3 billion by mid-century and global warming that will outstrip the UN target of two degrees Celsius** (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit).¶ **The team determined that once** 50-90 percent of small-scale ecosystems become altered**, the entire eco-web tips over into a new state, characterised especially by species extinction**s.¶ **Once the shift happens, it cannot be reversed.**¶ To support today’s population, about 43 percent of Earth’s ice-free land surface is being used for farming or habitation, according to the study.

**U.S. leadership is key to solve for global ghg’s and warming, lead to massive amount of modeling, and decrease use of oil**

**NREL, 08**

is a national laboratory of the U. S. Department of Energy, “Strengthening U.S. Leadership of International Clean Energy Cooperation “,<http://www.nrel.gov/international/pdfs/44261.pdf>, accessed 9-2-12,WYO/JF

Greenhouse Gas Impacts **The primary environmental benefit of the U.S.-led global clean energy market transformation will be reduced greenhouse gas emissions of 50-80% by 2050, which scientists think will prevent catastrophic climate change impacts—a large benefit to the U.S. and the global community**. **Clean energy tech**nologies **will provide more than half of the reductions needed to achieve that goal** (Figure 3) Other Environmental Benefits Significant local air quality and other environmental benefits will accompany the reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. **Reduced air emissions translate to improved health, lower health care costs, improved visibility, and reduced impacts on natural ecosystems**. **Increased use of clean energy also will reduce impacts from fossil fuel extraction and processing.** Increased access to clean energy in the poorest regions of the world will reduce the use of firewood, enabling cleaner indoor air quality and contributing to local sustainable development. Energy Security Benefits In addition to the decreased oil prices mentioned above, international clean energy market transformation will reduce global vulnerability to supply and price shocks, and could also decrease tensions over petroleum resources in key supply regions and U.S. costs of military intervention to help address conflicts that arise. **Reductions in U.S. demand for oil, which will be enabled by accelerated cost reductions for biofuels and transportation efficiency technologies through international cooperation, also will decrease U.S. vulnerability**. Impacts on Development **The clean energy market transformation will accelerate global economic growth and stability by enhancing access to clean energy in rural and urban areas worldwide**. More than 1 billion people around the world do not have modern energy services. **Providing access to clean energy will provide the power necessary for micro-enterprises, health clinics, schools, water supply, enhanced agricultural production, and similar services. U.S. leadership in this area will enhance diplomatic influence and help achieve U.S. and global sustainable development objectives, including universal access to modern energy services around the world by 2020, which is consistent with the Millennium Development Goals.**

#### Now is key to curbing climate change – wind power sends an international signal

Global Wind Energy Council ’12

(“Wind Energy Must be Key Climate Change Solution,” <http://www.gwec.net/index.php?id=136>, accessed 9/30/12,WYO/JF

Climate change is now generally accepted to be the greatest environmental threat facing the world, and keeping our planet’s temperature at sustainable levels has become one of the major concerns of policy makers. The UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change projects that average temperatures around the world will increase by up to 5.8°C over the coming century. This is predicted to result in a wide range of climate shifts, including melting ice caps, flooding of low-lying land, storms, droughts and violent changes in weather patterns. One of the main messages from the Nobel Prize winning IPCC’s 4th Assessment Report released in 2007 was that in order to avoid the worst ravages of climate change, global greenhouse gas emissions must peak and begin to decline before 2020. While the power sector is far from being the only culprit when it comes to climate change, it is the largest single source of emissions, accounting for about 40% of CO2 emissions, and about 25% of overall emissions. The options for making major emissions reductions in the power sector between now and 2020 are basically three: energy efficiency and conservation; fuel switching from coal to gas; and renewable energy, primarily wind power. Wind power does not emit any climate change inducing carbon dioxide nor other air pollutants which are polluting the major cities of the world and costing billions in additional health costs and infrastructure damage. Within three to six months of operation, a wind turbine has offset all emissions caused by its construction, to run virtually carbon free for the remainder of its 20 year life. Further, in an increasingly carbon-constrained world, wind power is risk-free insurance against the long term downside of carbon intense investments. Given the crucial timeframe up to 2020 during which global emission must start to decline, the speed of deployment of wind farms is of key importance in combating climate change. Building a conventional power plant can take 10 or 12 years or more, and until it is completed, no power is being generated. Wind power deployment is measured in months, and a half completed wind farm is just a smaller power plant, starting to generate power and income as soon as the first turbines are connected to the grid. The global wind industry has set itself a target of saving 1.5 billion tons of CO2 per year by 2020, which would amount to a total of 10 billion tons saved in this period. See Global Wind 2008 Outlook for GWEC's scenarios of wind energy development up to 2050. While developments in 2008 show that the sector is well on track to meeting this target, a strong global signal from governments is needed to show that they are serious about moving away from fossil fuels and protecting the climate. As positive outcome to the climate negotiations throughout this year, resulting in a new global agreement in Copenhagen in December, is of fundamental importance and will send the kind of signal that the industry, investors and the finance sector need for wind power to reach its full potential.

#### Climate change creates cold and hot wars that are unique to every other conflict in history

Mumuney 09

(Qudus Mumuney, Phd Nigerian Insititute Of Advanced Legal Studies University Of Lagos Campus, Lagos, Nigeria; and Director, Environmental Law Research Institute. “CLIMATE CHANGE: A ROOT OF ARMED CONFLICT” Social Science Research Network. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1488775//wyoccd)

Climate change is an all encompassing threat to human health, to global food supply, and to peace and security. However, the risks of climate change to social systems are as much about the characteristics of those systems as it is about changes in environmental systems. The extent to which global warming constitutes a threat to human security is determined by the affected society’s level of vulnerability. Owing to the accumulation of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, current trends in climate change will not appreciably alter over the next half century even if drastic action is taken now. Changes in climate will produce unique types and modes of conflict, redefine the value of important resources and create new challenges to maintaining social order and stability. The issue of climate change and armed conflict is characterized by two paradoxes that have passed by largely unnoticed by the public debate. First, the many processes associated with global warming, which have truly started to appear only over the last fifteen years, have occurred during a time when we have witnessed a dramatic reduction in the frequency and severity of armed conflict. While we should not conclude about current and future links based on this simplistic comparison, the opposing trends nonetheless deserve some consideration. Second, the empirical foundation for a general relationship between resource scarcity and armed conflict is indicative at best, and numerous questions regarding the proposed causal association remain to be answered. Increase scarcity and variability of renewable resources, sea-level rise, and intensification of natural disaster are natural consequences of climate change. These consequences could produce two types of conflict: Cold Wars and Hot Wars. Cold wars will occur as warming draws countries into possible conflict due to expanding interests in exploiting new resources and territories (inter- state conflict). Hot wars will break out as warming expands and intensifies dry areas, increasing interests in exploiting new resources (intra- state conflict).

**MLPs solve renewables and greenhouse gas emissions and stable energy generation**

**Congressional Documents and Publications, 6-7-12**

[US senate documents news release, “Senators Coons, Moran introduce bill to spark investment in renewable energy projects: Sen. Christopher A. Coons (D-DE) News Release.” Accessed online via proquest] /Wyo-MB

Josh Freed, vice president for clean energy, Third Way: "There are **2.3 trillion** reasons the United States should grow our domestic clean energy market. That's **the potential size of the global clean energy market. We can win a huge share of it if our national energy policies put clean and fossil technologies on a level playing field and we get more private investment into the clean energy market.** That's why Third Way proposed **expanding Master Limited Partnerships**, which help finance oil and natural gas development, **to include wind, solar, and other clean energy projects**. This **is a commonsense idea that will give mature clean technologies access to the cheap, private capital they need to get built**. We're thrilled Senator Chris Coons, an honorary co-chair of Third Way, and Senator Jerry Moran are taking the lead to build a bipartisan consensus on this issue that will help clean energy, the economy, and the country."¶ Rhone Resch, president and CEO, Solar Energy Industries Association: "This bill is an excellent step toward **leveling the playing field between renewable and incumbent energy sources by providing the solar industry with private capital in the same manner enjoyed by the oil and gas industry.** The solar industry employs 100,000 Americans, costs for consumers are dropping nationwide and solar deployment grew by 109% last year. Senator Coons' MLP proposal would build on this success, and SEIA applauds him for putting forward an idea that has the potential to attract additional private sector investment in solar projects. We look forward to working with Senator Coons and other stakeholders to **use smart policy to add market liquidity for renewable energy projects and to efficiently utilize tax incentives**." Bob Cleaves, president, Biomass Power Association: "The Biomass Power Association lauds Senator Coons for taking the lead on this very important issue. His legislation, which harmonizes the Internal Revenue Code **to make Master Limited Partnership arrangements available to renewable electricity developers, simplifies the tax laws and moves away from picking energy winners and losers**. **By obtaining easier access to capital, renewable energy facility developers will be able to replace fossil fuels, reduce greenhouse gases, and secure the electrical grid with stable, baseload power."**

**1AC Economy Adv**

**Economic collapse is inevitable, double-dip’s coming now due to unemployment and lack of spending- the US is key**

**Islam 8/8**

Frank, International Business Times, "Double Dip Recession Looms Large", 2012, [www.ibtimes.co.in/articles/371450/20120808/double-dip-recession-economy-america-frank-islam.htm](http://www.ibtimes.co.in/articles/371450/20120808/double-dip-recession-economy-america-frank-islam.htm), accessed 9/22/12,WYO/JF

**A less-than-stellar recovery of the U.S. economy, the inability of the euro zone to dig out of a deep financial hole and a slowdown in emerging economies point to the need for different policy approaches to avoid another global recessio**n. For the world to get out of the current financial trouble, the United States first needs to switch gears. **The weakness of the U.S. economy is dragging down other economies because of its sheer size**. **With a gross domestic product of $15 trillion and per capita** [**GDP**](http://www.ibtimes.co.in/topics/detail/379/gdp/) **of more than $48,000, the U.S. is by far the largest economy**. But more than three years after the Great Recession officially ended, the American economy continues to give mixed signals. **While the job numbers announced Friday** certainly **were better than expected** - U.S. **employers added 163,000 jobs in July** - a slight uptick in the unemployment rate to 8.3 percent, coupled with the slower growth rate in the second quarter clearly show that the task ahead is not easy. Several factors are holding the United States back from making a full recovery, including a high unemployment rate, a dip in consumer spending, a dearth of business spending, and a dysfunctional U.S. Congress. Troubles in the euro zone and a slowdown in Asia are also a big factor. In the aftermath of the recession, Washington had spent about $800 billion to bail out troubled giants to restore investors' confidence. According to Bloomberg News, the United States has "spent, lent or committed $12.8 trillion" to battle the recession. The corporate bigwigs that were bailed out included American International Group, [Citigroup](http://www.ibtimes.co.in/topics/detail/261/citigroup/)and major carmakers such as [General Motors](http://www.ibtimes.co.in/topics/detail/239/general-motors/) and [Chrysler](http://www.ibtimes.co.in/topics/detail/359/chrysler/). **In the absence of bailout packages, the entire financial system would have collapsed**. But **despite all that**, **the U.S. recovery has been anemic largely because of an unemployment rate that has stayed above 8 percent since President** [**Barack Obama**](http://www.ibtimes.co.in/topics/detail/229/barack-obama/) **took office**. That's significantly higher than rate of around 5 percent that existed inDecember 2007 before the recession struck. **The scenario at the global level is no different**. According to the International Labor Organization, global jobless claims at the beginning of this year totaled 200 million. Only four countries have a bigger population than that - [China](http://www.ibtimes.co.in/topics/detail/227/china/), India, the United States and Indonesia. The ILO also says that about 80 percent of the worldwide population remains without social protection and 900 million people are struggling to stay above the poverty level by earning more than $2 a day. Another 400 million new jobs will be required in the next decade to absorb new talents. **The high jobless rate has had a depressing effect on consumers**, as amply shown in Nielsen's survey of global consumer confidence in second quarter. While consumer confidence slid three points to 91 from the first quarter, the survey also showed that the top concern for people is job security. Discretionary spending also slipped, as more than two-thirds of spent less and saved more. One bright spot: Consumer confidence is higher than it was in 2009, during the darkest days of the recession. Back then the level had reached a rock bottom of 77 points. With the euro zone in doldrums and the region unlikely to recover until at least 2013 due to the expanding debt crisis, the global economy needs a big boost from its third pillar, the emerging economies. But [China](http://www.ibtimes.co.in/topics/detail/227/china/), India, Brazil and other economies are also slowing down. The problems in Europe and the emerging markets alone are enough to tip the global economy into a double dip recession. **But there is another big factor that heightens the risk - the United States is expected to cut spending beginning next year** as part of an agreement between Democrats and Republicans to raise the U.S. debt limit in the future. **Policymakers around the world are working to prevent a double dip recession** by announcing various stimulus measures to spur growth. For instance, the European Central Bank has issued assurances that it will lower the borrowing costs of member countries. While such stimuli will be helpful in the short-term, what policymakers must do is focus on the long-term, structural problems that have led to the high unemployment rate. But one step that they must take urgently is to spur greater household spending. Keeping interest rates at record lows have not proven enough. Stronger actions are needed to restore consumers' confidence in the job market, but policymakers must first shed their political differences and work together to make the global economy more vibrant. **Otherwise, the global economy will be in jeopardy**.

**MLPs only way to solve for renewables and the economy**

**DiMugno 12**

(Laura, editor, writer and journalist work has spanned areas including energy, the environment, travel, and technology, North American Wind Power, “UPDATED: New Legislation Could Unlock Billions Of Dollars In Wind Energy Investment,” June 7, 2012, <http://www.nawindpower.com/e107_plugins/content/content.php?content.9961//wyo-mm>)

**Opening up an investment vehicle long used in fossil-fuel markets to renewable energy resources could unlock billions of dollars in wind energy investment, according to a new report released by the Maguire Energy Institute at Southern Methodist University**. According to the study, **federal tax-code restrictions currently limit investment in renewable energy infrastructure by $5** billion **to $6 billion while**, at the same time, **prohibiting thousands of jobs from being created**. If the federal production tax credit for wind energy is not renewed beyond the end of this year, up to $15 billion in private investment could disappear. **Absent support for renewables at the federal level, the market will have to find other ways to keep the industry afloat** and the capital flowing. **One way to secure that investment could be through master limited partnerships** (MLPs), in which regular investors are allowed to purchase shares in publicly traded partnerships just like stock shares. MLPs have been a key investment tool in the oil and gas industries since the 1980s, but they are not currently available to renewables such as wind power. **MLPs have been** quite **successful in the energy sector**, and as a result, their use has increased dramatically over the past couple of decades. According to the report, in 1996, there were just 12 MLPs, with a market capitalization of about $8 billion. By 2011, those numbers had grown to 75 MLPs representing over $270 billion in market capitalization. Eighty percent of MLPs are in the energy sector, according to the report, but renewables are currently excluded. **The study’s authors used financial modeling to expand the MLP structure to include renewable energy, and the results were astounding: Opening up MLPs to renewables could lead to an additional $3.2 billion to $5.6 billion in investment between now and 2021,** they said, noting that the specific number would depend on economic and market conditions. According to the report, **MLPs are a strong fit for renewable energy investments because power purchase agreements for wind and solar projects are generally long-term contracts that offer cashflow stability**.

**Thats key to economic growth**

**Economic Report to the President, 2011**

[White house staff, “Chapter 1: From Crisis recovery and growth.” Online, http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/2011\_erp\_chapter1.pdf] /Wyo-MB

**Energy plays a critical role in the economy**, and Chapter 6 outlines key ¶ steps the Administration is taking to transition the Nation toward **cleaner ¶ sources of energy** that **have the potential to support new industries, exports,** ¶ **and high-quality jobs**; to improve air quality and reduce the dangers of ¶ climate change; **and to enhance America’s energy security and international ¶ competitiveness**. ¶ As an initial step, the Recovery Act directed over $90 billion in **public** ¶ **investment** and tax incentives **to** increasing **renewable energy sources** **such ¶ as wind** and solar power, weatherizing homes, and boosting R&D for new 26 | Chapter 1¶ technologies. Looking forward, the President has proposed a Federal Clean ¶ Energy Standard to double the share of electricity produced by clean sources ¶ to 80 percent by 2035, a substantial commitment to cleaner transportation ¶ infrastructure, and has increased investments in energy efficiency and clean ¶ energy R&D.¶ These programs are interconnected in important ways. They **are** all ¶ **motivated by the fact that the national benefits from clean energy go beyond** ¶ **its immediate producers or consumers. The programs focus on different** ¶ **parts of the clean energy supply chain—innovation, manufacturing, generation, and use—and thus complement one another.** And in the end, the ¶ Administration’s clean energy programs are linked by the goal that in ¶ coming years Americans will breathe cleaner air, enjoy better health, face ¶ reduced risks from climate change, and work and do business in an economy ¶ based on a safer and more secure energy supply.

#### Wind Power spills over to other parts of the economy, produces massive amounts of jobs

Warburg, 12

Philip Warburg Environmental Lawyer and president of the Conservation Law Foundation 2012 Harvest the Wind: America’s Journey to Jobs, Energy Independence, and Climate Stability Beacon Press, Boston Pg95, accessed 9/30/12,WYO/JF

Under the 20% Wind Energy by 2030 scenario, manufacturing jobs directly related to producing wind turbine components and subcomponents would top 30,000 by 2021, peaking at 32,835 in 2028. While factory work would somewhat slacken thereafter, ongoing expansion in generating capacity – both onshore and offshore – and the need to repower aging wind plants would guarantee a continued high level of employment in the manufacturing sector. In construction, jobs would average over 70,000 a year from 2019 through 2030. And in wind farm operations, total jobs would reach 76,667 by 2030 – about 28,000 on-site O&M and another 48,000 in utility services and subcontractors. Adding them all up, DOE foresees about 180,000 jobs directly linked to wind energy as the 2030 target date approaches. ¶ Beyond all the “direct” jobs in the wind energy economy, DOE also explores the “indirect” employment benefits of growing this sector. These jobs include the producers and suppliers of steel, fiberglass, and other materials that are used to build wind turbines; the companies that produce the parts that go into turbine components and subcomponents; and the providers of banking, accounting, legal and others services to wind turbine manufacturers and wind farm contractors. These indirect jobs are expected to number about 100,000 annually in the years leading up to the 2030 target date.¶ Finally, DOE draws an even wider circle around the “induced” jobs resulting from consumer spending by people directly and indirectly employed in the wind energy sector. A Clipper factory worker buys a new pair of jeans in a local store; an O&M technician takes his family out to dinner; a crane operator stays at a local motel. The DOE team attributes another 200,000 jobs per year to these induced economic activities. ¶ Folding induced jobs in the assessment of wind energy benefits may go farther down the speculative road than some are ready to travel. But even setting that outer circle of employment impacts aside, we are looking at a roster that rises to more than a quarter-million direct and indirect jobs if we pursue DOE’s 20% by 2030 goal. A technology commitment that advances America’s energy independence and reduces our nation’s carbon footprint while creating hundreds of thousands of new, skill-based jobs – isn’t this a path worth taking?

**Manufacturing is key to the US economy**

**Ettlinger and Gordon, 2011**

[Michael Ettlinger is the Vice President for Economic Policy and Kate Gordon is the Vice President for Energy Policy at the Center for American Progress, “The Importance and Promise of American Manufacturing.” 4-7-2011, Online, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/labor/report/2011/04/07/9427/the-importance-and-promise-of-american-manufacturing/] /Wyo-MB

**Manufacturing is critically important to the American economy**. For generations, **the strength of our country rested on the power of our factory floors**—both the machines and the men and women who worked them. **We need manufacturing to continue to be a bedrock of strength for generations to come**. **Manufacturing is woven into the structure of our economy**: Its importance goes far beyond what happens behind the factory gates. **The strength or weakness of American manufacturing carries implications for the entire economy, our national security, and the well-being of all Americans.**

**Manufacturing Jobs are key to US technological leadership and economic competitiveness**

**Ettlinger and Gordon, 2011**

[Michael Ettlinger is the Vice President for Economic Policy and Kate Gordon is the Vice President for Energy Policy at the Center for American Progress, “The Importance and Promise of American Manufacturing.” 4-7-2011, Online, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/labor/report/2011/04/07/9427/the-importance-and-promise-of-american-manufacturing/] /Wyo-MB

First, **jobs in the manufacturing sector are good middle-class jobs for millions of Americans**. **Those jobs serve an important role**, offering economic opportunity to hard-working, middle-skill workers. **This creates upward mobility and broadens and strengthens the middle class to the benefit of the entire economy**.¶ What’s more, U**.S.-based manufacturing underpins a broad range of jobs** that are quite different from the usual image of manufacturing. These are **higher-skill service jobs that include the accountants, bankers, and lawyers** that are **associated** **with** any **industry**, as well as a broad range of other jobs including **basic research and technology development, product and process engineering and design, operations and maintenance, transportation, testing, and lab work**.¶ **Many of these jobs are critical to American technology and innovation leadership.** The problem today is this: Many multinational corporations may for a period keep these higher-skill jobs here at home while they move basic manufacturing elsewhere in response to other countries’ subsidies, the search for cheaper labor costs, and the desire for more direct access to overseas markets, but eventually many of these service jobs will follow. **When the basic manufacturing leaves, the feedback loop from the manufacturing floor to the rest of a manufacturing operation—a critical element in the innovative process—is eventually broken. To maintain that feedback loop, companies need to move higher-skill jobs to where they do their manufacturing.¶ And with those jobs goes American leadership in technology and innovation. This is why having a critical mass of both manufacturing and associated service jobs in the United States matters**. **The “industrial commons**” that comes from the crossfertilization and engagement of a community of experts in industry, academia, and government **is vital to our nation’s economic competitiveness**.

#### 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.

**Growth solves global wars—multiple reasons**

**Royal, 10**

Jedediah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense 2010, Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises, in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, 2010. p. 213-215

**Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline** may **increase the likelihood of external conflict**. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent stales. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level. Pollins (20081 advances Modclski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that **rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next.** As such, **exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power** (see also Gilpin. 19SJ) **that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation** (Fcaron. 1995). Alternatively, **even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power** (Werner. 1999). Separately. Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level. Copeland's (1996. 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states arc likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, **if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources.** Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, **others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level**. Mom berg and **Hes**s (2002) **find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn**. They write. **The linkage, between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing**. **Economic conflict lends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour.** Moreover, **the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other** (Hlomhen? & Hess. 2(102. p. X9> **Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism** (Blombcrg. Hess. & Wee ra pan a, 2004). **which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions**. Furthermore, **crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. "Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect.** Wang (1996), DcRoucn (1995), and Blombcrg. Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force arc at least indirecti) correlated. Gelpi (1997). Miller (1999). and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that Ihe tendency towards diversionary tactics arc greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked lo an increase in the use of force. In summary, rcccni **economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict** al systemic, dyadic and national levels.' This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

**MLPs solve job creation, and investment, which bolsters the economy**

**Congressional Documents and Publications, 6-7-12**

[US senate documents news release, “Senators Coons, Moran introduce bill to spark investment in renewable energy projects: Sen. Christopher A. Coons (D-DE) News Release.” Accessed online via proquest] /Wyo-MB

Doug Sims, Natural Resources Defense Council: "NRDC strongly endorses **the MLP** Parity Act. The tax code **currently enables** **the** well-established **fossil fuel industry** to have this financing advantage **while denying its use for** the newer, **cleaner forms of energy** that Americans want and need to encourage. That makes no sense. **Master Limited Partnerships should be one of the tools available to develop clean, renewable energy. MLPs provide a low risk way for Main Street to invest in renewable energy. This will create jobs and new investment opportunities** while reducing pollution. Sen. Coons is right to propose this forward-looking and fair-minded step to ensure that the today's clean, domestic energy sources have the same opportunities to succeed as the fossil fuel sources of the past."¶ Denise Bode, CEO, American Wind Energy Association: "We commend Senator Coons for his leadership in promoting the eligibility of master limited partnerships (MLPs) to include renewable energy projects. America's wind energy sector is a success story that has proven its strength by recruiting $15.5 billion in annual investment in America's energy infrastructure in recent years despite short-lived policy certainty. **MLPs work well for conventional energy infrastructure and will work best to spur more renewable energy investment and job creation if structured properly to match renewable tax incentives.** We look forward to working with Senator Coons to enable wind power developers to efficiently utilize MLP structures."¶ Judith Albert, executive director, Environmental Entrepreneurs: "The members of Environmental Entrepreneurs are supportive of Sen. Coons' MLP Parity Act. This bill would allow renewable energy companies access to a financing structure - M**aster** L**imited** P**artnerships** - that has long been available to the fossil fuel industry. Access to this structure **will expand the sources of private capital that renewable energy companies can tap and reduce the cost of financing new, job-creating projects**. If passed, **this important measure would be a significant step toward continued development of clean, renewable energy."**