## Case

### 2ac – Potsdam inst

#### 4 degree warming is inevitable with current carbon usage trends – emissions must be reduced

Potsdam Institute, 2012 (Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research and Climate Analytics, “Turn Down the Heat: Why a 4°C Warmer World Must be Avoided”, A report for the World Bank, November, http://climatechange.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/Turn\_Down\_the\_heat\_Why\_a\_4\_degree\_centrigrade\_warmer\_world\_must\_be\_avoided.pdf)

The emission pledges made at the climate conventions in Copenhagen and Cancun, if fully met, place the world on a trajectory for a global mean warming of well over 3°C. Even if these pledges are fully implemented there is still about a 20 percent chance of exceeding 4°C in 2100.10 If these pledges are not met then there is a much higher likelihood—more than 40 percent—of warming exceeding 4°C by 2100, and a 10 percent possibility of this occurring already by the 2070s, assuming emissions follow the medium business-as-usual reference pathway. On a higher fossil fuel intensive business-as-usual pathway, such as the IPCC SRESA1FI, warming exceeds 4°C earlier in the 21st century. It is important to note, however, that such a level of warming can still be avoided. There are technically and economically feasible emission pathways that could still limit warming to 2°C or below in the 21st century. To illustrate a possible pathway to warming of 4°C or more, Figure 22 uses the highest SRES scenario, SRESA1FI, and compares it to other, lower scenarios. SRESA1FI is a fossil-fuel intensive, high economic growth scenario that would very likely cause mean the global temperature to exceed a 4°C increase above preindustrial temperatures. Most striking in Figure 22 is the large gap between the projections by 2100 of current emissions reduction pledges and the (lower) emissions scenarios needed to limit warming to 1.5–2°C above pre-industrial levels. This large range in the climate change implications of the emission scenarios by 2100 is important in its own right, but it also sets the stage for an even wider divergence in the changes that would follow over the subsequent centuries, given the long response times of the climate system, including the carbon cycle and climate system components that contribute to sea-level rise. The scenarios presented in Figure 22 indicate the likely onset time for warming of 4°C or more. It can be seen that most of the scenarios remain fairly close together for the next few decades of the 21st century. By the 2050s, however, there are substantial differences among the changes in temperature projected for the different scenarios. In the highest scenario shown here (SRES A1FI), the median estimate (50 percent chance) of warming reaches 4°C by the 2080s, with a smaller probability of 10 percent of exceeding this level by the 2060s. Others have reached similar conclusions (Betts et al. 2011). Thus, even if the policy pledges from climate convention in Copenhagen and Cancun are fully implemented, there is still a chance of exceeding 4°C in 2100. If the pledges are not met and present carbon intensity trends continue, then the higher emissions scenarios shown in Figure 22 become more likely, raising the probability of reaching 4°C global mean warming by the last quarter of this century. Figure 23 shows a probabilistic picture of the regional patterns of change in temperature and precipitation for the lowest and highest RCP scenarios for the AR4 generation of AOGCMS. Patterns are broadly consistent between high and low scenarios. The high latitudes tend to warm substantially more than the global mean. RCP8.5, the highest of the new IPCC AR5 RCP scenarios, can be used to explore the regional implications of a 4°C or warmer world. For this report, results for RCP8.5 (Moss et al. 2010) from the new IPCC AR5 CMIP5 (Coupled Model Intercomparison Project; Taylor, Stouffer, & Meehl 2012) climate projections have been analyzed. Figure 24 shows the full range of increase of global mean temperature over the 21st century, relative to the 1980–2000 period from 24 models driven by the RCP8.5 scenario, with those eight models highlighted that produce a mean warming of 4–5°C above preindustrial temperatures averaged over the period 2080–2100. In terms of regional changes, the models agree that the most pronounced warming (between 4°C and 10°C) is likely to occur over land. During the boreal winter, a strong “arctic amplification” effect is projected, resulting in temperature anomalies of over 10°C in the Arctic region. The subtropical region consisting of the Mediterranean, northern Africa and the Middle East and the contiguous United States is likely to see a monthly summer temperature rise of more than 6°C.

### 2ac - moore

#### There are hundreds of causes of conflict – hegemony deters and controls escalation by internalizing costs

Moore 4 – Dir. Center for Security Law and Professor of Law @ University of Virginia, Editor of the American Journal of International Law

(John Norton, “Solving the War Puzzle: Beyond the Democratic Peace,” pg. 41-43)

If major interstate war is predominantly a product of a synergy between a potential nondemocratic aggressor and an absence of effective deterrence, what is the role of the many traditional "causes" of war? Past, and many contemporary, theories of war have focused on the role of specific disputes between nations, ethnic and religious differences, arms races, poverty or social injustice, competition for resources, incidents and accidents, greed, fear, and perceptions of "honor," or many other such factors. Such factors may well play a role in motivating aggression or in serving as a means for generating fear and manipulating public opinion. The reality, however, is that while some of these may have more potential to contribute to war than others, there may well be an infinite set of motivating factors, or human wants, motivating aggression. It is not independent the  existence of such motivating factors for war but rather the circumstances permitting or encouraging high risk decisions leading to war that is the key to more effectively controlling war. And the same may also be true of democide. The early focus in the Rwanda slaughter on "ethnic conflict," as though Hutus and Tutsis had begun to slaughter each other through spontaneous combustion, distracted our attention from the reality that a nondemocratic Hutu regime had carefully planned and orchestrated a genocide against Rwandan Tutsis as well as its Hutu opponents.I1 Certainly if we were able to press a button and end poverty, racism, religious intolerance, injustice, and endless disputes, we would want to do so. Indeed, democratic governments must remain committed to policies that will produce a better world by all measures of human progress. The broader achievement of democracy and the rule of law will itself assist in this progress. No one, however, has yet been able to demonstrate the kind of robust correlation with any of these "traditional" causes of war as is reflected in the "democratic peace." Further, given the difficulties in overcoming many of these social problems, an approach to war exclusively dependent on their solution may be to doom us to war for generations to come. A useful framework in thinking about the war puzzle is provided in the Kenneth Waltz classic Man, the State, and War,12 first published in 1954 for the Institute of War and Peace Studies, in which he notes that previous thinkers about the causes of war have tended to assign responsibility at one of the three levels of individual psychology, the nature of the state, or the nature of the international system. This tripartite level of analysis has subsequently been widely copied in the study of international relations. We might summarize my analysis in this classical construct by suggesting that the most critical variables are the second and third levels, or "images," of analysis. Government structures, at the second level, seem to play a central role in levels of aggressiveness in high risk behavior leading to major war. In this, the "democratic peace" is an essential insight. The third level of analysis, the international system, or totality of external incentives influencing the decision for war, is also critical when government structures do not restrain such high risk behavior on their own. Indeed, nondemocratic systems may not only fail to constrain inappropriate aggressive behavior, they may even massively enable it by placing the resources of the state at the disposal of a ruthless regime elite. It is not that the first level of analysis, the individual, is unimportant. I have already argued that it is important in elite perceptions about the permissibility and feasibility of force and resultant necessary levels of deterrence. It is, instead, that the second level of analysis, government structures, may be a powerful proxy for settings bringing to power those who may be disposed to aggressive military adventures and in creating incentive structures predisposing to high risk behavior. We should keep before us, however, the possibility, indeed probability, that a war/peace model focused on democracy and deterrence might be further usefully refined by adding psychological profiles of particular leaders, and systematically applying other findings of cognitive psychology, as we assess the likelihood of aggression and levels of necessary deterrence in context. A post-Gulf War edition of Gordon Craig and Alexander George's classic, Force and Statecraft,13 presents an important discussion of the inability of the pre-war coercive diplomacy effort to get Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait without war.14 This discussion, by two of the recognized masters of deterrence theory, reminds us of the many important psychological and other factors operating at the individual level of analysis that may well have been crucial in that failure to get Hussein to withdraw without war. We should also remember that nondemocracies can have differences between leaders as to the necessity or usefulness of force and, as Marcus Aurelius should remind us, not all absolute leaders are Caligulas or Neros. Further, the history of ancient Egypt reminds us that not all Pharaohs were disposed to make war on their neighbors. Despite the importance of individual leaders, however, we should also keep before us that major international war is predominantly and critically an interaction, or synergy, of certain characteristics at levels two and three, specifically an absence of democracy and an absence of effective deterrence. Yet another way to conceptualize the importance of democracy and deterrence in war avoidance is to note that each in its own way internalizes the costs to decision elites of engaging in high risk aggressive behavior. Democracy internalizes these costs in a variety of ways including displeasure of the electorate at having war imposed upon it by its own government. And deterrence either prevents achievement of the objective altogether or imposes punishing costs making the gamble not worth the risk.I5 VI Testing the Hypothesis Theory without truth is but costly entertainment. HYPOTHESES, OR PARADIGMS, are useful if they reflect the real world better than previously held paradigms. In the complex world of foreign affairs and the war puzzle, perfection is unlikely. No general construct will fit all cases even in the restricted category of "major interstate war"; there are simply too many variables. We should insist, however, on testing against the real world and on results that suggest enhanced usefulness over other constructs. In testing the hypothesis, we can test it for consistency with major wars; that is, in looking, for example, at the principal interstate wars in the twentieth century, did they present both a nondemocratic aggressor and an absence of effective deterrence?' And although it is by itself not going to prove causation, we might also want to test the hypothesis against settings of potential wars that did not occur. That is, in nonwar settings, was there an absence of at least one element of the synergy? We might also ask questions about the effect of changes on the international system in either element of the synergy; that is, what, in general, happens when a totalitarian state makes a transition to stable democracy or vice versa? And what, in general, happens when levels of deterrence are dramatically increased or decreased?

## T

### 2ac

#### W/M – development includes osw – our aff is inclusive and predictable

Vertical News 2012 JUL 6 (VerticalNews) -- By a News Reporter-Staff News Editor at Ecology, Environment & Conservation DOE/Pacific northwest national laboratory; turning down the dial: Ocean energy development with less sound. (2012). Ecology, Environment & Conservation, , 327. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/docview/1022310876?accountid=14667

**The rise of ocean infrastructure development to tap energy sources such as tides, offshore wind and natural gas will require more pile driving, the practice of pounding long, hollow steel pipes called piles into the ocean floor to support energy turbines and other structures. But pile driving creates loud, underwater booms that can harm fish and other marine animals.** Many scientists and regulators have assumed that limiting the combined amount of sound created during the course of a pile driving project can minimize harm to animals. But new research published in PLoS ONE indicates that if an individual blow to a pile rises above a particular sound level, fish can be irreparably harmed. The finding has led scientists to recommend the first-ever sound threshold for pile driving that is based on actual fish responses instead of estimates. It's hoped that regulators will use the threshold to help evaluate pile driving project applications. **"Our results can help regulators permit ocean development while also protecting marine life," said bioacoustician Michele Halvorsen, who led the research for** Battelle, which manages the Department of Energy's Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. "This is the first research that used controlled laboratory tests to reliably measure the affects of pile driving on fish."

#### C/I: Development includes management and regulation of resources

**Borgese, 94 -** Elisabeth Mann Borgese is Professor of Political Science at Dalhousie University. She is the Founder of the International Ocean Institute and acts as Chairperson of the IOI Planning Council.Elisabeth Mann Borgese is Professor of Political Science at Dalhousie University. She is the Founder of the International Ocean Institute and acts as Chairperson of the IOI Planning Council. Ocean Governance: Sustainable Development of the Seas, http://www.nzdl.org/gsdlmod?e=d-00000-00---off-0envl--00-0----0-10-0---0---0direct-10---4-------0-1l--11-en-50---20-about---00-0-1-00-0-0-11-1-0utfZz-8-00&cl=CL3.33&d=HASH015e0d6a44dfd69a2ad9fcdc.1&gt=2

The word "development," in its international setting too readily associated with "economic development," refers here to the use or exploitation of a natural resource. The word "sustainable," which conveys the idea of holding up or support, in this context means development that is conservative, and is conducive to continued viability of a resource. The term "sustainable development" which appeared in the World Conservation Strategy published in 1980 by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and was adopted by the World Commission on Environment and Development, is used to describe management (i.e. regulation of use and exploitation, and conservation) of a given resource in such a manner that the benefits of the resource are optimized, that is, made available on an equitable basis to the largest number over the longest term. It requires the sparing and economical use of non-renewable resources, and maintenance of the productivity of renewable resources, as well as avoidance of or compensation for, irreversible effects caused to the resource through use or exploitation that does not meet these standards. Such equitable allocation of benefits from a resource necessarily implies regulation of access to the resource, whether that resource is a stock of fish, a deposit of minerals, or the air or water; and whether the resource is fixed, or mobile and fluctuating across national boundaries, or beyond national jurisdiction in areas sometimes referred to as "global commons." The Report of the World Commission declares that ... physical sustainability cannot be secured unless development policies pay attention to such considerations as changes in access to resources and in the distribution of costs and benefits. Even the narrow notion or physical sustainability implies a concern for social equity between generations, a concern that must logically be extended to equity within each generation. (emphasis added)1 Thus, according to the Report, "sustainable development" requires, inter alia, (1) "that [the] poor get their fair share of the resources required to sustain [economic] growth"; and (2) "that those who are more affluent adopt lifestyles within the planet's ecological means.... Painful choices have to be made...." The Report is right to conclude, therefore, that "sustainable development" implies nothing less than the "progressive transformation of economy and society"; and to emphasize that "in the final analysis, sustainable development must rest on political will."2

#### Wind and waves are resources

Energy Department 1/22/2013—the mission of the Energy Department is to ensure America’s security and prosperity by addressing its energy, environmental and nuclear challenges through transformative science and technology solutions. “Ocean Energy Projects Developing On and Off America's Shores”

**Marine and hydrokinetic (MHK) technologies -- which generate power from waves, tides or currents in ocean waters -- are at an early but promising stage of development**. Many coastal areas in the United States have strong wave and tidal resources close to areas with high-energy demand. With widespread deployment, these technologies could make substantial contributions to our nation’s electricity needs. To advance the development of these promising technologies**, the Energy Department funds research and development of MHK technologies, including laboratory and field-testing of individual components up to demonstration and deployment of complete, utility-scale systems.**

### 1ar

#### **Development is also LNG, wind, renewables**

Massachusetts Govt, 13

[Massachusetts Governmnent, 5/22/13, “REVIEW OF THE

MASSACHUSETTS OCEAN MANAGEMENT PLAN”, <http://www.mass.gov/eea/docs/eea/oceans/draft-ma-ocean-plan-review-5-22-13.pdf>, page 5, accessed 7/19/14, GNL]

In the decade leading up to the enactment of the Massachusetts Oceans Act, in addition to project applications for dredging and dredged material disposal, desalination facilities, and electric and telecommunication cables, and the re-licensing of existing power and wastewater treatment plants, Massachusetts was also increasingly facing new proposals for major ocean-based development such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) pipelines and terminals, renewable wind and wave energy projects, and plans for the extraction of sand and gravel resources to be used for beach nourishment and shoreline stabilization.

## Midterms

### 2ac

#### GOP holds the edge in midterm elections but the election is still a toss up – 2 biggest election models proves

Cillizza 8/27/14 (Chris, Political Reporter for the Washington Post, “All of the election models are starting to converge. And they are all pointing to a Republican Senate.”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2014/08/27/all-of-the-election-models-are-starting-to-converge-and-they-are-all-pointing-to-a-republican-senate/>, accessed 8/28/14, BCG)

Over the past few days, two of three big election models -- the Post's and the New York Times' -- have updated their predictions about the likelihood of Republicans taking the Senate majority in 69 days. And, the predictions are remarkably similar.¶ First, the Post's Election Lab, run by George Washington University professor John Sides, gives Republicans a 58 percent chance of winning the six seats they need to be in the majority come 2015. Writes Sides: "The Republicans are very likely to control at least 48 seats after the elections, including Georgia. With just three seats out of the [six] discussed above, they would take control of the Senate. That’s why we still see them as having a better than 50:50 chance to do it."¶ Leo, the New York Times' Senate model, shows Republicans with a 67 percent chance of taking the majority. Writes the Upshot's Josh Katz:

#### We control momentum—it’s *sweeping* for the GOP

Murphy 7/7/14 (Bill Murphy | July 07, 2014, staff writer, Momentum: Politico Predicts A Republican Senate Majorityhttp://www.nrsc.org/blog/politico-predicts-a-republican-senate-majority)-AG

The forecast is sunny for the GOP. Yesterday, Politico predicted a Republican Senate Majority: With four months until Election Day, Republicans are as close to winning the Senate as they’ve been since losing it in 2006. That is quite the opposite from what the pundits were predicting a year ago. Outside of the states Romney carried in 2012, Republican chances were basically written off. Now Republican momentum is sweeping into Colorado where Cory Gardner is giving Mark Udall fits in Colorado. In Michigan, Terri Lynn Land's has polled ahead of Democrat Gary Peters in several polls. And even in blue states like Minnesota, Mike McFadden is making Democrats sweat. It's because of the Republicans impressive candidates: They’ve landed top recruits to take on first-term senators in New Hampshire and Colorado, nominated credible female candidates in open-seat contests in Michigan and Iowa, protected all of their incumbents from tea party challenges and thwarted more conservative candidates that could have hurt the GOP’s chances in states like North Carolina and Georgia. Obamacare's terrible approval numbers -- which all of the Democrats voted for -- has only added to the GOP's prospects in November. It's almost as if President Obama has given up on keeping the Senate. His unilateral regulations on CO2 cause the most harm in states most likely to flip. Republicans are taking advantage of the president's failures by expanding the electoral map. Montana, South Dakota, West Virginia, Louisiana, and Arkansas have long looked like wins for the GOP, but a new crop of states is coming into play. Democrats are on defense. Republicans have an opportunity to score big in the fall.

#### They conceded it’s a *turnout* election, not a swing-voters election—the GOP has an overwhelming turnout edge—outweighs snapshot Democratic optimism

Tomasky, 14—MA in PoliSci @ NYU, lifelong journalist/author, special Newsweek correspondent

Michael, “Here’s What Happens When the GOP Takes Over the Senate,” 4-30, The Daily Beast, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/04/30/here-s-what-happens-when-the-gop-takes-over-the-senate.html> --BR

Democrats have been feeling a wee bit better lately about this November. The Affordable Care Act is looking stronger. Southern incumbents like Mark Pryor and Mary Landrieu have seen some friendlier poll numbers. But the fact remains that the GOP has a decent to good shot at taking the Senate this fall. A brand new Washington Post/ABC poll splashed a little cold water across Democratic faces. It finds Obama’s approval at an all-time low in Post polls. More ominously, Republican respondents said they were planning on voting in far greater numbers than did Democrats. So this is a reality Democrats and liberals, like it or not, have to think about.

#### Environmental policies are a wedge issue that drives up Democratic turnout among diverse voters that would otherwise stay home

Myers 5/22 – Freelance Journalist

(Drew, “REPORTERS NOTEBOOK: GOLIATH V GOLIATH MATCH-UP AS ‘GREEN’ BILLIONAIRE TAKES ON THE KOCH BROTHERS”, <http://dmnewsi.com/2014/05/22/reporters-notebook-goliath-v-goliath-match-up-as-green-billionaire-takes-on-the-koch-brothers/>, HW)

GOP candidates in the NextGen cross hairs — Scott in Florida, Terri Lynn Land in Michigan, Scott Brown in New Hampshire and Cory Gardner in Colorado — hew closely to the “Republican troglodyte brand,” Lehane argued. “They are anti-immigrant, anti-women, anti-science,” he said. “It’s a tough brand to win elections around.” The group said that climate can be successfully used as a wedge issue — Lehane framed it as a moral clash between “right and wrong” — to boost turnout among Democratic voting groups that tend not to show up in midterm election years, specifically young voters, Hispanics and African-Americans. As in the Virginia governor’s race last year — when Steyer spent nearly $8 million on a campaign to disqualify GOP nominee Ken Cuccinelli with a combination of TV, mail and field operations — the efforts will extend beyond the TV airwaves and include what they call “nano-targeting” to tailor messaging to discrete voting groups. “We are not some super PAC that’s going to come in, throw up some ads and leave,” Lehane said. “You can come into these states and really run a total campaign.”

#### Thumpers and link defense don’t take out our link—multiple polls prove environmental policy is the key determining factor in minority turnout

Abdullah 10 – Reporter for New America Media

(Khalil, “Latinos, African Americans Willing to Pay More to Slow Climate Change”, <http://newamericamedia.org/2010/04/latinos-african-americans-willing-to-pay-more-to-slow-climate-change.php>, HW)

Latino and African-American communities in the United States increasingly share similar views on the negative impact of climate change and call for government support for a green economy, according to two recently released polls. Polls say these results may be factors determining which candidates get these ethnic votes in the mid-term November elections. Among Nevada’s Latinos, for example, 93 percent of Republicans said, “take action now” on climate change, a higher rate even than the state’s Latino independents (89 percent) and Democrats (88 percent). In Florida, 80 percent of Latino voters said the issue of climate change would affect their decision of who to vote for in the U.S. Senate race. In Nevada and Colorado, 67 and 58 percent, respectively, made the same assertion. The Latino poll was conducted by the National Latino Coalition on Climate Change (NLCCC) on the views of Latino voters in Colorado, Florida, and Nevada; the poll on African-American voters in Arkansas, Indiana, Missouri, and South Carolina was conducted by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies. While jobs and the economy are still leading concerns among the two ethnic groups, when asked what came closest to their view about whether “efforts to reduce global warming by switching to clean energy … will create new American jobs, “ 64 percent of Colorado’s Latino voters, 66 percent of Florida’s, and 72 percent of Nevada’s agreed. David Bositis, the Joint Center’s veteran pollster on African-American voting patterns, said that while the economy is still the top issue for black voters, climate change is in importance. Bositis said the African Americans surveyed - in Arkansas, Indiana, Missouri, and South Carolina -- tend to be more conservative and less financially well off than their counterparts in more affluent states. As a result, Bositis said the most important finding was the stated willingness to pay higher electric utility bills if electricity generators had to charge more for cleaner but more expensive fuels or technologies that would ameliorate global warming. Those with higher incomes were willing to pay more, yet the data were remarkably strong even among low-income African Americans surveyed. “Solid majorities in all four states - between 55 percent in South Carolina and 64 percent in Indiana - are willing to pay an additional ten dollars a month to fight global warming,” he said. The survey of Latinos also showed their willingness to pay more. Latinos also showed a heightened awareness linking droughts and extreme weather events with climate change. Frank Stewart, a member of the Joint Center’s Commission to Engage African Americans on Climate Change and president of the American Association of Blacks in Energy, an organization representing 1,800 senior executives in the energy business, said the debate among African American and Latino constituencies about whether climate change is real is all but over. “We’re no longer looking at the science,” Stewart said. At issue, he argued, is for communities to become more knowledgeable about climate change in order to make informed decisions about the transformations that will be necessary in the energy field. The economic cost of facing climate change is not the sole rationale for demanding immediate action. “There is a very, very clear link between our climate and our health,” said Dr. George Benjamin, executive director, American Public Health Commission and also a member of the Joint Center’s Commission. He said the effects of climate change can have disproportionate adverse health consequences for African Americans and Latinos who have higher rates of asthma and other medical conditions. Benjamin also cited the link between income status and health, mentioning a 1995 Chicago heat wave that left 600 people dead. Many of the dead were low-income African-American elderly, some of whom did not turn on their air conditioning for fear of being unable to pay a higher bill. Today, Benjamin said 22 percent of Latinos live below the poverty level. Four percent don’t have health insurance, making them and other low-income Americans less able to financially deal with the effects of toxic ecologies that can lead to “tragedy happening in our urban settings.” While financial reform proposals have ascended to the media limelight since the passage of healthcare reform legislation, the on-going Congressional debate over the best mechanisms -- like cap and trade -- to lower carbon emissions, may yet affect November’s races. Rafael Fantauzzi, vice-chair of NLCC and president of the National Puerto Rican Coalition, Inc., said pollsters of the Latino voters already knew that immigration was critically important to that community in determining support for November’s political candidates, so views on that topic were not sought. However, he said the intersection of today’s leading issues can play out at the ballot box. For instance, he said that 48.5 percent of Puerto Ricans are living below the poverty line and, due to the lack of jobs on the island, many are migrating to Florida, New York, Connecticut, or Illinois. Because they are American citizens, they can vote in those states, an impact he said was already seen in the 2008 election when Puerto Rican voters in and around Orlando tipped Florida for President Barack Obama. “Latinos are involved in every issue that affects them,” Fantauzzi said, and, on climate change, “they definitely want to see something done.”

#### Critical demographics put environmental issues as a top concern – the link only goes one way because they trust the Dems more to deal with it

Zogby 12 – Political analyst for Forbes

(John, “After Sandy, Poll Shows GOP Faces Growing Environmental Divide with Voters”, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/johnzogby/2012/11/14/after-sandy-poll-shows-gop-faces-growing-environmental-divide-with-voters/>, HW)

Superstorm Sandy is fueling concerns about climate change and how it’s inflating the costs and risks of extreme weather, according to a new post-election poll from Zogby Analytics. The poll shows key voting groups in the 2012 election – Hispanics, women, young voters – are among those most concerned with confronting climate change now and protecting America’s air, water, wildlife and other natural resources. These results show the dramatic impact 2012′s extreme weather has had across party lines, with half of Republicans, 73 percent of independents and 82 percent of Democrats saying they’re worried about the growing cost and risks of extreme weather disasters fueled by climate change. It’s a major change from our December 2009 poll, which showed two-thirds of Republicans and nearly half of political independents saying they were ‘not at all concerned’ about global climate change and global warming. The political climate has shifted and members of Congress need to catch up with their constituents. Among the poll’s findings: Two-thirds of voters (65 percent) say elected officials should take steps now to reduce the impact of climate change on future generations, while just 27 percent say we should wait for more evidence. A strong majority (57 percent) says climate change is adding to the severity of recent extreme weather such as Superstorm Sandy and the summer droughts. Concern is even deeper among key demographics, with 75 percent of Hispanics, 67 percent of African Americans, 65 percent of women, and 65 percent of voters 25-34 agreeing that climate change is fueling America’s extreme weather. Seven in ten voters (69 percent) are greatly or somewhat worried about the growing cost and risks of extreme weather disasters fueled by climate change. Six in ten (58 percent) of Tea Party sympathizers are greatly or somewhat worried, showing a connection between climate action and fiscal responsibility. Three times as many voters say the government is doing too little to protect America’s air, water, wildlife and other natural resources (44 percent) as say it’s doing too much (14 percent). Asked to pick the highest priority to help solve America’s energy challenges, twice as many voters select renewable energy like wind and solar power (38 percent) than any other choice. Independents favor wind and solar over fossil fuels by a 4-to-1 margin – 48 percent pick renewable energy while just 12 percent select the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline and only 11 percent prioritize more oil and gas drilling on America’s public lands. Two thirds of voters (67 percent) say they’re very or somewhat concerned that political donations by oil, gas and coal industries are influencing politicians in Washington to approve policies that benefit their corporations. The oil and gas industry alone made $59 million in political contributions in the 2012 election cycle and has spent another $104 million on lobbying so far in 2012, according to the Center for Responsive Politics. When asked which political party they trust more to protect America’s air, water, wildlife and other natural resources, twice as many voters choose Democrats (44 percent) than pick Republicans (24 percent). But independents are up for grabs, with 54 percent answering neither/not sure.

## Federalism da

### 2ac

#### The American Dream is fading and countries don’t want to model

**Moravcsik 05**

[Andrew Moravcsik, Professor of Politics at Princeton University. “Dream On, America.” Published January 2005]// GD

ECONOMIC PROSPERITY: The American Dream has always been chiefly economicâ€”a dynamic ideal of free enterprise, free markets and individual opportunity based on merit and mobility. Certainly the U.S. economy has been extraordinarily productive. Yes, American per capita income remains among the world's highest. Yet these days there's as much economic dynamism in the newly industrializing economies of Asia, Latin America and even eastern Europe. All are growing faster than the United States. At current trends, the Chinese economy will be bigger than America's by 2040. Whether those trends will continue is not so much the question. Better to ask whether the American way is so superior that everyone else should imitate it. And the answer to that, increasingly, is no. Much has made, for instance, of the differences between the dynamic American model and the purportedly sluggish and overregulated "European model." Ongoing efforts at European labor-market reform and fiscal cuts are ridiculed. Why can't these countries be more like Britain, businessmen ask, without the high tax burden, state regulation and restrictions on management that plague Continental economies? Sooner or later, the CW goes, Europeans will adopt the American model or perish. Yet this is a myth. For much of the postwar period Europe and Japan enjoyed higher growth rates than America. Airbus recently overtook Boeing in sales of commercial aircraft, and the EU recently surpassed America as China's top trading partner. This year's ranking of the world's most competitive economies by the World Economic Forum awarded five of the top 10 slots including No. 1 Finland to northern European social democracies. "Nordic social democracy remains robust," writes Anthony Giddens, former head of the London School of Economics and a "New Labour" theorist, in a recent issue of the New Statesman, "not because it has resisted reform, but because it embraced it." This is much of the secret of Britain's economic performance as well. Lorenzo Codogno, co-head of European economics at the Bank of America, believes the British, like Europeans elsewhere, "will try their own way to achieve a proper balance." Certainly they would never put up with the lack of social protections afforded in the American system. Europeans are aware that their systems provide better primary education, more job security and a more generous social net. They are willing to pay higher taxes and submit to regulation in order to bolster their quality of life. Americans work far longer hours than Europeans do, for instance. But they are not necessarily more productiveâ€”nor happier, buried as they are in household debt, without the time (or money) available to Europeans for vacation and international travel. George Monbiot, a British public intellectual, speaks for many when he says, "The American model has become an American nightmare rather than an American dream." Just look at booming bri-tain. Instead of cutting social welfare, Tony Blair's Labour government has expanded it. According to London's Centre for Policy Studies, public spending in Britain represented 43 percent of GDP in 2003, a figure closer to the Eurozone average than to the American share of 35 percent. It's still on the riseâ€”some 10 percent annually over the past three yearsâ€”at the same time that social welfare is being reformed to deliver services more efficiently. The inspiration, says Giddens, comes not from America, but from social-democratic Sweden, where universal child care, education and health care have been proved to increase social mobility, opportunity and, ultimately, economic productivity. In the United States, inequality once seemed tolerable because America was the land of equal opportunity. But this is no longer so. Two decades ago, a U.S. CEO earned 39 times the average worker; today he pulls in 1,000 times as much. Cross-national studies show that America has recently become a relatively difficult country for poorer people to get ahead. Monbiot summarizes the scientific data: "In Sweden, you are three times more likely to rise out of the economic class into which you were born than you are in the U.S." Other nations have begun to notice. Even in poorer, pro-American Hungary and Poland, polls show that only a slender minority (less than 25 percent) wants to import the American economic model. A big reason is its increasingly apparent deficiencies. "Americans have the best medical care in the world," Bush declared in his Inaugural Address. Yet the United States is the only developed democracy without a universal guarantee of health care, leaving about 45 million Americans uninsured. Nor do Americans receive higher-quality health care in exchange. Whether it is measured by questioning public-health experts, polling citizen satisfaction or survival rates, the health care offered by other countries increasingly ranks above America's. U.S. infant mortality rates are among the highest for developed democracies. The average Frenchman, like most Europeans, lives nearly four years longer than the average American. Small wonder that the World Health Organization rates the U.S. healthcare system only 37th best in the world, behind Colombia (22nd) and Saudi Arabia (26th), and on a par with Cuba. The list goes on: ugly racial tensions, sky-high incarceration rates, child-poverty rates higher than any Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development country except Mexico where Europe, these days, inspires more admiration than the United States. "Their solutions feel more natural to Mexicans because they offer real solutions to real, and seemingly intractable, problems," says Sergio Aguayo, a prominent democracy advocate in Mexico City, referring to European education, health care and social policies. And while undemocratic states like China may, ironically, be among the last places where the United States still presents an attractive political and social alternative to authoritarian government, new models are rising in prominence. Says Julie Zhu, a college student in Beijing: "When I was in high school I thought America was this dreamland, a fabled place." Anything she bought had to be American. Now that's changed, she says: "When people have money, they often choose European products." She might well have been talking about another key indicator. Not long ago, the United States was destination number one for foreign students seeking university educations. Today, growing numbers are going elsewhere to other parts of Asia, or Europe. You can almost feel the pendulum swinging.

### 1ar

#### Federalism sparks genocide

Mutunga 01 [Willy Mutunga is the Executive Director of the Kenya Human Rights Commission “Is Majimbo Federalism? Constitutional Debate in a Tribal Shark-Tank” May 20 2001 <http://www.hartford-hwp.com/archives/36/136.html>] JAKE LEE

Federalism promotes localism, ethnic and racial xenophobia and undermines the sense of nationhood. Unsurprising the United States and Nigeria are living survivors of debilitating separatist wars between their regions; India, despite its federal miracle still bleeds from secessionist movements. The introduction of ethnic-based 'quasi-regionalism' in post-Mengistu Ethiopia has fuelled the conflict over the proposed Oromia state by members of the Oromo ethnic population.¶ Majimboism in the early 1960s had let off the lid of secessionist movements, particularly by Kenyan Somalis in North Eastern Province and the clamour for an autonomous "Mwambao" on the Coast. There is no guarantee that this time around, majimboism will not trigger ethnic recidivism and separatist movements, especially in North Eastern, Coast and Eastern province where the Oromo population may lean towards the movement for an Oromia state.¶ Federalism's main weakness is that it is a very expensive system that duplicates services and office holders at the regional and federal levels. It lacks uniform policies on such issues of national concern as laws regulating marriages, divorce, abortions, liquor, voting rights and public education. Rather than ensuring economic equity, as many proponents of majimboism assume, it sets those regions, states or cantons with a weak market-base, capital, and resources down the spiral of economic decline. It subjects local governments to double subordination-by the central and regional governments-and the citizens to triple taxation. At a time when the country's economy is on its knees, the feasibility of a well-financed transition is highly doubtful.

#### Federalism is bad- causes natural disaster reliefe efforts to fail, disease and terrorism

Griffin 7 [Stephen Griffin is a Professor in Constitutional Law, Tulane School, “Stop Federalism Before It Kills Again: Reflections¶ on Hurricane Katrina” Spring 2007 <http://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1093&context=jcred>] JAKE LEE

And so it is still the case that when natural disasters strike,¶ the divided power of the federal structure presents a coordination¶ problem. The kind of coordination that had to occur to avoid the¶ Katrina disaster requires long-term planning before the event.¶ The American constitutional system makes taking¶ intergovernmental action difficult and complex. The process of¶ coordinating governments can take years. In many ways, the¶ government was just at the beginning of that process at the time¶ of Katrina,48 although we are now four years distant from the¶ terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 that set the latest round¶ of disaster coordination in motion.¶ Suppose, however, that we don't have the luxury of taking the¶ time to satisfy every official with a veto. This is the key point of¶ tension between what contemporary governance demands and¶ what the Constitution permits. The kind of limited change that¶ occurred in 1927 can take us only so far. What Hurricane¶ Katrina showed was that even after decades of experience with¶ natural disasters, the federal and state governments were still¶ uncoordinated and unprepared. The reasons they were¶ unprepared go to the heart of the constitutional order. III. FEDERAL LESSONS¶ Unless we learn some lessons, Katrina will happen again. It¶ may be a massive earthquake, an influenza pandemic, a terrorist¶ attack, or even another hurricane, but the same ill-coordinated¶ response will indeed happen again unless some attention is paid¶ to the constitutional and institutional lessons of Katrina. We¶ need to "stop federalism" before it kills again. That is, we need to¶ stop our customary thinking about what federalism requires in¶ order to prevent another horrific loss of life and property.

#### Federalism Crushes the war on terror—makes terrorism attack inevitable

Rubin 12 [Edward Rubin is Professor of Law at Penn, Jan, “Federalism Won’t Work,” July 2, 2013 <http://www.bostonreview.net/forum/right-fight/federalism-wont-work>] JAKE LEE

Richman is certainly correct to suggest that this approach is counterproductive, and that national-security agencies should develop more-cooperative relationships, particularly with local authorities. But his effort to link this proposal to the spirit of federalism is misplaced. The fragmentation of government encouraged by federalist rhetoric has led to inefficient duplication of facilities and a lack of coordination at the national level. The FBI was created as a partial solution to these problems, but without a truly national approach, they have persisted and will continue to do so.¶ Moreover, federalism does not establish or encourage the respect for local authorities that Richman urges. It grants legal rights to states and declares, as a subsidiary premise, that local governments, as creatures of states, possess no legal status of their own. A structure of this sort impedes the important relationship between the national government and local governments, subjecting these local governments to unnecessary state control. The problem is particularly serious for America’s large cities, whose economies, social services, and security are of national concern but which regularly find themselves constrained by rurally oriented state governments that are hostile to their interests. Faced with these impediments to a direct relationship with city governments, it is not surprising that the national government has tried to do things on its own. Federalism is not the solution to this problem but one of its principal causes. If we want better coordination of anti-terrorist activities between the national government and the cities, we need to abandon our outmoded federalist rhetoric and develop a coherent, coordinated approach to the relationship between national and local governments.

#### Terrorists don’t care about federalism

Ann Althouse, University of Wisconsin Law School Professor, 2004 (Brooklyn Law School, 69 Brooklyn L. Rev. 1231, Summer) p. 1273

Over the course of United States history, conditions have changed, causing people to look more and more to the national government for solutions to modern-day problems. It would seem that the war on terrorism can only increase the demand for the national government to extend its reach into more and more aspects of American life. One might well predict, then, that the war on terrorism will finish off the Rehnquist Court's federalism revival: Federalism neurotics n141 will need to snap out of their nostalgia and face the hard realities of a brutally changed world. What can survive of the Madisonian "double security . . . to the rights of the people"? How can the states play an important role in controlling abuse by the federal government when we are forced to look to the federal government to deal with such monumental threats?